AGENDA ITEM NO.: 15.1

TO: Council Meeting on 25 October 2016

DIRECTOR: Nathan Cunningham, Director Community and Planning

REPORT AUTHOR: Jo Cooper, Manager Library Services

SUBJECT: Community Hub, Library and Innovation Centre Project Update

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report provides an update of the work undertaken to progress the Community Hub, Library and Innovation Centre since Council determined to pursue detailed economic and social analysis of two sites for the new facility.

1.2 A Project Executive Group (PEG) has been established internally to guide the steps and give oversight to the project. This group will consider the business issues and make recommendations to Council on budgetary strategy, defining and realising benefits, whilst assisting in monitoring risks, quality and timeliness.

1.3 To assist the process of determining the site for the new facility, SGS Economics and Planning were engaged in August 2016 to analyse and provide a balanced approach to the true costs and benefits (and options) for the delivery of the Community Hub, Library and Innovation Centre across either site. Project Proposal and Plan from SGS Economics and Planning is provided as Attachments 1-16.

1.4 SGS Economics and Planning are undertaking an options assessment process to assist in determining the best financial option for Council (considering broader economic impact at each locality and social factors) and will provide an update with their draft findings at Council Workshop currently scheduled for 8 November 2016.

1.5 Staff are currently developing a “working brand” to assist in identification of the project which takes the acronym CLIC. It is considered this may also provide the basis for a marketing campaign, and this is also being considered by PEG.

1.6 Further work that is currently occurring includes preparation of a detailed scope of services for an Expression of Interest (EOI) for a Project Manager as well as a Draft Community Engagement Strategy for consideration by PEG which includes (amongst other things) the notion of a Community Reference Group.

1.7 Further information on these elements of the project will come over the next few reports and as the project is progressing towards a more active period of decision making, staff propose to provide updates (similar to this) to most Ordinary Meetings of Council.

2. RECOMMENDATION

(1) That Council receives and notes the Community Hub, Library and Innovation Centre (the CLIC) Project Update Report.
3. RELEVANCE TO CORE STRATEGIES / POLICY

3.1 Strategic Plan to 2020 Theme 1 – People “Know, empower, celebrate, educate and activate our community”

Strategy 1.3 Active living for every age, every stage

4. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

4.1 Elected Members have been engaged as representatives of the community at Council Workshops held on 10 February 2015, 10 March 2015, 10 November 2015 and 14 June 2016 as well as tours of Library facilities on 2 February 2016, 29 February 2016, 19 April 2016 and 14 June 2016. This engagement has been supplemented by a number of Council reports since with project commenced with the advice from Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) regarding the expiration of lease.

4.2 This engagement approach is consistent with City of Prospect ‘Community Engagement and Consultation Policy’ and the process covered both the ‘inform’ and ‘consult’ aspect of the engagement level in the IAP2 framework.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Elected Members adopted the ‘Library Services to the Future’ report and recommendations on 25 August 2015 which outlined the services of library and community facilities desirable for a population/catchment of our size. This was the first of a number of research analysis steps required to inform Elected Members throughout the ‘Community Hub, Library & Innovation Centre’ Project.

5.2 As a result of various discussion workshops through 2015, four (4) potential sites were adopted by Council on 15 December 2015 for further consideration as the site of the new facility. The shortlisted sites were: Prospect Oval Precinct, Depot/Tram Barn, Prospect Civic Centre and Northpark Shopping Centre.

5.3 Key staff and Elected Members undertook group tours to 14 library services between January and April 2016 throughout Greater Adelaide as well as some new facilities developed in and around Melbourne. The notes and observations of these tours were received in the recommendations outlined in a Council report, adopted on 24 May 2016.

5.4 Community consultation in relation to services and activities desired in the new facility was conducted from January to March 2016, with respondents providing feedback to refine the community aspirations. A report on the community consultation outcomes was received and adopted by Council on 24 May 2016.

5.5 Council Workshop on 14 June 2016 reviewed the list of initial draft locational criteria to create a final criteria list prioritised by Elected Members. This process was facilitated by Andrew Russell from Inizio Consulting with the outcome identifying the highest ranked sites based on agreed criteria and weighting. It concluded that the Prospect Civic Centre site and the Tram Barn/Depot site should be pursued for further detailed analysis over coming months (utilising funds allocated in the Draft 2016/17 Budget). It is noted that during that process an additional fifth site (Audley House) was considered and assessed.
5.6 SGS Economics and Planning have commenced research and analysis to address a range of issues in relation to the two preferred sites. These issues (which are to be discussed at a future workshop before being presented to the full Council) include the following:

- Opportunities for consolidating or otherwise streamlining Council operations, given that there are currently 3 sites in operation
- Achievability of commercial closure at the two candidate sites, acknowledging that Council has a fixed deadline for vacating Thomas Street Centre
- Site analysis including: physical capacity; engineering services; existing building attributes and scope of adaptation or reuse; environmental encumbrances and development approvals and Local Government Act compliance
- Indicative floor plates
- Commercial opportunities on the sites
- Broader economic impacts and benefits of such a facility at either site
- Property valuations
- Staff and operational impact
- Funding and financing arrangements formatted to support future preparation of a full Prudential report
- Social benefits and
- Risk analysis

5.7 The methodology employed by SGS Economics and Planning applies two sets of analysis. The first focuses on the financial consequences for Council and the other on the wider social, economic and environmental impacts of the alternative locations.

5.8 The financial appraisal considers the two sites purely from the perspective of cash flows and balance sheet impacts for Council. This recognises the comparative building costs, any variation on operating costs between the sites and impacts on the value of Council’s land portfolio.

5.9 The economic analysis then casts a wider net to look at the two site options from the perspective of the Prospect and wider community. This analysis accounts for several non-financial impacts, including potential differences in visitation levels between the options, travel times for people using the facility, opportunities to leverage the facility investment and to boost local economic activity.

5.10 SGS are considering a series of ‘Options’ as part of their assessment in relation to the two key sites. The options cover retention of both sites with development on one, retention of both sites with development and uplift on one, and disposal of either site to facilitate highest and best use at either location. The options under assessment are clarified in Attachments 17-18.

5.11 A Project Executive Group has been established to oversee the project. This group consists of the following members:

- Mayor David O’Loughlin
- Deputy Mayor Mark Groote
- CEO Cate Atkinson
- Director Community & Planning Nathan Cunningham
- A/Director Economic Development & Communications Chris Newby
- Administration Support, Megan Gillett and Jasmyn Page
Terms of Reference for the group are being established and will be attached to the November Council information report for this project.

5.12 The PEG recently considered the draft community engagement strategy and are proposing to ‘brand’ the Community Hub, Library & Innovation Centre as ‘the CLIC’. This term (a basic acronym) should also inspire thoughts of wanting to be involved, and being part of the in-crowd.

5.13 A detailed scope of services for an EOI for a Project Manager has been developed to engage/employ a Project Manager to assist with the project from here. Their role will include initial feasibilities, development of the detailed brief and program, engagement of broader consultants as well as tendering of the project before moving into a construction management phase. This role will include the administering the building contract and provide the formal channel and liaison between the contractors, Council staff and the Project Executive Group.

5.14 The EOI process for this position will commence shortly and future reports will provide further detail on the Project Manager role.

5.15 A community engagement strategy is being developed, including the establishment of a Community Reference Group made up of key stakeholders. Further information on this will also be attached to the November Council report for this project.

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachments 1-16:**  SGS Economics & Planning Project Plan - Library and Innovation Centre site selection economic analysis

**Attachments 17-18:**  SGS Options for Site Assessment
Library site selection: economic analysis

Proposal
City of Prospect
August 2016
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

By August 2019, the City of Prospect must vacate the former Nailsworth Primary School site at 1 Thomas Street, Nailsworth, which has housed a Council library service for more than 35 years. The Council has been 'on a journey' to identify a preferred site for the replacement library.

This journey has included a qualitative and quantitative analysis of a number of candidate sites (reducing them to a field of 4), fact finding visits to leading examples of library services elsewhere, community consultation programs and structured discussions with Councillors and staff about the level of service expected from Prospect’s new facility.

More recently, Council has further narrowed the list of candidate sites for the new library to 2 possibilities; the Prospect Civic Centre on Prospect Road and the Tram Barn/Depot Site at the corner of Main North Road and Johns Road.

The next step in this journey is to subject the two candidate sites to more detailed assessment from an economic impact or benefit perspective. This work is the focus of the current brief. It is expected to cover a range of criteria, broadly described to include “market analysis, consideration of site opportunities and constraints, opportunity cost assessment, staff / operational impact and financing options”. Moreover, “risk considerations and social benefit are to underpin the research”.

The brief makes clear that the work in question must empower Councillors and management to make the decision on the best site for the replacement library. Accordingly, the analytical methods and consultancy process applied by the appointed team must directly involve Councillors and management in the scoping and validation of all key assumptions, logic trails and data.

1.2 This proposal

SGS Economics & Planning Pty Ltd (SGS) is pleased to have this opportunity to respond to Council’s brief.

We come to the task with nationally leading expertise in three areas critical to the brief:
- Understanding the role and function of municipal library services
- Applying rigorous discounted cash flow analysis to simulate the financial performance of the options for Council as an operator / investor in the library service, and
- Applying advanced cost benefit analysis to comprehensively explore the wider social, economic and environmental impacts of the options at hand.

Furthermore, SGS is very familiar with the South Australian and Adelaide environments having delivered successful consultancy services to a wide range of public sector agencies in the State over more than 2 decades. These services have dealt with housing, economic development, community facilities planning and cost benefit analyses.

Our proposal in response to the City of Prospect’s brief is in 6 parts.

Following this introductory section, we discuss, in Section 2, our understanding of the brief and our conceptual framework for answering the question posed by Council.
Section 3 builds on this conceptual framework and provides a detailed account of the methodology we will apply to meet the brief.

Section 4 profiles SGS and our relevant assignment experience, while Section 5 introduces the team of consultants we propose to undertake the work for Prospect.

Finally, in Section 6, we provide our analysis of project costs and our tendered fee.
2 APPRECIATION OF THE BRIEF

2.1 Specific provisions

Council’s brief is calling for “a balanced approach to the true costs and benefits (and options) for the delivery of a new Library & Innovation Centre facility which has significant opportunity to be a community hub”.

More specifically, the brief requires the options assessment process to address a range of issues including but not limited to the following:

- Opportunities for consolidating or otherwise streamlining Council library operations, given that there are presently 3 locations in service (including Thomas Street)
- Achievability of commercial closure at the two candidate sites, acknowledging that Council must deal with a fixed deadline for vacating Thomas Street
- Site analysis including:
  - physical capacity
  - engineering services
  - existing building attributes and scope for adaptation or re-use
  - environmental encumbrances
  - development approvals and Local Government Act compliance
- Indicative floor plans
- Commercial opportunities on the sites
- Property valuations
- Staff/operational impact
- Funding and financing arrangements formatted to support future preparation of a full Prudential Report
- Social benefits, and
- Risk analysis.

This is a broad scope of work to be delivered in a relatively short time frame and with limited resources. To successfully meet this challenge a suitable multi-disciplinary team is required, along with a very clear conceptual framework to guide the project. This is essential to minimise time and resource loss in clarifying scope and appropriate analytical methods.

We now turn to our conceptualisation of the challenge posed by Council.

2.2 Conceptual framework

Based on the business case processes routinely pursued by governments across Australia, the exercise of finding the best site for Prospect’s replacement library would comprise of four elements as illustrated in Figure 1 overleaf.

Firstly, any option must be shown to be compliant with Council’s policies and objectives. Secondly, options should be tested for their contribution to net community wellbeing, taking into account the full gamut of financial and non-financial cost and benefits. Thirdly, the financial implications of each option for Council must be properly analysed to confirm that Council can, indeed, ‘afford’ the preferred option.
Finally, the contemplated preferred option must be demonstrably deliverable, given the practicalities of the site in question and the nature of Council library operations.

**FIGURE 1 ELEMENTS OF OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

![Diagram showing elements of options appraisal: policy alignment, cost benefit analysis, financial analysis, delivery risk assessment.]

Based on our understanding of Council’s brief, we can safely assume that, having survived the appraisal journey so far, the two sites under consideration are wholly compliant with Council’s policy framework.

What is needed now is testing against the other three parameters in Figure 1 with a particular focus on cost benefit analysis and financial analysis.

**Cost benefit analysis**

The cost benefit analysis (CBA) element must address the full spectrum of environmental, social and business impacts of the options under consideration. Positive and negative effects are quantified and monetised (expressed in dollar terms) as far as possible. They are then compared so that we may arrive
at a conclusion as to whether the option in question is likely to make the community better off, or worse off, in net terms compared with persevering with a defined base case.

The principal steps in the cost benefit analysis method include:

1. Differentiating between the outcomes under a ‘base case’ scenario and those arising with the option under consideration
2. Identifying the economic, social and environmental costs and benefits that might arise in moving from the ‘base case’ to the alternative option
3. Quantifying and monetising these costs and benefits, where possible, over a suitable project evaluation period (in this case 20 years is suggested)
4. Generating measures of net community impact using discounted cash flow techniques over the 20 year duration of the project; this requires expression of future costs and benefits in present value terms using a discount rate that is reflective of the opportunity costs of resources diverted to the implementation of the reforms
5. Testing the sensitivity of these measures to changes in the underlying assumptions utilised, and
6. Supplementing this quantitative analysis with a description of costs and benefits that cannot be readily quantified and monetised.

It is particularly important to note that all impacts of the option under consideration versus the base case must be taken into account, whether or not they are ‘traded’ effects or ‘externalities’.

As the name implies, traded effects have a price in the market. Externalities on the other hand are unpriced costs and benefits sustained by third parties in any market transaction. The cost benefit analysis must account for these impacts even though they are not directly mediated (bought and sold) in the market. The monetised value of these external effects needs to be imputed using a variety of techniques as advised by the SA Treasury.

Financial analysis

Financial analysis is sometimes confused or conflated with CBA. Financial analysis is undertaken from the narrow perspective of an investor, or buyer, or seller in the market and only tracks market transacted costs and benefits. It also takes into account tax liabilities. In contrast, CBA is undertaken from a society wide perspective and, as noted, considers all impacts on welfare, whether priced or unpriced. Moreover, because CBA is concerned with net effects, tax impacts are typically set aside as they are simply transfers within the wider community.

Accordingly, financial analysis can be seen to be a subset of CBA or net community benefit assessment.

2.3 Suggested order of analysis

Commonly, in evaluations of this nature, the sequence of tests runs from appraisal of policy alignment, then to CBA, then to financial analysis and finally to deliverability.

In determining a preferred site for Prospect’s new library, however, we recommend running the financial analysis ahead of the CBA. This is because, as noted, CBA is a marginal analysis versus a base case. We understand that Prospect is committed to replacing the Thomas Street library somewhere. Therefore, the base case for CBA purposes cannot be a ‘zero’ proposition where Prospect is left with only 2 library service outlets. Nor can the base case be ‘business as usual’ at Thomas Street as Council must vacate by 2019.

Our approach, therefore, will be to undertake a financial analysis of both options against a zero base case, as this will fully reveal Council’s direct exposure to this service commitment. The option that is superior from a financial perspective will then form the base case for the marginal CBA.
The ultimate ‘preferred option’ will be a matter for Council to judge, but laying out the analysis in the fashion outlined above means that Councillors can strike a conscious balance between what it can afford and what is best for the community. Alternatively, the analysis will be capable of a ‘mathematical solution’ being the option that maximises benefits for the costs incurred regardless of where these costs and benefits fall.

**FIGURE 2 SEQUENCE OF FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC TESTS**

![Diagram showing sequence of financial and economic tests]

In the next section of this proposal we describe in detail how we will put this conceptual framework into practice.
3  METHOD

3.1  Overall approach

In line with the discussion in Section 2, SGS proposes to undertake this options assessment by applying two sets of analysis; one focussed on the financial consequences for Council and one focussed on the wider social, economic and environmental impacts of the alternative locations. Our approach is summarised in the chart overleaf.

The financial appraisal will consider the two sites purely from the perspective of cash flows and balance sheet impacts for the City of Prospect as a corporation. This will have regard to comparative building costs, any variations in operating costs between the sites, impacts on the value of Council’s land portfolio and so on.

Meanwhile, the economic analysis will cast a wider net and look at the two options from the perspective of the Prospect and regional community. This will take into account several non-financial or non-traded impacts, including differences in visitation levels between the options; travel times for people using the library, opportunities to leverage the library investment to boost local economic activity, traffic congestion and other externalities.

These two perspectives will be synthesised into a single report, so that Council can judge which option is best for Prospect on balance.

In populating both analyses, our method involves facilitated workshopping with the Councillors and officers so that the logic and data are owned and understood by the City, and not seen as the result of a ‘black box’ exercise, or the pronouncements of remote experts.

As discussed, we anticipate that the financial analysis will be carried out on the assumption of a ‘zero base case’; that is absolute costs and benefits of both options versus closure of the library will be measured and compared. The economic analysis will then use the better performed financial option as the base case for a marginal appraisal of non-financial effects including library visitation, private travel and local business effects etc.

We elaborate on the various tasks in the chart in the following pages.

3.2  Details of study tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Project mobilisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>As part of the mobilisation process, SGS will prepare a draft project management plan. This will be prepared ahead of a formal Inception Meeting, but following due consultation with Council’s project manager. This project management plan will set out anticipated data requirements for both the financial and economic analyses and propose a set of key project milestones. All these matters will be discussed and confirmed (or amended) after a face to face Inception Meeting. On the same visit, SGS will undertake site inspections and document the context of the two candidate sites as well as the current location of the library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deliverables: A project management report, confirming method, timelines and expected outputs.
**Task 2: Resolve option details**

**Description**
This task will be focussed on marshalling and validating all the data for the financial and economic analyses as identified in the project management plan. We would work closely with Council’s valuers, designers, quantitative surveyors and planners to identify relevant sources and secure the required information. **Note that we have made no provision for architectural design work in our budget** on the assumption that Council can already access these resources. However, we could sub-contract these skills, if necessary, at an additional cost.
A key challenge in this task will be to understand in detail what it will cost to build, own and operate the library in each location in turn. This includes due scrutiny of whether the two options differ in terms of specification / quality aside from the location.

**Deliverables**
- Working paper for circulation to the Council Project Manager for noting, and for ultimate incorporation in SGS’s final report.

**Task 3  Analyse financial impact**

**Description**
The financial analysis will involve discounted cash flow analysis built from the perspective of Council as ‘investor and operator’. This will measure the relative performance of the options by the usual measures of net present value (NPV), internal rate of return (IRR) and payback period (though the latter may not be relevant as the library is not a major revenue generator from users).

Ordinarily, Councils would choose the best performing financial option – as this is best for ratepayers – **UNLESS** the less well performed financial option delivers more than compensating non-financial benefits including, for example, better utilisation rates, lower vehicular travel and better local economic stimulus effects.

**Deliverables**
- Working paper for circulation to the Council Project Manager for noting, and for ultimate incorporation in SGS’s final report.

**Task 4  Cost benefit analysis**

**Description**
SGS would carry out a cost benefit analysis (CBA) following the methodology prescribed by the SA Treasury. As per Treasury guidelines, the CBA will be performed on a marginal basis, with the better financial option acting as the Base Case. Costs and benefits offered by the other option versus this Base Case will be measured by the SGS team. Some of these marginal impacts will come straight from the financial analysis, for example, pluses and minuses in terms of build and operational costs. But mostly, the marginal variations will be external to the financial analysis and look to wider effects on the Prospect community and broader region. As noted, these will cover social, environmental and cultural effects.

SGS will nominate and quantify these external marginal effects wherever possible. Also, wherever feasible, SGS will monetise these marginal effects, by using a range of acknowledged tools like the travel cost method, application of shadow prices and ‘willingness to pay’ surveys, reported in the literature.

**Deliverables**
- A preliminary findings report and PowerPoint presentation for use in the Council workshop (see below).

**Task 5  Council workshop**

**Description**
SGS will facilitate a comprehensive workshop with Councillors, designed to make sure they can understand and critique the assumptions, data, method and findings of both the financial and economic arms of the options appraisal.

The workshop will be used to explore Councillor views on how each of these parameters (assumptions, data and method) might be varied to ensure that the ultimate findings from this consultancy are robust, believable and communicable to the Prospect community.
Deliverables – Workshop report, including directions for warranted changes to the financial and economic analyses.

Task 6 | Synthesis and report
---|---
Description | Following the Council workshop, the SGS team will undertake the necessary additional research and consultation to implement the warranted adjustments to the financial and economic analyses.

The results of these adjustments, in terms of the rating of the options, will be provided to the Council project manager in draft form for further feedback and direction.

Pending this input, the SGS team will finalise the study report. This will synthesise all the relevant task outputs in a concise but comprehensive account of the relative merits of the options, including a finding on the option that is best from a total value perspective.

Deliverables – Final project report
Library and innovation centre site selection: economic analysis

Draft Project Management Plan
City of Prospect
September 2016
Introduction

There are two purposes of this work plan:

1. To provide the SGS team with a framework for completing agreed project tasks
2. To provide the Prospect Council team with key milestones, invoicing dates and our data requests.

The project management plan is a valuable way for each party to understand their responsibilities and to keep track of their own involvement in each of the tasks. Any modifications/additions/comments in relation to this document should be made clear to the consultants as soon as is practicable.
## Work Plan

### TABLE 1. WORK PLAN TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Task</th>
<th>Sub-task</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Week ending</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project mobilisation</td>
<td>- Draft project management plan</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>26/08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Council PM</td>
<td>26/08/16</td>
<td>Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Project inception meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>25/08</td>
<td>JD, TC, RM</td>
<td></td>
<td>25/08/16</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Undertake site and locality inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>25/08</td>
<td>JD, TC, RM</td>
<td></td>
<td>25/08/16</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Arrange for data inputs from Council’s valuers, designers, quantitative surveyors, engineers and planners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>25/08</td>
<td>TC, RM &amp; JD</td>
<td></td>
<td>23/09/16</td>
<td>Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting to discuss revised scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>02/09</td>
<td>JD, TC, JD &amp; MS</td>
<td>Council &amp; Mayor</td>
<td>02/09/16</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prepare revised proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background data review</td>
<td>- Understand the context of the sites and their localities &amp; differences between them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23/09</td>
<td>TC, RM &amp; JD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understand the future library services, users groups, build costs and operating costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Validate data for financial and economic analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve site option details</td>
<td>- Assess highest and best use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/10</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td></td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>M3 Property (land use values)</td>
<td>30/09/16</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understand land values of each site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JD</td>
<td></td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>M3 Property (verify GRV &amp; RLV of HBU options)</td>
<td>14/10/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For each option understand and outline future services, build costs and operating costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21/10</td>
<td>Working paper to Council PM</td>
<td>JD &amp; RM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Task</td>
<td>Sub-task</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td>Week ending</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date required Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse financial impact</td>
<td>- Discounted cashflow analysis tables</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>21/10/16</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Compare and contrast findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>paper to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify lower (NPV) cost option as base case for CBA to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost benefit analysis</td>
<td>- Nominate and identify measurement and monetisation strategy and rationale for anticipated wider costs and benefits offered by the other options versus base case wherever possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>TC &amp; RM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Monetised marginal effects wherever feasible (in a table).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Apply DTF recommended discount rates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Undertake sensitivity testing (increase costs by 20% &amp; decrease benefits by 20%).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analyse and compare findings of the CBA for each site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare presentation to Elected Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PowerPoint presentation</td>
<td>11/11/16</td>
<td>JD &amp; MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>08/11</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Project team &amp; EMs</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis and draft report</td>
<td>- Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>18/11/16</td>
<td>JD &amp; MS</td>
<td>Council PM</td>
<td>25/11/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>- Final report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>02/12/16</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Timing schedule

**TABLE 2. TIMING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>week</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td>22/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project mobilisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>29/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve option details</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background data review</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse financial impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>19/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost benefit analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare presentation to EMs</td>
<td></td>
<td>26/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis and draft report</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td></td>
<td>19/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management &amp; QA</td>
<td></td>
<td>26/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Task Description**
  - **Project mobilisation**
  - **Resolve option details**
  - **Background data review**
  - **Analyse financial impact**
  - **Cost benefit analysis**
  - **Prepare presentation to EMs**
  - **Council workshop**
  - **Synthesis and draft report**
  - **Final report**
  - **Project management & QA**

- **Timeline**
  - **Beginning Monday**
  - **Week 1**
  - **Week 2**
  - **Week 3**
  - **Week 4**
  - **Week 5**
  - **Week 6**
  - **Week 7**
  - **Week 8**
  - **Week 9**
  - **Week 10**
  - **Week 11**
  - **Week 12**
  - **Week 13**
  - **Week 14**
  - **Week 15**
### SGS Options for Site Assessment

**Prospect Civic Centre – 128 Prospect Road, Prospect**  
**Prospect Depot/Tram Barn – Corner of Johns Road and Main North Road, Prospect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Centre Site</th>
<th>Depot/Tram Barn Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retain Both Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Option 1 | Retain Civic Centre site  
Retain current operations on Prospect Road site | Retain Depot/Tram Barn site  
Develop CLIC with modest updated services from the current Library  
Relocate Depot operations elsewhere  
No further development on that site |

| **Retain Both Sites & Maximise Depot/Tram Barn** | |
| Option 2 | Retain Civic Centre site  
Retain current operations at Prospect Road site | Retain Depot/Tram Barn site  
Develop CLIC with expanded facilities  
Reference the potential to include/retain Depot Operations (analyse impact on highest & best use)  
Maximise development potential (highest & best use) on that site |

| **Sell Civic Centre** | |
| Option 3 | Sell Civic Centre site to facilitate highest & best use by other | Retain Depot/Tram Barn site  
Develop CLIC with expanded facilities  
Include new Civic Centre  
Reference the potential to include/retain Depot Operations |

| **Sell Civic Centre & Maximise Depot/Tram Barn** | |
| Option 4 | Sell Civic Centre site to facilitate highest & best use by other | Retain Depot/Tram Barn site  
Develop CLIC with expanded facilities  
Include new Civic Centre  
Reference the potential to include/retain Depot Operations (analyse impact on highest & best use)  
Maximise development potential (highest & best use) on that site |

| **Sell Depot/Tram Barn Site** | |
| Option 5 | Retain Civic Centre site  
Develop CLIC with expanded facilities  
Include new Civic Centre  
Reference the potential to include/retain Depot Operations  
No further development on that site. | Sell Depot/Tram Barn site to facilitate highest & best use by other |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Sell Depot/ Tram Barn Site &amp; Maximise Civic Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain Civic Centre site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop CLIC with expanded facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include new Civic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference the potential to include/ retain Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations (analyse impact on highest &amp; best use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximise development potential (highest &amp; best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use) on that site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sell Depot/ Tram Barn site to facilitate highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; best use by other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note –**

*Updated services includes – Library Services, Art Gallery, Digital Hub, Basic Meeting Facilities.*

(Taken from minimum requirements as noted on CLIC Floor Space requirements spreadsheet)

*Expanded facility includes – Expanded Library Services, Art Gallery, Digital Hub, Broad Meeting Facilities, Maker spaces, co-working space (possibly), Living Laboratory etc.*

(Taken from the exceeding minimum requirements as noted on CLIC Floor Space requirements spreadsheet)

*Updated 19/10/16*