

## OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE (OBC)

### A. GENERAL INFORMATION

#### A1. General

<b>Project Title</b> <i>(as per Voyager)</i>	<b>Outline Business Case: Extension to Nechells Pod, Oliver Street</b>		
<b>Voyager code</b>	CA-02809-03		
<b>Portfolio /Committee</b>	Education, Skills and Culture	<b>Directorate</b>	Neighbourhoods
<b>Approved by Project Sponsor</b>	Chris Jordan AD Neighbourhoods	<b>Approved by Finance Business Partner</b>	Parmjit Phipps Finance Business Partner Service Finance

#### A2. Project Description

Bloomsbury Library served the local community in Nechells until 26th November 2013. Due to health and safety reasons resulting from the theft of lead from the roof the building was closed. The cost of repairs was unaffordable, and it was sold at auction on the 23rd October 2014.

A comprehensive, high level options appraisal was carried out in 2014 which identified 6 potential options with additional options identified later as part of the review (7 & 8). The following sites were considered:

1. A relocation into the proposed new build owned by Free @ Last
2. Nechells Pod, Oliver Street - extension to provide library space
3. A new build on Nechells Play Centre site
4. Nechells Green Community Centre- conversion of the hall to a library.
5. Demolition of Nechells CC and replace with a new build and housing.
6. Refurbish Bloomsbury Library
7. Parcel of Land fronting Loxton Park, Duddeston Manor Road – new build provision
8. Bloomsbury Park, Bloomsbury Street – new build provision

Option 5 was deemed the most favourable especially if a joint scheme with BMHT could be progressed. The site was reviewed by Housing but deemed unfavourable due to a private social venue being sited opposite which operated unsociable hours. It was therefore deemed unsuitable for family housing and the option rejected.

Option 7 was investigated as it would also support the refurbishment of the park. This option was later abandoned due to the need to identify efficiency savings within the service leading to the logistics of operating a standalone facility no longer being viable.

A further option was then explored, which included a new way of providing library services in conjunction with third sector partners. As a result, Nechells Pod freed up some internal circulation space to provide some library provision. Due to the lack of spatial capacity the service on offer is limited hence the proposal to extend the building to provide additional floor space to provide a more comprehensive library service. The nearest libraries from Nechells Pod are Birchfield Library and Ward End Library both of which are just over 2 miles away.

A proposed extension to the existing community hub within the Nechells area known as, 'Nechells Pod,' Oliver Street, has been identified as a permanent location. On 22nd June 2018 Nechells POD coordinated a public consultation meeting to consider local library services with residents, BCC officers, local councillors and MP invited. To promote local democracy and provide residents with a 'voice' in respect of the future of Nechells Bloomsbury Library a public 'vote' on the library was run. All residents were invited to vote in a secret ballot – 107 individual votes were

cast – with 100% in favour of establishing a new ‘Bloomsbury Library’ extension to the building known as Nechells POD.

Nechells POD acts as a resource for the Nechells community by providing a safe and welcoming space in which residents can get together to participate in a wide range of activities and access services that empower them to lead self-determined, fulfilled lives and feel a sense of belonging to their community regardless of age, gender, race, faith or social background.

Nechells POD developed as a result of the successful community work that evolved through Nechells Education Action Zone (EAZ). In May 2008 the EAZ Head teachers appointed an EAZ Director to renovate a derelict nursery and turn it into a community hub that would support the residents of Nechells.

In September 2008 Nechells POD opened its doors and started offering a wide range of support, advice and guidance to improve the life chances of the community. Unfortunately, EAZ funding ended in March 2011, but such was the commitment of the EAZ head teachers and the success of the work of the POD that the service continued to grow and in May 2012 Nechells POD became a Community Interest Company (CIC), allowing access to funding streams that would further develop the work. In 2015 the Pod established itself as a charity.

Nechells POD houses: Nechells POD CIC, SHINE@NechellsPOD Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) and the Birmingham Special Educational Needs & Disability Information, Advice and Support Service (SENDIASS) who offer impartial information, advice and support to children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities.

It is proposed that Nechells Pod is subject to a Community Asset Transfer with a target date of March 2020 for the different stages to of been completed (value in worth, interview and scoring). A full repairing and insuring lease will then be drawn up to formalise the tenancy.

SHINE@NechellsPOD CIO currently operate under a management agreement with BCC. Nechells Pod will operate as a Community led Hub supplementing the Public Hub programme.

A feasibility study has been developed to look at the viability and cost of extending the existing building. The feasibility study established a budget estimate together with outline designs for the scheme for a single storey extension with extended office and toilet facilities. The next stage will be to develop the design to RIBA Stage 4 of Technical Design and to procure the project to secure tenders.

The additional space will allow for a library service to operate from the building on a permanent basis with 15 hours supported by a library member of staff but outside of these hours the service will operate via a self-service kiosk so access to the books can be maintained throughout the week. The additional room will allow for other activities to be offered by Nechells POD.

A petition with 391 signatures was submitted to Birmingham City Council in December 2018 supporting an extension to house a library and community café at Nechells Pod.

## **B. STRATEGIC CASE**

*This sets out the case for change and the project's fit to the Council Plan objectives*

### **B1. Project objectives and outcomes**

*The case for change including the contribution to Council Plan objectives and outcomes*

**Birmingham City Council Plan :2018 -2022** specifically:

Outcome 2 Birmingham is an aspirational city to grow up in.

Outcome 3 Birmingham is a fulfilling city to age well in

Outcome 4 Birmingham is a great city to live in.

Nechells Pod offers essential community services which are focused on learning and increasing residents' independence enabling local people and communities to thrive.

The Pod works towards creating a strong cohesive community which values and supports each of

its members, allowing them to influence the services and decisions affecting their neighbourhood.

**Finance** - Ladywood District Committee (as was) were consulted on a plan to dispose of a range of not-fit-for-purpose expensive buildings in Nechells Green area and use the capital receipts to a) achieve revenue budget savings b) re-invest in a purpose-built community library facility. These buildings being:

- Nechells Neighbourhood Office
- Nechells Play Centre
- Bloomsbury Library
- Nechells Green Community Centre

SHINE@NechellsPOD CIO currently have a management agreement with BCC which involves BCC having no direct responsibility for any operational costs associated with the building. This financial arrangement will continue via the CAT.

### **Community Library Service Tiered Delivery Model (Cabinet 14th February 2017) –**

Bloomsbury Library (replacement) has been identified as a tier 3 provision. Tier 3 libraries will be professionally supported by Birmingham City Council but led by local communities and volunteers. The Council will be looking to work in partnership with local communities or other organisations in the city to provide library services in these locations. This will include volunteers undertaking library duties in order to achieve enhanced opening hours.

As part of the partnership the council will offer 15 hours of professional staff support per week. The City Council will provide access to the Library Management system, through a self-service terminal, training and support through a parent Tier 1 Library. Consideration will also be given to Community Asset Transferring the building from which the library currently operates. This option gives community organisations the opportunity to lead, manage and deliver their Library Service. Tier 3 libraries will provide the opportunity for community organisations to maintain or introduce services to meet local demand; Will provide a focus for the local community; Offer other services as led by community needs; Volunteer support to deliver the offer; Provide Social space; Provide self-service access to borrow, return and reserve stock from the city's libraries.

### **Property Strategy 2018/19 – 2023/24 specifically:**

Community – support third party not for profit organisations to deliver City Council's core objectives, encouraging independent social cohesion using sport, culture and third sector neighbourhood activities.

Operational – efficient and rationalised buildings to support the provision of modern 21st century council services.

## **B2. Project Deliverables**

*These are the outputs from the project eg a new building with xm2 of internal space, xm of new road, etc*

A new single storey extension approx. 88m2 to include a multipurpose room with storage and café facility and to reconfigure space within the existing building to include refurbished DDA toilet, extended office and new front entrance. To be used as a community library and when not be used for this purpose to be used to support other community activities.

## **B3. Project Benefits**

*These are the social benefits and outcomes from the project, eg additional school places or economic benefits.*

Measure	Outline Impact
<i>List at least one measure associated with <b>each</b> of the objectives and outcomes in B1 above</i>	<i>What the estimated impact of the project will be on the measure identified</i>
A tier 3 library service will be able to operate from dedicated space.	The corridor will no longer be taken up with shelving which creates congestion and is also difficult to manage and monitor with an impact

	on the safeguarding measures for the centre
A fuller range of library services will be on offer to the local community	Prescribed services will include free internet access, assisted digital support, job clubs, business start-up sessions, job search database, CV writing workshops, online courses, story time and rhyme times, Summer reading challenge etc.
The extension is to be a sustainable construction. Energy efficient fittings are to be used e.g. LED lighting on a motion sensor,	To reduce energy consumption having a positive impact on the carbon footprint.
New front entrance will allow for areas to be zoned for independent use.	Improved sightlines and security.
Nechells Pod is to be a Community Asset Transfer	Formalises the tenancy.

## B4. Property implications

*Describe any implications for Council properties and for the Council's property strategies*

Nechells POD, Oliver Street sits in the Education, Skills and Culture portfolio. It is operated by SHINE@NechellsPOD CIO. The tenant has a management agreement with BCC which commenced in July 2008. The tenant occupies the building rent free but is responsible for all building related repairs and maintenance costs (inclusive of running costs e.g. gas, electricity, refuse etc.) A requirement of this investment will be to review this arrangement either through a Community Asset Transfer or similar. This will support the Property Strategy 2018/19 -2023/24 by reducing the need for Council delivered services and continue to empower the POD community to continue being a 'best in class' partner organization.

## C. ECONOMIC CASE - OPTIONS APPRAISAL

*This sets out the options that have been considered to determine the best value for money in achieving the Council's priorities*

### C1. Options reviewed

*A full description and review of each option is in Section G1*

- Please note an earlier options appraisal was carried out in 2014/15 as illustrated in A2 of this document following the closure of Bloomsbury Library whereby a wide range of options were investigated and considered prior to focusing on the following:
- Option 1 – Do nothing (business as usual) – this does not allow for the delivery of an efficient and effective library service for the community. Currently the library provision is limited to the loan of books with no support services i.e. public use P. C's, homework clubs, reading groups, storytelling. Also, the current operation with shelves in the entrance corridor creates a safeguarding/security risk for other users of the centre as the public need to be managed and monitored.
  - Option 2 – Stand-alone new build – whilst this would offer the opportunity for a full range of library services the new library tier model does not identify this as a tier 1 library therefore it would need to be financially sustainable. There is insufficient revenue funding to operate a standalone facility or afford the running costs. Also, a priority of the Property Strategy is to co locate services rather than have them operating in silos.
  - Option 3 – Extension to the POD – this would offer the flexible space to support a fuller library service whilst also providing the local community opportunities to volunteer to assist in the running of a library and café facility. When not in operation the space can be used by the POD to expand the range of activities they offer. They are limited by the current space availability.

C2. Summary of Options Appraisal – Price/Quality Matrix									
Criteria	Option score (out of 10)				Weight	Weighted Score			
	1. Do nothing	2. New build	3. Extend			1. Do nothing	2. New build	3. Extend	
1. Total capital cost	8	4	6		20	1.6	0.8	1.2	
2. Upfront revenue cost	4	6	6		5	0.2	0.3	0.3	
3. Full year revenue consequences	6	4	8		10	0.6	0.4	0.8	
4. Benefits: Council priorities	2	6	8		25	0.5	1.5	2	
5. Benefits: Service priorities	2	6	8		25	0.5	1.5	2	
6. Deliverability and risks	4	4	8		10	0.4	0.4	0.8	
7. Other impacts	2	6	8		5	0.1	0.3	0.4	
<b>Total</b>	28	36	52		<b>100%</b>	3.9	5.2	7.5	

Further details are given in the Options Appraisal Records attached at the end of this OBC.

C3. Option recommended, with reasons									
*Which option is recommended and the key reasons for this decision?*									
In line with the principles set out in the Property Strategy methodology of operating out of “Hub” type buildings where multi service provision can be delivered out of a single building and the remodelling of the Library offer whereby a tiered library model has been introduced the options were revisited. The Client identified the need to have a flexible Library / community facility within the Nechells Ward for the local community. Nechells Pod was identified as the most suitable building to collocate the library service.									
C4. Risks and Issues of the preferred option									
An Outline Risks and Issues Register is attached at the end of this OBC, including risks during the development to Full Business Case stage.  The main risk at this stage is the tenders exceeding the budget. If this is the case, then the scheme will need to be value engineered to deliver it within the available funds.									
C5. Other impacts of the preferred option									
*Describe other significant impacts, both positive and negative*									
This proposal supports a Community Asset Transfer which will provide the community organisation and BCC with a formal tenancy agreement via a lease.  This proposal addresses the short fall in library service provision in the Nechells community since the closure of Bloomsbury Library in 2013.									

**D. COMMERCIAL CASE**

*This considers whether realistic and commercial arrangements for the project can be made*

**D1. Partnership, Joint venture and accountable body working**

*Describe how the project will be controlled, managed and delivered if using these arrangements*

The library will operate as a Tier 3 model library which will operate 15 hours a week, run by volunteers supported by a member of the Library Service. The space when not operating as a library will be used for other activities to ensure it is fully utilised.

The accountable body will be Shine@NechellsPOD

**D2. Procurement implications:**

*What is the proposed procurement strategy and route? Which Framework, or OJEU?*

The project will be administered by Acivico Ltd who will either procure via the Building Fabric Repair and Maintenance Framework Agreement – POD2 whereby a mini tendering exercise will be carried out or advertise tenders from the open market via Find it on Birmingham.

**E. FINANCIAL CASE***This sets out the cost and affordability of the project***E1. Financial implications and funding**

	Financial Year: pre 2019/20	2019/20	2020/21	later	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Capital code: <input type="text"/>					
<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</b>					
Capital costs already incurred	23.0				23.0
Development costs to proceed to FBC			30.0		30.0
Other costs to complete:					
Fees	0.0		27.0	5.0	32.0
Land acquisition	0.0				0.0
Works			450.0	45.0	495.0
[please itemise other costs]					0.0
					0.0
Contingencies					0.0
<b>Total capital expenditure</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>507.0</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>580.0</b>
<b>CAPITAL FUNDING:</b>					
Development costs funded by:					
capital receipt CA-02809-03	23.0		57.0		80.0
					0.0
Other costs funded by:					
capital receipt			450.0	50.0	500.0
(Nechells CC)					0.0
					0.0
<b>Total capital funding</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>507.0</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>580.0</b>

## APPENDIX 1

Financial Year:	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	later	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Revenue code: <input type="text"/>					
<b>REVENUE CONSEQUENCES</b>					
Revenue costs during project delivery:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
					0.0
Operating period expenditure:					
[Library Service contribution]	16.7	16.7	14.7	14.7	62.8
<a href="#">SHINE@NechellsPOD CIO</a>	18.5	18.5	18.5	18.5	74.0
					0.0
					0.0
Less income:					
[please itemise] <i>[enter as negatives]</i>					0.0
					0.0
Less proposed savings					0.0
<b>Net revenue consequences</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>136.8</b>
<b>REVENUE FUNDING:</b>					0.0
Current budget provision					0.0
Other revenue resources identified:					0.0
[Library Service contribution]	16.7	16.7	14.7	14.7	62.8
<a href="#">SHINE@NechellsPOD CIO</a>	18.5	18.5	18.5	18.5	74.0
<b>Total revenue funding</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>136.8</b>
<p><b>All building related running costs will continue to be funded by SHINE@NechellsPOD CIO.</b></p>					
<b>E2. Evaluation and comment on financial implications:</b>					
<p>Capital costs are to be funded from capital receipts from the sale of assets within the Nechells Ward. The sale of these assets was supported by local members on the proviso that the funding was reinvested into a library /community facility within the ward.</p> <p>The operational running costs are the responsibility of the tenant Shine@NechellsPod.</p>					
<b>E3. Approach to optimism bias and provision of contingency</b>					
A construction contingency of approx. 4 % has been included.					
<b>E4. Taxation</b>					
Describe any tax implications and how they will be managed, including VAT					
To be procured internally (via BCC) therefore no tax implications.					
<b>F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT CASE</b>					



<i>This considers how project delivery plans are robust and realistic</i>	
<b>F1. Key Project Milestones</b>	<b>Planned Delivery Dates</b>
Approval of Capital funding ( capital receipt)	March 2019
Capital Board	2 <sup>nd</sup> June 2020
OBC approval	June 2020
CAT completed	July 2020
Developed design	July 2020
Planning permission submitted	August 2020
Technical design and tender documentation	August 2020
Main contract out to tender (FIIB)	September 2020
Tender returns	October 2020
Contract award & FBC approval	Dec 2020/Jan2021
Contractor lead in	Feb 2021
Start on site	March 2021
Date project operational / complete	Sept/Oct 2021
Date of Post Implementation Review	Oct 2022
<b>F2. Achievability</b>	
<i>Describe how the project can be delivered given the organisational skills and capacity available</i>	
<p>Property Services and Acivico Ltd have worked together to deliver similar successful projects e.g. most recently on creating an extension to the nursery unit at the Birmingham Crisis Centre. This was procured via FIIB. The contract was administered by Acivico and projected managed by BPS. The project was delivered within budget (including an underspend of approx. £4k) and within programme. It is envisaged that Property Services would act as Client PM and have overall responsibility for delivery within the agreed tolerances (cost, time, quality).</p>	
<b>F3. Dependencies on other projects or activities</b>	
<p>Sale of Nechells Community Centre – to secure capital receipt (this has now achieved £1.3m at auction on 14/02/2019)</p> <p>Approval of capital budget.</p> <p>Planning approval for extension.</p> <p>FBC approval.</p>	
<b>F4. Products required to produce Full Business Case</b>	
<i>This should be a full list of the items required in order to produce a Full Business Case.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial plan including funding</li> <li>• Technical design to stage 4 of the RIBA Plan of Work</li> <li>• Submission of planning application</li> <li>• Building Regulations</li> <li>• Community Asset Transfer agreement with the building operator.</li> <li>• Tender documentation and submissions</li> <li>• Consultation/Stakeholder analysis</li> <li>• Design and Access statements</li> </ul>	
<b>F5. Estimated time to complete project development to FBC</b>	
<i>Give an estimate of how long it will take to complete the delivery of all the products stated above and incorporate them into a Full Business Case.</i>	
6 months	

**F6. Estimated cost to complete project development to FBC**

*Provide details of the development costs shown in Section F1 above (capital and revenue). This should include an estimate of the costs of delivering all the products stated above, and incorporating them into a Full Business Case. The cost of internal resources, where these are charged to the project budget, should be included. A separate analysis may be attached.*

Spent to date: £23k fees for a concept design and initial surveys including condition ground, utilities, topographical and bomb survey.  
Additional £30K required to develop design and specification to tender and progress to FBC

**F7. Funding of development costs**

*Provide details of development costs funding shown in Section F1 above.*

Capital Receipt from the sale of Nechells Play Centre CA-02809-03 £80K (£23K spent to date)  
Capital receipt from the sale of Nechells Community Centre £500k

**F8. Officer support**

**Project Manager: Lesley Steele**

**Project Accountant: Lisa Pendlebury**

**Project Sponsor: Chris Jordan AD Neighbourhoods**

**F9. Project Management**

*Describe how the project will be managed, including the responsible Project Board and who its members are*

The construction contract will be administered via Acivico Ltd the client will be represented by the client PM who will be responsible for ensuring the governance process and project methodology is adhered to.

Project Board Members: Proposal :Finance Parmjit Phipps  
Service: Chris Jordan  
Property Services : Phillip Andrews

**G. SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

*(Please adapt or replace the formats as appropriate to the project)*

**G1. OBC OPTIONS APPRAISAL RECORDS (these are summarised in section C2)**

*The following sections are evidence of the different options that have been considered in arriving at the proposed solution. All options should be documented individually.*

<b>Option 1</b>	<i>Do Nothing</i>
<b>Information Considered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The existing spatial capacity of the 'Nechells Pod '</i></li> <li>• <i>Location and infrastructure including links to public transport</i></li> <li>• <i>Capital and revenue funding</i></li> <li>• <i>Revenue operational/running costs</i></li> <li>• <i>Opportunity to work with partner organisations in a joined-up service approach</i></li> <li>• <i>Opportunity to extend and improve its service delivery offer to the local community.</i></li> <li>• <i>Safeguarding implications</i></li> </ul>
<b>Pros and Cons of Option</b>	<p><b><i>What were the advantages/positive aspects of this option?</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Capital receipts can be utilised on other projects</i></li> </ul> <p><b><i>What are the Disadvantages/negative aspects of this option?</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The library service is at risk of being lost. Temporarily located in the corridor of the Pod is both a health and safety risk but also impacts on the security/safeguarding of the centre.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Due to the limited space and capacity of the existing building:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It does not allow for the library service to provide digital activities and training to the community as there is no space for P. C's.</i></li> <li>• <i>No volunteer opportunities for members of the community to learn new library skills</i></li> <li>• <i>Cannot extend the library service offer e.g. additional activities, programmes and initiatives.</i></li> <li>• <i>Limited access to arts and culture especially for those in the community who are less likely to access arts and culture.</i></li> </ul>
<b>People Consulted</b>	<i>Elected Members, library staff, Pod representatives, users, local community, Leader of the Council, Acting Director Neighbourhoods, A.D Neighbourhoods, AD Education and Skills</i>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<i>Abandon</i>
<b>Principal Reason for Decision</b>	<i>This option does not provide an opportunity to expand on the service delivery offer or support the development of the local community.</i>

<b>Option 2</b>	<i>Standalone new build</i>
<b>Information Considered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The existing spatial capacity of the 'Nechells Pod '</i></li> <li>• <i>Location and infrastructure including links to public transport</i></li> <li>• <i>Capital and revenue funding</i></li> <li>• <i>Revenue operational/running costs</i></li> <li>• <i>Opportunity to work with partner organisations in a joined-up service approach</i></li> <li>• <i>Opportunity to extend and improve its service delivery offer to the local community.</i></li> <li>• <i>Safeguarding implications</i></li> </ul>

<b>Pros and Cons of Option</b>	<p><b>What were the advantages/positive aspects of this option?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of a purpose-built modern library facility.</li> <li>• Reduced maintenance costs associated with a new build</li> <li>• A new build would be more attractive to a partner organisation to operate.</li> <li>• Allows the library service to provide additional services based on local needs.</li> <li>• A new build provides an opportunity to operate as a hub building if service partners can be identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>What are the Disadvantages/negative aspects of this option?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient revenue funding to operate and maintain a standalone facility.</li> <li>• This library has been identified as a tier 3 provision which would require a community group to take on the running of the facility. No group has been identified to take on this offer.</li> <li>• The capital funding identified may not be sufficient to afford a stand-alone building.</li> </ul>
<b>People Consulted</b>	<i>Elected Members, library staff, Pod representatives, users, local community, Leader of the Council, Acting Director Neighbourhoods, A.D Neighbourhoods, AD Education and Skills</i>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<i>Abandon</i>
<b>Principal Reason for Decision</b>	<i>Revenue and capital affordability</i>

<b>Option 3</b>	<i>Extension to 'The Pod'</i>
<b>Information Considered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing spatial capacity of the 'Nechells Pod '</li> <li>• Location and infrastructure including links to public transport</li> <li>• Capital and revenue funding</li> <li>• Revenue operational/running costs</li> <li>• Opportunity to work with partner organisations in a joined-up service approach</li> <li>• Opportunity to extend and improve its service delivery offer to the local community.</li> <li>• Safeguarding implications</li> </ul>
<b>Pros and Cons of Option</b>	<p><b>What were the advantages/positive aspects of this option?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An affordable proposal.</li> <li>• A partner who can work with the Library Service and support a tier 3 library model.</li> <li>• It would be located within an established, successful community operated building.</li> <li>• Infrastructure to operate already in place e.g. car parking, staffing, toilets etc.</li> <li>• BCC owns the building (The Pod)</li> <li>• Idea location with good transport routes.</li> </ul> <p><b>What are the Disadvantages/negative aspects of this option?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial one-off capital investment required to deliver the extension</li> </ul>

<b>People Consulted</b>	<i>Elected Members, library staff, Pod representatives, users, local community, Leader of the Council, Acting Director Neighbourhoods, A.D Neighbourhoods, AD Education and Skills</i>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<i>Proceed</i>
<b>Principal Reason for Decision</b>	<i>The building identified as the Pod is operated by a successful well-established community group who will support the running of a tier 3 library service. This proposal offers an affordable solution to providing a library service to the local community.</i>

<b>G2. OUTLINE RISKS AND ISSUES REGISTER</b>			
<i>Risks should include Optimism Bias, and risks during the development to FBC</i>			
<i>Grading of severity and likelihood: High – Significant – Medium - Low</i>			
		Risk after mitigation:	
Risk or issue	mitigation	Likelihood	Severity
1. Planning permission is refused	Early consultation with planning officer prior to submission of the planning application to ensure it will be supported	Low	Medium
2. Tenders come in over budget	A pretender estimate will be established to gauge affordability. The specification will be value engineered if a cost cutting exercise is required to look at options	Medium	Medium
3. Programme delayed	A draft programme will be compiled in line with the schedule of activities including some float to offset any delays	Medium	Low
4. Unforeseen additional works are identified	Intrusive surveys will be carried out as part of the feasibility/design works. A contingency will be included within the overall cost to offset any risks.	Low	Low
5. CAT not approved	BCC to support and work alongside Shine@NechellsPOD CIO to ensure there is a robust business case	Low	Low
6. User/partner expectations are not managed	Consultation with all stakeholders will be ongoing throughout the project to ensure all are kept informed of progress.	Low	Low
7. Departure of key members of the project/delivery team	Work is done on a team basis with sharing of information.	Medium	Low
8. Limited capacity on site for contractor/compound	The site of the extension will be cordoned off together with the bottom end of the car park for sole use of the contractor. Users can park on the road during the duration of the construction contract as a temporary measure.	Low	Low