



## **Report to Cabinet**

**Subject**      **Proposed Development of Arnold Health Centre**

**Date**          **12 July 2006**

**Author**       **Deputy Chief Executive**

### **1. Purpose of the Report**

To outline the proposals for the development of Arnold Health Centre and the implications for the Council.

### **2. Information**

Gedling Primary Care Trust has proposed the redevelopment of the Arnold Health Centre as a tranche 2 scheme of the Nottingham LIFT. The scheme will cost in the region of £3.5 million and provide a new building of approximately 2,900 m<sup>2</sup>. The intent is to provide modern facilities that will improve the patient experience, bringing together health and social care and enabling more care outside of hospital to be provided locally.

The Greater Nottingham LIFT Company Limited (LIFTCo) is leading on the proposed development and has written asking that formal consideration be given by the Council for the sale of land to enable a suitable site to be assembled. Essentially the required anticipated start of construction for the new Health Centre is August 2007 and this requires determination of site etc. by July/August 2006 to allow for the necessary design, consultation and planning processes to be completed by then.

Option 2 would see the existing car park adjacent the Leisure Centre redeveloped to provide a Health Centre and a multi-storey car park. The latter would also replace Croft Street car park in the longer term. Appendix 1 sets out the implications of pursuing option 1 and releasing Croft Road car park for comparative purposes.

This raises a number of issues that members will need to consider. These are:

1. Temporary loss of approximately 75 to 150 car parking spaces
2. Provision of 200 space multi-storey car park

### **Loss of car parking provision**

The proposed development of the Health Centre will mean the loss of 75 to 150 car parking spaces until such time as the new multi-storey car park was available. It is anticipated at this stage that there would effectively be a land swap between the council and the PCT. Furthermore the PCT would wish to keep the existing Health Centre open until the new centre was ready. Once it had been built then the Health Centre site could be cleared and used for temporary parking. As such the council could opt to wait until this site became available and then build the multi-storey car park. This would mean a temporary loss of 75 spaces until this site became available and then the remaining 75 spaces lost whilst the new car park is built. The alternative would mean 150 spaces lost but the new car park built in a shorter timescale.

### **Provision of 200 space multi-storey car park**

Although only 150 spaces are provided on the High Street car park option 2 envisages the loss of the existing Croft Road car park to allow a suitable development in that area. As such the new provision needs to allow for a minimum of 200 spaces rather than just 150 spaces.

The indicative costs for a very basic multi-storey car park with 200 places is £800,000. This is inherent with option 2 and could either be financed through prudential borrowing or through participation in the LIFT scheme. Further work will be necessary to determine the most cost effective route. No budgetary provision exists for this development.

## **3 Resource Implications**

There are a number of potential resource implications for the Council. These are:

1. Redirection of staff resources to deal with this issue, this represents an opportunity cost but is considered desirable if members agree to the request by LIFTCo.
2. Cost of building a basic multi-storey car park, estimated at £800,000. No current budgetary provision exists for this.

The estimates provided are all broad brush given that there has not been time to undertake more detailed studies but they do provide some guidance to assist members in reaching a decision.

## **4 Recommendation**

It is recommended that members support the request by LIFTCo to sell the required land and that

1. the Estates and Valuation Manager begin negotiations with LIFTCo on the sale of the required area or land swap as appropriate
2. a further report detailing the cost and funding of the replacement multi-storey car park be brought to a future cabinet.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Croft Road car park option**

This would see the existing health centre site and Croft Street Car park redeveloped to provide the new facility. This raises a number of issues that members would need to consider. These are:

1. Loss of approximately 50 car parking spaces
2. Loss of shop mobility provision
3. Loss of public toilets

### **Loss of car parking provision**

The proposed development of the Health Centre will mean the loss of 50 car parking spaces until such time as the rest of the Arnold Masterplan is implemented. This would either see the provision of new car parking on the original ASDA site or the development of additional car parking as part of the northern development. This could of course take some years to come to fruition. No opportunities exist for further provision of car parking at this time.

### **Loss of shop mobility provision**

Croft Road Car park currently provides a base for the Arnold shop mobility scheme. Members could make it a requirement that the new Health Centre makes provision for shop mobility at a similar rent to that paid to the Council at present as part of the agreement to sell the car park. This would provide a permanent home for shop mobility.

In the short term it is recommended that Members consider providing a temporary base until the new facilities are ready. Unfortunately this would probably require a portakabin on another of the Council's car parks, meaning a further reduction in car parking. Further work would be necessary to determine whether this is feasible and whether or not other solutions are possible.

It is estimated that temporary accommodation would cost around £30,000, which includes site set-up costs, utilities (water, drainage, electric), access ramps and phones. To provide the 6 replacement mobility bays requires 9 standard bays along with an estimated 5 bays to provide temp accommodation giving a total loss of 14 bays.

### **Loss of public toilets**

The loss of the Car Park would also mean the loss of public toilets at Wood Street. No current provision exists for their replacement and indeed a site has not yet been identified for alternative provision. It is suggested that further work be undertaken to determine whether or not replacement provision is required and if considered necessary, the type of provision as well as possible location. For example there are public toilets at King George V playing Field. It may be feasible to upgrade these and improve signposting so that replacement provision is not necessary. For example refurbishment of the toilets at King George V Playing Field would cost an estimated £15,000 and a new facility on that site in the region of £80,000.

### **Resource Implications**

There are a number of potential resource implications for the Council, not all of which can be answered in the time available. These are:

1. Provision of new toilet facilities or refurbishment of existing provision at King George V Playing Field along with any revised signposting required, estimated at £15,000 for refurbishment and £80,000 for new.
2. Provision of temporary accommodation for shop mobility assuming permanent provision is made with the new Health Centre estimated at £30,000.
3. Redirection of staff resources to deal with this issue, this represents an opportunity cost but is considered desirable if members agree to the request by LIFTCo.

The estimates provided are all broad brush given that there has not been time to undertake more detailed studies but they do provide some guidance to assist members in reaching a decision.