

CABINET

12 July 2022

Title: Parsloes Park 'Parklife' Project	
Report of the Cabinet Member for Community Leadership and Engagement	
Open Report	For Decision
Wards Affected: Parsloes	Key Decision: Yes
Report Author: Neil Pearce, Head of Sustainability, Net Zero & Parks Commissioning	Contact Details: Tel: 020 8227 5733 E-mail: neil.pearce@lbbd.gov.uk
Accountable Strategic Leadership Director: Abi Gbago, Strategic Director of Inclusive Growth	
Summary: <p>By Minute 4 (19 June 2018), Cabinet agreed proposals to work with grant-funder, the Football Foundation, to upgrade the pitch and pavilion facilities at Parsloes Park with a £5.6m capital investment as part of the nationwide Parklife Football Hubs programme for key strategic sport sites.</p> <p>The existing pitches in Parsloes Park were of poor quality and the sports pavilion facilities no longer fit for purpose. It was proposed to develop three artificial grass pitches (AGPs) and a new sports pavilion allowing for changing rooms for up to eight teams, gym facilities, sports café, multi-use areas and social space to be leased to the Foundation's charitable arm, now known as the National Football Trust (company no: 11535526).</p> <p>Overall project costs have been steadily rising through protracted procurement exercises, and despite one round of value engineering in 2021, costs have continued to rise. Since the end of last year, inflation in construction and component costs has more than doubled the total project cost to £13.6m.</p> <p>The Football Foundation increased their grant to £6.2m and is waiting for the Council to sign a Grant Deed which is at risk of HM Treasury decommitment; Alliance Leisure, the building contractor, has accrued circa £156,000 of access fees, design and pre-construction surveys and wants LBBD to go into contract for the delivery of the pavilion. Neither have been signed following the project review which identified a significant funding shortfall that the Foundation believed the Council could cover. Parts of the project have already been completed with the 3G pitches handed over and there is an outstanding bill of £2.1m, for which the Council is liable.</p> <p>The project review has found that the Council currently has only £1m set aside for the whole scheme with another £1.1m of monies and grant potentially attributable to the project over time, leaving a £5.7m shortfall. Having assessed all the options and weighing up the reputational importance to the Council of constructing these flagship facilities, it is recommended to fund the remainder of the scheme through borrowing.</p>	

Recommendation(s)

The Cabinet is recommended to:

- (i) Agree that the Council proceeds with the Parklife project in Parsloes Park to deliver high-quality pavilion facilities to support local football growth in the Borough and associated sports and social activity and enter the Grant Deed and Delivery Agreements;
- (ii) Agree the provision of additional funding of up to £6.1m, via prudential borrowing, to address the project shortfall;
- (iii) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director, Inclusive Growth, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Leadership and Engagement and Chief Legal Officer, to let the facilities to the National Football Trust on the terms set out in the report subject to compliance with s123 of the Local Government Act 1972; and
- (iv) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director, Inclusive Growth, in consultation with the Chief Legal Officer, procure and enter into all necessary contracts and agreements, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, to ensure completion of the Parklife project.

Reason(s)

The Council has responsibility for the management and improvement of parks and open spaces in the Borough and Parsloes Park has been identified as a key strategic sports site. Failure to fund and complete delivery of the project will result in immeasurable reputational damage to the standing of the Council among local sports groups and grant-funders of sports projects, as well as life-expired assets and new pitches with no revenue funding allocated to maintain them.

1. Introduction and Background

- 1.1 The Football Association, Premier League and Sport England, through their delivery partner, The Football Foundation, launched a national funding scheme called Parklife in 2016, which provides capital investment at sports sites of strategic importance. Prior to this the Council had been working with Sport England and the Essex County Football Association to develop new facilities in Parsloes Park when Cabinet approved Barking & Dagenham's participation in the project in June 2018.
- 1.2 The decision was taken because Parsloes Park was considered a critically important part of the Borough's urban infrastructure due to its size, location and catchment area and the potential regional significance for its football pitch provision. Investment was drastically needed because the quality of the grass pitches was evidently poor, and the associated changing facilities were life-expired.
- 1.3 The original report expected the scheme to cost about £6m and sought to encourage the growth of local football. Consultation with local stakeholders helped identify which facilities would be required to make Parklife a success, allowing for local football teams, like May & Baker FC, to gain promotion to higher leagues and

provide much needed high-quality facilities for other groups like the Muslimah Sports Association and Inclusive Fitness Initiative Gym for disabled users. West Ham United Foundation expressed interest in supporting community sports at the new pavilion and through the usage of the pitches.

1.4 The scheme aimed to deliver:

- New changing facilities incorporating 8 team changing rooms (suitable for use by children, adult teams and officials);
- 55 station gym and dance studio;
- Bar, café and social space
- Public toilets
- 3 artificial grass pitches (AGPs) with floodlighting that can be used for 11-a-side football matches and compartmentalised to accommodate multiple mini, junior and five-a-side games being played simultaneously

1.5 As part of the package, and as a condition of £3.6m grant-funding from the Football Foundation (FF), it was agreed that a London based Trust would manage the new facilities. This aspect has now changed and a pan-regional charitable football Trust (eventually becoming the National Football Trust) has been established and it is proposed that it manage the new facilities in Parsloes Park via a 30-year lease from the Council. The trust model supports football to have more responsibility and involvement in the management of its grassroots facilities and is a way of ensuring an affordable, consistent, and high-quality customer experience. As the Contracting Authority, the Trust is to procure the services of a leisure operator to manage the facilities on its behalf. A peppercorn rent was previously agreed recognising the Trust's responsibilities for repairing, maintaining and insuring the premises. The vesting of the facilities in this way also allows for the local authority to retain an exemption from VAT payments on the construction costs accruing from the project under 1994 legislation.

1.6 It was agreed that under the trust model, the FF would support the procurement of a leisure operator and with the Council it would jointly procure contractors to deliver the 3G pitches and pavilion under design and build contracts. To summarise what were complex and lengthy procurement exercises, SIS were appointed to develop the 3G pitches and Alliance Leisure identified as preferred supplier to design and build the pavilion facilities.

1.7 In late 2021, the National Football Trust (NFT) became the legal owner of Leisure United (LU) – the incumbent charity operator of 10 existing Parklife hubs in Sheffield, Liverpool, and Sunderland. The NFT can choose to procure an operator to manage facilities under Teckal exemption rules ie by a company that complies with Regulation 12 of the Public Contract Regulations, or it will have to carry out a tender procedure under those Regulations. The NFT is seeking to appoint LU as the operator of the new facilities at Parsloes Park due to LU's track-record and experience and it offers the most cost-effective and financially sustainable solution as a fully charitable model. The Council need to be satisfied that LU can carry out its obligations.

1.8 The NFT and LU have committed to ringfence all surplus income generated by the new facilities to be re-invested within Barking and Dagenham – there is no leakage through profit or cross-subsidy with other local authority areas. The NFT will use the

surpluses to support the achievement of the objects set out in its articles of association, which included the promotion of community participation in healthy recreation by providing facilities for the playing of association football and other sports capable of improving health and supporting persons who have need for such facilities by reason of their youth, age, infirmity or disability, financial hardship, poverty or social and economic circumstances or for the public at large in the interests of social welfare and with the object of improving their conditions of life. Generally advancing public education, recreation, physical education and with a focus on children and young people.

- 1.9 In the 2018 Cabinet report the FF had confirmed £3.6m of grant, with an ambition to obtain £500k from the GLA and £500K from the London Marathon Charitable Trust. The Council had committed to £400K of capital (on the proviso of borrowing), £600K SCIL and work towards obtaining £350K from the Beam Park development via s106:

Description	£'000s	Notes
LBBB capital funding	400	Committed
London Marathon Charitable Trust	500	Stage one bid successful. Stage 2 final bid decision expected in August 2018
Football Foundation	3,600	Earmarked. Formal funding application to be submitted in July 2018. Decision expected when planning permission is granted (estimated to be September 2018).
GLA	500	Earmarked by Football Foundation. Will be confirmed once planning permission is granted
LBBB Community Infrastructure Levy funding	600	Applied for. Decision by Cabinet on 19 June 2018
LBBB s106 funding	350	Linked to the Beam Park housing development and specifically earmarked for the proposed facilities at Parsloes Park. Expected to be confirmed in summer 2018.
TOTAL	5,950	

- 1.10 By the time the project was granted planning permission from the Council in September 2019, the costs had climbed to £7.3m.

2. Proposal and Issues

- 2.1 Progress on the scheme slowed during the pandemic and overall project costs have been steadily rising through protracted procurement exercises involving the Foundation, and despite one round of value engineering in 2021, it continues to rise. Since the end of last year, inflation in construction and component costs has more than doubled the total project cost. Some of the reasons are identified below:

- The Alliance Leisure offer contains equipment, fittings, IT and audio-visual systems, whereas under the original London Construction Programme framework the aim was to procure IT, AV, equipment and fittings separately. Hence, they fell outside the original estimate but were always project costs.

- The floor area of actual building being procured is now slightly larger (1650m² versus 1627m²) which while marginal still adds up to just over a £100K. This is partly due to the change from modular to a traditional build solution and because of some of the operator requested design changes to create a more efficient layout.
- The initial estimated costs for achieving the mandatory BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) Excellent, which is a planning requirement, seem to have been undervalued.
- The pavilion building has more CCTV and security alarm systems than originally envisaged, plus the building now has security shutters. The additional CCTV and shutters have come out of engagement with the lessee who will be responsible for insuring, maintaining, and repairing the new facility.
- Steel costs have just risen by 5%, contributing another £500K cost to the project

2.2 The FF has increased its grant contribution to £6.2m (which includes £500k GLA monies) but subsequently the costs of the project have hit £13.6m. If the Council do not contractually lock-in prices through the Delivery Agreement with Alliance Leisure promptly, then those costs are expected to carry on increasing because of the highest levels of inflation in 40 years.

2.3 Following a recent internal restructure, the cost problem was further magnified when a significant shortfall in the Council's funding commitment to Parklife was identified following a review of several parks commissioned projects. As a result, the Council has not been able to make further progress on signing the Deed of Grant with the FF or enter Delivery Agreements with Alliance Leisure for the build of the pavilion.

2.4 The Council has £600,000 of SCIL readily available to contribute to the project. In the original report it also agreed to honour a borrowing commitment of £400,000 but that arguably still only allows for £1m of agreed funding. There is £500,000 of additional grant from the London Marathon Charitable Trust which is due to be paid.

2.5 Long-term, a contribution of £350,000 allocated to the project from s.106 monies from Beam Park will fall due but will not be monetised any time soon. There are conditions that half will be paid when Phase 1 has 90% occupation and Phase 2 has 90% occupation. There is potentially some legacy s106 funding worth £289K from another scheme which could be utilised for the project.

2.6 Working in collaboration with the FF, we estimate that a further value engineering exercise may shave £288K off the project cost with contractor preliminaries and alternative products for fixtures and fittings also identified as targets to generate further savings. Alliance Leisure could also run a mini-competition among their contractors to provide additional assurance, if that is cost and time effective.

2.7 Even so, at best case scenario the Council shortfall would still be £5.4m. The Council would need to borrow £6.1m to cover the shortfall, the committed £400K pledged in the original report and cover the £350K upfront eventually due from the Beam Park development.

2.8 Equally, in the absence of accessing the FF grant, the Council is now liable for the payment of £2.1m following the completion of the 3G artificial pitches by SIS, which

were handed over to the Council in April. This is factored into the overall £13.6m project cost.

- 2.9 This a flagship project for both the Borough and the capital, which has had high profile media attention and significant stakeholder engagement. Senior officers, parks commissioners and Be First construction managers have reviewed the options and are of the view that the Council should continue with the planned project. The options are set out in the appraisal below:

3. Options Appraisal

- 3.1 **Option 1: Decide that due to inflation the project is unaffordable and stop the scheme** - The Council would be left with several 3G pitches for which there is nil grant funding and still be liable for the payment of £2.1m in costs to the contractor, SIS, following the completion of the pitches. There is currently no revenue budget for maintaining or securing the pitches as this was due to fall to the operator. There is also no funding to provide additional make-shift facilities to keep the pitches in use. The pitches are unlikely to attract the expected usage or deliver the expected community outcomes without the equivalent pavilion facilities.
- 3.2 The existing dilapidated pavilion is not suitable to cater for this clientele and there is no revenue budget to maintain and repair it. All grants would be withdrawn, and it would certainly hinder the Council's relationship with sporting bodies and its ability to attract funding for parks and roll-out of sporting facilities in the future. In addition to Parsloes Park, there are a further 11 priority projects in the Local Football Facility Plan (LFFP) for Barking and Dagenham, together worth in excess of £7m and earmarked for investment from the FF which would be severely inhibited if this project was not to progress. Relationships with local stakeholders, such as West Ham United Foundation and disadvantaged groups looking to utilise the facilities would also be impacted.
- 3.3 **Option 2: Pause the project and redesign, descope and retender the proposal for the pavilion** - The Council would still be liable for the £2.1m cost for 3G pitches with a nil grant scenario - this will almost certainly see the loss of all grant-funding from the FF and facilities which the operator cannot use without compromising the viability of their business plan. This would also be the third procurement exercise in relation to the project with a likelihood of even higher pricing due to the significant inflationary increase in construction costs. The Council did consider removing the gym facilities from the project, which make up a large proportion of the footprint, but this would have a major impact upon the sustainability of the facility and re-investment potential. In the current circumstances, if we reprocure we are likely to end up with the same or higher costs for a lesser product.
- 3.4 Even if the project were descoped, redesigned and planning consent obtained we are looking at a further delay of approximately nine months before construction could start. The grant funders and operator would likely withdraw, meaning the Council would have to budget or borrow for the entire build cost. There is no revenue budget to support the facility meaning the Council would need to procure a private leisure operator, which in the absence of gym facilities would probably need subsidy from the Council to run and with no investment back into community sports.

- 3.5 **Option 3: Accept the current designs, look for savings and borrow to support the project** - Collaborating with the FF, £288,000 worth of fixtures, fittings and design elements could be trimmed out of the current proposal, and potentially reduce very high subcontractor prelims. However, there is very little we can achieve in substantial cost reduction, without compromising the business plan. Stripping out health and fitness, cafe and social facilities will compromise the very purpose of the scheme and demands of the stakeholders who helped to develop the vision.
- 3.6 It should be noted that the Council cannot borrow and try to recoup the money through a fully-fledged commercial lease without losing the £6.2m grant or losing the exemption for VAT costs.
- 3.7 The Council did make the point that the operator, which is running other Parklife schemes throughout the country, could make a further, annual contribution from surpluses achieved on other projects to cover some of the servicing of the borrowing debt. This however has been rejected by the FF Trustees on the basis that they have already set aside the single most significant volume of grant that they have ever awarded, to Barking & Dagenham; it sets a precedent for future Parklife developments and would be an unfair arrangement in comparison to other local authorities which have Parklife schemes and have taken on the burden of several million pounds worth of borrowing themselves; it also creates a 30 year liability for repayment to the Council which would need to be underwritten by the FF, in case the operator suffers more challenging commercial circumstances than were projected.
- 3.8 More positively, the scheme will remove the Council's current liability for life-expired changing facilities. Importantly the quality of sports facilities in the park will be transformed and with it the potential to reduce the Council's existing grounds maintenance costs because fewer grass pitches need to be maintained. The Council will no longer be responsible for maintaining or operating the existing pavilion in the park. It is estimated that this will save £25,000 per annum in utility costs, non-domestic rates, cleaning and staffing, and a non-indexed saving of £750,000 over 30 years.
- 3.9 The average annual operating surplus of the new facilities is expected to be £241,000, of which 100% would be ringfenced for reinvestment to support grassroots football development, clubs and facilities within Barking & Dagenham. This has been incorporated into the lease. The Council will have a representative on the Advisory Board which will decide how the funds are invested in local football growth. Subject to further negotiation, the surplus could be used to eliminate the Council having to budget for maintaining and improving 30 other poor quality football pitches and surrounding grass areas in Parsloes, Barking, Old Dagenham and Valence parks. Each of these sites is identified as a priority within the borough's LFFP to bring the grass pitches up to a 'Good' standard for football as measured by the Grounds Management Association (GMA).
- 3.10 This would provide an approximate saving of £31,000 per year to the Parks & Environment service, a non-indexed saving of £930k over 30 years. The Council is likely to be preferred partner for the continued maintenance of the pitches and associated green spaces but would be charging the operator, Leisure United, for the cost of doing so. The Council could also sub-contract expertise to deliver the GMA required standard of pitches, also rechargeable to the operator.

- 3.11 The social value impact of this scheme and the reinvestment back into the sport locally from the operator’s surplus are both significant. Not only does the project bring £6.2m of FF funding to the project, plus £500K from the LMCT, but potentially an additional £6.8m+ in ringfenced funding in Barking and Dagenham for football projects and improved facilities over the term of the lease. The Football Association’s Social and Economic Value of Grassroots Football Report in March 2021 has estimated the value of economic, health, social interaction, volunteering, workforce contribution and participatory consumption of grassroots football in Barking and Dagenham at £38m.
- 3.12 Delivery of the project will enhance the Council’s reputation and its standing among sports bodies and local stakeholders. It will also secure new high-quality facilities in Parsloes Park; the enhancement of 30 poor-conditioned pitches; £7.2m in grant from collective funders and a potential £6.8m inject of capital and resource into Barking & Dagenham, making grassroots football in the borough more sustainable and less reliant on public subsidy. The Cabinet is therefore recommended to borrow the £6.1m required to ensure the scheme is delivered.

4. Consultation

- 4.1 The historic consultation with stakeholders which helped develop the general vision and requirements of Parklife has been well documented in the previous report.
- 4.2 The current situation regarding the increase in costs have been discussed with the senior leadership of the Council and the proposals in this report were considered and endorsed by the Corporate Strategy Group at its meeting on 16 June 2022.

5. Financial Implications

Implications completed by: David Dickinson, Investment Fund Manager

- 5.1 The report outlines total costs to upgrade the pitch and pavilion facilities at Parsloes Park. A breakdown of the costs is below, which show that there is a shortfall in funding for this project, based on an asset life of 30 years, of £286k per year. In addition, short term borrowing would be required to cover the potential Beam Park contribution of £350k.

Total Costs	13,600
FF Grant	-5,700
GLA Grant	-500
SCIL	-600
London Marathon Charitable Trust	-500
Beam S106	-350
Value Engineering	-288
Legacy S106	-289
LBBB Agreed	-400
Total Additional Net Funding	4,973
Funding	

Shortfall	4,973
Agreed	400
Short Term Borrowing (Interest only)	350
Total Funding Required	5,723
Asset Life	30 Years
Annual Borrowing Costs (fixed, includes repayment)	£286k

- 5.2 As outlined in the report the main drivers behind the increase in costs is that the Council is responsible for cost increases above the level of funding being provided. As build costs have increased and as the specifications have changed, the increased costs fall on the Council to fund.
- 5.3 A review of all projects is currently being undertaken as it is likely that the current high rate of inflation will impact schemes, especially where there is a fixed level of funding.
- 5.4 As outlined in the report, the FF has been contacted and there have been discussions with them around the potential to use surpluses from the lease to fund borrowing but they have confirmed that this is not possible as it would set a precedent and does not fit within the funding model they use.
- 5.5 The FF did confirm that the grant funding provided is the highest amount of grant they have ever awarded, and the site does benefit from funding of £8.23m for a much-improved site, including the pavilion.
- 5.6 The report confirms that the business plan forecasts an average annual operating surplus of £299k which would be reinvestment to support grassroots football development, clubs and facilities within Barking & Dagenham. Although the money would not be paid to the Council to pay the loan and interest repayments, there is the potential that this money could be used to reduce the Council's budget for maintaining and improving 30 other poor quality football pitches and surrounding grass areas in Parsloes, Barking, Old Dagenham and Valence. Each of these sites is identified as a priority within the borough's LFFP to bring the grass pitches up to a 'Good' standard for football as measured by the Grounds Management Association (GMA).
- 5.7 The report outlines a potential savings of £31k per year to the parks and environment service. This would reduce the annual cost to the Council to £259k.
- 5.8 Working closely with the Leisure United and the FF would focus the surpluses on improving the football pitches in Parsloes, Barking, Old Dagenham and Valence. This cost is currently not budgeted for and can be seen as a future cost that will be funded.
- 5.9 The Leisure United Business Plan does include provision for a sinking funding (£87.5k per year), an operating reserve of £200k and gym and general equipment leases of £96k per year. Surpluses also do not include summer partner income and it is likely that an agreement can be reached with partner clubs to play during the summer season at an agreeable rate. Additional contracts for the gym have not been included. Increased utility costs have been factored into the assumptions.

6. Legal Implications

Implications completed by: Ian Chisnell, Locum Special Projects Lawyer

- 6.1 The Council has power under s19 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 to provide recreational facilities and give loans or grants to voluntary organisations in connection therewith.
- 6.2 In relation to any disposal of land or lease for more than seven years the Council must comply with s123 of the Local Government Act 1972, which requires that any such disposal is for best consideration unless the consent of the Secretary of State is obtained.
- 6.3 There is a General Disposal Consent issued by the Secretary of State in 2003 that provides that a disposal can be at less than best consideration provided that the difference between the price for which it is disposed and best consideration is less than £2M and:
 - a) the local authority considers that the purpose for which the land is to be disposed is likely to contribute to the achievement of any one or more of the following objects in respect of the whole or any part of its area, or of all or any persons resident or present in its area;
 - i) the promotion or improvement of economic well-being;
 - ii) the promotion or improvement of social well-being;
 - iii) the promotion or improvement of environmental well-being;
- 6.4 The Park is designated Metropolitan Open Land and it is presumed that all planning requirements have been met and that nothing has changed in relation thereto since the inception of the project.
- 6.5 The Council will have no interest in the companies leasing or operating the facilities so any control of the use of the facilities will have to be by way of the lease.
- 6.6 As regards the contractual arrangements, if the increase in value of the contract with Alliance Leisure is more than 50%, then that contract will need to be retendered under the Public Contract Regulations 2015 (PCR), as any variation over that amount is not permitted without a new procurement by Regulation 72. The Council's Contract Rules reflect the conditions in Reg 72.
- 6.7 If it is necessary to tender for a new contract there may be breakage costs payable to the current contractor.
- 6.8 As the Lessee will be a Contracting Authority, in procuring an operator, it must comply with the PCR. If it lets the contract to a company wholly owned by it which complies with Reg 32 of the PCR then that will suffice. If it cannot then it must carry out a tender exercise according to the PCR.

7. Procurement Implications

Implications completed by: Euan Beales, Head of Procurement & Accounts Payable

- 7.1 Based on the principle that the lease owner will be contracting through an owned subsidiary, then the action would not constitute as a formal process that would be managed through PCR2015. In the event that the contract does not fall to the owned subsidiary, then the principles of PCR2015 would apply and a formal procurement process would need to be undertaken by the Lease owner.
- 7.2 Based on the information contained in the paper, and on the basis that the requirement to procure is negated through Regulation 32 then the decision is purely one of reputation and financial viability due to the cost increases.

8. Other Implications

- 8.1 **Risk Management Issues** – The main body of the report addresses in detail the risks involved in either not proceeding with the project or trying to descope and retender.
- 8.2 **Contractual Issues** – If Cabinet approved the strategy set out in this report, then the Council could execute the Deed of Grant with the FF; the Delivery Agreement with Alliance Leisure and eventually the lease for pitches and the pavilion with Leisure United. Contractual exchanges could take place imminently, locking in prices against any further cost inflation.

Due to the previous fragmented nature of the projects administration, going forwards it will be overseen directly by the Head of Sustainability, Net Zero and Parks Commissioning and the new Programme Manager for Green Spaces and Nature Recover and there will be weekly meetings comprised of Be First, Finance and Parks & Environment. This group will be responsible for monitoring the contractual arrangements and delivery of the programme and commissioners will report back monthly to the Assets & Capital Board.

- 8.3 **Corporate Policy, Customer and Equality Impact** - Grassroots football is estimated to contribute to improving the physical and mental well-being of 2.9m children and 8.2m adults. The provision of first-class pitches and pavilion facilities in Parsloes Park and beyond, over the course of the next thirty years, will transform the grassroots football offer to the residents of Barking & Dagenham considerably with an estimated 30,000 people expected to use the pitches and pavilion facilities every year, welcoming over 200,000 visits annually.

Other national Parklife hubs put on activities such as Care home cinema days with lunch and bingo, community Christmas markets, Young Asian Voice events, disability football access and toddler groups to encourage greater social interaction within the community and this is expected to be replicated here.

The proposal is positive in its impact upon the protected characteristics outlined in the Equality Act 2010.

- 8.4 **Health Issues** – As per the 2018 report these facilities would lead to increased physical activity and opportunities for women and girls; children and young people; disabled participants; amongst older people and adults.
- 8.5 **Crime and Disorder Issues** - There are no general crime and disorder issues, but the football hub will provide a programme of positive and diversionary activities for children and young people. High quality and accessible sports facilities with extensive operating hours should have a positive impact on levels of anti-social behaviour and wider perceptions of safety in Parsloes Park.
- 8.6 **Property / Asset Issues** – The scheme replaces life-expired facilities and poor-condition pitches and removes their ongoing maintenance and utility costs, which will be passed onto the operator.

Public Background Papers Used in the Preparation of the Report:

- Cabinet report on Parklife Project 19th June 2018:
<https://modgov.lbbd.gov.uk/Internet/documents/s124287/Parklife%20Report%20final.pdf>
- Football Association – Social Economic Value of Grassroots Football report – March 2021: <file:///C:/Users/npearce/Downloads/the-social-economic-value-of-grassroots-football-in-england-march-2021.pdf>

List of appendices: None