



**September 2020**

**Update/Report and Recommendations**

**Festival Hall Working Party**

*Update 3*

**Cllr JC Crissey and Cllr Phil Shaw**

*Co-chairs FHWP*



# Aim of this report

- To enable the Public Halls Committee to select a refurbishment strategy for the Festival and Town Hall, and use that decision to make a recommendation to the F&GP and Full Council.
- Enable the FHWP to move to a more tactical stage needed to determine:
  - the financing options of the chosen strategy
  - develop a more definitive project timetable (including milestones)
  - develop recommendations for beginning RIBA3/4 work asap

# FHWP - Terms of Reference

- To hold meetings as and when needed to discuss details of the project
- To provide and update colleagues with factual information between meetings
- To make use of 'user groups' expertise as and when required
- To provide leadership and guidance to other members to progress the project building works
- To test and challenge the recommendations of Chris Moore's report and to monitor the financial performance of the Festival Hall
- To report the findings of its tests to the Public Halls Committee
- To mitigate the risks highlighted in Chris Moore's report
- To consider the issues of governance of the Festival Hall including monitoring of financial performance

*(The FHWP was set up at the Public Halls committee meeting in September 2019, minute PH0330 refers, and approved by Full Council, minute C0401)*

# Long history of delay

- January 1990 – proposals were drawn up on plans to “replace existing single storey cedar clad timber framed building with a permanent two-storey extension.” This would include on the ground floor a kitchen, store room, bin store (now a health and safety hazard), toilets and car parking spaces. The 1<sup>st</sup> floor included a projection room, toilets, galley kitchen and one large office space (Roger Hill Building Design 1990)
- Sept 1998 – an access survey for disability was commissioned (PHC Mins 1998)
- May 2008 – major fire at the Festival Hall (Ibid., 2008)
- Oct 2010 – proposed ventilation and double glazing for Rose Room (Ibid., 2010)
- Apr 2013 – concerns raised about Festival Hall utilisation (Ibid., 2010)
- Jun 2016 – commencing of current project – members asked to submit ideas for refurbishment (Ibid., 2016)



# Refurbishment priorities by 'zones'

- ✓ Priority zone 1: Two story extension zone — £1,390,000
- ✓ Priority zone 2: Rose room & lobby zone — £630,000
- ✓ Priority zone 3: New foyer extension zone — £740,000
- ✓ Priority zone 4: Technical upgrades to the hall — £1,250,000 (a 'top down' FHWP estimate)\*
- ✓ Priority zone 5: Main hall and backstage — £4,320,000 (includes the cost estimate for Priority 4)
- ✓ Priority zone 6: Town hall offices and small hall zone — £1,580,000

**Total as provided by FW: £8,660,000 (\*Excluding PZ4 £1,250,000 for technical upgrades)**

This prioritised list is derived from input from: public consultations, councillors, PTC officers, provisional findings from the structural report, Foster Wilson architects and the business consultant ACL Consultancy Ltd..

The main deviation from Foster Wilson's list is the addition of 'Priority 4: Technical upgrades to the hall — £1,250,000', otherwise the list of component 'zone' refurbishments is adopted from architect's revised RIBA2 listing and costings (Foster Wilson 2018).



# Refurbishment strategy options

- 1) Maintain status quo
- 2) Dispose of the building
- 3) Undertake priorities to ~£2m
- 4) Undertake priorities to ~£4m
- 5) Full refurbishment of the FH to ~£8.6m

# 1. Maintain status quo

Use the new annual maintenance fund of £217k to make repairs when needed. In effect, the FH would remain unchanged and the existing structure would be repaired on an 'as best as can be afforded' basis.

## Advantages:

- No borrowing requirement
- No further expenditure or planning effort needed (RIBA3/4)
- Possibly maintain existing income

## Disadvantages:

- Very limited scope for business development
- Very limited scope for greater community use
- Minimal ability to achieve net-zero objectives
- Major repairs/upgrades could only be done if budget has been accrued

## 2. Dispose of the building

Dispose of the building in a manner that supports an increase in other community benefit use (e.g. number of affordable homes) and use the proceeds of the sale to support the local arts and charities in other Petersfield venues.

### Advantages:

- No borrowing required
- Major contribution to net-zero objectives for PTC
- Might prove a sensible decision in a post-COVID-19 environment (uncertainty of group gathering and not need to subsidise the FH)
- PTC significantly increases its ability to financially support the arts and charities in other Petersfield venues
- PTC increases its ability to invest in other 'capital projects' only (e.g. library, post office)

### Disadvantages:

- Decision is inconsistent with existing town plan
- Potential loss of 'public funding' to support amateur arts and community groups
- Loss of a major property holding and ability to generate revenue
- The need to move the town hall (disruption and cost)

## 3. Refurbish to ~£2m

This option allows for the most important refurbishment priorities to be undertaken, specifically Priorities 1 (two story extension @ £1,390,000) and 2 (Rose room & lobby zone @ £630,000) for approximately £2,020,000 in total. Some consideration could be made about including new toilets in the ground floor extension and diverting some of the money not needed for the lobby zone to increase the energy efficiency of the extension.

### Advantages:

- The opportunity to open the hall up to other events
- More H&S compliant
- Most important refurbishment priorities will be done
- Some budgetary flexibility for net-zero objectives
- Debt might still be avoided if reserves are used

### Disadvantages:

- Limited scope for future business development
- Limited scope for greater community use
- Reduced ability to achieve net-zero objectives
- Future-proofing the building would not be achieved

## 4. Refurbish to ~£4m

This option allows for the most important refurbishment priorities to be undertaken, specifically Priorities 1 (two story extension @ £1,390,000), 2 (Rose room & lobby zone @ £630,000), 3 (new foyer extension £740,000), and 4 (technical upgrades to the hall @ £1,250,000 that include hall ventilation and technical installations) for £4,010,000 in total. Some consideration could be made about including new toilets in the ground floor extension and diverting some of the money not needed for the lobby zone to increase the energy efficiency of the extension.

### Advantages:

- The opportunity to open the hall up to other events
- Even more H&S compliant (in relation to Option 3)
- Most important refurbishment priorities will be done
- More budgetary flexibility to achieve net-zero objectives in relation to option 3
- Debt would be maintained at a minimum level if reserves are used

### Disadvantages:

- Less scope for business development
- Less scope for greater community use when compared to the final option
- Limited capability to achieve net-zero objectives
- Future-proofing of the building would not be fully achieved

## 5. Full refurbishment to ~£8.7m

The full refurbishment based on RIBA2. The implementation phases of this strategy could be done in a way to reduce risk, with milestones between RIBA3/4 stages and zone developments.

### Advantages:

- Future-proof of the building would be achieved with an accompanying business operations model
- Significant expansion of the 'events portfolio' based on a building that can achieve the highest level of utilisation (especially for underserved groups, e.g. youth via e-games)
- Explore the potential for bringing in the 'festival hall chambers' into the scope of full refurbishment and community use
- More budgetary flexibility to achieve net-zero objectives in relation to option 4
- Major 'market-based' revenue generating venue

### Disadvantages:

- Requires additional cost for a full-time business operations team
- Possible limits on taking on other major projects (e.g. Library, Post Office building)
- Highest level of debt, with most logistical disruption and loss of existing revenue
- Highest level of risk

# Options summary and recommendation



- 1) Maintain status quo
- 2) Dispose of the building
- 3) Undertake priorities to ~£2m
- 4) Undertake priorities to ~£4m
- 5) Full refurbishment of the FH to ~£8.6m

**FHWP RECOMMENDATION: SELECT ONE!**



## Major assumptions

- RIBA2 Scope of work and costs, including revised cost projections
- Structural report would be done starting in mid-September
- Other projects investigated by other WPs, such as tourism, will have an impact on FH operations, but have not been listed as part of the advantages or disadvantages of any option



# Bibliography

Foster, Tim (2018) *Petersfield Festival Hall RIBA Stage 2 Design Proposal Presentation*, Foster Wilson Architects, pp 14

Hill, Roger (1990) *Building Design Proposal*, Roger Hill Building Design

Moore, Chris (2019) *Development of the Festival Hall Petersfield: Options and Programme*, ACL Consultancy Solutions Ltd., pp 88

Petersfield Town Council (1998) *Public Halls Committee Meeting Minutes for September 1998*, PTC, pp 7 [Accessed 26/08/20 via [www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk](http://www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk)]

\_\_\_\_ (2008) *Public Halls Committee Meeting Minutes for May 2008*, PTC, pp 9 [Accessed 26/08/20 via [www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk](http://www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk)]

\_\_\_\_ (2010) *Public Halls Committee Meeting Minutes for October 2010*, PTC, pp 8 [Accessed 27/08/20 via [www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk](http://www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk)]

\_\_\_\_ (2013) *Public Halls Committee Meeting Minutes for April 2012*, PTC, pp 12 [Accessed 26/08/20 via [www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk](http://www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk)]

\_\_\_\_ (2015) *Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan*, PTC, pp 132 [Accessed on 25/08/20 via [www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk](http://www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk)]

\_\_\_\_ (2016) *Public Halls Committee Meeting Minutes for June 2016*, PTC, pp 17 [Accessed on 27/08/20 via [www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk](http://www.Petersfield-tc.gov.uk)]

# Supplementary Materials



Supplementary Officers Comments and Observations Document  
[Attached]