
Report to: Cabinet **Date of Meeting:** 19th January 2012

Subject: The Southport Cultural Centre

Report of: Strategic Director People **Wards Affected:** All

Is this a Key Decision? Yes **Is it included in the Forward Plan?** Yes

Exempt/Confidential No

Purpose/Summary

This report sets out background information relating to the development of the Southport Cultural Centre (SCC) in the context of economic development and the funding strategy employed to realise the proposal.

The report then outlines the various options that have been considered in terms of operating the Centre including the option of it being managed by a community team with volunteers.

The report concludes by examining the options of either directly operating the Centre in the intermediate future or mothballing the development.

Recommendation(s)

The Cabinet approves:-

1. The opening of the SCC with a limited but appropriate programme at additional budget of £398,150 in 2012/13 and £722,200 in subsequent financial years
2. The acceptance of the Heritage Lottery Fund Grant of £973,200 be authorised in accordance with the conditions of the grant.
3. The additional budget requirements be built into the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.
4. That the determination of the name for the Centre be referred for consideration by Southport Area Committee with a view to the Committee making a recommendation to the Cabinet Member (Leisure & Tourism)

How does the decision contribute to the Council's Corporate Objectives?

<u>Corporate Objective</u>		<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community	✓		
2	Jobs and Prosperity	✓		
3	Environmental Sustainability	✓		
4	Health and Well-Being	✓		
5	Children and Young People	✓		
6	Creating Safe Communities			
7	Creating Inclusive Communities	✓		
8	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening Local Democracy		✓	

Reasons for the Recommendation:

To determine whether the SCC will open as originally envisaged

What will it cost and how will it be financed?

(A) Revenue Costs

The additional budget uplift required to the Arts Budget to operate the SCC with a limited but appropriate programme would be £398,150 in 2012/13 and £722,200 in subsequent financial years

If the new building had to be 'mothballed' the Council would still need to make additional budget uplift to the Arts budget of £578,800 in 2012/13 and £387,100 in subsequent financial years.

(B) Capital Costs

The revised total of £15.6m comprised:

Sefton Council Capital programme	£7.7m
NWDA	£4m
Sea Change	£3.9m

Implications:

The following implications of this proposal have been considered and where there are specific implications, these are set out below:

Legal
Human Resources

Equality

- | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | No Equality Implication | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | Equality Implications identified and mitigated | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | Equality Implication identified and risk remains | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Impact on Service Delivery:

If the SCC does not open there will be reduced Arts provision in the Borough together with associated economic development implications

What consultations have taken place on the proposals and when?

The Head of Corporate Finance (FD 4291) and Head of Corporate Legal Services (LD636/12) have been consulted and any comments have been incorporated into the report.

Are there any other options available for consideration?

No

Implementation Date for the Decision

Following the expiry of the “call-in” period for the Minutes of the Cabinet/Cabinet Member Meeting

Contact Officer: Peter Morgan
Tel: 0151 934 3706
Email: peter.morgan@sefton.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Cabinet 27 November 2008 “Southport Cultural Centre”
Cabinet 21 January 2010 “Southport Cultural Centre”
Cabinet 8 December 2011 “Capital Programme Update”

1. Background – The Development of Southport Cultural Centre (SCC)

- 1.1 The concept of SCC grew out of the case for economic development in Southport. The importance of culture to economic regeneration was first recognised in the Locum report – Southport Classic Resort in 2004. The report said:

“A classic resort will have a varied and high quality cultural offer. The town’s ‘Four Graces’, the Atkinson Library, Art Gallery, Arts Centre and Town Hall provide the raw materials for a cultural quarter of outstanding quality.”

- 1.2 The concept of an integrated Cultural Centre was further endorsed in the 2004 “Vision for Southport” agreement between Sefton Council and the North West Development Agency (NWDA). This set out a 10 year plan for regenerating Southport into a successful and vibrant destination. It made specific reference to three large transformational projects, Lord Street infrastructure improvements, the Southport Theatre and Convention Centre development, *(both of which have been completed)* and the Cultural Centre. This “Vision for Southport” agreement set out the following guidance as to the way forward:

“The Southport Arts Centre and adjacent Art Gallery will be upgraded to deliver a cultural attraction of regional and national significance. This will increase the attractiveness and pulling power of Lord Street especially for more affluent and sophisticated consumers.”

- 1.3 The economic regeneration of Southport as England’s Classic Resort is firmly embedded in a number of key strategies including, from a regional stand point, the 2006 Regional Economic Strategy which states in Action point 102 that we must:

“Capitalise on the strengths and key assets of Southport as a Classic Resort”.

The Cultural Centre was considered to deliver against Action Point 102 on all levels.

- 1.4 Members agreed to the concept of the SCC based on the redevelopment of the existing Arts Centre, Art Gallery and Library when they approved the Southport Investment Strategy in 2008. *(The Centre was a specifically listed project)*. This strategy was endorsed by the NWDA and the Cultural Centre is listed as a significant ‘destination’ in their current tourism development plan. Sefton’s visitor economy strategy goes on to say;

“The opportunities to harness the potential of the arts and creative industries through the Southport Cultural Centre initiative are crucial and provide the catalyst from which the resort’s cultural offer can be developed providing renewed focus for independent retail along Market St and King St. Similarly, reinvigorating Southport’s night time economy is a priority given the need to encourage younger visitors to the resort and the high per capital expenditure they bring.”

- 1.5 The SCC project is specifically highlighted in Liverpool City Region’s Destination Management Plan 2008–11 as a “Priority project for Public Funding”. This

mandated NWDA to support Sefton's Sea Change bid to CABE and to agree to match any funds received. A further confirmation of the strategic importance of the Centre is the Heritage Lottery Fund's awarding of a grant of nearly £1m towards the cost of fitting out the museum.

- 1.6 The economic driver for the range of endorsements for the SCC is that Southport attracts over 11.5m visitors a year and generates annually approximately £250m in day, short break and conference business. In turn, this supports over 4000 f.t.e. jobs and creates demand for new and additional services that lead to the creation and growth of business. Over the last 10 years, in excess of £200m of both private and public sector money has been invested in the infrastructure of Southport's visitor economy to sustain the attractiveness of the resort in the face of increasing competition from domestic and overseas destinations. To add to these difficulties, the current visitor profile suggests one which is aging and therefore likely to be reducing its financial outgoings. Therefore the need to attract a new type of visitor is essential. The centre is considered imperative to maintaining the advantages gained from the investment made by both the public and private sector over the last 10 years and with it, its principal economic driver as a visitor economy.

2.0 The Development of the Capital Programme for SCC

- 2.1 There have been a number of previous reports on the SCC project commencing with the report to Cabinet, at its meeting on 27th November 2008, seeking in principle approval to develop a project with a total budget of £22M.
- 2.2 After much development work it became clear that not all of the anticipated external funding would be available and, in April 2009, a working budget of £16.3M was established. This comprised:

Sefton Council Capital programme	£7.3M
NWDA	£4M
Sea Change	£4M
Heritage Lottery Fund	£1m

- 2.3 Unfortunately the bid for Heritage Lottery funding towards both the broader construction works, as well as the museum fit out, was unsuccessful. Although a modified bid (discussed in Section 3 of this report) now appears to have now been successful this will provide funding for Museum fit out works only and is of no financial assistance in respect of the general construction works.
- 2.4 At the same time, the Sea Change fund indicated that it was reducing its grant from £4.0m to £3.9m.
- 2.5 The total budget was therefore amended to reflect the loss of Heritage Lottery and Sea Change funding and the increase in Sefton's own Capital resources from £7.3m to £7.7m making a total of £15.6m made up as follows:

Sefton Council Capital programme	£7.7M
NWDA	£4M
Sea Change	£3.9M

- 2.6 It is important to recall that both NWDA and Sea Change required the Authority to make a physical start on the project in May 2010 and to defray £8M of expenditure by the end of March 2011, i.e. within 10 months.
- 2.7 The reduced project budget and the grant draw-down timescales set a number of difficult challenges for the project team and it was extremely difficult to develop a coherent set of proposals that met the Council's operational requirements and the requirements of the external funding bodies. Amongst the savings identified and implemented so far are;
- Rationalising of painting specification and floor coverings
 - Omission of the glazing of the porte cochere
 - Reduction in permanent external lighting in lieu of a more flexible projection system
 - Relocation of the sub station from the roof into Cambridge Arcade
 - Reduction in the scope of public realm works
 - Omission of improvement works to offices in Bank Buildings
 - Rationalisation of doors, and ironmongery.

Where possible, extensive negotiations have been held with suppliers and sub contractors to drive down costs without impacting on efficiency and appearance.

- 2.8 Ultimately following the various value engineering and redesign exercises Cabinet, at its meeting in 21st January 2010, were asked to approve the acceptance of terms attached to the grant funding and approved the appointment of Bovis Lend Lease as the main contractor to proceed with the project budget set at £15.6M.
- 2.9 Despite the tight timescale a site start was achieved at the end of May 2010 and the required expenditure target was achieved before the end of March 2011. The Council has claimed the full of grant from NWDA and is awaiting the final payment of £1.2M from Sea Change, which will be released once they have received satisfactory information on the future operation of the SCC.
- 2.10 Members will be aware, from the Capital Programme Update, reported to Cabinet on 8th December 2011, that the SCC is suffering significant cost pressures. The project has proven more complex and challenging than originally envisaged and although there have been a number of value engineering exercises aimed at reducing the scope of the works, the anticipated increased liability to the Council may be as much as £1.4M. Consequently Members were asked to consider using the balance of savings from other schemes within the Council's Capital Programme to mitigate these additional costs.

3.0 Accepting the HLF Grant for fitting out the Museum

- 3.1 The Museum budget for fitting out the 4 galleries was cut because it was considered the most likely to be able to draw in additional resources from the HLF. That assumption has proved to be correct and HLF has awarded the SCC a Round 1 approval for the fit out for the museum. This means that the Goodison

collection of Egyptology, which includes many items dating back over 3,000 years, will be the centrepiece of the displays. The grant given in Round 1 will allow all the necessary preparatory work to be fully developed in order to make a successful bid at Round 2.

3.2 Details of the grant and the Council's contribution are as follows.

	Grant from HLF	Sefton's contribution	Total available spend
Round 1	73,700	5,500	79,200
Round 2	899,500	44,500	944,000
Total	973,200	50,000*	1,023,200

3.3 As Sefton's contribution (*) is already included in the capital programme, accepting this grant does not require the Council to provide any further match funding. Members will appreciate that without this grant, it will be impossible to fit out the museum to the standard required to attract either local or regional visitors. The award was made in June of this year but, so far, has not been accepted. Following correspondence with the HLF the Strategic Director – People has been informed by the HLF that the Council must accept the grant by the end of January or the offer could be withdrawn.

3.4 **The post of Museums and Galleries manager:-** Sefton's museum and gallery service was 'Accredited' with the Museums Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) before it closed. Being 'Accredited' means you meet certain standards with regard to the security, conservation, documentation and display of your collections, the management of your buildings and the service you offer to the public. Regaining 'Accreditation' is seen by HLF as essential for the SCC scheme because it confers;

- Automatic eligibility for external capital and revenue funding from most government and charitable sources.
- The right to borrow work from any of the national collections such as the Tate and the British Museum. (It is also a benchmark used by private collectors in considering requests to borrow items.)
- Support from the Government Indemnity Scheme which meets some of the costs of borrowing works of art from other institutions.

3.5 A large proportion of the exhibition programme will rely on being able to borrow high-profile work from other collections and meeting some of the costs from external sources. The museum and gallery spaces have all been designed and equipped to meet appropriate standards of security and environmental management to facilitate this. To regain 'Accreditation' will require the appointment of a suitably qualified and experienced manager who will also ensure the standard of exhibitions in both the Museum and the Art Gallery is maintained.

4.0 Options for the Operation of the SCC

4.1 Officers examined five management options with a view to ensuring the building and its services give 'best value' and which would deliver the outputs required by the funders as well as business and community partners:-

- In-house management
- Community management of the SCC building
- External contractor
- Charitable Trust
- Cluster management

4.2 In-house management : This would involve a reduced management team buying in services from the private sector such as catering, cleaning, retail, technical services, and security. The team would commission independent programmers to develop visual and performing arts programmes and would work with community partners to support amateur visual arts and performance groups, to provide courses and classes and other cultural interests such as local history, reading and writing and music.

- Positive outcome – Political and budget control would remain with the Council ensuring the Centre would remain focused on delivering corporate objectives.
- Negative outcomes – Sefton's operational policies, employment terms and conditions and procurement practices have higher costs compared with similar facilities in the private and third sector.

4.3 Community management of the SCC building : This would require the formation of a permanent management group, including representatives of the many groups who have used the Centre in the past, and a constitution which would allow new groups access to the decision making process in the future. Given the Centre's primary purpose, business representatives would also have to be on the management committee.

- Positive outcome – Core costs could be significantly reduced if the majority of staff are volunteers. The Centre could make a substantial contribution to the social regeneration of the town centre.
- Negative outcomes - The SCC is a complex, rather than a single facility bringing together private sector operators such as the Bistro and the Design Centre, independent promoters and hirers, the TIC and Mersey Travel and possibly other businesses. A private sector tenant would expect the venue to be run in a professional manor in everything from the quality of the performances to the cleanliness of the toilets.
- The SCC will be licensed for approximately 1,800 people at any one time. Any operator will have to supply the number of trained and experienced staff legally required to meet the Licence stipulations, plus staff for the bars and box office for every performance, event or exhibition. The emergency

services will want to be sure that all emergency procedures, equipment and staff training are kept up to date

- The museum and gallery have been specifically designed and equipped to allow the SCC to borrow high value items from the national collections such as the British Museum and the Tate Gallery. These institutions will not lend any items to unqualified or unaccountable members of the public. Managing Sefton's collections to ensure their security, conservation, documentation and display is not compromised requires trained and experienced staff.
- The cost of operating the building will require substantial income from ticket sales, hire fees, rents, grant aid, sponsorship and commission. A voluntary group cannot be held responsible if income targets are not met.
- There are health and safety issues associated with operating a building of this size and complexity. For example, the air conditioning system, if not appropriately maintained, could be a source of Legionella.
- The complex occupies a 65,000 sq. ft. 3 storey building which will require cleaning each day, security patrols during opening hours and routine repairs and maintenance.

4.4 **External contractor** : Members asked for the operation of the Centre to be opened up to the independent sector to 'market test' the estimated running costs. A specification was produced and a call for expressions of interest from external contractors was made via the industry's principal media. 24 responses were received. However, none of them had the essential experience required. Given the thoroughness of the process gone through, officers do not believe repeating it will improve the quality of respondents and that it is unlikely in the current financial climate that a suitable independent operator will be found.

4.5 **Charitable Trust** : The vast majority of the arts organisations throughout the country are managed by independent trusts. Organisations such as the RLPO and Everyman and Playhouse in Liverpool, The Exchange Theatre, Bridgewater Hall and Lowry in Manchester are all managed by trusts.

- Positive outcomes – The whole purpose of an arts trust is to focus on delivering a high quality arts programme to the maximum number of people. Its Board of Trustees will have both the interest and the experience needed to give it the best possible chance of success.
- It will have greater flexibility in managing staff costs, in using volunteers and in accessing external sources of capital and revenue
- A trust would have VAT and NNDR advantages over both the local authority and the private sector.
- Negative outcomes – The Centre and its programme would be outside local political control.
- Like any other business, it would be at risk of going 'bust'.

4.6 **Cluster management** : Cluster management is where a number of authorities with similar facilities or services come together to see if overall costs can be reduced by sharing management, operational and programming staff. Officers had expected that when the adverts calling for expressions of interest from independent contractors were published, established trusts would come forward with proposals of this nature but none of them did.

- Positive – Such an arrangement could reduce overall costs by reducing staff costs at venues where a full time arts programme is no longer required. There may be other savings through joint commissioning and marketing.
- Negative – The respective venues would need to share corporate aims and objectives and be willing to have similar programmes and activities. They would need to be appealing to the same audiences.
- Such an agreement would require political buy-in and long term budgetary commitment from each Council.
- Whichever authority took control of the overall management would be likely to be liable for the financial performance of the group or any other agreed output.

5.0 **Joint management of the SCC and the Southport Theatre & Convention Centre (STCC)**

5.1 The management of the STCC is currently undertaken by a private sector company. The contract comes up for renewal in July 2012 and therefore a call for 'expressions of interest' (EoI) in taking on the contract was published in the appropriate leisure press to ensure awareness of it was high. As with the Atkinson, the numeric response was satisfactory but the quality and experience of the individual contractors was not, to the extent that only the current operator's EoI was considered to be eligible and officers have reservations as to whether they are currently providing the council with a 'best value' service.

5.2 Therefore, the Head of Tourism is looking at alternative options;

- (a) Taking the Service back in-house
- (b) Setting up an arms length Trust to manage the facility

Either of these options would be suitable for the SCC and therefore it would be appropriate to examine whether there could be further operational saving by having one managing team (in-house or under a Trust) looking after both facilities.

5.3 However, to examine this option fully will take some time and is therefore an option in the medium term. Therefore, a contingency plan would need to be in place to ensure operational continuity for the STCC, and some form of temporary management of the SCC to eliminate the risk of claw-back of grant.

6.0 Consideration of Mothballing' the SCC or opening it with an appropriate programme.

- 6.1 The annual costs of 'mothballing' the SCC and returning the grants is approximately £927k details of which are attached as appendix 1. This figure includes the repayment of the grants through prudential borrowing which is estimated will cost the Council £670k p.a. for a period of 25 years.
- 6.2 In the context of the Council's budget, the proposed budget for the arts in 2012-13 is £349k. An additional £200k has been included in the MTFP for a period of three years starting in 2013-14. The figures below are in addition to this and relate to period 2012/13 – 2015/16.
- 6.3 Therefore, the additional budget required to 'mothball' the SCC would be £579k in 2012-13, £387k in subsequent years.
- 6.4 The cost of the in-house management team opening it to the public in the Spring of 2013 with a limited and appropriate programme that enables the outputs for the capital grants to be met is approximately £747k in 2012-13 (preparatory programming and marketing activities) rising to £1.263m in 2013-14 and each year thereafter. A more detailed budget is attached as appendix 2
- 6.5 Therefore the additional budget required to open the facility would be £398k in 2012-13 rising to £722k in 2013-14 with the same figure for subsequent years.

7.0 Principal risks associated with 'mothballing'.

- 7.1 The Sea Change fund has indicated that the final payment of £1.2m could be withheld pending confirmation of the Council's intention to open the Centre when the building is handed back in the summer of 2012. They are also asking for confirmation that there will be a high quality arts and culture programme as previously indicated. Accordingly an indicative programme has been produced in order to secure this final payment.
- 7.2 'Mothballing' the building could be seen by the two principal donors to be a breach of their agreement with the Council. If so, they might ask for some, if not the entire grant of £7.9m to be repaid. See Section 6.1
- 7.3 When the building is handed back to the Council, it will need to be commissioned. This involves operating all facilities and services for a 12 month period in order to highlight any faults, defects or operational problems. This includes the training of staff in the operation of the building and the implementation of emergency procedures. This is essential in order to acquire a Public Entertainment Licence.
- 7.4 Commissioning the building after the 12 month guarantee period could leave the Council with major capital liabilities. The vast majority of equipment within any building will only carry a 12 month warranty which could also leave the SCC with a repair and maintenance liability.
- 7.5 The owners of the building from which the temporary Library operates currently have a rolling month by month contract with the Council. If the Library had to be relocated in the SCC, partial opening of the ground floor would be possible but

this would incur capital costs to isolate the Library from the rest of the complex and to modify their entrance to meet DDA requirements. They would not have access to public toilets nor to their own express, self service area. To open the whole ground floor would require security and cleaning regimes for the whole site.

- 7.6 Both the museum and gallery collections are intended to be stored in purpose built facilities within the SCC. Therefore the environmental and security systems will need to be active and someone will need to be responsible for responding to the alarms. The art collection could continue to be stored off site, at the current cost of £39,104 p.a., and the museum collection could remain in the existing museum building. However this would require an increasingly dilapidated building to be kept 'warm, safe and dry' and for the emergency alarms to be kept active. It would prevent the Council from disposing of the building if an opportunity arose.
- 7.7 The Tourist Information Centre (T.I.C) and the Events Box Office are scheduled to relocate to the SCC as soon as it opens. Merseytravel, who have recently agreed to share premises with the T.I.C. are also expecting to relocate. To accommodate them on the ground floor will create the same building management issues as the Library. However, if the Library does return to the SCC, there would be no additional cost if the T.I.C. did the same.
- 7.8 The SCC site is composed of different leases owned by different organisations so it has been necessary to negotiate access agreements with them. In exchange for access to Cambridge Walks, the Council has given the owners a commitment to opening up the SCC's foyer as an entrance into their arcade. In a recent newspaper article, they have indicated that the success of Cambridge Walks relies on the SCC opening next year. If the Council fails to honour this agreement, it could give rise to a legal challenge with associated costs.

8.0 Mitigating the risk of claw-back

- 8.1 Opening the SCC with a limited programme will help to reduce, if not eliminate the risk of claw-back. If it is decided to 'mothball' the Centre, officers will attempt to renegotiate the two funding agreements but this will be difficult if the Council gives no guarantee to open the SCC with a full programme at some time in the near future. It's the programme which will deliver the outputs, not the building.

9.0 Estimating the revenue costs for the SCC.

- 9.1 In 2009, officers were asked to indicate what the annual revenue budget for the SCC was likely to be. The answer was 'no more than the sum of the controllable budgets that were allocated to the existing individual services in the 2009-10 budget. These were:

- Arts Centre/Crosby Civic Hall - £821k
- Art Gallery/Museum - £329k
- Southport Library, excluding staff costs - £60k
- Tourism Information Centre - £140k

A total of £1.350m.

- 9.2 In 2010, at the request of the funders, a business plan and operational budget was prepared by an external consultant. The resulting plan indicated the Centre would need an annual revenue budget of £2.2m. Officers believe this represents a 'worst-case-scenario' and remain confident that their estimate of £1.350m will be sufficient to operate the SCC as intended.
- 9.3 However, in the light of the Council's need to make savings, officers have re-examined this figure with a view to implementing the minimum programme necessary to eliminate the risk of claw-back. That figure is £1.263m details of which are attached as appendix 2

10.0 Community participation in the delivery of the SCC programme.

- 10.1 Participating in arts activities is very popular throughout Sefton and arts groups of all kinds will be very welcome when the Centre opens. A group of Southport based arts organisations have recently formed the Sefton Cultural Forum with a view to working with the Council to deliver a wider range of community arts and cultural activities and to support local artists working in the creative industries. Officers are working with them, supporting them in making funding applications and developing a business plan. If these plans come to fruition, it would be both appropriate and cost effective to commission community based activities from such an organisation which could draw in resources not accessible to the Council.

11. The Name of the SCC

- 11.1 The term 'Southport Cultural Centre' has been a working title for the development of an existing and complex arts centre which is intended to contribute significantly to economic development of the Sefton economy. However, as yet, a decision has to agree the name for the Centre. Accordingly it is proposed that Southport Area Committee give consideration to possible names for the Centre and make a recommendation to the Cabinet Member (Leisure & Tourism)

APPENDIX 1

Costs of 'mothballing' the SCC

This example only includes controllable budgets and external liabilities. Non-controllable budgets, such as NNDR and capital costs are not included.

Cost of mothballing the building

Claw back of grant (Prudential borrowing)	£	670,000	Probable outcome if the Centre doesn't open and no definite plans are in place for it to do so. The chances of claw-back are high given the current Sea Change intention to with hold the final payment of £1.2m
Maintaining the Library in its current location on a short term lease.	£	55,000	The temporary library site is due to go up for sale. Putting a stay on that is likely to cost more than the current rent of £45,000 because it will be for an indeterminate period.
Routine maintenance and costs of vandalism and graffiti, vermin control etc.	£	65,000	It's a high value building and therefore expensive to 'mothball'
Cost of keeping the art collection in off site storage	£	39,104	This is the current annual charge which may increase.
Cost of keeping the museum collections in their current location. NB , the security of the collections in an unstaffed building is likely to put them at risk.	£	23,850	This is the current cost of energy, essential repairs and maintenance and monitoring by Sefton Security. This cost is also likely to rise. It does not include any staff costs
Security costs including the physical monitoring of the site	£	27,500	Assumes the majority of monitoring will be done digitally with routine physical monitoring by outside contractor
Statutory testing and maintenance	£	47,000	Lifts, electrical testing, Legionella, lifting equipment, etc. will have to be continued even when closed in order to retain certification.
Cost sub total	£	927,454	

APPENDIX 2

CONTROLLABLE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE SCC

	Base 2012-13 £	Base 2013-14 £
<u>Employee Costs</u>	319,900	623,650
<u>Premises Related</u>		
Repairs & Mtce (Incl statutory Testing)	47,000	57,000
Utility Costs	78,900	192,050
Other	7,200	14,600
	133,100	263,650
<u>Transport Related</u>	14,000	16,500
<u>Supplies and Services</u>		
Printing & Stationery	12,000	12,000
Clothing & Uniforms	2,500	7,500
Security Charges	5,000	5,000
Officers Subsistence	600	1,000
Conservation Fund	5,000	5,000
Leasing	92,000	92,000
Bar/ Catering Provisions	10,000	30,000
Retail /Museum Goods	10,000	20,000
	137,100	172,500
<u>Agency & Contracted Services</u>	1,000	3,000
<u>Direct Programme Related (Net of Income)</u>		
Performing Arts	17,600	27,200
Visual Arts	17,650	203,600
Festival and Events	14,000	51,750
Community Partnership Activities	-28,550	3,700
Community Partnerships Fund	10,000	20,000
Licensing, Performing Rights & Admin Costs	43,000	113,000
Marketing - Generic/Tourism	150,000	50,000
	223,700	469,250
<u>Income</u>		
Rent/ Commission & Recharges	-27,000	-81,000
Lettings	-25,000	-75,000
Bar / Catering Income	-30,000	-90,000
Sales	0	-40,000
	-82,000	-286,000
	746,800	1,262,550