

Alternative Proposal put forward to the council by Chris Hartley

Lendal Bridge Sub Station Secure Cycle Park Feasibility Study

Summary

I believe the report is fundamentally flawed from the outset based on the spatial and financial restraints it is based on. It is these two factors that the reports recommendation to sell rather than that of the cycle scheme are based.

The financial burden placed on the council and the prospective lessor is based solely on the £106k that the report believes would be the estimated set up costs. These set up costs then have negative burden on the remainder of the study as the report sets such high goals in order to reach the repayment plan. The need for extra income streams is needed in order to pay for the high set up cost. The space issue is partly I believe due to the wrong units being selected for the actual cycle storage also impacting on the initial spend.

It also seems crazy to commit over 25% of total spend on project management, design and contingencies all placing a burden on the repayment.

Costs of conversion

Item

Cycle parking (100 units @£35.00)	£3500
<i>The £220 price tag is just not realistic, the unit will be managed. Individual cycle boxes are simply an extravagance. These £35.00 units take up less than half the space as the proposed boxes thus relinquishing space for other revenue streams.</i>	
Connections	£26000
<i>Seems high</i>	
Internal installation costs	£15310
Refurbishment of building	£13190
<i>Seems high again, the building only needs a rustic look for a cycle store!</i>	
Marketing	£2000
 Sub total	 <u>£60000</u>
 Design supervision	 £3000
Project management	£0
<i>On a project so small the operators and council property team can easily manage the development.</i>	
Contingencies	£5000
 Total	 <u>£68000</u>

Based on the new set up costs the repayment plan is only £4500 per annum based on the same 15-year payback. The repayment plan could be reduced to 7 years if the original payback sum was adopted.

The reduction in space by utilising the more efficient cycle racks would allow for the revenue streams identified in the report thus adding further to the cost effectiveness of the building as a cycle store.

Rooftop café

Little real thought has gone into the café idea which seems a shame as the revenue generated by its rental income would certainly help secure the success of the cycle store particularly in its early years.

I do not believe too much effort has gone into the really assessing the feasibility of the café area.

Raised concerns

The **parapet height** at its lowest point on the rooftop is the same height as the parapet on Lendal Bridge?

Impact of **roof top furniture**. Of course the wrong furniture could have a massive negative impact on the building and the surrounding view. But similarly the right furniture will dramatically add value to a redundant space. The report is damning before any ideas have been tabled, surely that is what planning is for. If we can allow 'Orgasmic' to be two doors down from the Guildhall I am sure we can entertain the idea of a smart roof top café.

Toll house link. Again some sweeping assumptions have been made. The connection of the two buildings can be done with no permanent impact on either building.

Disability access is a real concern and one that the experts would need to get involved with. I do not pretend to know all the legal implications but do not believe it should be a reason to write off an idea at its conception.

It maybe that the council can benefit more by the sale of the building but the decision should not be made solely on the figures placed in the report. I hope that the brief exercise that I have carried out raises one last question whether the right recommendation has been made.

Council Officer Response

- C1 The cycle units which have been quoted for in the original report were triple-decker racks to enable 100 cycles to be accommodated, the only type of racks which could be purchased for £35 each are either “Sheffield” stands such as those used throughout the city centre or “Butterfly” racks which enable the front wheel only to be clamped. Neither of these two types of rack are suitable for the cycle park as they would only accommodate cycles on one level and if placed too close together may result in cycles being scratched or damaged. “Butterfly” racks are never used in council provided cycle parking areas because they are deemed not to be fit for purpose as only the front wheel can be locked and they provided the bare minimum of support to the cycle hence their more commonly used nickname of “wheel-benders”.
- C2 The costs for utility connections are those provided by the consultants based on similar projects undertaken elsewhere.
- C3 The costs to refurbish the building include such things as repairing the external guttering, removing all loose paint and overpainting the whole of the interior to provide brighter working conditions, filling in trenches where appropriate where the sub-station apparatus had been located and bringing the building up to a standard to satisfy health & safety regulations.
- C4 Costs for design and management of the project and contingencies were provided by the consultants and are based on standard percentages used on projects, these may be able to be reduced if the works were supervised in-house, however, they would still cost more than the figure put forward by Mr. Hartley.
- C5 The pay-back costs quoted are only based on repaying the original sum and do not take into account interest payable which would bring the cost up to £6500 per annum based on the £68000 figure.