# MUGA / PlayZone programme

Executive Decision - Additional MUGA capital budget allocation for: Football Foundation – PlayZone awards, S106 funds and OPCC funding.

Decision to be taken by:

City Mayor

Decision to be taken on: 16 July

Lead director/officer: Sean Atterbury

#### **Useful information**

- Ward(s) affected: Citywide
- Report author: Crispin Clark
- Author contact details: crispin.clark@leicester.gov.uk
- Report version number: 1

#### 1. Summary

- 1.1. The paper outlines amendments to the Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) budget within the General Fund Capital Programme, which includes the addition of Football Foundation grant awards, funds from Section 106 agreements and an award to refurbish MUGAs from the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner (OPCC).
- 1.2. Football Foundation (FF) award agreements have been received for nine sites resulting in a total grant award of £1,858,066. To help deliver these projects the Football Foundation has developed its own Framework, which the funding agreements make conditional to use. Once the budget has been increased an assessment of the framework by procurement services will be required to ensure Leicester City Council can use the framework and issue call off contracts for each project.
- 1.3. Additional budget will also need to be added from S106 contributions totalling £443k, which is required to construct new ball courts at Rally Park and Victoria Park. In addition, £28k has been granted by the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for the refurbishment of ball courts.
- 1.4. The work for capital and section 106 projects will be procured through the Council's own Construction Framework.

#### 2. Recommended actions/decision

The City Mayor is recommended to:

- 2.1. Note the successful grant awards for 9 x Playzone sites from the Football Foundation.
- 2.2. Approve the addition of £1.858k to the existing MUGA budget within the General Fund Capital Programme, financed from the Football Foundation grant funding.
- 2.3. Approve the use of £705k of existing MUGA budget as match-funding, to enable acceptance of the Football Foundation grant.
- 2.4. Approve the addition of £443k to the existing MUGA budget within the General Fund Capital Programme, financed from S106 contributions.
- 2.5. Approve the addition of £28k to the existing MUGA budget within the General Fund Capital Programme, financed from OPCC grant funding.
- 2.6. Note the overall budget change to the existing MUGA budget within the General Fund Capital Programme from £3,130k to £5,444k.
- 2.7. Note the requirement to use the Football Foundation's framework to call off contracts.

#### 3. Scrutiny / stakeholder engagement

3.1. City Mayor approved submission of the Football Foundation applications in September 2023 which outlined in that paper Scrutiny and stakeholder engagement

#### 4. Background and options with supporting evidence

#### <u>Playzone</u>

- 4.1. The Football Foundation PlayZone project is an investment programme, aimed at tackling inequalities in physical activity and developing access to localised facilities by funding community-led spaces. Sports, in conjunction with Parks and Open Spaces and Neighbourhood Services have worked together in developing a city wide PlayZone bid to the Football Foundation.
- 4.2. The Football Foundation grant funding is part of a series of nine awards, which will cover the costs of refurbishing 5 existing ball courts and building 4 new ball courts across the city. 5 of these will be macadam and 4 will be sand dressed.
- 4.3. The Playzone sites will also include an online booking platform through ClubSpark (the same system to those already used on Parks Tennis Courts) and include access gates which will help programming activities on the courts. No hire fees however will be charged for bookings made.
- 4.4. The PlayZone project will feed into the wider capital MUGA board programme, allowing these other funds to be used on other locations in the city, and in a different capacity to offer more creative spaces which in turn will attract more diverse audiences.

#### MUGA Capital

- 4.5. The Football Foundation awards require a match-funding requirement of £705k, which has been set aside within the capital budget, leaving £2,410k for MUGA refurbishment.
- 4.6. The additions proposed within this report total £2,329k, making the overall revised scheme budget is £5,444k summarised in the below table.

MUGA Capital	£3,115k
Proposed Addition of Football	£1,858k
Foundation Grant	
Proposed Addition of Section 106	£44k
Contributions	
Proposed Addition of OPCC	£28k
Contributions	
Total Revised Scheme Budget	£5,444k
Less: Spend to end of 2024/25	£600k
Remaining Budget	£4,844k

4.7. Locations for the 9 x Playzones and 2 x S106 schemes are detailed below:

Location	Funding Pot	Wards
Eyres Monsell	PlayZone	Eyres Monsell
Mowmacre	PlayZone	Abbey
Elston Fields	PlayZone	Saffron
Cossington Rec Ground	PlayZone	Belgrave
Atlas Close	PlayZone	Wycliffe
Armadale Drive	PlayZone	Humberstone & Hamilton
Hamilton Park	PlayZone	Humberstone & Hamilton
Sharmon Crescent Play Park	PlayZone	Western
Spinney Hill Park	PlayZone	Spinney Hills
Rally Park	Section 106	Fosse
Victoria Park	Section 106	Castle

#### S106 commitments

4.8. The MUGA project board are also overseeing the construction of additional two ball courts, a MUGA at Rally Park and a basketball court at Victoria Park. The funding for this has been secured from S106 agreements totalling £443k.

#### Office of the Police Crime Commissioner

4.9. In 2022 the OPCC provided a commitment of £28,000 as a contribution towards the refurbishment of MUGAs, with the aim this funding can support community safety initiatives. This funding has been added to the MUGA capital programme and subsequently needs to be included in its capital budget.

#### **Procurement**

- 4.10. To help deliver the PlayZone projects the Football Foundation has developed a Framework that operates as a 'turnkey' package that ensures best value for the level of quality required of grant funded projects, which the funding agreements make conditional to use.
- 4.11. The work for capital and section 106 projects will be delivered in two phases. Phase 1 consists of the sites under permitted development and Phase 2 consists of the sites with planning approval requirements. Both phases will be procured through a mini competition amongst suppliers on the Council's own Construction Framework, PAN2916 Lot 1 and Lot 2, this approach should generate competitive bids to ensure value for money.

### 5. Financial, legal, equalities, climate emergency and other implications

#### 5.1 Financial implications

The MUGA budget approved within the General Fund Capital Programme since 2023 is  $\pounds$ 3,115k (against which there has been spend to date of  $\pounds$ 600k). This report proposes the addition of £1,858k of grant income from the Football Foundation, £443k from section 106 contributions, and £28k financed by contributions from the Officer of the Police & Crime Commissioner. This will increase the remaining scheme budget for 2025/26 to £4,844k, as shown in the table below:

Proposed Addition of Football Foundation Grant£1,858Proposed Addition of Section 106 Contributions£443kProposed Addition of OPCC Contributions£28kTotal Revised Scheme Budget£5,444Less: Spend to end of 2024/25(£600kRemaining Budget£4,844Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance		
Proposed Addition of Section 106 Contributions£443kProposed Addition of OPCC Contributions£28kTotal Revised Scheme Budget£5,444Less: Spend to end of 2024/25(£600kRemaining Budget£4,844Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance	Capital Budget Approved Since 2023	£3,115k
Proposed Addition of OPCC Contributions£28kTotal Revised Scheme Budget£5,444Less: Spend to end of 2024/25(£600kRemaining Budget£4,844Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance	Proposed Addition of Football Foundation Grant	£1,858k
Total Revised Scheme Budget£5,444Less: Spend to end of 2024/25(£600kRemaining Budget£4,844Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance	Proposed Addition of Section 106 Contributions	£443k
Less: Spend to end of 2024/25 (£600k   Remaining Budget £4,844   Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance	Proposed Addition of OPCC Contributions	£28k
Remaining Budget £4,844   Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance	Total Revised Scheme Budget	£5,444k
Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance	Less: Spend to end of 2024/25	(£600k)
	Remaining Budget	£4,844k
	Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance	
	Dated: 1 <sup>st</sup> May 2025	

#### 5.2 Legal implications

There are no adverse legal implications of the increase in capital funding.

As stated above, in order to avoid each site being procured via a FEW (or new equivalent), a contract appraisal of the Football Foundation framework agreement for the Playzone projects will be required. Provided that the FWA is acceptable (or can be adapted to meet Council protocols), it will then be possible to call off contracts from this direct.

An assessment under the Subsidy Control Act 2022 will also need to be conducted once the final grant funding has been determined.

Signed: Emma Young Dated: 01 May 2025

#### 5.3 Equalities implications

Under the Equality Act 2010, public authorities have a Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) which means that, in making decisions and carrying out their activities they have a statutory duty to pay due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't and to foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't.

Protected Characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation.

The paper is for noting around the received awards from the Football Foundation and an increase in the capital programme budget. There are no direct equalities implications arising from the report.

Having safe and inclusive facilities will help to foster good relations for local communities and advance equality of opportunity. Investment into projects that target and support groups and communities who have faced barriers in terms of participation, along with initiatives that improve activity levels in under-represented groups should lead to positive outcomes for people from many protected characterises

#### 5.4 Climate Emergency implications

Depending on the type of works undertaken, construction works can create very significant levels of carbon emissions in the supply chain, due to the impacts of raw materials extraction and processing, product manufacture, transport and distribution. Any cement or steel-based products are especially high-impact. In addition, decisions made at the design stage in terms of the longevity of materials and their reusability or recyclability at the end of their lifespan can affect the carbon emissions caused when the facility needs to be refurbished or removed and disposed of.

Sports Services should actively consider if there are any opportunities (within the constraints of the existing framework we are being required to use and any other funder requirements) to:

- a. Ensure the new/upgraded facilities are designed to aid reusability/recyclability of materials at the end of their life. For example, if artificial playing surfaces are to be installed, can a product be found for which there's an existing recycling or reuse route? Can this be asked during the procurement?
- b. Specify highly durable materials/products, to reduce the need for early replacement and the associated waste.
- c. Specify the use of materials/products with a high recycled content and/or a reduced carbon footprint.

Signed: Duncan Bell, Change Manager (Climate Emergency). Ext. 37 2249 Dated: 20<sup>th</sup> March 2025

5.5 Other implications (You will need to have considered other implications in preparing this report. Please indicate which ones apply?)

#### 6. Background information and other papers:

N/a

#### 7. Summary of appendices:

N/a

## 8. Is this a private report (If so, please indicate the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?

No

#### 9. Is this a "key decision"? If so, why?

Yes. This report proposes spending of over £1 million to be committed on a scheme which isn't already within the capital programme.