

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL and MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Joint Member Integration Board	Report Number: P63
To: Executive Committee Strategy Committee	Date of meeting: 13 October 2014 16 October 2014

ACCOMMODATION REVIEW – RESULTS OF PHASE A AND NEXT STEPS

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To report on the conclusions of Phase A of the accommodation review.
- 1.2 To determine the next steps and agree the commencement of Phase B.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That Phase B of the review be undertaken, based on the JMIB steer set out at paragraph 8.25.

The Committee is able to resolve this matter.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1 Phase B will require expertise to be commissioned and also increased capacity within the councils. There is adequate provision in the councils' transformation and earmarked reserves.

4. Risk Management

- 4.1 This project is most closely linked with the Councils' Significant Business Risk Reference SIT12:

Risk Description	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation Measures
SIT12 – Failure to identify the best location for particular services resulting in deterioration to the services provided	3 – Probable	2 – Noticeable	Comprehensive accommodation review

5. Consultation and engagement

- 5.1 The consultation and engagement programme is set out at Appendix 1.

6. Equality Analysis

- 6.1 An equality analysis is not necessary at this stage.

7. Shared Service / Partnership Implications

- 7.1 The use of the councils' accommodation is of paramount importance to the future workings of the two councils – in terms of service provision, leadership, partnership working and organisational performance.
- 7.2 There are also strong links to the countywide Transformation Challenge Award bid *Redefining Public Service Delivery in Suffolk* – which focuses on collaborative working and locality working.

8. Key Information

- 8.1 The two Councils know that having the right accommodation is critical to the efficient and effective delivery of the Councils' priorities and services; and that it needs to:
- Contribute to the organisational culture that sees staff and Members working in a more flexible manner
 - Align work space with contemporary working styles that improve the wellbeing, motivation, effectiveness and ultimately, efficiency of staff and Members
 - Promote collaborative working.
- 8.2 Members agreed to carry out a review of the main accommodation buildings through two phases:
- 8.3 Phase A:
- A review of the current accommodation, work styles and potential alternative uses for the buildings
 - An understanding of how the Councils wish to work in the future
 - The identification and analysis of broad alternative accommodation options.
- 8.4 Phase B:
- The production of a business case for the preferred option(s) or approach incorporating a detailed assessment of risk and delivery.
- 8.5 Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) was commissioned to carry out Phase A.
- 8.6 LSH held a number of meetings, interviews and workshops with individual Members and officers; and MB and JMIB (Appendix 2). It also set out initial findings at a Members' Briefing.
- 8.7 It confirmed that:
- The integration process was well advanced, but that there was a need to deal with a number of practical issues such as ICT and organisational development. The meetings confirmed that an accommodation strategy was essential in dealing with these issues
 - There was a clear consensus that status quo was not an option for accommodation and that the occupation of both buildings resulted in inefficiencies and costs; and was a block to full integration, and collaboration
 - Future savings and costs were important factors, but more important was the quality of the arrangements for the public, staff, Members and partners.

- Future accommodation must be able to support agile working, team working and collaborative working – in essence the fourth priority of *Smaller, Smarter, Swifter*. There was a strong desire to move on from a traditional local government management style.

8.8 LSH also carried out a review of the current accommodation (Appendix 3). The summary is that both buildings are inefficient in terms of use and occupation, have listed building elements and would not be easily converted into modern office accommodation suitable for a modern workforce.

8.9 Through meetings and workshops, a Quality Assessment Framework (QAF) that would measure the quality of these arrangements was developed and agreed.

8.10 The meetings, interviews and workshops generated some broad illustrative options to be investigated:

Option 1 – Retain current offices and seek to improve efficiency and sub-let surplus space

Options 2 (a) and (b) - Use just one of the existing offices and dispose of surplus site and space

Option 3 – Collocate majority of functions to a new build at one of the existing sites (Needham Market modelled) and retain part of other site for some service delivery

Option 4 – Develop administrative hub at one of the existing sites (Needham Market modelled) and deliver services in the districts' two largest towns. Dispose of surplus site and space

Option 5 – Locate administrative hub in SCC Ipswich building and deliver services in the districts' two largest towns. Dispose of both sites

Option 6 – Locate administrative hub in SCC Ipswich building and develop service delivery centres (five modelled) in the districts' main towns

Option 7 – Locate administrative hub in the Ipswich fringe and develop service delivery centres (five modelled) in the districts' main towns.

Workspace

8.11 LSH calculated the amount of space the Councils currently had and how much they would require if a more flexible approach to workspace was adopted – including hot-desking (Appendix 4).

8.12 It concluded that only 50% of space was being used; staff have large work areas and, although the Councils advocate open-plan working, the building structures and layout weren't conducive to this.

8.13 The Councils had a total space area of 9,154 m², giving an average of 20 m² per person against a public sector benchmark of 12.1 m².

- 8.14 An analysis of the workforce was carried out to identify who in a modern organisation required a fixed working area (for example customer services staff), who were out of the office for a significant part of their time, and who could work (more or less) at any work station. 10.5 m² per desk was selected as the standard resulting in a total space requirement of 2,905 m². This would increase to 3,409 m² if the Councils retained their current sub-lets.
- 8.15 An administrative hub would require around 1,000 m² with the remainder of the space requirement utilised according to the option selected.

Financial and quality analysis

- 8.16 The financial analysis for each option is set out at Appendix 5. It is presented in terms of Net Present Value (NPV) – a standard method to appraise accommodation projects. In essence it measures the excess or shortfall of cash flows, in present value terms, above the cost of funds.
- 8.17 All of the options are assessed against option 1, which can be taken as the current accommodation strategy; and all are better than option 1. The highest performing finance option is option 2(a) (consolidate in the Hadleigh office), very closely followed by option 2(b) (consolidate in the Needham Market office). Options 5 and 6 (moving to a SCC building) are the lowest performing - primarily due to high occupational costs.
- 8.18 The current revenue costs of the two buildings is approximately £900k per annum. Option savings range from £400k for option 2(a) to £200k for options 5 and 6. Some of the options also require capital investment or generate capital receipts. A truly integrated modern organisation will also provide productivity gains and efficiency savings.
- 8.19 Appendix 6 sets out the quality analysis.
- 8.20 Option 2(a) (consolidate in Hadleigh) performed the worst against the QAF followed by option 1 (continued occupation of current buildings) and 2(b) (consolidate in Needham Market). These were closely followed by options 3 (new build at one of the existing sites and retain part of the other site) and 4 (new administrative building at one of the existing sites and service delivery in the districts' two largest towns). Option 7 (Ipswich fringe plus five spokes) was a middle performer; and the option that most closely fitted the qualitative requirements for accommodation was option 6 (SCC building plus five spokes), closely followed by option 5 (SCC building plus service delivery in the districts' two largest towns). The highly performing options from a quality perspective perform particularly well against service delivery, culture shift and the introduction of agile / flexible working styles. This is very much in line with what the Councils are trying to achieve.
- 8.21 The graph at Appendix 7 setting out both the financial and quality analysis shows that those options that involve remaining in current accommodation have a higher financial NPV but a lower quality score. Options 5 and 6 (using SCC building) score best in qualitative terms but are less favourable from a financial perspective. A key question is therefore that, given they produce the best quality score, can they be obtained at a lower cost?

Conclusion

- 8.22 The financial and quality assessment show that the best options for a modern flexible public sector organisation, that allows collaboration, locality working and joined up services are those that focus on service delivery points at key points within the districts, and an administrative hub. This means that options 1 to 5 can be discarded; and the focus should be on the models described in options 6 and 7.

Potential uses of the current buildings

- 8.23 These are set out within the Confidential item on the agenda relating to this subject.

Next steps

- 8.24 JMIB has considered the conclusions of Phase A and has given the following steer for consideration:
- 8.25 The best performing options all involve the creation of service delivery centres and an administrative hub (hub and spokes).
- Develop this model further to work out how it would work in practice, who would be where – both staff and Members; and what implications does it have on our future collaboration with partners, and for service delivery and leadership
 - Identify space for the service delivery centres and what sharing arrangements are available
 - Do a more detailed appraisal of the hub options, including discussions with SCC
 - Explore the alternative options for the existing sites including soft market testing, working with local communities, and exploring economic opportunities and impact
 - Develop a model to split costs, benefits and risks across the two Councils to ensure that the financial arrangements are compliant and acceptable to the auditor
 - Carry out this work over the life time of the current Councils with a view to final decisions being taken by the new Councils.

9. Appendices

Title
Appendix 1 – Consultation and engagement programme
Appendix 2 – Stakeholder meetings
Appendix 3 – Review of current accommodation
Appendix 4 – Current and proposed use of space
Appendix 5 – Financial analysis
Appendix 6 – Quality analysis
Appendix 7 – Financial and quality analysis

Note: Please also refer to item in part 2 of this Agenda relating to this subject

10. Background Documents

Authorship:
Andrew Hunkin
Strategic Director (Corporate)

01473 825820 or 01449 724526
Andrew.hunkin@babergh.gov.uk

K:\DOCS\Committee\REPORTS\Strategy\2014\161014-Accomm Review.docx

Accommodation Review – Phase A

Consultation and engagement programme

Talk Amongst Ourselves article explaining that a review was to be undertaken	21 Oct
Email to all staff and Members informing that Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) would carry out the review; and also setting out timescales and how the review would be conducted	23 April
Working Together article to all staff and Members setting out the progress made and the next steps	6 May
Management Board (MB) informed of the progress made and next steps	6 May
Detailed timetable, progress made and next steps discussed with Lead Members	7 and 8 May
A series of interviews with senior officers and Lead Members	8 to 16 May
Detailed timetable, progress made and next steps sent to Public Access TEG Lead Members	13 May
Article prepared for the town and parish council newsletter	15 May
Stakeholder workshop to explain progress made and to give initial consideration to the Qualitative Assessment Framework (QAF)	19 May
JMIB received presentation on the progress made and next steps	20 May
MSDC Leader's meeting	21 May
JMIB presentation sent to Public Access TEG Lead Members	23 May
Member briefings / seminar held at both Councils to explain progress made and next steps	27 May
Final draft of the QAF agreed through stakeholder workshop	5 June
Progress made, next steps and the QAF discussed with political groups	10 to 13 June
QAF sent to Public Access TEG Lead Members	12 June
Progress made, next steps and the QAF discussed with Hadleigh Town Council and Hadleigh district councillors	12 June
QAF sent to Members that hadn't held political group meetings during 10 to 13 June.	13 June
MSDC Leader's meeting	16 June
Progress made, next steps and the QAF discussed with Needham Market Town Council and Needham Market district councillors	18 June
JMIB – progress made, next steps and a final steer on the QAF	19 June
PLG – progress made and next steps	23 June
Portfolio holders' meeting – progress made and next steps	26 June
PLG – preliminary outcomes discussed	22 July
Preliminary outcomes discussed with Council Leaders	4 to 7 August
Preliminary outcomes discussed with some political groups	Wb 18 August
JMIB report discussed with some political groups	Wb 22 September
Steer on Phase A received from JMIB	25 Sept
Phase A results and next steps presented to Executive and Strategy Committees	13 and 16 October

Stakeholder meetings

11 meetings were held with stakeholders to ascertain accommodation needs and priorities. Interviews were held with: Asset Management, Customer Support, Finance, Heads of Service, HR, IM & ICT, Management Board and Members. There were also presentations at Member Briefings / Seminars, and to the Joint Member Implementation Board.

The meetings confirmed that the integration process between Babergh and Mid Suffolk is well advanced. Service delivery has been fully integrated, while two sovereign Councils have been retained. The completion of the integration journey must be sensitive to the fact that Councils' staff have experienced a prolonged period of the effects of the austerity programme and are subject to a comprehensive change programme. There remains, however, an overriding priority to complete the integration process at a number of practical levels. These include technology infrastructure, organisational development, accommodation, and all the associated culture change. More specifically there is a need to achieve the following:

- Service delivery: connect to community; connect to partners; connect to commerce
- Management culture: develop the right leadership style – primarily through the 'Leadership in Mind' programme
- Seamless ICT
- Co-location: bring teams together to overcome major inefficiencies
- Workstyles: introduce agile working, agility in service delivery, and collaborative working.

The meetings confirmed the absolute need for an accommodation strategy to support the outcome of corporate priorities. Furthermore, there is a strong desire to create accommodation that expresses 'what the Councils are about', reflecting service delivery priorities and the Councils' strategic priorities. The accommodation strategy must deliver a work environment that makes the Councils more effective, whether that is in terms of delivering services, working between colleagues, or working with Members.

There is a clear consensus among the stakeholders interviewed, that the *status quo* is not an option for accommodation. The occupation of both the Needham Market and Hadleigh buildings is recognised to be inefficient, costly, wasteful and a block to full integration.

Rather, stakeholders wish to see reorganised accommodation that ensures efficient and effective service delivery and satisfies political priorities. They want a work environment that supports management, culture, and systems to secure full and sustainable integration. At the same time, it should contribute to 'channel shift' and demand management to improve service access and reduce face-to-face contact between officers and the public.

A number of specific issues were raised during the stakeholder consultations and these are summarised as follows:

- Need to retain two sovereign Councils; less focus on distinctive Council chambers
- The single public sector estate agenda is important but should not delay action
- Need to resolve separate site issues; single site for HQ preferred
- Sudbury/Stowmarket better for service delivery than Hadleigh/Needham Market
- Should admin (back office) and service delivery be separated?

- The lack of a seamless resilient ICT solution
- Potential need to find alternative uses for Hadleigh and Needham Market
- Staff morale and change fatigue? Not major, but care needed
- Accessibility: staff to public and public to buildings
- Space for Members to meet with officers

There is a strong corporate focus on workplace culture and leadership which needs to be accompanied by smarter, or agile, working and appropriate HR policies. The accommodation of the future must be able to support agile working, team working, and collaborative working (in service delivery and delivering the priorities). There is a strong desire to move on from a traditional local government management style and the accommodation must reflect this.

It must reflect: corporate priorities; management style; agility; connectivity and motivation.

It must also support 'smaller, smarter, swifter'.

K:\DOCS\Committee\REPORTS\Strategy\2014\161014-Accomm Review-App2.docx

Review of current accommodation

Needham Market

The property comprises a four storey listed building, (Hurstlea House) which dates from the mid 1800s and has been extended to the rear over two storeys; the Mid Suffolk Council Chamber is located within the first floor of the 1960s extension. Annexed to the listed building is a substantial, two storey office building of steel framed construction which dates from the early 1980s.

The listed building element forms office accommodation which is heavily cellularised reflecting the layout of the original dwelling house – it is therefore inefficient in terms of use and occupation. Circulation is via principal and secondary staircases and that building has no lift. The building is constructed of solid masonry, with single glazed, timber sash windows, timber doors and a slate covered pitched roof. Internally, the building is provided with carpet tile floor finishes to timber floors and surface mounted light fittings to plastered ceilings. Power and data installations are accommodated within perimeter trunking. The incoming gas supply for the whole building is located within the basement. There is no air conditioning within the building.

The 1980s element of the building is constructed via a steel frame with cavity masonry cladding; windows comprise single glazed, aluminium framed units with a tile covered pitched roof. Internally, the building is provided with carpet tile floor finishes to concrete floors. Ceilings comprise suspended ceilings with recessed modular light units, the majority of the lighting was changed in 2012 to LED fittings. Power and data installations are accommodated within perimeter trunking and power poles. There is a central lift within the building. The incoming water and electrical supplies are located within the ground floor. There are a number of wall mounted air conditioning units located within isolated cellular rooms.

The site sprawls over a large site incorporating many separate external areas. The main entrance to the site is via the High Street and the reception is suited to this function. Visitors arriving by car use a further entrance to the rear of the property.

There are substantial grounds which incorporate sections of the original, stone boundary to the settlement which falls within the listing.

There are two further, single storey, timber framed outbuildings which comprise a generator housing and external sports store.

Externally, routine external redecoration has been completed and the grounds are well maintained. Internally, the property presents well; the almost total replacement of lighting in 2012 with LED fittings has introduced bright, white light, and internal redecorations, whilst requiring renewal in the short to medium term, are generally in fair condition throughout. Carpets are worn and would benefit from replacement.

Hadleigh

The Hadleigh property comprises a number of inter-linked (and listed) buildings. The accommodation is inefficient in planning terms with a significant amount of irregularly shaped space, poor circulation routes and cellularisation caused by structural walls. The specification is low, with single-glazed windows and perimeter trunking. The building was refurbished in the 1980s and has been well-maintained since. However, the inefficiency of the internal layout, combined with the Listing of the space, makes the building unsuitable in many ways for meeting key organisational objectives.

Circulation throughout the buildings is poor with many restricted corridors, pinch points and changes in level.

A scheme to extend and connect the listed properties including the construction of a central, showcase, tiered council chamber was recognised with an architectural award in the 1980s for the intuitive and sympathetic manner in which the listed buildings were incorporated into a holistic scheme.

The listed building elements generally comprise a solid masonry structure with timber floors and tile covered pitched roofs. Windows throughout comprise single glazed, timber framed units.

The accommodation is heavily cellularised which is influenced by the configuration of the listed buildings. In addition, where the buildings have been extended, the structure of the extension, via a timber frame with supplemental steel tensioning, significantly constrains the internal layout which is uneconomic.

Power and data distribution is generally by perimeter trunking; air conditioning is provided to a number of isolated rooms by local units with remote external condensers.

The property has been well maintained and presents in good general condition.

Current and proposed use of space

In order to assess the use of space, the two main buildings were visited on a number of occasions and observations were made on the quality and use of the space.

Across the office floors of both buildings there are various furniture solutions, with differing types and standards of desks, chairs and filing cabinets. The significance of this observation is that non-standard solutions introduce inefficiencies in space usage and churn costs. Apart from the variety, there is a predominance of large workstations. There are many large (1,800mm), traditional L-shaped desks, designed for use in conjunction with CRT screens rather than the flat screens that now occupy them.

Furthermore, not only are many of the workstations large in their own right, but they are often supplemented with returns, filing cabinets and tables, resulting in large desk areas and space inefficiency.

Across the two buildings there does not appear to be a severe problem with storage space, certainly not in the sense of a chronic shortage: most groups have adequate space, with few apparent shortages. However, it does appear that there is a proportion of on-floor storage that could be more kept more efficiently either archived off-site or stored centrally.

There appear to be some loose house rules regarding the provision of refreshment facilities. Essentially, many staff 'do their own thing'. As a result, there are informal tea/coffee points, fridges and food and drink making materials at the workplace. Some of these informal facilities are poorly managed, and inevitably become dirty and untidy. Apart from the fact that informal local vending points tend to be untidy, they take up unnecessary space. Not only is there the footprint of the fridge or cabinet itself, but there is also the secondary circulation around it. Each point can, in practice, occupy space equivalent to one whole workstation.

The Councils have made significant strides towards open plan working, and many partitions and high level storage cabinets have been removed to enhance the working environment. However, the local division of space to create departmental or section areas, persists. One of the side effects of the sub-division of space is the impact on air circulation. A further side effect of the partitioning of space is the impact on space efficiency. Where tall cabinets, for example, divide space to segregate teams, they introduce unnecessary secondary circulation space. This brings about a 10% to 15% penalty in terms of occupancy densities at the local level.

The nature of the floor plan in Hadleigh creates a number of segregated units. This places the building at a space planning disadvantage because it limits options for increasing density and introducing agile working practices.

The utilisation of space across the buildings varies quite widely, and this is the source of inefficiency in space use. While, to some degree, certain areas have lower densities (i.e. more space) because they have sorted out their filing and storage issues, the prevalent reason is that some standards across the buildings are inequitable. However, there are space planning inefficiencies at Hadleigh in particular that are intrinsic to the building and make efficient and equitable distribution of space difficult. The scale of the difference between benchmark and existing layout suggests that significant improvements could be

made. This is verified by our visual inspection of the buildings and experience of other, similar organisations.

The utilisation of space is worsened by the large number of officers who have a dedicated desk in both buildings. This is reported to number around 50. Again this is contrary to the 'smaller, smarter, swifter' priority.

Meeting rooms are a perennial problem in modern offices in so far as there are rarely enough to cater for demand. While there are times when meetings rooms are fully booked (exacerbated by the block bookings of rooms for election preparation when the review was taking place) this does not appear to be a major problem for the Councils. Observational evidence suggests that there is an adequate number of meeting rooms for the level of demand.

Part of the reason for demand for meeting rooms being relatively low could be that the current predominant work style does not demand a high level of collaborative activity. Perhaps many staff are focussed on transactional work or the management of "cases" (Planning, Legal, Housing) which require individual endeavour rather than team work. Of course this might change in the future.

The above discussion relates specifically to internal meeting rooms and does not include the interview rooms used for public consultations. Such rooms are required for purposes of confidentiality, and currently no shortages are reported.

The Councils' asset registers lists Hadleigh as 3,920 sq m and Needham Market as 4,478 sq m, giving a combined total of 8,398 sq m. These figures represent Net Usable Area (NUA). For the purposes of space budgeting and planning future accommodation, it is normal practice to work with Net Internal Area data (NIA). NIA is equivalent to NUA plus main corridors, and includes meeting rooms, catering, council chambers, etc. For benchmarking purposes, the conversion factor from NUA to NIA is 9%, which means that 8,398 sq m NUA becomes 9,154 sq m NIA.

The two buildings currently accommodate 397 staff from an officer establishment of 443. The difference between the two figures is accounted for by staff who spend all their time in community and other premises. Needham Market also contains around 74 other public sector staff, the majority of which (60) are office-bound County Council ACS/CYP staff, which pushes the total building population up to 457. This implies an area of 20 sq m per person/desk, which is a low density compared with best practice. To place this figure into context, we can compare it to the British Council for Office (BCO) benchmark research.

The BCO Occupier Density Study 2013, which sampled over 2.3 million sq m nationally, provides an overall density average of 10.9 sq m. More specifically, its average for the public sector is 12.1 sq m. The Government is currently targeting 10 sq m in its asset rationalisation programme. These are all desk density figures, and do not take account of desk sharing.

It is important to emphasise that within the overall density of 20 sq m per person/desk, there is significant variation. For example, Needham Market is more densely occupied than Hadleigh – around 16 sq m per desk compared to 22 sq m. Similarly, in those areas where re-planning has taken place in recent times, densities are significantly higher. The newly-planned Finance area is a good example.

Financial Analysis

Measure	Option 1 – Retain current offices; improve efficiency; sub-let surplus space	Options 2(a) - Use Hadleigh office; dispose of surplus site & space	Options 2(b) - Use NM office; dispose of surplus site & space	Option 3 – Majority of functions to new build at one of existing sites; retain part of other for some service delivery	Option 4 – Admin hub at one of existing sites; deliver services in districts' two largest towns. Dispose of surplus site and space	Option 5 – Admin hub in SCC Ipswich building; deliver services in districts' two largest towns. Dispose of both sites	Option 6 – Admin hub in SCC Ipswich building; develop service delivery centres in districts' main towns	Option 7 – Admin hub in Ipswich fringe; develop service delivery centres in districts' main towns.
Net Present Value (NPV)	-15,903,000	-7,902,000	-8,959,225	-9,314,000	-9,284,047	-14,131,116	-13,786,626	-10,839,739
% NPV saving against option 1	0%	50%	44%	41%	42%	11%	13%	32%

Note:

All options produce a negative NPV

K:\DOCS\Committee\REPORTS\Strategy\2014\161014-Accomm Review-App5.docx

Quality Analysis

Criteria	Sub criteria	Definition	Weighting		Weighted score							
					Option 1	Option 2(a)	Option 2(b)	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
Service delivery	Delivers co-location & integration	Recognises the need for increased partnership working to deliver customer led services. Opportunities for co-location with public sector partners are maximised to allow for improved services & maximising the efficiency and value of the single public sector estate	5%	36%	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.35	0.50	0.50	0.35
	Flexibility and future proofing	Allows for service delivery to change over time – particularly in response to demographic change, policy shifts in service delivery, channel shift & evolving public sector partnerships	9%				0.27	0.27	0.27	0.63	0.63	0.27
	Accommodation that supports service delivery	Of a quality and quantity that supports & encourages the shift in service delivery to more project work & partner working	5%		0.15		0.15	0.15	0.15	0.35	0.35	0.15
	Accessibility	Is suitably located to allow efficient & simple access for effective service delivery	7%					0.21	0.21	0.49	0.70	0.49
		Where the public need to access services at Council offices, these are located in areas that are easily accessible by private & public transport	10%		0.30			0.30	0.30	0.70	1.00	0.30
Organisation	Supports culture shift & council leadership	Supports cultural & leadership initiatives	13%	33%			0.39	0.39	0.39	0.91	1.30	0.91
	Supports flexible / agile working	Provides an environment that will allow the organisation to become more efficient and productive. Will support various agile working strategies & breakdown of silos	12%				0.36	0.36	0.36	0.84	0.84	0.36
	Staff accessibility & recruitment	Is accessible to current & future staff through private & public transport	8%		0.24					0.24	0.24	
Revenue generation	Enterprise opportunity	Creates opportunities for the Councils to establish commercial activities as revenue generating opportunities	6%	6%		0.18	0.18			0.42	0.42	0.42
Delivering outcomes	Delivering outcomes	Net contribution from new locations & future use of existing sites to the Councils' strategic priorities	11%	11%		0.33				0.77	0.77	0.77
Democracy	Democratic identity & civic pride	Local presence in the districts; retains & supports sovereign identity; provides a satisfactory solution to requirement for Council & committee meetings	10%	14%	0.70			0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	
	Ability to meet in the districts	Provides opportunities for Members to meet with local communities, each other & officers	4%		0.12			0.12	0.12	0.12	0.28	0.12
Total			100%		1.66	0.66	1.50	2.25	2.45	6.27	7.33	4.14

