

In this issue of The Bee, we have included the text of some interesting documents relating to the proposed new stadium. Firstly we have the Summary Report of the Feasibility Study. Below that is the London Borough of Hounslow response to the study. There is also a short report of the Council Meeting at which both these documents were presented and discussed by the full Council.

## **MULTI-PURPOSE STADIUM FEASIBILITY STUDY SUMMARY REPORT BY PMP CONSULTANCY FOR BRENTFORD FC, LONDON BOROUGH OF HOUNSLOW, CIP NOVEMBER 1999**

### **Introduction**

1.1 Our brief was to determine the feasibility of the Brentford FC/LB Hounslow/CIP Partnership developing a multi-purpose stadium with the Borough of Hounslow of circa 25,000 seats to provide a home venue for a number of football and rugby clubs, to be a focal point for large community festivals, weddings and concerts etc and to be a venue for regional, national and international entertainment and sporting events.

1.2 The Phase 1 report (February 1999) examined potential sites and the recommended facility mix and our Phase 2 report (September 1999) focused on the business case (capital and revenue), design issues and the stadium's role as a catalyst for local regeneration in terms of employment, community impact and profile.

1.3 The objective of our work was to clarify whether there was the market potential for a landmark community stadium building and 'something special' in Hounslow and, if there was, where it could be, what it would consist of and how it could be funded and operated.

### **The Process**

2.1 An extensive process of research and consultation has taken place over a 12 month period involving the following disciplines:

- land-use planning
- economic development and business planning
- transportation planning
- architecture and design

2.2 The PMP Consultancy led team has consulted with a wide range of local, regional and international organisations to clarify local needs and gaps in the market and gauge the support for meeting these gaps.

2.3 This consultation process included over 100 individuals and organisations and a representative selection is set out below to confirm the extensive nature of the research carried out:

- London Tourist Board
- Football Association and Football Trust
- Sport England
- Members and Officers - LB Hounslow and CIP
- Board Directors and staff - Brentford FC
- Rugby Football Union and Clubs
- Government Office for London
- Leading Event Promoters
- London International Sport
- Leading Commercial Leisure plcs

2.4 Our work involved a review of best practice in stadia design, funding operation and development throughout the world and several UK case studies with similar objectives to the Hounslow brief (Reebok Stadium - Bolton, McAlpine Stadium - Huddersfield).

2.5 Regular meetings were held with the client team (Brentford FC/LB Hounslow/CIP) throughout the study process and several presentations were made to both Hounslow Members and the Brentford FC Board.

2.6 Our two key outputs, in addition to these presentations, are the Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports (121 pages plus appendices) with text, drawings and detailed financial projections.

2.7 The multi-disciplinary team is confident that the findings are robust, soundly based in the markets in which the proposed new stadium development would operate and provide all interested parties with a clear steer on the potential way forward.

## **Key findings**

### **i) Site Location**

3.1 Having evaluated a long list of potential sites, our shortlist included Feltham Arenas, Chiswick Bus Works, Boston Manor Playing Fields and Western International Markets (WIM).

3.2 Once the scale and mix of development had been identified, the need recognised for a high profile 'flagship' location and landmark building and access issues clarified, the site evaluation matrix demonstrated that the WIM site was by far the best location, whilst recognising the important Green Belt and transportation factors to be resolved. Feltham Arenas, whilst having better public transport links was too small a site for the required total development footprint. The Arenas site was also felt to be too small to accommodate the scale of the planned development without significant affect on the residential amenity of the surrounding streets.

3.3 Our recommendation was for an integrated master plan for the WIM site to enable the proposed stadium and related development to be pursued in tandem with the proposed new Market. This would enable all interested parties to achieve their respective objectives and create a landmark building as a high profile focal point on the western approach to London.

### **ii) The Proposed Development**

3.4 We concluded that to meet all the objectives of the prospective partners to be financially sustainable, the 'stadium plex' development should consist of the following facility mix:

- a 15,000 - 30,000 stadium/arena (possibly developed on a two phase basis) with potential for retractable pitch and sliding roof
- extensive banqueting, conference and exhibition areas built within the stadium itself to enable local festivals/weddings for upwards of 500 people plus major national events
- hotels, restaurants, family entertainment centre, children's play and innovation business centre to be physically linked to the stadium to create a critical mass of stadia business opportunities - sporting, social, tourism, cultural and community.

### **iii) The Business Case**

3.5 We identified that the capital costs would range from circa £22.6 million for the 15,000 seat stadium plus all of the above development mix, to an estimated £34.2 million for the complete 30,000 seat project.

3.6 Our market appraisal and funding strategy demonstrates that the stadium could be the 'home' venue for at least three professional clubs (two football and one rugby) and that funding is achievable from a variety of sources.

3.7 Whilst a level of debt finance would be needed, the detailed business projections confirmed that the cost of this could be met in the trading account and that the respective partners could expect operating profits of between £0.45 and £0.7 million per annum.

3.8 We anticipate that the Council would expect and receive both a guaranteed annual rental payment in return for the contribution of land on the WIM site and a share in the financial returns, subject to what involvement it has in the operational structure established to own and operate the new development.

### **iv) Land Use and Transportation Planning**

3.9 The proposed stadium development on WIM is expected to be assessed, in land use planning terms, through the local plan process (as advised by PPG17). In order to be part of the local plans discussions from the UDP review period to 2006, representations will need to be made by 20 December this year.

3.10 By the time of the anticipated Local Plan Inquiry, these representations should be in the form of a comprehensive approach to the WIM land, ie we must demonstrate that both the stadium and the market can work together.

3.11 The report also addressed the issues facing transportation planning for the WIM site in the light of National and local policies to ensure a workable and effective public transport plan for the site (rail, tube, bus, coach, cycle and pedestrians).

3.12 Transportation issues represent considerable challenges for the WIM site. From our detailed appraisal of what public transport already exists, the strong interest in enhancing these by operators and the results achieved by other stadia developments around the country, we are confident that both transport and land use issues can be successfully addressed.

## **The Way Forward**

4.1 Brentford FC are totally committed to moving into the project development phase. We understand that CIP have a similar commitment. It is vitally important however that the Council give their support to progressing with this development phase in order that all the potential beneficiaries (partner clubs, potential funding agencies and the local community etc) have confidence that a thorough and credible analysis has taken place to determine whether the stadium development is achievable or not.

4.2 The next phase of the development process would involve the following:

### Land Use Planning

- prepare and submit Deposit Draft Representations (by 20 December 1999)
- carry out 'out of Borough' site searches
- prepare for the Local Public Inquiry

### Transportation Planning

- detailed discussions with public transport operators, traffic impact and parking strategy - all to form part of the Green Transport Plan for the development

### Business Case

- liaise with and secure potential partners and end users (resident clubs, leisure operators etc) in order to refine the development brief, confirm the facility mix and finalise the capital and revenue projections

### Design Development

- liaise with the Council to ensure that the new Market and the Stadium can be planned and co-exist effectively together
- act on the development brief to continue the design process

### Project Management

- prepare the costings and the critical path stages of the Project Development phase
- lead and coordinate the work of the multi-disciplinary project team
- liaise closely with the client partnership (Brentford FC and CIP) and present regular progress reports

4.3 A prompt decision from the Council will help to ensure that the considerable momentum and support achieved to date is maintained, that the project is rightfully placed in the public arena and that responsible Go/No Go decisions can be taken at key phases in the project development process.

Peter Mann/SH/Nov 1999

## **Feasibility Study For A Multi-Purpose Stadium**

1. Purpose of report: To advise Members on progress in developing the proposals for a multi-purpose Stadium/Events Centre within the Borough.

2. Recommendations: That members endorse the need to undertake further feasibility work with regard to the planning, transportation and economic viability issues relating to the two possible sites - land adjacent to Western International Market and Feltham Arenas - and that due regard be taken of this work in relation to the processes of reviewing the UDP.

### 3.0 INTRODUCTION

3.1 Following a presentation to members by the Sports Council in 1994, the possibility of a major event stadium in west London was discussed and members were made aware of the significant benefits that a

multi-purpose stadium could have upon Hounslow. A new multi-purpose stadium could result in significant inward investment and the creation of new commercial, cultural and job opportunities.

3.2 The Sports Council has supported the concept of establishing a new stadium in West London, more specifically within Hounslow. Such a development is seen as part of the drive to establish London as a "World Class City" and would be supportive of the bid to bring the 2012 Olympics to London.

3.3 Partly as a consequence of this, there is a 1998 manifesto commitment and therefore Council policy pledge to seek to establish a 25,000 seater stadium in the Borough.

3.4 Running parallel with the above, the Council and Brentford Football Club have been engaged in discussions for some considerable time concerning the club's aspiration to relocate from Griffin Park and find an alternative home in the Borough.

3.5 As a consequence of members wishing to explore these initiatives in a co-ordinated way, the London Borough of Hounslow, Brentford Football Club and CIP embarked on a formal partnership in 1998 to investigate the viability of a 25,000 seater Stadium in Hounslow.

#### 4.0 THE OBJECTIVE

4.1 The provision of a multi-purpose Stadium/Events Centre in the Borough will make a significant contribution to the Borough's social and cultural image. It could be an important catalyst for inward investment, employment and regeneration.

4.2 The Stadium/Events Centre would be capable of hosting a range of not only sporting events, but also a wide range of cultural and arts events, celebrations and other alternative entertainment. It could accommodate large scale catering and banqueting suites together with corporate hospitality opportunities to accommodate functions ranging from large scale weddings to small company and community meetings.

4.3 In addition to football, the Stadium/Events Centre could become the home ground for a range of rugby and other sports clubs. Indeed there has already been a significant level of interest from a number of football and rugby clubs to confirm this statement. Brunel University is also proposing to use the site for sports medicine, sports science studies and support for local clubs and the venue could house a range of community activities and training opportunities.

4.4 The Stadium/Events Centre could become a focus for community/cultural activities throughout the year, as a modern Stadium must include a range of supporting development to support catering, accommodation and business activities.

4.5 If the Stadium is located on a site owned by LBH, the Authority could benefit from a significant level of rental income from the land.

#### 5.0 FEASIBILITY STUDY

5.1 Following the Council's agreement, a partnership and funding package was agreed to commission a feasibility study to be undertaken by specialist consultants. £40k has been committed by the football club with a small contribution, primarily comprised of officer time, coming from the Council/CIP.

5.2 A two-phase brief for the feasibility study was agreed by the partners, following consultation with all relevant departments.

5.3 Phase I considered all available sites in the borough as identified by the planners within Environmental Services and assessed them in terms of planning policy, transport issues and accessibility. This phase also undertook a brief assessment of the cost and potential financial viability of the project.

5.4 Phase II has been an assessment of the economic viability, examining capital cost, funding potential and revenue budgets. This work included consideration of the various mixes of activity possible within such a Stadium/Events Centre and an exploration of the anticipated market demand for such services. Management structures were also explored.

5.5 An analysis of the regeneration impact of such a development was made, including an assessment of the new employment created (750 jobs) and the level of secondary spending accruing in the local economy (£10 for every £1 spent in the Stadium/Events Centre).

5.6 The report noted that further work must be undertaken before any development is proposed, particularly to

meet the need to fully examine issues arising from national and local green belt and transportation policies.

5.7 In Appendix I, a summary of the findings of the report is attached for Members information. A full version of the report is available in the Members area.

5.8 The Report is not a conclusive study of all issues to be explored. It has demonstrated that there are a number of sites worthy of consideration, and that for the WIM site, there were green belt and transportation issues to be resolved. Feltham arenas also has planning issues to be resolved and it needs a similar economic viability study to be undertaken to ensure that the stadium development on that site is sustainable.

## 6.0 THE WAY FORWARD

6.1 The Executive of the Council, local ward members and other members of the partnership received a report from the consultants on the 4 November at Heston Community School. The Executive noted a number of difficulties highlighted within the feasibility study, particularly in terms of transport and green belt policy.

6.2 The executive stated that Feltham arenas should also be considered for a stadium, and that it will be commissioning a further study to explore the Arenas site for a public stadium. It was recognised by all parties that both sites require further work in planning policy, and that the Arenas site could not accommodate the scale and range of Multi purpose events proposed on the WIM site.

6.3 Majority Party advice on the way forward will be made available at the meeting of the Committee of the Council.

### 6.4 Comments of the Borough Treasurer

The Borough Treasurer comments that there is no budget provision for any further feasibility work.

## **Committee of the Council meeting - London Borough of Hounslow, 7th Dec 1999**

The Council received the report of the feasibility study and noted the recommendations of the Leisure Services department, namely:

"That members endorse the need to undertake further feasibility work with regard to the planning, transportation and economic viability issues relating to the two possible sites - land adjacent to Western International Market and Feltham Arenas - and that due regard be taken of this work in relation to the processes of reviewing the UDP."

Council Leader John Connelly moved that the report and recommendation be accepted and reported that the Majority Group on the Council (the Labour group) advised that "this Council notes the Feasibility Study's main conclusion that land in the vicinity of Western International Market is the only 'feasible site' on which to build a Multi-Purpose Stadium but also notes the constraints that arise from its Green Belt designation. The Council will examine the possibility of promoting a Multi-Purpose Stadium in the Borough and will carry out a review of UDP policies to facilitate such a proposal."

The motion was passed "on the nod". In effect this means that the Council has given the go-ahead to progress to the next stage in what will inevitably be a rather long drawn-out process. BIAS will continue to represent the supporters' position and keep you informed.

## **Ron Noades, Crystal Palace & BIAS**

Over recent months, since Crystal Palace's financial plight first became known, there has been continued speculation over the future plans of Brentford's owner, chairman and manager, Ron Noades. It must be said that a very large proportion of the reports in the media have been entirely unfounded, based on little more than journalists' eye for a good story to fill the back pages. Undoubtedly, for the neutral, the return of the prodigal son (as it were) to Selhurst Park would make for a great story.

Naturally, BIAS has followed the developments very closely, as we believe that Brentford's future would be placed at some risk if Ron Noades departed. As the story of Palace's administration and potential rescue has

twisted and turned, we have monitored in as much detail as possible what is going on. Various contacts have been established who are very close to what is going on within Crystal Palace FC and Moore Stephens, the administrators. From these sources we have been able to judge which stories are pure fiction and which have some foundation in truth. In fact, probably over 99% of what you have read about the situation falls into the former category.

Ron Noades will undoubtedly have a major part to play in any rescue of Crystal Palace. He is the freeholder of their stadium and friends with many of the directors and staff there. It is our understanding that he has offered to lend at least one of the directors some money to help the directors' buy-out plans. Knowing Ron, it is quite possible that he has speculated himself on what might happen and what he might do. No doubt some people, eager to get the inside track, from the best possible source have lapped it up.

At present it is very unclear what will happen to Crystal Palace. It seems that Juventus and Strasbourg FC are the key players as they are being asked to accept 10% of what is owed to them. If they refuse to accept this it seems possible that Crystal Palace will go into liquidation. It is extremely unlikely that Ron Noades has made any firm plans for the outcome, while that outcome is so uncertain. You can be sure that BIAS will continue to keep a daily eye on events and that should any firm plan emerge that places Brentford's future at risk, we will do everything we can to mount a successful campaign of opposition. However, please remember that we cannot launch a campaign of opposition to speculation!

Incidentally, it is clear from following this story through contacts in South London that feelings towards Ron Noades in that part of the world have not changed much since he left and it would seem his return would be as welcome there as would David Webb's to Griffin Park!

### **Free Hey Jude enclosed**

You will find enclosed with this edition of The Bee a free copy of the latest Hey Jude fanzine, which includes a question and answer section with BIAS Chairman John McGlashan, plus a questionnaire for all Brentford supporters to complete. Please take a few moments to fill this in and return to Hey Jude since the results will help BIAS to help you. Our thanks to Hey Jude's editor and BIAS member Pete Johnston for his generous offer of assistance.

### **BIAS draw winners**

Brentford's Darren Powell was kind enough to do the honours during the half-time break of the Bristol Rovers fixture to pick November's BIAS draw winner Dave Lane. Congratulations also go to Dave on the arrival of his first son. The December winner was Dan Glazier whose name was drawn during the interval of the Boxing Day fixture against Bristol City. A Brentford Fan-Attic gift voucher for the value of £40 goes to each.

### **BIAS Predict The League results**

A familiar name headed the November PTL table - Chris Beesley. Phil Cook and John Sear were 2nd and 3rd respectively. For December, Phil took pride of place at the top of the table, sopping places with Chris. 3rd spot went to Neil Smith who moved up from 6th position. The full PTL table as at the end of December is set out below:

#### **BIAS Predict The League Table - December 1999**

Pos. Player Score Pos. Player Score

- 1 Phil Cook ( B1263, Entry 1 of 1) 3 22 D.S. Wilcox ( B1187, Entry 3 of 3) -74
- 2 Chris Beesley ( A1035, Entry 1 of 1) 0 23 Neil Smith (SB) ( B1211, Entry 2 of 2) -75
- 3 Neil Smith ( B1211, Entry 1 of 2) -6 24 Martin Hughes ( B1264, Entry 2 of 3) -78
- 4 D.S. Wilcox ( B1187, Entry 2 of 3) -9 25 S Hayes ( B1188, Entry 1 of 1) -80
- 5 Keith Piggot ( A1081, Entry 1 of 1) -9 26 Paul Minkinen ( B1182, Entry 1 of 1) -83
- 6 Martin Hughes ( B1264, Entry 1 of 3) -10 27 Rod Scales ( A1101, Entry 2 of 2) -86
- 7 Pete Johnston ( A1056, Entry 1 of 1) -15 28 Ian Jarvis ( B1172, Entry 1 of 1) -90
- 8 Paul Ridley ( B1252, Entry 1 of 2) -15 29 Chris Wickham ( B1205, Entry 1 of 1) -91
- 9 Mark Croxford ( B1209, Entry 1 of 1) -22 30 Michael Turner ( ??, Entry 1 of 1) -93
- 10 John Hirdle ( A1121, Entry 1 of 1) -23 31 John Gillespie ( A1132, Entry 1 of 1) -104
- 11 Paul Harrison ( B1273, Entry 1 of 1) -24 32 Seth Dalton ( B1233, Entry 1 of 1) -110
- 12 Gary Piggot ( A1032, Entry 1 of 1) -29 33 David Merritt ( A1084, Entry 2 of 2) -115
- 13 Phil Roker ( ??, Entry 1 of 1) -32 34 Martin Hughes ( B1264, Entry 3 of 3) -116
- 14 Rod Scales ( A1101, Entry 1 of 2) -33 35 D.S. Wilcox ( B1187, Entry 1 of 3) -135

15 Paul Gorham ( A1014, Entry 1 of 1) -35 36 Larry Signy ( A1042, Entry 1 of 1) -136  
16 Chris Dean ( B1244, Entry 1 of 1) -47 37 Paul Fitzsimons ( A1083, Entry 1 of 1) -138  
17 John Sear ( A1109, Entry 1 of 1) -48 38 Paul Ridley ( B1252, Entry 2 of 2) -143  
18 David Maton ( ??, Entry 1 of 1) -61 39 David Merritt ( A1084, Entry 1 of 2) -147  
19 Paul Sabine ( B1184, Entry 1 of 1) -66 40 Graham Hall ( B1247, Entry 1 of 1) -163  
20 Ian Anderson ( A1112, Entry 1 of 1) -69 41 Geoff Rogers ( A1139, Entry 1 of 1) -166  
21 Malcolm Harrod ( B1206, Entry 1 of 1) -72