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The Challenge

- Restore Gunnersbury Park and Museum by its centenary in 2026
- Return it to the heart of the community and ensure it can offer something for everyone
- Ensure it is looked after for the next 100 years and beyond

Opening of Gunnersbury Park, 1926
Development of the Masterplan

- High level cost estimate of £51m to address all the issues and challenges
- Holistic approach taken as advised by English Heritage
- Phasing of the 12 year programme to maximise the opportunity of delivering a first phase
- A strategy supported by both Councils for HLF funding with park and museum bids running in parallel
- Governance – clear structure, both councils working together with English Heritage on the Project Board
Development of the Masterplan – Phase 1 (£21m)

- Repair and refurbishment of large mansion and museum
- Priority repairs following condition surveys
- Refurbishment of priority heritage parkland inc Orangery plus other key park features including boating lake, signage and interpretation
Development of the Masterplan – Phase 2 (£15m)

- Refurbishment of other listed structures including Temple, lodges and walls and developing options for small mansion and stables
- Refurbishment of ‘desirable’ parkland assets including Potomac Lake and Japanese Garden
Development of the Masterplan – Phase 3 (£15m)

- New sports and community facilities
- Remaining structures incl model farm
- ‘Other’ parkland projects including Walled Garden / Capel Manor College site
### Gunnersbury 2026 Masterplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Phase 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phase 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phase 3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings</strong></td>
<td>Repair and Refurbishment of Large Mansion and Museum</td>
<td>Refurbishment of other listed structures including Temple, lodges and walls and developing options for Small mansion and Stables.</td>
<td>Remaining Structures incl Farm changing rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority Repairs following condition surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td>Refurbishment of Priority Heritage Parkland inc Orangery plus other key park features including boating lake, signage and interpretation</td>
<td>Refurbishment of ‘desirable’ parkland assets Including Potomac Lake and Japanese Garden</td>
<td>‘Other’ Parkland projects including Walled garden / Capel Manor, woodland biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>£21m</td>
<td>£15m</td>
<td>£15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>HLF, Councils, English Heritage</td>
<td>Councils, Enabling Development Trusts S106/CIL</td>
<td>HLF, Sporting organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1: Priority Repairs Completed - £330,000

- Roof repairs to Large Mansion
- Roof repairs to Small Mansion
- Roof and Parapets to West Lodge
- Roof, chimneys and rainwater goods to North Lodge
- Stabilisation of East Lodge and Arch
Stables - £280,000

Completed:
- Taken down unstable parts and stored
- Removed rubbish and vegetation
- Prepared plans for additional repairs

Next steps:
- Agree approach with English Heritage
- Apply for English Heritage grant
- Carry out works
- Marketing of repaired building for future use
Phase 1: New Gunnersbury Park Museum

• To conserve and repair the Large Mansion and open more areas to the public
• To create an exciting new museum which tells the stories of Ealing and Hounslow and its residents
• To refurbish key historic rooms: the Drawing Room, Long Gallery and Dining Room and the unique historic kitchen and servants rooms
• Dynamic programme of events, activities and workshops for adults, families, community groups and schools
Phase 1: Historic park restoration

- Recreate the beautiful garden setting for the mansions including restoring the West Horseshoe Pond
- Create exciting opportunities for local people and community groups to help restore and look after the park
- Repair the unique park structures including the Orangery and ensure that they continue to be maintained
- Bring back boating on the repaired Round Pond
- Dedicated Head Gardener and onsite team to look after the park
Phase 1 : Timetable

Planning Stage

February 2014  Submit application to HLF for the park (£7.6 million)
April 2014  Submit application to HLF for the museum (£12.3 million)

Delivery Stage

Permission to start project from HLF  Autumn 2014
Further project planning  Autumn 2014 to Spring 2015
Works start on site  Summer 2015 – Summer 2018
Public Consultation : November 2013

• 69 people gave their views, overall response:
  - 67% agree
  - 15% neutral
  - 18% disagree

Park
• 90% agreed : Recreating West Horseshoe Lake and removing rockeries
• 87% agreed : Repairing Round Pond near café and reintroducing boating
• 69% agreed : Developing a community garden in the East Walled Garden

Museum
• 85% agreed : Restoring and opening more rooms in the museum as galleries
• 79% agreed : Relocating displays to reveal principal rooms
• 79% agreed : Make reception more welcoming, improve signage to facilities
Public Consultation: November 2013

- Public consultation gave us feedback on these areas:
  - Cycling
  - Pitch and Putt
  - Sports
  - Catering Offer
  - Future Sustainability
  - Governance
Public Consultation : Cycling

• Mixed feedback on cycling in the park (47% agreed 20% neutral 33% disagreed)
• Opportunity to better manage cycling in the park to tackle issues with other users
• Opportunity to connect Gunnersbury Park to the London Cycle Network
• Further external funding available from Transport for London for improving paths and signage
Public Consultation: Pitch and Putt

• Open up over 18 acres of heritage parkland
• Link the inner and outer areas of the park
• Preserve long grass meadow as wildlife habitat
• Enable people to enjoy the wilder side of the park’s nature
• Improve pitch and putt course to appeal to wider range of player
• Funded by pitch and putt operator
Public Consultation: Sport and Community Facility

- Many people commented they would like to see leisure activities expanded.
- National sports organisations are working with us.
- Gunnersbury Park is seen as a priority for investment in sports facilities.
- Working very closely with Brentford FC.
- The facilities will not just be for sports but community activities as well.
- We will develop plans over the next 12-18 months.
- The aim to complete this phase by 2019.
- £¼ million in place to start planning this phase.

Gunnersbury Park Regeneration Project

www.ealing.gov.uk

London Borough of Hounslow

LOTTERY FUNDED
Public Consultation: Catering

- Over 50% dissatisfied with the cafe
- Nearly 75% said that we should improve the cafe building
- Allocated £120k to substantially refurbish existing cafe
- Exploring possibility of a new cafe which will allow for carriage display extension in the future
GUNNERSBURY PARK London

Gunnersbury Park and Museum

DARREN BARKER, BARKER LANGHAM
CAROLE STEWART, EALING COUNCIL

February 2014

Gunnersbury 2026 Gunnersbury Park Regeneration Project
BARKER LANGHAM EXPERIENCE

Clissold House and Park

Victoria Park

Gorky Park

Zaryadye Park
OUR BRIEF

- Ensuring that financial sustainability is at the core
- Optimising the use of buildings and spaces to create uses
- Bringing buildings back into viable economic re-use
- Celebrating key historic buildings / spaces
- Clear zones of use with appropriate adjacencies and links (within the park and buildings)
- Using spaces and buildings appropriately
- Creating a key ‘hub’ with life
- Diversifying incomes
- Ensuring that the project has the right governance and HR
THE CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT

- Two Councils running one site and the issues this has created
- Declining state of the park and structures
- Many consultancy reports and options – a need to make these real
- Local authority cuts in budget a challenge
- Good local examples of investment in heritage sites
- Changing landscape in the way local authorities deliver of services
- Changing perception of the value of park and landscape schemes

"The 2026 vision is one of huge aspiration – a step change and transformation for Gunnersbury Park"
CURRENT BARRIERS TO FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

General
No clarity of brand
Commercial activity - but unattractive to the market
No day to day hands on commercial development

Museum
Lack of investment in the exhibition
Lack of investment in the building fabric
Use of key historic rooms for collections storage
Use of key historic rooms for fixed exhibition elements
Constrained arrival space / shop
Lack of accessibility throughout the museum
Not maximising income from key spaces eg Drawing Room, Kitchens etc
Limited flexible space for learning or functions
Limited space for temporary exhibitions
Poor quality spaces for rental either commercial or residential
Limited marketing budget and web presence
Lack of brand identity
Issues over security

Park
Poor state of heritage buildings
Poor state of sports facilities
Residential properties in poor repair
Little investment by commercial lease holders eg cafe
Limited parking provision
Limited marketing budget and web presence
Disconnected from Museum offer and activities
Issues over security
Low event income, as facilities poor
Need for further parking
A TRANSFORMATIONAL PROJECT
THE 7 KEY MOVES

1. Governance
2. Management & Human Resources
3. Capital Investment
4. Re-Investment in the Assets
5. High Quality Experience
6. Diverse Economy
7. Well-Managed Change
PURPOSE OF REVIEW

Background

- Major long term and high value regeneration project
- £50m + budget
- Acknowledged need to refine governance structure
- Major project will require new approach to deliver it
- Previous studies acknowledged

Questions

- What needs to be refined to make joint management work?
- What are the options?
- What will give investors comfort?
- What’s best for the park / people?
- What happens post-2018?

Process

- Review existing data
- Look at potential other options
- Score potential options to compare pros/cons
- Make a recommendation [for discussion] for the future.
CURRENT SITUATION

Ealing and Hounslow Councils are the owners of Gunnersbury Park Museum and the parkland of the Gunnersbury estate:

- 1927: establishment of an agreement on the joint stewardship
- 1967: latest signed agreement
- 2009: latest agreement update, which is pending final sign off

Advisory Committee/Panel:

- Comprises three councillors from each local authority
- Holds open meetings with the public
- Comments on the project and the park but no formal decision making powers

Decisions are made through Cabinet with parallel reports to the respective Cabinets of each council
OPTIONS IDENTIFIED IN 2004

Option 1:
Preserve the status quo and explore the opportunities to secure revenue providing activities and external funds

Option 2:
Revise the existing arrangements so that one council has sole responsibility and can take a strong leadership role

Option 3:
Re-launch Gunnersbury Park as a Social Enterprise and hand the management and/or ownership of the estate over to an independent trust
### MAIN OPTIONS

The key options are:

1. **Local government managed**  
   - **Details:** This would involve bringing the Park into local government direct management. One of the two authorities could take overall control of the Park with the other acting as a client. This would be one option for a potential management solution.  
   - **Applicability:** The applicability of this model is possible. The transfer of services in-house does pose challenges arising from new terms and conditions of employment, the management of the operation and potentially added costs.

2. **Trust model**  
   - **Details:** Moving the operation to a charitable status, governed by Trustees. This is an applicable model, although the risks are that the quality of Trustees and direction cannot be guaranteed, and therefore the overall operation could be compromised. There are good examples such as Chiswick House and Gardens locally. Moving to a Trust doesn’t guarantee success — and often Trusts don’t benefit from the access local authorities have to expertise and resources.

3. **Private sector operation**  
   - **Details:** The current mode of operation. Applicable if the overall operation has a clearer management structure, and the overall Park has a well-defined vision, brand and identity. Could be applicable for certain elements of the operation — such as maintenance etc.

4. **Partnership with a non-profit organisation**  
   - **Details:** This would involve working in partnership with an existing non-profit distributing organisation (NPDO) and entering into contractual arrangements for the delivery of agreed KPis. There are a number of existing NPDos managing and operating heritage services in partnership with local authorities. However, organisations located elsewhere may be unable to take on the whole Park and is less likely to have a specifically local focus.

5. **Mixed economy**  
   - **Details:** This would involve the diversification of delivery of the Park by different delivery models whether public, private or voluntary sector and/or in-house. A clear strategy of operation would be required beyond that currently discussed. It is suggested that there are no significant advantages of breaking up the Park operations in this way.

6. **Joint Venture company**  
   - **Details:** A bespoke vehicle that allows the Public Sector to trade commercially for profit. The Flowers under the Local Government Act, 2003 and Localism Bill 2011 enable trade with private bodies and persons for profit (i.e. charges fixed at more than cost recovery) and provide new freedoms and flexibilities with the power to trade only exercisable through a company. The potential for this model is extensive. The model in this instance could be a Joint Venture model with both Local Authorities jointly owning the company. It allows the focus to be both local — whilst allowing trading beyond the borders. It also allows for joint procurement of services from third party providers.
## HIGHEST SCORING OPTIONS

### OPTION 2  
**A Trust Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Score /10</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected to the community</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strong local representation through Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Seen as solid, charitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Needs foundation of financial support from the Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Can be creative, depends on Trustee skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Can be stable, but affected by external factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE SCORE** 6.8

### OPTION 6  
**Joint Venture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Score /10</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected to the community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Connected at Board level to the community, more connected to business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Positive perceptions - a specific vehicle for Gunnersbury Park, which has the site as its full focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Same access to funds as a local authority, possibly has more commercial focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A creative structure that offers opportunities for diverse approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Solid management team, strategic commitment to the park with Councils involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE SCORE** 8.2
OPTION FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION: JOINT VENTURE

Benefits

- Resonates with the 1925/6 agreement
- Supported by both Councils’ infrastructure and skills
- Control of the site’s activities
- Ownership of site – a long term ownership
- Still part of local democratic framework
- Structure means it doesn’t lose momentum through complex Council processes
- Simple to set up
- Can have a Development Trust alongside to allow fundraising
- A new model for Council collaboration for a cultural project
POTENTIAL JOINT VENTURE

Ealing Council

Hounslow Council

Board for Joint Venture

CEO

(1)

Museum and Estate Programmes

Commercial and Finance Management

Heritage Estate Management

- Curatorial
- Education
- Outreach
- Volunteer Development
- Internships Apprentices

- FOH
- Retail
- Catering
- Visitor Services
- Marketing
- HR
- IT
- Admin

- Lead on horticulture
- Gardeners
- Operatives
- Park operations
- Caretaking
- Cleaning

(1) CEO
Project champion / on-site leadership, overall management of estate and all on-site activities, masterplan delivery, fundraising direction / strategic leadership

(2) Museum and Estate Programmes

(3) Commercial and Finance

(4) Heritage Estate Management

1. Governance
2. Management & Human Resources
3. Capital Investment
4. Re-Investment in the Assets
5. High Quality Experience
6. Diverse Economy
7. Well-Managed Change
DEVELOPMENT TRUST

WHY A DEVELOPMENT TRUST?
- Eligible for funding from restricted charity funders
- Enables peer to peer giving
- Provides donors with reassurance

ROLE OF TRUSTEES
- Strategic oversight and expert advice on fundraising / finances
- Acting as influential role models
- Tapping their existing networks of contacts
- Active role as fundraisers: making the “ask” of individual and corporate donors and writing funding bids
- Hosting events and acting as figureheads

GUNNERSBURY DEVELOPMENT TRUST
- Ealing and Hounslow Councils joint enablers
- Single focus on raising funds for Gunnersbury
- Refine fundraising strategy
- Key tasks now:
  - Developing the governance framework
  - Source trustees
  - Objects and draft constitution
  - Registration

‘charitable trust established to receive private and corporate gifts, as well as to be a conduit for grants from charitable trusts and foundations or funding routes for which the parent organisation would normally be ineligible’.
GUNNERSBURY DEVELOPMENT TRUST TIME-LINE

1. Governance
   2. Management & Human Resources
   3. Capital Investment
   4. Re-Investment in the Assets
   5. High Quality Experience
   6. Diverse Economy
   7. Well-Managed Change

Governance Framework
April 2014

Registration
November 2014

Source Trustees
June 2014

Application
September 2014

Constitution
July 2014
2. MANAGEMENT & HUMAN RESOURCES
3. CAPITAL INVESTMENT

Need for Investment

- Investment in:
  - Landscape
  - Historic fabric
  - Exhibition
  - Interpretation
  - Fixtures and fittings

- Creating marketable high quality spaces

- The foundation for the future of the site

- Provides infrastructure for generating income

- A strategic ongoing process through the masterplan
### 4. RE-INVESTMENT IN THE ASSETS

Summary of Costs for Maintenance and Cyclical Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building / Structure</th>
<th>Maintenance costs per year (inc VAT) from Year 2</th>
<th>Maintenance costs per year (inc VAT) - Year 1 [50%]</th>
<th>Maintenance costs over 10 years</th>
<th>Cyclical Costs for 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orangery</td>
<td>26,440</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>253,500</td>
<td>153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>16,890</td>
<td>8,445</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>141,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Tower</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Structures</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansion</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>27,750</td>
<td>555,000</td>
<td>1,173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>128,830</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,266,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,741,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. HIGH QUALITY EXPERIENCE

- More accessible - more users
- Restored features and heritage
- High quality exhibition / interpretation
- Improved visitor facilities
- Visible staff presence and welcome
- New café and external landscape
- Great programmes and activities
6. DIVERSE ECONOMY

- 40% Events (Buildings)
- 8% Events (Landscape)
- 10% Catering
- 10% Programme
- 9% License / Lease
- 9% Donations
- 3% Retail
- 9% External Funds
- 7% Residential
- 3% Other

1. Governance
2. Management & Human Resources
3. Capital Investment
4. Re-Investment in the Assets
5. High Quality Experience
6. Diverse Economy
7. Well-Managed Change
7. WELL MANAGED CHANGE

- Carillion [private]
  - Ealing Council
  - Hounslow Council
  - Mix of contract arrangements

- Set up Joint Venture
- Transfer / recruit staff
- Open / transparent process

- Full Board in place
- JV working well

CURRENT STRUCTURE
2014/15

TRANSITION PERIOD
2015/18

FUTURE
2018 onwards
OVERVIEW OF KEY INCOMES

Income Generation on the Estate

- Pop-up and Temple Hire
- Bath House
- Mansion and Museum
- Café
- Orangery Hire
- Stables
- Pitch and Putt
- Location TBC
- Boats
- New Lodge
- Café / Sports
- Capel Manor
- Events
- Pop-up Café
- Potomac Tower
- West Lodge

Catering
Retail
Wedding / Events Hire
Sports
Residential
Licences / leases
Educational activities
Community activities
OVERVIEW OF KEY EXPENDITURES

- Staff: £200,000, Current 800K
- Maintenance: £600,000, Future 1.8m
- Other running costs: £400,000
- Total: £1,400,000

Total expenditure: £1,800,000
OVERVIEW OF KEY INCOMES

COUNCILS’ CONTRIBUTION C.600K

- Events (Buildings): £200,000
- Events (Landscape): £0
- Catering: £400,000
- Programme: £600,000
- Residential: £800,000
- Licence / Lease: £1,000,000
- Retail: £1,200,000
- Donations: £200K
- External Funds: £600K
- Other: £800K

Total: £1,200,000
# KEY CHANGES FROM ROUND 1

Changes from Current operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance structure</td>
<td>Joint Committee</td>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Structure</td>
<td>Off site</td>
<td>Team on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors to the Park</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors to the Museum</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>45-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School users</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum staff costs</td>
<td>£210,000</td>
<td>£355,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park staff costs</td>
<td>£62,000</td>
<td>£344,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum staff numbers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park staff numbers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>£203,250</td>
<td>£1,182,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum/Mansion maintenance p/a</td>
<td>£78,000</td>
<td>£194,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Structures maintenance p/a</td>
<td>£515,000</td>
<td>£577,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANY QUESTIONS?