

## Floral Pavilion Future Options

- Option 1: Existing model operating with max. £500k (or less) council subsidy (Council only)
- Option 2: An Arts and Cultural Hub (Council + Commercial + Community)
- Option 3: Alternative Delivery Model (Fully Outsourced Commercial Operation)
- Option 4: Service closure.

### Assessment Criteria

<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Proposed Weighting 0 – 100 (100 representing an extremely important criterion and 0 representing one that isn't important)</b>
Ability of the option to support the priorities of the Council Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To deliver high quality efficient universal services to all residents</li> <li>• To prioritise those with the greatest needs</li> <li>• To deliver council services within the means of the Council budget</li> <li>• To be prepared to innovate and face the future</li> <li>• To play our part in addressing the climate emergency and protecting our environment</li> <li>• To work across communities with community, voluntary and faith organisations and partners to improve all residents' life chances</li> <li>• To deliver our ambitious regeneration programme through increased investment, jobs and new businesses throughout the borough</li> <li>• Assets Strategy</li> <li>• Climate Strategy</li> <li>• People Strategy</li> <li>• Customer Experience Strategy</li> <li>• Community Wealth initiatives</li> </ul>	100 (17%)
Ability of the option to support the regeneration priorities of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the option support the local culture and visitor economy?</li> <li>• Does the option align to the Marine Promenade Masterplan?</li> <li>• Does the option attract people to the area?</li> </ul>	80 (14%)
Ability of the option to improve the Council's wider service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the option allow for improved service delivery?</li> <li>• Does the option make services more accessible for residents?</li> <li>• Does the option support joined-up service delivery?</li> </ul>	70 (12%)
Ability of the option to create long-term sustainability for the service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the option give opportunity for the service to improve efficiencies and potentially reduce council subsidies?</li> </ul>	80 (14%)
Ability of the option to positively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the option positively contribute towards the M/LTFS?</li> </ul>	100 (17%)

contribute towards the Council's Medium/Long Term Financial Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would significant savings be achieved by the option?</li> </ul>	
Ability of the option to provide a return on investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the option allow an opportunity for the service to generate income?</li> <li>• Does the option provide a service that has reasonable cost vs income generation opportunities?</li> <li>• Does the option provide any non-cashable benefits (Improve social value, economic value, people focused regeneration etc)</li> </ul>	80 (14%)
Ability of the option to attract partner & community organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the option provide a venue that partner and supplier organisations could access?</li> <li>• Does the option create/enhance collaborative working with partner organisations?</li> </ul>	70 (12%)

Scoring Mechanism:

0. Not appropriate (0% of the weighting)
1. The Option significantly fails to meet the Criterion (25% of the weighting)
2. The Option falls short of meeting the Criterion, meeting some but not all elements (50% of the weighting)
3. The Option satisfies the Criterion (75% of the weighting)
4. The Option satisfies and provides additional benefit to the Criterion (100% of the weighting)