

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 4 November 2015 at the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa at 6.00 pm.

Present: Councillor Mobbs (Chairman); Councillors Coker, Cross, Mrs Gallagher, Mrs Grainger and Councillor Whiting.

Also present: Councillor Boad (Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee & Liberal Democrat Group Observer), Councillor Barrott (Chair Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee) and Councillor Naimo (Labour Group Observer)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Shilton.

57. **Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

58. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2015 were agreed as written, subject to a minor amendment to record Councillor Phillips apologies instead of Councillor Quinney and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Part 1

(Items on which a decision by Council is required)

59. **Leisure Development Programme**

The report asked the Executive to approve a series of recommendations following completion of the initial phase of the Leisure Development Programme. The programme was established in November 2014 to formulate options for the future provision and management of the Council's leisure centres and dual-use sites. The recommendations were based on strengthening the Council's facilities, service offering and income. The report addressed two significant issues that Members would need to determine.

Firstly, whether the Council should invest significant capital sums in two of its existing leisure centres (Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park) to make them fit for purpose for the next 20/30 years. The investment proposals at these two leisure centres included: the creation of state of the art health and fitness facilities; remodelling and updating of reception areas; and at Newbold Comyn, the construction of a new sports hall. Without this investment, there was a significant risk that these major leisure facilities would no longer be fit for purpose, resulting in a reduction in usage and a potential increase in public subsidy. There was also robust evidence supported by the Sport England Facilities Planning Model to support the

view that without this investment the facilities would be insufficient for the growing population of the District.

Secondly, deciding what was the best model for managing the Council's leisure facilities in the future – keeping the management of the Leisure Service in-house or management via an external partner. Such a decision needed to be made in the context of the continuing reductions in local authority funding and take account of the need to secure best value for money without compromising the aim of securing the best outcome for the District in terms of providing quality leisure facilities and services.

The Council had 4 main leisure centres, all of which were built 20 – 30 years ago, which for many years have provided the District with a range of modern and varied facilities. The Council also managed dual use centres at Kenilworth School and Myton School which were available for community-use outside of school hours. Over time investment had been made in the centres, adding new elements and updating the internal finishes, ensuring that the facilities had remained in good condition and were structurally sound. This ongoing investment was justified when in 2013 a condition survey of all the Council's assets found the leisure centres to be in good structural condition, but crucially found them to be in need of modernisation and requiring the establishment of a programme of planned preventative maintenance including the replacement of significant elements of mechanical and electrical plant and building fabric.

In parallel with the condition survey, a facility audit (available on the Council website) was undertaken by Neil Allen Associates (NAA) to establish whether the range of leisure facilities was appropriate for the District, and if this provision would be able to meet the future needs and demands of the local community. The audit concluded that when using the Sport England Facility Planning Model (FPM), the existing provision was largely in the right place and was providing a suitable range of activities and facilities for the people of Warwick District. There was no evidence to suggest that any of the facilities were under-used nor that there were parts of the District that did not have reasonable access to facilities. The model took account of the anticipated growth of population in the District and at the time of assessment in 2014, used the then Local Plan figures to calculate demand. Based on the figures at that time, the audit recommended that the present facilities were retained, but that investment was made to bring the facilities up to modern standards and extended to provide additional health and fitness provision and an additional sports hall (located in Leamington).

However, following receipt of the Planning Inspector's Local Plan letter early that summer and the subsequent development of the sub regional Memorandum of Understanding about housing numbers, officers had liaised with Sport England on the potential implications for sports facilities. Officers have been advised that the FPM should be re-run in the next 12 months to take into account the additional houses that were now required in the District. However, having undertaken an initial desk-top exercise using the model, the data suggest that the additional houses would not

change the outcome of the FPM significantly and that the approach of extending and refurbishing current facilities remained valid.

The NAA report strongly supported the proposals for significant expansion of the health and fitness element of the facilities (gyms and studios). It was acknowledged that this was a strong and commercially significant element of the leisure sector and one which was a key source of income for any operator. A soft market testing exercise was undertaken by Strategic Leisure (consultants commissioned by the Council to support on the Programme) in Spring 2014 to examine the appetite and interest of the private sector in partnering with the Council to manage its leisure centres. The respondents confirmed that they would see the expansion of health and fitness facilities as a priority in the event that they were offered the opportunity to manage the Council's leisure centres.

Aware of the levels of potential investment being proposed, set against the volatile nature of the health and fitness sector, officers had undertaken a review of the status of health and fitness provision locally, Appendix 2 to the report. It concluded that, whilst there were some local gyms that were not identified in the NAA report, there remained a strong case for expansion of the Council's facilities to offer a modern and accessible health and fitness product that would have the capacity to attract new members and increase levels of physical activity across all sectors of the community.

The investment recommendations in this report related only to the leisure centres in Leamington and Warwick. The situation in Kenilworth was significantly different for two reasons. Firstly, the proposed relocation of Kenilworth School and the Kenilworth Wardens sports club from land allocated as strategic housing development sites within the Submission Draft Local Plan could directly impact on the existing Council facilities. Secondly, unlike Leamington and Warwick, there was a potential impact on the Council's leisure facilities in Kenilworth from planned future facility development in neighbouring areas and, in particular, the emerging plans that Coventry City Council and the University of Warwick had for their leisure provision. Discussions were held, and continued, with both bodies. Coventry's plans relating to the replacement of the Fairfax Street 50m pool and sports centre were acknowledged but due to the travel time from the District were not considered relevant to Warwick District's facility planning exercise. Warwick University were reviewing their campus master-plan and this process included a review of sports and leisure provision. Whilst any changes made at the University site had a broad relevance to the whole District they were not considered to be in conflict with the proposals for St Nicholas Park and Newbold Comyn but, due to the proximity of the University to Kenilworth, they would potentially have a direct impact on the Council's facilities in Kenilworth.

In the light of these issues officers had consulted with Kenilworth Councillors on the recommendations of the NAA report and the feedback from Strategic Leisure in respect of the leisure facilities in the town. The conclusion of these discussions was that it would be premature to recommend an investment programme for the Kenilworth facilities until

the Local Plan had been adopted, the funding issues around the relevant site developments clarified and the potential impact of facility development in neighbouring areas confirmed. Future plans for the Kenilworth facilities should, therefore, be viewed as a second phase to a programme of investment and development with the current proposals for Newbold Comyn and St. Nicholas Leisure Centres forming Phase I. Members should note that, if recommendation 2.6 of the report, was approved and a procurement process undertaken to identify an external operator for the Council's leisure facilities, any future contract would include the current Kenilworth sites. Any contract would need to be structured in a way that would allow for variation in the event of significant changes to the facilities in Kenilworth in the future.

In developing the investment proposals to RIBA Stage 2 (Appendix 3 to the report), project managers, Mace Ltd, and their professional colleagues such as architects and Mechanical & Electrical (M&E) consultants had produced a cost model (Confidential Appendix 1 in the Part B). The model included construction costs, M&E costs and an allowance for professional fees, which total £11,984,698. Initial fees to the total of £171,400 was approved previously by the Executive and had already been spent in reaching RIBA Stage 2. Should the Executive approve Recommendations 2.1 – 2.5 which enabled the project to progress to RIBA Stage 4, the design plans would be refined and a comprehensive cost model developed. Invasive surveys of the existing buildings would be carried out in order to provide certainty that the designs being prepared could be successfully built. The designs would be prepared for a planning application and the application would be submitted towards the end of RIBA Stage 4 as can be seen in Table 1, in the report.

It should be noted that the investment proposals had subsumed some of the leisure centre elements of the Council's Planned Preventative Maintenance Programme (PPM). These elements were estimated to cost in the region of £3m over a period of 30 years. The first 5 years of the leisure centre PPM Programme had an estimated cost of £836,000. Further detail on the financial implications of the PPM Programme was included in paragraph 5.7 of the report.

The plans and costs included in respect of Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres represent Stage 2, the "Concept Design" phase of the RIBA framework. In Stages 3 and 4, the project progressed with updated proposals for structural design, building service systems, outline specifications, and fully detailed cost projections and Risk Assessments. At the end of this phase, the Council had the opportunity to continue with the proposals or halt the project. In order to achieve this, £550,000 was required to fund the Project and Programme Management, planning applications and surveys.

To progress the investment proposals to RIBA Stage 2, the Council engaged Mace Ltd as project managers through the NHS Shared Business Services Framework. In doing so the project had benefited from the services of a range of professions including architects and M&E consultants, all of whom have been sub contracted by Mace Ltd on

competitive rates. If the Executive approves Recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 and authorised officers to produce detailed proposals for the investment and thereby progressed the scheme to RIBA Stage 4, consideration needed to be given to the most appropriate way of procuring the relevant services.

Officers had sought advice from the Procurement Manager and Head of Finance on the most appropriate approach to the next stage that minimises costs and ensures continuity of the project to RIBA Stage 4. Officers therefore continued to work with Mace Ltd as project managers under the NHS Shared Business Services Framework to complete this next phase of work and, subject to the decision to progress to construction, Mace Ltd continued as project managers until the end of the construction phase.

It was proposed that an application for planning permission should be made towards the end of RIBA Stage 4, using the information prepared as part of the RIBA Stage 4 process. This would ensure that the planning process could be undertaken in time to begin work on site in accordance with the agreed programme, subject to permission being granted. Delegated authority was also sought to apply for planning permission and for any other necessary and statutory consents to allow the project to proceed to the next stage of proceedings.

It was anticipated that the investment proposals would be funded from a number of sources, some of which were already secured, and others which had yet to be confirmed. Further details were included in 5.2.4, of the report.

It was proposed that officers sought to access funding from the Sport England Strategic Facilities Fund (SFF). Due to the way in which Sport England manage that fund, there was no indication at that stage as to whether an application would be successful. Recommendation 2.4 sought the relevant delegation to the appropriate officer and Member to progress any application.

The Sport England SFF was designed to direct capital investment to local authority projects that had been identified through a strategic needs assessment and that have a maximum impact on growing and sustaining community sport participation. Projects that were funded from this source were promoted as best practice in the delivery of quality and affordable facilities and were able to demonstrate long term efficiencies. Projects needed to be able to demonstrate that they were bringing together a number of partners, with input from public and private sectors, and had the support of national governing bodies of sport.

Applications to this fund were on a "solicited-only" basis, meaning that the Council had to be invited by Sport England to make an application. Consequently, officers had been working closely over the last 12 months with Sport England, and with the County Sports Partnership who had an overview of the regional strategic picture of facility provision, to get to a

point where Sport England would hopefully invite an application for the improvements at Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure centres.

In the event that the Executive approved Recommendations 2.1 – 2.5, officers would confirm, to Sport England, the Council's commitment to the investment proposals and would look to work with the relevant Sport England officers to secure funding from this source in order to improve the affordability of the schemes. The modelling explained in Section 5 of this report and Confidential Appendix Z of the Part B report showed the impact of the Council being unsuccessful in securing Sport England funding.

A fundamental consideration in finalising the detail of the investment proposals for Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres was the impact of increased customer visits to these sites and the additional pressure that this would place on the car parking provision. If facilities were expanded and insufficient parking provision is made, business models would not be deliverable and customer satisfaction levels would be reduced.

Recognising the challenges that this could pose, consultants Atkins were commissioned to assess the current level of car park usage, to consider the future pressures on parking provision at these sites as a result of the investment proposals and to make recommendations on how car parking provision could be managed in future to minimise the impact on customers of the leisure centres and other car park users.

The high level summary of the surveys for St Nicholas Park and Newbold Comyn leisure centres were set out in the report.

Officers of Cultural Services and Neighbourhood Services had considered the findings and recommendations of the Atkins surveys and had concluded that car parking provision at Newbold Comyn was satisfactory for the extended facilities proposed for this site. In respect of St Nicholas Park it was clear that, whilst the current parking provision could meet demand at most times of the day/week, there were some times when demand would exceed capacity. Officers had considered a range of mitigation measures that could be put in place in future to address these shortfalls, but also taking into account the emerging findings of an investigation into car parking throughout Warwick town centre currently being undertaken. It was proposed that the outcome of this work would be reported to the Executive alongside the further report referred to in Recommendation 2.1. It was believed that the car parking issues at St Nicholas Park Leisure Centre was not severe enough to question the decision to invest in the facilities. Nonetheless, any mitigation would be advantageous to the future performance of the Centre and the user experience more broadly.

As part of the planning process Green Travel Plans would be developed for both facilities and that would help to alleviate pressure on car parking.

The recommendation that tenders would be invited for the management of all the Council's leisure and dual use facilities (subject to agreement by

dual use partners), took into consideration the Business Plan (Confidential Appendix 2 in the Part B report) and the confidential Prospectus (Confidential Appendix 3 in Part B of the report) submitted by the in-house team. It considered the report from Strategic Leisure (Confidential Appendix 4 in Part B of the Agenda) comparing the relative merits of the in-house model and potential external operators (based on industry benchmarks for external operators).

Due to the commercial sensitivity of this information, the full details of the in-house proposal was included in Part B of the Agenda. The proposal was considered to be a robust and comprehensive Business Plan and Prospectus that had been developed from first principles and had included forensic challenge of all aspects of the business.

The Business Plan had been written to address two scenarios. Firstly, and referred to hereafter as Option 1, there was an assumption that the Executive decides not to invest in the enhancement and extension of Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres (other than essential £3.9m of works referred to in paragraph 5.7), and so relied on the in-house team delivering the service in a more commercial manner with a clear focus on the areas of greatest potential for income generation i.e. swimming lessons and health and fitness.

The alternative, Option 2, was based on Executive agreeing to invest in the region of £12m in the Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres, and so relied on significant increase in the income generated by the expanded health & fitness provision, the expansion of the swimming lesson programme (as in Option 1), the installation of a "Clip and Climb" facility and a new sports hall at Newbold Comyn, and a consequent uplift in income from a number of areas as a result of the improved changing provision, refurbished reception areas and general service improvement.

The Prospectus described in detail how the in-house team intended to approach the service improvement that was essential for both Option 1 & 2 to be successful. It highlighted the many benefits that would be optimised by retaining the service in-house, focuses on the Principles that would underpin the new-look "Warwick District Sports & Leisure" team going forward, and describes the areas that the team intends to focus on in order to develop the service.

In order to get an independent assessment of the in-house proposals, Strategic Leisure was asked to produce an evaluation report which was included in full as confidential Appendix 4 in Part B of the report. Strategic Leisure highlighted a number of areas which they believed warranted detailed consideration when comparing the in-house v external model for both Options 1 & 2. A financial analysis of the two models was included at section 5 of this report and in all scenarios Strategic Leisure considers that an external provider would out-perform the in-house model, albeit by a margin that requires careful consideration.

However, when considering the in-house bid against what an external operator might be able to provide in the context of the separate decision

on investment, the Council needed to consider a wider number of issues, not all of which are financial. These were set out in Table 2, of the report.

:

This assessment brought out issues; track record of the in-house offer, financial impact, impact on staff, impact on procuring an external supplier on the rest of the Council, certainty of benefit of procuring an external supplier; and best value.

It was acknowledged that over the course of the last two years, and more particularly the last six months, the in-house operation has improved significantly, with income projected to be circa £50k above the 2015/16 budget at year end. However, the increased income detailed in the business plan, whilst being cautious, was a major step-change on what has previously been delivered by the in-house team. Consequently, the Option 2 business plan which would increase income by some £2m could be a major challenge for the Council in-house team to sustain. The contrast with a commercial operator was that driving income is its day-to-day business. The recent improvement coincides with the appointment of the current Sports & Leisure Manager and other operational management changes. It was the case, though, that if the current position had largely been driven by one individual there was a significant risk to the business if that individual leaves the organisation, or falls ill or is otherwise prevented from performing as now.

Strategic Leisure's view was that an external operator would be able to deliver a financial benefit at least as good as the in-house offer, indeed surpassing it. If that was not the case and the operator was unable to deliver to its business plan it would still be liable to pay the agreed contractual fee to the Council. However, should the in-house bid not deliver in accordance with the business plan, it would lie with the Council to make good any deficit.

The impact on staff was more difficult to estimate but feedback from Strategic Leisure's experience in similar leisure service outsourcing projects elsewhere suggests that the overwhelming majority of staff who work within the current service were likely to continue to do so. This was of course subject to the Council's compliance with the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations (TUPE) and the Government's Fair Deal pension policy.

No modelling had been done so far on what other savings could be made from "back-office" changes should Executive decide to externalise the service. However, should Executive make this decision then the next report would detail the areas where it was considered that further savings could be made and would also address any other possible consequences.

Strategic Leisure states, *"Without formal procurement of the service it is difficult to confirm definitively the difference between an in-house operation and an external operator."* The whole tenor of Strategic Leisure's appraisal was that an external operator could deliver a greater financial advantage than the in-house provider and deliver the same service, but the only way to determine this was by going to the market.

The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 placed a requirement on the Council to consider overall value, including economic, environmental and social value, when reviewing service provision. These elements would be integrated into the evaluation methodology for the tenders for both the management and the construction and refurbishment projects.

Taking into careful consideration the recommendations from Strategic Leisure, it was recommended that the Council procured a partner to manage its leisure centres on a long-term basis through a competitive process in compliance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015. The specific procurement procedure likely to be used was the Competitive Procedure with Negotiation, as that would enable the Council to specify its minimum requirements and then to negotiate with bidders on their proposals with a view to refining and improving the proposals, ultimately to arrive at a preferred bidder and a preferred arrangement.

As part of the procurement process, the Council would set down minimum requirements which it was seeking from any proposal in the Service Specification. Bidders would be invited to submit proposals which, amongst other things, were deliverable, financially acceptable to the Council and best fit with the Council's requirements.

The timing of the procurement process would be heavily influenced by the construction programme should that be approved and it was proposed that the two processes dovetail to cause minimum interruption for service users, staff and management. The provisional procurement timetable was set out in the report.

The decision by the Executive to undertake a procurement to seek tenders from the external market must be a considered one. Members would need to balance a number of factors when reaching their decision, including:

The financial and other benefits of what the market could offer compared to an in-house model, which was capable of being clearly articulated to all interested parties,

That Council officer time and costs would be incurred in undertaking the procurement process, as well as increased costs of contract monitoring and risk of contract failure,

That the procurement procedure would need to be planned in such a way as to avoid the need for cancellations and avoid the risk of challenge from prospective partners, and

To mitigate (but not remove) this risk, it was recommended that the Council, in the procurement documents, reserves the right not to award any contracts as a result of the procurement process, and that the Council would not be liable for any of the bidders' costs in submitting a bid.

If the decision was made by the Executive to procure a provider to manage the Council's leisure center management service, it was recommended that the Executive delegated authority to the Head of Cultural Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Culture, to finalise the Service Specification, to undertake the procurement process through to one preferred party, and to complete the necessary legal documentation with this party. In the event that a significant risk or change to the proposed project emerges through the procurement process, then a full report would be brought back to the Executive before any decision was made.

The Service Specification was a detailed document that lays out the parameters within which the service would be delivered, and at the same time was the document by which the performance of any operator, be it the in-house team or an external contractor, could be monitored and managed. The successful delivery of the service would rely on the development of a "partnership approach" between Council and operator, subject to the terms and conditions agreed in the contract.

For example, the Service Specification includes minimum standards in respect of opening hours, cleanliness and maintenance, health and safety management, customer service, staff training and qualifications, and how the facilities were programmed to accommodate a wide range of users.

The Service Specification would also include a list of index-linked key charges and concessionary rates that any operator would be required to adhere to as maximum charges. It would be left to the discretion of the operator should they wish to lower the key charges. In this way the Council was able to protect certain user groups and ensure that they were not disadvantaged or discouraged from using the facilities.

The Specification would also include a performance management framework which again would be an essential tool in the Council managing the performance of the operator.

The draft Service Specification was attached as Appendix 1, to the report. The Council must recognise that there was many variables in the provision of leisure services which officers would need to work through in more detail should the Executive agree Recommendation 2.6. This would enable officers to finalise the Service Specification prior to the commencement of the tender process and then to enter into the necessary legal agreements with the chosen partner in order to best protect the Council's and the customers' interests.

The cross-party Members' Working Group had played a crucial role in steering the Programme to date. As the Programme entered the new phase it was considered appropriate for the Group to continue to provide oversight of the procurement and contract award process, and the investment work as it progresses to RIBA Stage 4. Members of the Group were also able to feed-back to their political Groups to ensure that Councillors remain up to date as the programme develops.

Throughout the course of the programme, sports and leisure staff and Unison representatives had been engaged in the process through regular briefing notes, and by the Unison Secretary being a member of the Programme Board. Staff from the leisure centres were also involved in the development of the in-house Prospectus and Business Plan and took part in a design workshop for the refurbishment work.

If the management of the service was externalised pursuant to Recommendation 2.6 all operational staff will automatically transfer to the new operator under the terms of the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations (TUPE). HR and other relevant officers would work closely with the Programme Manager to ensure that appropriate pension arrangements were in place. They would also identify other support staff that may be subject to TUPE by virtue of their duties as they relate to the Leisure Service. This would ensure the necessary work in this area was progressed in line with Council policies, and that staff were fully consulted at the appropriate times.

The report detailed the reasons why investment in Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres was considered necessary (Section 3.1). However, a decision could be taken not to make the significant investment outlined in the report. If that were the decision, there would be some substantial essential maintenance required to the structure of the facilities, and some significant replacement of plant. Without these items, the leisure centres would become "not fit for purpose", attendances would fall, and the subsidy required to operate the facilities would increase. There would also be a shortfall in sports and leisure provision in the District which would have a detrimental effect on the health and well-being of current and future residents of the area.

A decision could be taken to invest on one but not both of the above venues. In that case some of the additional demand on sporting provision would be met by the additional provision made, but the District would face a shortfall in terms of the levels of provision that has been modelled by the Sport England Facilities Planning Model, and again risk not meeting the demands of a growing population. There would also remain a need to undertake essential maintenance/replacement at the venue that was not refurbished.

A Joint meeting of the Finance & Audit and Overview & Scrutiny Committee had taken place and recommended to the Executive that

- (1) recommendations 2.6, 2.7, 2.8 and 2.9 of the report are removed, effectively retaining the Leisure Options in Council's management control and continuing under existing arrangements; and
- (2) officers investigate the option of introduction a "Passport to Leisure" into the contract to enable access to leisure facilities for all members of the community.

The Executive welcomed the recommendations from the Joint Scrutiny Committee and agreed to support the second point. However they could not support the first recommendation because of the substantial reasons

within report to support the recommendations, the information and debate within the confidential part of the meeting relating to this matter, the way this provided upgrade to the facilities, the way the external management option provided for growth in this District including provision of further jobs, that this would provide a substantial improvement in the financial health of the Council and the significant and important advice received from officers on this matter.

The Executive therefore

Resolved that

- (1) the refurbishment and expansion of the Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres, be approved, at a cost in the region of £12 million, subject to a further report to the Executive in June/July 2016 detailing the final cost model and the sources of funding for the investment;
- (3) (2) authority be delegated to the Head of Cultural Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Culture to seek planning permission and such other necessary statutory consents that would enable the proposed improvements to Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres to be implemented; the Head of Cultural Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Culture, to work with Sport England to seek funding from Sport England's Strategic Facilities Fund (SFF) as a contribution to the costs of the capital investment;
- (4) that a further report be brought forward that would also provide details of further mitigation of car parking constraints at St Nicholas Park and note that the mitigation may involve:
 - i) Improved signage directing traffic to Myton Fields
 - ii) Remodelling of some areas of St Nicholas Park car park
 - iii) Reviewing the relative charges at St Nicholas Park and Myton Fields car parks.
- (5) the procurement of a partner to manage all of the Council's leisure centres and dual-use operations (subject to necessary consents by dual use partners) is undertaken on a timeline that marries-up with the refurbishment programme,; and a budget of £30,000 was

allocated from the Contingency Budget to fund the cost of the procurement exercise;

- (6) note the principles of the draft Service Specification at Appendix 1 to the report, which detailed the future service standards that would be delivered at the Council's leisure centres and dual-use facilities (subject to necessary consents by dual-use partners); and delegates authority to the Head of Cultural Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Culture, to finalise the Service Specification, to undertake the procurement process to select one partner, and to enter into the necessary legal agreements with that partner including arrangements in relation to staffing, pensions and assets;
- (7) the current Members' Working Group that had been overseeing the Leisure Development Programme to date extend its role to provide oversight of the procurement process and risk logs;
- (8) the current level and process of liaison and consultation with staff and their representative bodies continue; and
- (9) officers investigate the option of introduction a "Passport to Leisure" into the contract to enable access to leisure facilities for all members of the community.

Recommended that Council approves the funding of £550,000 (included in the £12m) from Section 106 payments (c£170,000) already received and internal borrowing (c£380,000) managed by the Head of Finance, to allow the design proposals for Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres to be developed up to and including the end of RIBA Stage 4, thereby enabling appropriate planning applications to be submitted, a preferred developer to be selected and a provisional contract price to be established.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Whiting)
(Forward Plan reference number 697)