APPENDIX A

Chesterfield
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Enterprise and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee

Scrutiny Project Group

Interim report on

New Leisure Facilities

Date : August 2014

PROJECT GROUP MEMBERS:

Councillors:

Lead	Councillor Flood
Group Members	Councillor Bradford Councillor Callan Councillor Clarke Councillor Elliott Councillor Miles Councillor D Stone

1. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW AIMS

1.1 This review aims to focus on the decision made to replace the existing leisure facilities at Queens Park with a new building on the Queens Park Annexe site.

1.2 The main objectives of this review are:

a) to review the Feasibility Study which was produced to support the development or renewal of the Queens Park Sports Centre

b) to look at the possible risks/implications of the covenant associated with the land at Queens Park

c) to review the procurement processes which were used when appointing the consultants to manage the project and the communication and consultation undertaken with the public in respect of the options available regarding the redevelopment of the leisure centre.

d) to review the cost of funding the new leisure centre

e) to review the procurement process used for appointing the building contractor by Deloittes and to reconfirm this process with the successful bidder.

f) to review the partnership contract with Chesterfield College and identify Employment opportunities for young people and also opportunities in respect of Health and Wellbeing

g) to establish the design of the new building, including specification and facilities to be provided.

h) to review the planning and development process for the building, including employment, resources and how it affects the local community.

i) to review the pre-marketing of the new facilities

j) to review how the new facilities are being monitored and evaluated during the first 6 months of it opening.

1.3 The Group will continue its work into 2015/16, alongside the development of the new centre and the evaluation stage. Any further reports and/or recommendations from the Project Group will be considered by the Scrutiny Committee and brought forward for Cabinet consideration as necessary.

2. REASONS FOR THE REVIEW AND LINK TO PRIORITIES

2.1 Cabinet made a decision to build a new sports and leisure centre on the Queens Park annexe site. The Project Group were set up to provide ongoing monitoring of this project, from work undertaken to date through to delivery and evaluation of the project. The review aligned with 2013/14 Corporate Plan Aim 5:

"Healthier and Active Community – Participation in Sport and Recreation, especially in hard to reach Groups and the quality of our Leisure Centres will have improved"

3. INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 In order to inform future projects and decision making the Project Group recommends:

3.1.1 That the best practice guidance and principles for community engagement, as highlighted in the Council's Community Engagement Strategy are considered throughout the life of projects including pre-decision consultation.

3.1.2 That where possible and appropriate, pre-consultation dialogue takes place with key stakeholders. This may include Community Assemblies, service users, special interest groups, employees etc. particularly for major projects and decisions.

3.1.3 That for projects impacting on employees a strong and sustained internal communications and engagement plan is developed which includes a variety of opportunities to engage in the decision making process.

4. REVIEW APPROACH

4.1 The Project Group have met regularly to review the process at all stages of the new leisure facilities project. The terms of reference were agreed at the first meeting held on 12th July, 2013, along with membership of the Group, all of whom were self nominated.

4.1.1 The methodology used to gather information was through interviews, meetings, reviewing relevant document via the internet and those held in the Town Hall, reviewing other sports centres websites and undertaking site visits to the Council's existing leisure centres, and Ripley, Leicester and The Arc to compare facilities.

4.2 Design of the Building

4.2.1 The replacement Queens Park Sport Centre is to be a modern state of the art leisure centre providing a wide range of sport and physical activities. It will be fully accessible, light and spacious, built to be energy efficient and to make good use of space.

4.2.2 The building will have a modern, contemporary design and will be built using robust materials. The height of the building will be kept low to avoid spoiling the view around the new centre, to keep energy costs low and to stay below the height of the surrounding trees to avoid having to remove any. The facilities to be included are:

- 25m 6 lane swimming pool
- Learner pool
- 2 squash courts
- Fitness suite with specialist gym equipment
- 6 court sports hall
- Dry changing area
- Wet changing village
- Flexible multi-functional Training Zones
- Café

4.2.3 The centre has been designed to be fully accessible to individual users and groups providing the most up to date standards. Key features to promote accessibility and usage by a variety of users include:

- Accessible car parking spaces and dedicated family friendly spaces
- Range of accessible changing facilities, including equipment such as a hoist and moveable bed
- Easy access steps and a platform hoist to be provided in the main pool
- Steps and a moveable floor to learner pool
- Deck level swimming pool surrounds
- Inclusive Fitness Initiative (IFI) accredited equipment in the gym
- Spaces for buggies

4.2.4 There have been risks identified relating to the building of a new sports centre on the Annexe Site, one of which is the existence of restrictive covenants, and specialist legal advice has been sought in relation to this.

4.2.5 Insurance has been suggested as a very real option to use to mitigate against the risk, and owing to the change of use aspect of the development a bespoke quote would need to be obtained. A level of indemnity would also need to be set based on the proposed value of the development or developments. Once the insurance policy is in place there needs to be no allowance made internally for future enforcement other than deciding the allocation of the premium or which party will pay it. Therefore it represents the most effective and cost efficient method of proceeding and would be satisfactory if any funding is to be secured against the development.

4.2.6 Another issue encountered related to Queens Park Annexe being undermined by badgers. As a result of this the building has had to be re-designed to include patio/outside eating area adjacent to the café.

4.3 **Consultation**

4.3.1 The first consultation took place between 24th May and 6th June 2013 using a variety of methods. These included:

- On-line and paper questionnaire to public and stakeholders
- Sports Clubs questionnaire

- Touchscreen Opinion meter at both leisure centre sites

860 responses were received and an analysis of the information was undertaken with the following being the top 5 choices for inclusion in the new facility:

1. 25 metre swimming pool
2. Learner pool
3. Multi purpose sports hall
4. Fitness Suite
5. Children's water fun

4.3.2 Phase 2 of the consultation took place between 26th July and 16th August 2013 and also utilised a variety of methods including:

- Online and paper based questionnaires
- Touchscreen opinion meter and display boards
- Roadshow events in a variety of public locations
- Accessibility meeting

976 people took part in phase 2 of the consultation.

Members of the Group visited the Queens Park Sports Centre during this period to sample the consultation machine used and spoke to members of the public and the staff undertaking the consultation.

Feedback had been positive in the main with two thirds of consultees being happy with the proposals.

The main changes arising from the consultation included increasing the accessible parking from 6 to 16 spaces and increasing family parking spaces from 8 to 20.

Access to the car park would need to be controlled as the Council were planning on offering free parking for users of the Leisure Centre and therefore use by non-centre users would need to be monitored.

A choice was given in respect of the café facilities, which would be either 'traditional' or a mixed service. The mixed service was deemed to be the preference, serving light snacks. However this would require the reconfiguration of the servery. A franchise was the preferred option for the café, subject to Member approval.

4.4 Visits to Sites

Members undertook visits to the Health Living Centre, Ripley Leisure Centre, Leicester Leisure Centre and Arc Leisure Matlock to compare their facilities including the following:

- Outside
- Entrance/Café
- Sports Hall
- Gym
- Pool
- Disabled Facilities
- Changing Facilities

4.5 Appointment of Main Contractor

The Head of Environment was invited to the first meeting of the Group and at this meeting explained how the decision had been taken to appoint the contractor. There had been 6 companies to bid on the tender which included Project Management of the whole process using RM457 framework for Public Sector Organisations Procurement.

The contract was awarded to Deloittes, one of the 3 shortlisted on price/quality.

The Group interviewed the Procurement Officer who took them through the process which had been undertaken in appointing Deloittes. The key things which were asked for as part of the tendering exercise were:

- Experience in specialised building
- Project Management
- Methodology
- Timescales for delivery
- Budget
- Quality management
- Health and Safety record

4.6 Process for Appointing Building Contractor

The Procurement Officer was also required to explain the agreed procurement route for appointing the building contractor. This was

done as a two part tender, and initially 30 applications were received. Deloittes undertook a sift of these and came up with a shortlist of 5. Invitations to tender were sent out to the successful candidates with a deadline of 29th November to return their bids.

Only 4 of the 5 tenders were received back and the assessment was based on quality/price, 60/40. The tender also required that a local labour clause be included, which would include the use of apprenticeships.

4.7 Partnership Working with Chesterfield College

Members were briefed on the background to the College seeking dual use of the sports hall with the Council. The College will be investing £2.5m in the new facility and an ongoing amount to cover maintenance and for assistance to reduce subsidy.

The College will require use of 4 training rooms, including the sports hall for 7 hours per day for 32 weeks of the year. There will be some use of the courts and fitness suite and also use of the swimming pool, although that would now form part of the formal agreement.

4.8 Funding the cost of the New Leisure Centre

The Council's Cabinet allocated £9.25m for the capital cost of the leisure centre project, which included contingency and a sum for the demolition of the existing centre.

4.9 Staff Questionnaire

Donna Reddish, Policy Manager attended a meeting of the Scrutiny Group in October 2013 to discuss the preparation of a survey questionnaire for employees affected by the restructure of leisure services and the Leisure Centre new build. She agreed to meet with the trade unions to devise some suitable questions for inclusion on the survey.

Representatives from Unison were invited to a further meeting on 5th February 2014 with a copy of the proposed questionnaire and the Group discussed the pros and cons of it.

It was proposed that with the agreement of Members and Officers, the questionnaire would be made available to staff in early March with a deadline for completion of 3 weeks. Unfortunately this coincided with

the staff survey circulated by the Chief Executive and it was felt that this would have a negative impact on the number of questionnaires being returned therefore the proposed leisure survey did not take place.

5. EVIDENCE AND RESEARCH

5.1 Evidence gathered to support the review work includes:

- New Sport and Leisure Facilities Scoping Document
- Interviews with consultants (Deloittes)
- Interviews with officers including Head of Environment and the Sports and Leisure Manager
- Interview with Procurement Officer relating to the appointment of Consultants.
- Consideration of the Covenant relating to Queens Park Annexe
- Scrutiny of the Feasibility Study
- Consideration of the Cabinet Report and its recommendations
- Comparison of similar projects including visits to other leisure sites and research of other councils via their websites.
- Review how the public were consulted
- Review of how staff were consulted and compiling staff questionnaire to establish their views

6. INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 In order to inform future projects and decision making the Project Group recommends:

6.1.1 That the best practice guidance and principles for community engagement, as highlighted in the Council's Community Engagement Strategy are considered throughout the life of projects including pre-decision consultation.

6.1.2 That where possible and appropriate, pre-consultation dialogue takes place with key stakeholders. This may include Community Assemblies, service users, special interest groups, employees etc. particularly for major projects and decisions.

6.1.3 That for projects impacting on employees a strong and sustained internal communications and engagement plan is developed which includes a variety of opportunities to engage in the decision making process.