

---

A separate report is submitted in the private part of the agenda in respect of this item, as it contains details of financial information required to be kept private in accordance with Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. The grounds for privacy are that it refers to the identity, financial and business affairs of an organisation and the amount of expenditure proposed to be incurred by the Council under a particular contract for the supply of goods or services.

Cabinet  
Council

5 August 2014  
9 September 2014

**Name of Cabinet Member:**

Cabinet Member (Culture, Leisure, Sports and Parks) – Councillor Abdul Salam Khan

**Director Approving Submission of the report:**

Executive Director, Place

**Ward(s) affected:**

All Wards

**Title:**

City Centre Sports and Public Leisure Facility Development

---

**Is this a key decision?**

Yes - The potential financial implications for the City Council of the recommendations will exceed £1,000,000 for the development of public leisure facilities in the City Centre and will significantly affect residents in all Wards of the City.

---

**Executive Summary:**

Approval is sought for the Coventry Indoor Facilities Strategy 2014 - 2024, the development of a new City Centre destination facility, the subsequent closure of Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre and for the Coventry Aquatics Strategy 2014 - 2024.

The new City Centre facility is proposed to be built on the existing Christchurch House and Spire House site, resulting in the subsequent closure of the ageing Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre (CSLC) in Fairfax Street. The aim of these proposals is to provide high quality, sustainable sports and leisure facilities in the city centre and create a destination facility that will complement other developments in the south side of the city centre, such as Friargate and the proposed City Centre South development. It is anticipated that the provision of the new city centre facility will further contribute to widening and increasing participation in sport and active recreation, thereby also contributing to health and wellbeing outcomes for local people, particularly younger people and families.

These proposals further contribute to the delivery of a more coherent, consistent and sustainable public leisure offer for the people of Coventry, including the use of an investment model that recycles existing finances into both the proposed city centre development and any future public leisure developments. The recycled savings would be realised from the closure and withdrawal of public leisure service provision from the existing Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre.

On 23 July 2014, a Joint Meeting of Cabinet Members (Business, Enterprise and Employment) and (Culture, Leisure, Sports and Parks) heard three petitions relating to proposals within the draft Sports Strategy 2014-2024 linked to public sports and leisure provision, as follows:

- (i) an e-petition regarding a campaign to keep a 50m swimming pool in Coventry (containing 3,966 signatures on 23 July 2014)
- (ii) a written petition requesting that the Council retain a 50m swimming pool in Coventry (containing 7,333 signatures on 23 July 2014)
- (iii) an e-petition regarding a campaign to help develop competitive gymnastics sports in Coventry (containing 29 signatures on 23 July 2014)

Specific considerations (including expressed concerns regarding obesity associated with health and fitness issues, Olympic legacy and the reputation of the City) were approved for review in the Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024 and the City Centre Sports and Public Leisure Facility Development reports being considered by Cabinet on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2014.

#### **Recommendations:**

Cabinet is requested:

- (1) to approve the Coventry Indoor Facilities Strategy 2014 - 2024
- (2) to recommend to Council that it approves the addition of £36.7m, to the capital programme for 2014/15 onwards for the development of a city centre destination facility on the existing Christchurch House and Spire House site
- (3) to approve project management and design costs of up to £1.9million, (which are already funded) to be incurred for the development of a city centre destination facility on the existing Christchurch House and Spire House site. These costs will be at risk up until January 2017 when the contracts for construction are planned to be signed
- (4) to approve letting a service concession through a call for competition for the operation of public sports and leisure facilities for a period of up to 15 years
- (5) to delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place and the Executive Director of Resources, in consultation with Cabinet Member (Culture, Leisure, Sports and Parks) to approve the detailed scope of the proposed scheme, associated professional appointments, implementation of works relating to the new city centre destination facility and to award a service concession
- (6) to approve the managed decommissioning and closure of Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre with the intention of facilitating a seamless transition of service provision in the City Centre
- (7) to approve the Coventry Aquatics Strategy 2014 - 2024

Council is requested:

- (1) to approve the addition of £36.7m, to the capital programme for 2014/15 onwards for the development of a City Centre destination facility on the existing Christchurch House and Spire House site

**List of Appendices included:**

1. Public Leisure Facility Development – City Centre Options Appraisal: Options Overview and Facility Mixes
2. Public Leisure Facility Development – City Centre Options Appraisal: Options Overview and Appraisal Conclusions
3. High Level Options Appraisal for City Centre Public Leisure Provision (Deloitte, 2014)
4. New Destination Sports and Leisure Facility for Coventry (Deloitte 2014)

**Background Papers**

None

**Other useful documents:**

In addition to those papers incorporated within the appendices above, the following useful papers are posted for reference on the Coventry Sports Strategy website, at the following link:

<http://www.covsport.org.uk> -

1. 'Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024' Cabinet Paper (Coventry City Council, 5 August 2014)
2. Coventry Sports Strategy – Equality and Consultation Analysis (Coventry City Coventry 2014)
3. Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024
4. Coventry Indoor Facilities Strategy 2014-2024
5. Coventry Aquatics Strategy 2014-2024
6. Joint Cabinet Member Meeting Report – Petition – Retention of a 50 Metre Swimming Pool in Coventry (Coventry City Council, 23 July 2014)
7. Joint Cabinet Member Meeting Report – Petition – Gymnastics Campaign for the Children of Coventry (Coventry City Council, 23 July 2014)
8. Cabinet Report – Public Leisure Facility Re-Provisioning for the North East of Coventry (Coventry City Council, 5<sup>th</sup> March 2013)
9. Coventry Sports and Leisure Report (Coventry City Council, November 2012)
10. Coventry Sports and Leisure Survey 2012 – Survey Template (Coventry City Council, June 2012)
11. Cabinet Report – Public Leisure Services and Facility Re-Provisioning (Coventry City Council, 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2012)
12. Cabinet Report – Public Sports and Leisure Provision (Coventry City Council 19<sup>th</sup> July 2011)

**Has it been or will it be considered by Scrutiny?**

No

**Has it been or will it be considered by any other Council Committee, Advisory Panel or other body?**

No

**Will this report go to Council?**

Yes – 9<sup>th</sup> September 2014

**Report title:**

City Centre Sports and Public Leisure Facility Development.

**1. Context (or background)**

- 1.1 In 2012, local people were asked to take part in the Coventry Sports and Leisure Survey. The survey attracted 1,532 responses and provided valuable insight into which sports were enjoyed by people in Coventry, where they took part in these sports and their satisfaction with local facilities.
- 1.2 Further to the survey, assessments of the city's indoor sports facilities and outdoor playing pitches were also carried out. These assessments provided a detailed picture of current indoor and outdoor sports provision in Coventry, showing the number, location, quality and use of the city's indoor facilities and outdoor pitches.
- 1.3 Through a process of stakeholder engagement and consultation, a Coventry Sports Strategy 2014 - 2024 (the Strategy) was developed with the following mission:

“To develop a more active, inclusive and vibrant Coventry through positive experiences in sport”
- 1.4 This strategy was covered in detail in the Cabinet Report ‘Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024’ (Coventry City Council, 5 August 2014).
- 1.5 Within the eight Vision Aims of the Strategy, Vision Aim 5 seeks:

“To provide a range of modern, accessible, and high-quality sports facilities.”
- 1.6 An options appraisal for the redevelopment of city centre sports and leisure facilities was undertaken which considered a range of options, from continuing to operate the existing facility; through various modernisation and rationalisation options; to closure of the existing facility without any re-provision of public sports and leisure in the city centre.
- 1.7 In February 2014, the draft partnership ‘Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024’ was formally launched for a period of consultation. In addition to considering the responses to the survey undertaken as part of public consultation on the draft Strategy, representations were received from the City of Coventry Swimming Club (CO CSC) and the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA).
- 1.8 As a result of these representations, the City Council, Coventry Sports Foundation (CSF) and Coventry Sports Trust (CST) undertook additional facility modelling that focused on the feasibility of providing a new 50m swimming pool in the city centre. This additional modelling was included in the options appraisal.
- 1.9 During the above period of consultation, a petition (containing 7,333 signatures on 23 July 2014) was submitted to the Council, along with an e-petition (containing 3,966 signatures on 23 July 2014), both expressing opposition to the loss of a 50m pool in Coventry. A further petition regarding a campaign to help develop competitive gymnastics sports in Coventry (containing 29 signatures on 23 July 2014) was also submitted. These three petitions were considered at a Joint Meeting of Cabinet Member (Business, Enterprise and Employment) and Cabinet Member (Culture, Leisure, Sports and Parks) on 23 July 2014 who agreed:

### 50m swimming pool petitions

- (i) To consider the two petitions, the submission from the City of Coventry Swimming Club (COCSC) and the matters raised by the petitioners.
- (ii) To instruct the Executive Director, Place on key considerations including concerns regarding obesity associated with health and fitness issues, Olympic legacy and the reputation of the City to be reviewed and considered in the Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024 and the City Centre Sports and Public Leisure Facility Development reports being considered by Cabinet on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2014.

### Gymnastics petition

- (i) To acknowledge the petition and to ensure officers consider gymnastics development as part of the wider Coventry Sports Strategy and the associated Indoor Facilities Strategy.
- (ii) To review the information contained within the Indoor Facilities Assessment report regarding gymnastics provision and review provisions within the Indoor Facilities Strategy to ensure the future facility needs for gymnastics in the City are adequately and appropriately addressed based on proven demand.
- (iii) To request the Executive Director, Place to approach British Gymnastics the National Governing Body (NGB) with a view to developing a City-wide implementation plan for the sport across the city in partnership with the gymnastics clubs and other stakeholders.
- (iv) To agree that where facility programming impacts on gymnastic club facility usage, the Executive Director, Place works with the gymnastics club(s) to secure alternative sports hall provision.

1.10 The Council has for a period of time now concentrated its resources into regenerating the City Centre and has heavily supported schemes that will provide both commerce and leisure and retail activities. The Council has already invested heavily in public realm works which have not only improved the legibility and appearance of the City but have also attracted developers to invest in the City.

1.11 The focus of this regeneration has been around the city centre south scheme and Friargate as it is recognised that both act as a catalyst for the other and therefore together provide the largest possible regeneration of the city, a fact made plain by the independent report from SQW consultants. To this end the City has obtained grant and invested directly in creating the deck link to Friargate and the station and has kick started the scheme by commissioning its own new council building.

1.12 The proposed new leisure pool has a massive regenerative benefit with upwards of 1.3 million visitors anticipated this will act as a leisure anchor for both restaurants and shops proposed in the City Centre South scheme and as a leisure resource for occupiers to the Friargate scheme. This leisure pool will therefore will increase interest in both schemes which will help with their viability and hence deliverability.

## 2. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 2.1 Initial options appraisal modelling, undertaken prior to public consultation on the Strategy, considered twelve options for city centre public leisure provision. This work informed the initial options appraisal that shaped and informed the draft strategy.
- 2.2 As a result of feedback received during the consultation period, four further options were modelled to consider the re-provision of a 50m pool within a proposed new facility. This resulted in 16 options being reviewed in total.
- 2.3 Due to the large number of options considered and for ease of presentation, the 16 options have been grouped into six high level categories as follows:

Table 1: Sixteen options grouped into six categories

Category	Category Description	Options
A	Continued operation of CSLC with phased modernisation	Option 1
B	Development of a 'traditional' sports and leisure facility on the existing site	Options 2a – 4a and 5a
C	Development of a 'traditional' sports and leisure facility on a new site in the city centre	Options 4b and 5b
D	Development of a destination facility (including water park) on a new site in the city centre	Options 6a and 6b
E	Closure of CSLC and no provision of public sports and leisure facilities in the city centre	Option 7
F	Development of a sports and leisure facility that includes a 50m pool on a new site in the city centre	Options 8a – 8d

- 2.4 The findings from this options appraisal are summarised in Table 2 and are considered in more detail in Appendix 1: 'Public Leisure Facility Development – City Centre Options Appraisal: Options Overview and Facility Mixes'; and Appendix 2: 'Public Leisure Facility Development – City Centre Options Appraisal: Options Overview and Appraisal Conclusions'.

**Table 2: Executive Summary of all 16 options in the City Centre Options Appraisal**

Category	Option	Facility Closure of (CSLC)	Capital Cost	Revenue Cost / (Saving) over 45 years	Indicative Annual Revenue Cost/(Saving)	Can progress without de-listing of CSLC	Generates significant capacity for Future Investment	Ranking within Category
A	<b>Option 1:</b> Retain the existing facility and modernise over a 40 year period	Phases	£52.4m	£34.9m	£0.78m	✓	✗	1
B	<b>Option 2a:</b> Modernise the existing facility – both wet and dry sides	2 years 8m	£33.0m	£15.50m	£0.35m	✓	✗	3
	<b>Option 2b:</b> Modernise the existing facility – listed wet side only	2 years 2m	£27.7m	£9.4m	£0.21m	✓	✗	1
	<b>Option 3a:</b> Rationalise, reconfigure and modernise existing facility – both wet and dry sides	2 years 8m	£44.1m	£27.6m	£0.61m	✓	✗	4
	<b>Option 3b:</b> Rationalise, reconfigure and modernise existing facility – listed wet side only	2 years 2m	£33.5m	£14.6m	£0.32m	✓	✗	2
	<b>Option 4a:</b> Provide a new build 'replacement' leisure centre on the existing city centre site	2 years 10m	£29.1m	(£4.5m)	(£0.10m)	✗	✓	Not feasible due to building being listed

	<b>Option 5a:</b> Provide a new build leisure centre on the existing site as part of a wider urban redevelopment.	2 years 10m	£24.2m	(£7.2m)	(£0.16m)	✘	✓	Not feasible due to building being listed
C	<b>Option 4b:</b> Provide a new build 'replacement' leisure centre on a new city centre site	0 years	£31.3m	(£0.1m)	(£0.00m)	✓	✘	2
	<b>Option 5b:</b> Provide a new build leisure centre on a new city centre site as part of a wider urban redevelopment.	0 years	£26.4m	(£2.8m)	(£0.06m)	✓	✘	1
D	<b>Option 6a:</b> Provide a new build destination facility on a new city centre site (incl. bowls).	0 years	£35.5m	(£8.5m)	(£0.19m)	✓	✓	2
	<b>Option 6b:</b> Provide a new build destination facility on a new city centre site (excl. bowls but incl. Health Spa)	0 years	£36.7m	(£13.3m)	(£0.30m)	✓	✓	1
E	<b>Option 7:</b> Close the existing CSLC and do not provide public sports and leisure facilities in the city centre	NA	£1.1m	(£56.7m)	(£1.26m)	NA	NA	1



F	<b>Option 8a:</b> Provide a new build 50m pool facility with spectator seating for 1,000 people on a new city centre site	0 months	£31.1m	£5.5m	£0.12m	✓	✗	1
	<b>Option 8b:</b> Provide a new build 50m pool facility with spectator seating for 1,000 people, along with a 20m warm up pool on a new city centre site	0 months	£32.6m	£7.4m	£0.17m	✓	✗	2
	<b>Option 8c:</b> Provide a new build 50m pool facility with spectator seating for 500 people, along with a 500m <sup>2</sup> splash pool facility on a new city centre site	0 months	£33.6m	£7.9m	£0.17m	✓	✗	3
	<b>Option 8d:</b> Provide a new build 50m pool facility (to include diving provision) with spectator seating for 1,000 people, along with a 20m warm up pool on a new city centre site	0 months	£34.2m	£11.1m	£0.25m	✓	✗	4

2.5 The option considered most feasible within each category is analysed in more detail in the following section.

**2.6 Category A – Option 1: Retain the existing facility and modernise over a 40 year period (not recommended).**

- (i) This option would continue to operate the **existing** CSLC facilities, whilst modernising these facilities in phases over the course of the equivalent development period (40 years) that has been applied to all of the options.

However, Option 1 is not recommended for the following reasons:

- (ii) Whilst £6m would be invested early on into some essential and immediate modernisation of the facilities, the Centre would **not be fully modernised / refurbished** from the outset, and would still be largely **inefficient** in its use of space and the layout would not be to modern specifications.
- (iii) Despite modernisation, the structure would be nearly 90 years old by end of the modelled period.
- (iv) This modernisation would continually require area closures within the Centre.
- (v) It would not contribute to the **regeneration** and retention of footfall in the south of the city centre.
- (vi) It would not be financially **sustainable**, with a net cost of £34.9m over the 45 year period of financial modelling.
- (vii) It would not therefore contribute to any future **investment** in other potential sport/leisure solutions within the city.

**2.7 Category B – Option 2b: Modernise the existing facility – listed wet side only (not recommended).**

- (i) This option would completely **modernise** the existing facility mix within the wet side only of CSLC, retaining the existing layout of facilities within this area. The dry side would be demolished.

However, Option 2b is not recommended for the following reasons:

- (ii) Whilst the building would retain **some modernised** city centre leisure facilities, the building would still be largely **inefficient** in its use of space and the layout would not be to modern specifications.
- (iii) The building structure and fabric would be over 90 years old by the end of the period of financial modelling.
- (iv) The programme would involve a 2 year 2 month closure without any city centre sport and leisure provision.
- (v) It would not contribute to the **regeneration** and retention of footfall in the south of the city centre.
- (vi) It would not be financially **sustainable**, with a net cost of £9.4m over the 45 year period of financial modelling.
- (vii) It would not therefore contribute to any future **investment** in other potential sport/leisure solutions within the city.

## 2.8 Category C – Option 5b: Provide a new build leisure centre on a new city centre site as part of a wider urban redevelopment (not recommended).

- (i) This option would build a completely **new replacement** facility on a new city centre site as part of a wider **urban** development, to include a new facility mix, built to modern standards and specifications.
- (ii) It would deliver new and modern city centre public leisure facilities and the new build would ensure a **modern** facility mix within an **efficient** layout.
- (iii) It could be delivered with a seamless transition of public leisure in the city centre.
- (iv) It could contribute to the **regeneration** and retention of footfall in the south of the city centre, depending upon the site selection.
- (v) It would be financially **sustainable**, with a net saving of £2.8m over the 45 year period of financial modelling.

However, Option 5 is not recommended for the following reasons:

- (vi) It would only generate a small surplus towards future **investment** in other potential sport/leisure solutions within the city.
- (vii) It would not necessarily retain footfall in the south of the city centre.

## 2.9 Category D – Option 6b: Provide a new build destination facility on a new city centre site (excluding indoor bowls but including a health spa) (Recommended).

- (i) This option would build a new '**destination** leisure facility' of regional significance on a **new** city centre site to incorporate a water park and health day spa provision without the re-provisioning of indoor bowls on this site.
- (ii) Feasibility work would be undertaken to explore the potential for relocating and re-providing indoor bowls at an alternative site within the city. Current modelling suggests that there would be sufficient capital funding available within the repatriation investment model to deliver this alternative bowls facility, although this would be an additional cost to that currently modelled within this option.
- (iii) The new build leisure and destination facility would ensure a **modern** facility mix within an efficient layout.
- (iv) It could be delivered with a seamless transition of public leisure in the city centre.
- (v) It would contribute to the **regeneration** and retention of footfall in the south of the city centre.
- (vi) It is the most financially **sustainable** option, with a net saving of £13.3m over the 45 year period of financial modelling.
- (vii) It would therefore generate the greatest surplus of all the options as a contribution towards future **investment** in other potential sport/leisure solutions within the city.

**2.10 Category E - Option 7: Close the existing CSLC and do not provide public sports and leisure facilities in the city centre (not recommended).**

- (i) This option would close the existing CSLC facility and would **not provide** any public sports and leisure centre facilities within the city centre.

Option 7 is not recommended for the following reasons:

- (ii) This option would completely remove any public leisure facility provision from the city centre.
- (iii) It would not contribute to the **regeneration** and retention of footfall in the south of the city centre.
- (iv) Whilst this option would be financially **sustainable**, with a net saving of £56.7m over the 45 year period of financial modelling and would generate significant surplus towards **investment** in other future potential sport/leisure solutions within the city, it would result in the removal of all **city centre public leisure provision**.

**2.11 Category F - Option 8a: Provide a new build 50m pool facility with spectator seating for 1,000 people on a new city centre site (not recommended).**

- (i) This option would build a **new** sports and leisure centre on a **new** city centre site and retain 50m provision with a 50m x 8 lane swimming pool complete with booms and a moveable floor, within an **efficient** layout and built to modern standards and specifications.
- (ii) It could be delivered with a seamless transition of public leisure in the city centre.
- (iii) It would contribute to the **regeneration** of the south of the city centre.

However, Option 8a is not recommended for the following reasons:

- (iv) It would not necessarily retain significant footfall in the south of the city centre.
- (v) It would not be financially sustainable, with a net cost of £5.5m over the 45 year period of financial modelling.
- (vi) It would not therefore contribute to any future **investment** in other potential sport/leisure solutions within the city.

2.12 In summary, the benefits and challenges of the preferred option 6b, which is to provide a 25m pool and destination water park facility are summarised below:

Table 3: Summary of benefits and challenges

Benefits	Challenges
The most financially sustainable option and allows for future investment in other sport/leisure facilities within the city.	Loss of a 50m competition pool with spectator facilities in the city centre
A 25m pool v 50m pool provides greater business planning certainty going forward as it is not dependent on a single client for 40 years (i.e. the swimming club)	Loss of a facility within the city that meets some of the competition needs of competitive club swimmers
The leisure complex would be of regional significance and provide the greatest footfall in the city centre	Potential loss of Beacon Club status for City of Coventry Swimming Club
The water park and 25m pool would encourage greater participation in physical activity by a wider group of people	Potentially de-stabilises the City of Coventry Swimming Club model
The water park and 25m pool will have a more positive impact on levels of inactivity and improving related health outcomes	Reduction in 'traditional' pool water space in the city centre compared to the current model.

### Operation of the new facility

2.13 There are two options for the operation of the new facility.

- I. Operate in-house . We do not currently have an in house provider
- II. Operate via an external provider. This could take the form of either;
  - a. A public services contract which means a contract, in writing, for consideration (whatever the nature of the consideration) under which a contracting authority engages a person to provide service, but does not include a) a public works contract, b) a public supply contract.
  - b. A public services concession contract which is a services contract under which the consideration given by the contracting authority consists of or includes the grant of a right to exploit the service or services to be carried out under the contract.

2.14 The preferred option is a public services concession contract which enables the Council to work in partnership with the provider for effective delivery of the sports strategy and to ensure that services offered by facilities are complementary and holistic in nature. At the same time the service concession model will allow the Council to seek a provider who will share with the Council in the profits generated.

### 3. Results of consultation undertaken

3.1 A more detailed account of the consultation undertaken in developing the Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024 is included in the 'Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024' Cabinet Paper (Coventry City Council, 2014). This paper focuses only on those elements of the consultation that are particularly pertinent to the Coventry Indoor Facilities Strategy 2014-2024, the development of a new City Centre Destination Facility, the subsequent closure of Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre and the Coventry Aquatics Strategy 2014-2024.

### Coventry Sports and Leisure Survey (2012)

- 3.2 Public consultation to inform the early development of the Sports Strategy was undertaken through the city-wide Coventry Sport and Leisure Survey, between 25 June 2012 and 26 August 2012. A total of 1,532 completed surveys were received from across the city.
- 3.3 Extensive desktop research and analysis was undertaken in order to consider the findings from the above survey in the context of wider data. The results of the Coventry Sports and Leisure Survey and desk top research were first published in 2013, and a detailed paper outlining these findings can be viewed at [www.covsport.org.uk](http://www.covsport.org.uk).
- 3.4 The headline findings from this detailed paper that are particularly relevant to subject matters of this paper are that:
- (i) in Coventry, the proportion of women regularly taking part in sport is less than half that of men
  - (ii) the proportion of disabled people taking part in sport in the city is less than both national and regional averages
  - (iii) the sports that people most take part in are keep fit / gym; football; swimming; athletics; and cycling
  - (iv) swimming and keep fit / gym are the sports that attract the most participants from all backgrounds
  - (v) swimming is the activity most likely to encourage new participation
  - (vi) the survey also identified the need for increasing the availability of activities for children and young people and children's gym facilities
  - (vii) Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre, Xcel Leisure Centre and the Alan Higgs Centre are the most-used public sports and leisure centres
  - (viii) just over a third of Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre users only use that facility for their sport and leisure centre needs
  - (ix) the Xcel Leisure Centre and Alan Higgs Centre are the public sports and leisure centres that draw the highest levels of satisfaction
  - (x) Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre and Foleshill Sports and Leisure Centre are the public sports and leisure centres that draw the lowest levels of satisfaction
  - (xi) cleanliness of changing rooms/toilets, friendliness of staff, enjoyment of the activity, feeling safe and secure, cost and being in a comfortable environment were factors which were most important to respondents when choosing a sports and leisure centre
  - (xii) although participation rates are generally lower in deprived areas of the city, a high number of members of Coventry Sports Trust and Coventry Sport Foundation come from lower income and social housing households

### Emerging Vision for Sport in Coventry (2012)

- 3.5 The Emerging Vision for Sport in Coventry was developed through the review and detailed consideration of responses from the Coventry Sport and Leisure Survey; further direct consultation with local, regional and national sporting stakeholders; and extensive desktop research and analysis. This process culminated in the drafting of eight key Vision Aims designed to encapsulate the sporting aspirations for Coventry over the next ten years.
- 3.6 Within the eight Vision Aims of the Strategy, Vision Aim 5 seeks:

“To provide a range of modern, accessible, and high-quality sports facilities.”

- 3.7 Accordingly, assessments of the city's indoor sports facilities were also carried out, in collaboration with facility operators. These assessments provided a detailed picture of current indoor sports provision in Coventry, showing the number, location, quality and use of the city's indoor facilities.
- 3.8 The key findings to emerge from this assessment were that:
- (i) the quality of indoor facilities varied greatly - from those that were of 'very poor' quality to those that were of 'very good' quality
  - (ii) many of the city's indoor facilities were found to be located within schools, which offered varying levels of community use
  - (iii) Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre and Foleshill Sports and Leisure Centre were both adjudged to be no longer 'fit for purpose'
  - (iv) funding being used to support these ageing public sports and leisure facilities could be used to invest in new, modern and more accessible sports and leisure facilities
  - (v) swimming pool provision across the city would need to be considered in light of the proposed closure of Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre
- 3.9 Further to the launch of the Emerging Vision for Sport in Coventry, work was undertaken with a range of stakeholders to develop the Strategic Objectives for the Strategy. Initially, 48 Strategic Objectives were drafted, although these were refined to 37 throughout the period of early stakeholder consultation.
- 3.10 One of the Strategic Objectives under Vision Aim 5 refers to the development of city centre sports facilities that are accessible, high quality, sustainable and of significance to the Midlands.
- 3.11 In February 2014, the draft partnership 'Sports Strategy 2014-2024' was formally launched for a period of public consultation. In addition to considering the responses to the survey undertaken as part of public consultation on the draft Strategy, representations from the City of Coventry Swimming Club and the ASA resulted in the City Council, CSF and CST undertaking additional facility modelling focused on the feasibility of providing a new 50m swimming pool in the city centre (see paragraphs 2.2 - 2.11 above).
- 3.12 During the above period of consultation, three petitions were also launched, two expressing opposition to the loss of a 50m pool in Coventry and one concerning the development of gymnastics in the city. These petitions were considered at the Joint Cabinet Member meeting of 23 July 2014.

#### Key Findings of the Consultation

- 3.13 A detailed paper outlining the results of the public consultation can be viewed at [www.covsport.org.uk](http://www.covsport.org.uk). The key findings of relevance to this paper are that:
- (i) the strategy was very well received and there was little opposition to either the Vision Aims or the Strategic Objectives. There was agreement to each of the Vision Aims from at least 82% of respondents
  - (ii) the area attracting the most objections across survey responses was the proposed loss of 50m swimming pool provision in the city. Each Vision Aim invited comments and there was also a general comments section at the end. In total, 3,022 comments were received across all sections of the survey. Of these, 1,573 were objections to the loss of 50m pool provision
  - (iii) the following issues were included amongst those identified in responses that referenced concern over the loss of 50m pool provision in the city: the destabilising

the City of Coventry Swimming Club, specifically including the impact of the loss of Amateur Swimming Club National Beacon Status; reduced pool capacity for club training; the displacement of current pool users; the loss of competition facilities in the city; the loss of the only current 50m competition pool in the West Midlands region

- (iv) there is a need to ensure sports provision and support for disabled people. In total, 101 comments were received supporting both the need to improve facilities for disabled people and to increase participation in sport and active recreation by disabled people and/or people with long-term limiting illness
- (v) many of the respondents commented on the need for high quality facilities for people of all sporting abilities. In total there were 250 comments relating to this, and many of these also referred to the need for facilities in neighbourhoods
- (vi) linking sport to public health received 51 comments, with respondents wanting to see more done to improve the health of local people through sport

#### **4. Timetable for implementing this decision**

- 4.1 Subject to approval of the recommendations contained within this report, the Coventry Indoor Facilities Strategy 2014-2024 and Coventry Aquatic Strategy 2014-2024 will be adopted as policy with immediate effect.
- 4.2 The aim is to go to the market for a service concession as soon as possible, at least within the next six months.
- 4.3 The OJEU procurement and appointment for project management and cost consultants for the city centre destination facility will be completed by mid-February 2015.
- 4.4 The OJEU procurement and appointment of the design team and associated consultants will be completed by mid-July 2015.
- 4.5 The designs of the new destination facility will be developed to RIBA stage 3 for planning by mid-March 2016.
- 4.6 Planning permission for the new destination facility will be sought from mid-May 2016 with an anticipated approval mid-August 2016. A travel plan will be developed for the new destination facility in accordance with planning processes, requirements and timescales.
- 4.7 The contractor procurement will be through an OJEU process for a two-stage Design and Build contract, with the second stage appointment being the start of January 2017, which aligns to CRH/SH site becoming available.
- 4.8 The programme currently assumes that the preferred Contractor will undertake both the demolition works as well as the construction of the new facility. If the demolition works were to be undertaken by a different Contractor then this would provide us (if required) with further time to secure best value for the project with the new build Contractor.
- 4.9 The overall development includes a six month demolition phase followed by a two year construction phase, such that the new city centre destination facility will be scheduled for opening to the public end of July 2019.
- 4.10 The Defects Liability Period would commence on the date of practical completion of works (end of July 2019), as would the 12 year period of Latent Defects.
- 4.11 Therefore, the planned decommissioning of CSLC would commence from the end of July 2019, thereby enabling the intended (subject to risk management and budget constraints) seamless transition of city public sports and leisure provision.



## 5. Comments from Executive Director, Resources

### Financial implications

- 5.1. The collaborative work approved in the July 2011 Cabinet report resulted in the proposal of a new management and investment model for public leisure services and facilities within the city.
- 5.2. The aquatic development at Centre AT7 approved by Cabinet in March 2013 was funded through this investment model drawn from the collaborative work between Coventry Sports Foundation (CSF) and Coventry Sports Trust (CST).
- 5.3. The aims of the investment model are to deliver a more coherent and consistent leisure offer for the people of Coventry through service and organisational restructuring in order to drive greater efficiency, cost savings and opportunities for reinvestment in high-quality, public leisure facilities.
- 5.4. Within the Coventry Sports Strategy, Coventry's Vision Aim for 'Facilities' is outlined within Vision Aim 5. One of the key challenges for the city in successfully delivering this Vision Aim, is the extent to which any future public sport provision can meet the city's investment model for sports facilities.
- 5.5. The principles of the investment model are drawn from the following criteria:
  - (i) Recycling of council funding from financially unsustainable facilities and operating models.
  - (ii) Profitability of facilities to remove the need for additional subsidy.
  - (iii) Seeking grants to support capital developments.
  - (iv) Sweating existing assets.
  - (v) Investing further in neighbourhood provision, where there is proven demand.
- 5.6. A key element of the investment model is for facilities to become profitable enough not to require further subsidy from Coventry City Council and to enable the on-going operation of the sports and leisure facilities to contribute to any future neighbourhood investment where there is proven demand for services.
- 5.7. Within the financial modelling undertaken, only options 4a, 5a, 6a, 6b and 7 provide sufficient surplus to be able to contribute towards any future facility developments based on proven demand. Table 4 below shows the indicative annual savings that each option could contribute to future investment in sports and leisure facilities.

Table 4: Options which meet the investment model

Option	4a	5a	6a	6b	7
Indicative annual saving which can be contributed to future investment in sport and leisure	£100k	£160k	£190k	£300k	£1,260k

- 5.8. All of the other options that were modelled produce an annual loss or marginal saving which would be insufficient for future investment.
- 5.9. Only option 6b would provide a new city centre facility and sufficient resource to contribute to the known level of investment required for the re-provision of indoor bowls (circa £2m) and a contribution towards further neighbourhood facilities if there was proven demand.

5.10. Option 7 provides sufficient resource for future investment in sports and leisure facilities but would not result in any public city centre provision so is not deemed to be a feasible option.

5.11. Table 5 below illustrates the forecast capital and revenue costs for all of the options that were explored. For further details see Appendix 1: 'Public Leisure Facility Development – City Centre Options Appraisal: Options Overview and Facility Mixes'; and Appendix 2: 'Public Leisure Facility Development – City Centre Options Appraisal: Options Overview and Appraisal Conclusions'.

Table 5: Summary of Capital and Revenue Implications of each option

	Option 1 £'m	Option 2a £'m	Option 2b £'m	Option 3a £'m	Option 3b £'m	Option 4a £'m	Option 4b £'m	Option 5a £'m
<b>Capital Cost</b>	52.4	33.0	27.7	44.1	33.5	29.1	31.3	24.2
<b>Net Overall Revenue Cost/ (Saving) over 45 Years</b>	34.9	15.5	9.4	27.6	14.6	(4.5)	(0.1)	(7.2)

	Option 5b £'m	Option 6a £'m	Option 6b £'m	Option 7 £'m	Option 8a £'m	Option 8b £'m	Option 8c £'m	Option 8d £'m
<b>Capital Cost</b>	26.4	35.5	36.7	1.1	31.1	32.6	33.6	34.2
<b>Net Overall Revenue Cost/ (Saving) over 45 Years</b>	(2.8)	(8.5)	(13.3)	(56.7)	5.5	7.4	7.9	11.1

### Financial modelling assumptions

5.12. The assumptions that have been made within the context of the financial modelling are:

- (i) *Capital Costs* include all capital building costs including fees, and where relevant initial mothballing costs, additional demolition costs and site acquisition.
- (ii) *Capital Financing Costs* have been based upon Prudential Borrowing at 3.71% for all of the options, spread over a term of 45 years (based on 40 year asset life, and 5 year project development).
- (iii) *Overall Operating Costs* include all income and expenditure (e.g. staffing, premises, operational and commercial); lifecycling costs and where applicable revenue mothballing costs for the existing site.
- (iv) *Financial Resource Available* for all options is an annual grant of £1.3m. This is made up of the current annual funding for CST of £1.6m, less the £0.3m required for capital repayment and financing costs for the Centre AT7 aquatic development. It is assumed that there would be no on going subsidy required for Moat House Leisure and Neighbourhood Centre and Brandon Wood Golf Course.
- (v) *Single city wide operator – to enable modelling with financial certainty, it has been assumed that operation of all the city's public leisure facilities would be with a single operator as this is more likely to result in a holistic, coherent and efficient approach to public leisure provision. If we were to appoint a single operator for the existing and any new facilities under our direct control, and continue with separate operators for any other facilities, the surplus/deficits within the financial model could be higher or*

*lower than those stated in the models shown, although the modelled figures would be used as the expected benchmark.*

### **Summary of financial evaluation**

- 5.13. The forecast capital costs range from £24.2m for Option 5a to £52.4m for Option 1. The forecast net revenue figures over the 45 year life of funding the project range between an overall **saving of £13.3m for Option 6b to a £34.9m cost for Option 1**. It should be noted that Option 7 does have the lowest capital cost of £1.1m and the greatest net revenue saving of £56.7m but would result in no public sport and leisure provision in the city centre.
- 5.14. Whilst the capital costs for Option 6b are £9m higher than for Option 2b (the lowest costing feasible option), there is a significantly higher outturn revenue **cost** over the 45 year funding profile for Option 2b (being £9.4m compared to the £13.3m revenue **saving** for Option 6b).
- 5.15. The revenue costs for Options 1 to 3b and 8a to 8d all produce an on-going cost over the 45 year period of financial modelling, ranging from the highest cost at £34.9m for Option 1 to the lowest cost of £5.5m for Option 8a. For Options 4b and 5b, there are small revenue savings of £0.1m and £2.8m respectively over the 45 year period of financial modelling, but this is insufficient to provide significant capacity for future investment in public sports and leisure facilities. Option 7 provides the highest revenue return of £56.7m, but this option does not retain any public leisure provision in the city centre.
- 5.16. Option 6b produces the highest overall **saving** of £13.3m over the 45 year period of financial modelling, which is equivalent to an indicative annual saving of £0.30m a year. This saving can be used to contribute to future investment in public sport and leisure in line with the Coventry Sport Strategy. For example, a £0.30m per year surplus would make a significant contribution towards future capital build and financing costs of other neighbourhood sports facilities (including the replacement of indoor bowls facilities) if there were proven demand.
- 5.17. These projections do not include the development of any associated service facilities such as bespoke car parking that might be required to service such significant footfall as that projected (circa 1.3m visits per annum). However, there are several car parks within a short distance of the proposed new leisure designation facility. Further feasibility works will be undertaken to determine the best location(s) to ensure the new facility has the best possible public access.

### **Project Funding**

- 5.18. The proposed overall capital cost for Option 6b of £36.7m will be funded through Prudential Borrowing, which will be repaid by recycling savings through the closure of existing sports facilities such as Foxford School, the Arena Health and Fitness Club (Rico Arena), Foleshill Sports and Leisure Centre (FSLC) and the proposed closure of CSLC along with the annual surpluses generated from the operation of the new city centre destination facility.
- 5.19. Officers will seek to reduce the extent of this prudential borrowing through sourcing external funding contributions, which would in turn make more resource available for the delivery of facility re-provisioning and/or additional neighbourhood facilities where this demand can be evidenced.
- 5.20. In the early years of the 45 year period of financial modelling there will be a cashflow shortfall, but over the life of the project there will be an overall saving of £13.3m which can

be recycled back into sport and leisure facilities in line with the Sports Strategy (see 5.5 for in relation to the investment model).

- 5.21. The cash-flow shortfall in the early years of the funding programme (where the revenue commitments would exceed the Financial Resources Available) would be 'smoothed' by the provisions already made within the City Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), with such funding being 'recovered' in the latter years where the Financial Resources Available would exceed the project funding requirements.
- 5.22. The operation of the new facility will be awarded as a 'service concession' as part of a combined package with other existing public facilities under the City Council's control. The value of the concession is likely to be in the region of £2.65m per annum.

### **Legal implications**

- 5.23. The Council will use its power under section 19 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (the Act) as power to implement the delivery of the Sport and Playing Pitch Strategies. Section 19 of the Act provides that this section provides that local authorities have the discretion to provide, inside or outside their area, such recreational facilities as they think fit. The implementation of the strategies will also assist the Council in discharging its duty under section 507B Education Act 1996 whereby the Council is under a duty to secure positive leisure time activities for the improvement of the well-being of young people in its area and to secure facilities for such activities.
- 5.24. Service concession contracts, although excluded from the requirements of the current Procurement Regulations, do require some form of advertisement and competition.
- 5.25. A recent Court of Justice decision indicates that the duty to advertise Europe wide and run a competitive process only apply if the contract is of interest to an undertaking located in a different member state and it is for the Council to decide the level of competition and advertisement. To the best of our knowledge it is considered that there is unlikely to be cross border interest due to the nature of the market.
- 5.26. Section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 1999 (the 1999 Act) provides that as a best value authority the Council must "make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised having regard to a combination economy, efficiency and effectiveness.
- 5.27. Section 3(4) of the 1999 Act provides that in deciding how to fulfil the duty Council must have regard to any guidance issued by the Secretary. The Guidance issued by the Secretary of State issued in September 2011 states that authorities should consider overall value, including economic, environmental and social value when reviewing service provision.
- 5.28. Although it is not suggested that the discharge of the Councils best value duty requires it to put the delivery of the sports and catering service out to tender to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party, the use of the competitive process will assist the Council in demonstrating that it has discharged the duty.
- 5.29. The Council will offer the service concession contract through a form of competition by open advertisement. The Council will be able to structure the procurement process in a manner giving it a degree of flexibility albeit following treaty principles of fairness, transparency and non-discrimination.

## 6. Other implications

### 6.1 How will this contribute to achievement of the Council's key objectives / corporate priorities (corporate plan/scorecard) / organisational blueprint / Local Area Agreement (or Coventry Sustainable Community Strategy)?

The recommended proposals will contribute to the Council's core aims of:

- (i) *Developing the city centre for the 21st century by bringing the city centre to life with a range of leisure opportunities* – Vision Aim 5 of the Strategy outlines the need “to provide a range of modern, accessible and high quality sports facilities in the city”. The first Strategic Objective for this Vision Aim specifically concerns future city centre leisure provision and the need “to develop city centre sports and leisure facilities that are accessible, high-quality, sustainable and of significance to the Midlands”.
- (ii) *Raising the profile of Coventry through promoting Coventry as a visitor destination and centre for events* – Through the proposed provision of a ‘destination city centre facility’, the Strategy puts leisure at the heart of city centre regeneration and promotes the city centre as a key regional destination for leisure activities and leisure tourism.
- (iii) *Improve the health and wellbeing of local residents by helping them lead healthier lifestyles* – Vision Aim 1 of the Sports Strategy sets the ambition “to develop a more active, inclusive and vibrant Coventry through positive experiences in sport”. Through encouraging and supporting engagement in regular sport and/or active recreation, the Strategy aims to positively influence and contribute to the physical and mental health and wellbeing of the residents of Coventry. In particular, public leisure facilities and their operation have a key role to play in supporting the Council to deliver its public health objectives, directly supporting action to address priorities within the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for the city. The provision of a city centre destination facility is intended to broaden and widen participation in sport and leisure, particularly amongst children and families who might not otherwise participate in structured forms of sport and leisure.
- (iv) *Make savings so that we can continue to support front-line services by reducing operating costs (low carbon)* – The significant age and largely poor condition of Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre have resulted in it being adjudged as no longer ‘fit for purpose’. A modern city centre public leisure facility, such as that proposed in this Paper, offers greater energy efficiency and environmental benefits to that of an ageing facility. Furthermore, the development of such proposed facilities in the city centre are predicated on a financially efficient model concerning the use of recycled savings from the closure and withdrawal of public leisure service provision from Foleshill Sports and Leisure Centre, the Arena Health and Fitness Club, Foxford School and Community Arts College and Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre. This enables the existing resource to be moved from an inefficient model of subsidy to one of investment in quality, sustainable facilities and a projected revenue surplus due to the Council over the duration of the funding model.

### 6.2 How is risk being managed?

6.2.1 A detailed Risk Register has been produced and maintained, which is reviewed regularly and managed by individuals throughout the process.

6.2.2 The most significant risks along with the associated control measures have been identified to be:

- (i) a significant risk of failure to major plant and/or equipment resulting in the potential closure of CSLC prior to its proposed closure date subsequent to the opening of the city centre destination facility. The control measure has been to commission a condition survey and asset management plan in order to identify and prioritise essential repair and maintenance work that will be required to keep the facility open and operational until the anticipated date of closure, being end of July 2019
- (ii) the risk of the project costing more than would be approved within the £36.7m that is being requested from Council. The control measures include the appointment of project managers, costs consultants and contractors through competitive processes, along with a six month window within the programme to negotiate the contract terms and price. The capital projections also currently include sizeable contingencies
- (iii) the Council may not have the specific expertise or experience internally to project manage the client aspects of the city centre destination facility construction contract. The control measure is through the formation of a client-side project management group that will include representation from Property Services, City Centre and Development Services, Major Projects Finance and the current public leisure operators, all of whom will work alongside the Professional Adviser to the Employer's Representation
- (iv) the risk of Contractor insolvency throughout the course of the contract. CCC will undertake a financial appraisal of the contractor that is successful through the tendering process
- (v) the risk of installation failure of key elements of the project construction. The control measure would be the project management undertaken by the Employer's Representation, the Professional Adviser to the Employer's Representation; the 12 month defects period; Contractor warranties and collateral warranties; and (as a contract signed under deed) a 12 year latent defects period
- (vi) the risk that the service provision from the building and the maintenance of the building might not be fulfilling the objectives of service and maintenance required by the Council. The Council as landlord will ensure compliance with the lease covenants and shall take enforcement action if there is any non-compliance

### **6.3 What is the impact on the organisation?**

6.3.1 The proposed Coventry Indoor Facilities Strategy 2014-2024 and Coventry Aquatics Strategy 2014-2024 are partnership documents developed through consultation with a range of stakeholders.

6.3.2 Approving these partnership strategies for Coventry will confirm the strategic direction and priorities for sport in the city – developing a more active, inclusive and vibrant Coventry through positive experiences in sport. Approving these strategies will further show recognition of the wide range of benefits that sport and active recreation can bring to both individuals and communities.

6.3.3 Approval of these strategies will give confidence to external funders that the city has clear objectives and priorities for sport in the next ten years. This should assist partners in applying for external grant funding and will bring greater coherence in the links from sport to wider city agendas (e.g. tourism, health, jobs and economy, regeneration).

6.3.4 The report recommendations would further deliver new, accessible and sustainable sports facilities in Council ownership, whilst delivering a surplus revenue position for the Council through the reinvestment of recycled savings from the closure and withdrawal of public leisure service provision from other sports facilities. The recommendations would further deliver a vacant site (asset) for alternative use. Initial modelling work suggests that the

provision of the new City Centre destination facility would result in circa 1.3m visits to the facility per annum.

6.3.5 There are no HR implications for the organisation as these proposals will not affect City Council employees.

## **6.4 Equalities / EIA**

6.4.1 Following consultation and analysis of demographic, health, sport and leisure data for and survey responses for the city (and specifically including that of members accessing the current city centre leisure provision), an Equality and Consultation Analysis (ECA) was produced for the Sports Strategy (see Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024 Cabinet Report, Coventry City Council, August 2014).

6.4.2 Demographic, health, sport and leisure data and public survey responses highlighted the following considerations within the ECA concerning protected groups under equalities legislation:

### *Vulnerable Communities (disadvantage/poverty)*

- a) The pattern of participation in the city mirrors the city's deprivation patterns, with lower participation rates to be found in the north and east of the city and the higher participation rates to be found to the west and parts of the south.
- b) Uniquely, city centre public leisure provision (via Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre) draws members relatively evenly from across the city, with only 25% of its members (with known postcode information) residing within a mile of the centre.
- c) The geographic spread of Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre (CSLC) members and users means its impact is likely to be more evenly felt (positively and negatively) across the protected groups in the city.
- d) CSLC attracts members from a range of household types, similar to that of the city's profile.
- e) CSLC achieved both the highest level of satisfaction of all public leisure centres in the city and the second highest level of dissatisfaction.
- f) Over 52% of CSLC users travelled to the centre by car/motorbike, with a further 21% travelling to the centre by bus.
- g) 41% of CSLC users pay a discounted rate.

### *Disability*

- a) 4.5% of the total population of Coventry are economically inactive due to a long term illness or disability.
- b) The proportion of disabled people taking part in sport in the city is less than both national and regional averages.

### *Age*

- a) There is a correlation between age and inactivity rates which are the highest amongst those aged 55+ (67.9%) and lowest for young adults aged 16-25 (43.3%)
- b) Coventry Sports and Leisure Centre has a higher than average proportion of both younger members and members over the age of 55 years.
- c) Cycling, swimming and athletics are characterised by an even spread throughout the age cohorts up to 64 years
- d) Young people often struggle to afford to participate in sport and active recreation as youth unemployment remains high and students and young earners are often under financial pressure.

### *Gender*

- a) 50.3% of the local population are female.

- b) In Coventry, female inactivity (61.3%) is significantly higher than the equivalent male rate.
- c) In Coventry, the proportion of women regularly taking part in sport (15.2%) is less than half that of men (31.3%).
- d) Just under nine in ten of those taking part in keep fit exercises and six in ten swimmers are women.

6.4.4 The Equality and Consultation Analysis contained as an appendix to the 'Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024' Cabinet Paper (Coventry City Council, 2014) indicated the following potential equalities impacts with regard to the protected groups under equalities legislation:

- a) The strategy was very well received and there was little opposition to either the aims or the strategic objectives. There was agreement to all eight of the vision aims from at least 80% of all respondents.
- b) A need to ensure sport provision and support for people with disabilities was highlighted in the consultation. In total 25 comments (2.3% of all comments) were received supporting the need for increased participation from people with disabilities and for facilities for the disabled.
- c) Many of the respondents commented on the need for high quality facilities for all abilities. In total there were 250 comments relating to this, and many of these also referred to the need for facilities in neighbourhoods.
- d) Linking sport to public health received 51 comments, with respondents wanting to see more done to improve the health of local people through sport.
- e) The importance of links to schools and the need for opportunities for young people was highlighted, 101 comments were received on this subject.
- f) Comments relating to age were made by 46 respondents. These were almost equally spread between a need for more sporting opportunities for children and young people and older people. A number of comments also supported better use of schools as a sporting venue.
- g) Very few comments were received in relation to gender, although support for Vision Aim 1 – relating to increased participation for females – was very well supported.
- h) Five comments were received supporting sport provision within neighbourhoods and how this could help those with an economic disadvantage participate more in sport.
- i) Four comments were received regarding race and religion. These related to incorporating minority community sports into programmes and ensuring cultural and BME representation on partnerships.
- j) With regards to city centre sport and public leisure provision, a new destination leisure facility on a new city centre site would mean there would be no gap in provision. To mitigate the loss of bowls provision under option 6b, a suitable site could be considered elsewhere in the city, allowing easier access for participants.

## **6.5 Implications for (or impact on) the environment**

### **6.5.1 During Construction**

Construction would be undertaken in accordance with Secured By Design principles. Modern construction materials would be utilised and would present a significantly lesser impact on the environment than materials that were historically used. Site Waste Management techniques would be utilised and off-site manufacture would be prioritised wherever possible, thereby reducing reliance on water, minerals and other natural resources. Local contractors would be prioritised where appropriate and local specialised



sub-contractors, suppliers and labour sources would also be utilised, wherever possible. If approved, the demolition and disposal of building materials from the existing CSLC would require an approved risk management and methodology strategy.

#### 6.5.2. In Use

It is anticipated that the operation of a modern destination facility would deliver significant efficiencies in water and energy consumption compared to an ageing site, and would deliver an overall reduction in the carbon footprint. Energy saving controls would be incorporated into scheme, potentially through a connection to the Heatline supply, to reduce the on-going impact on natural resources. The modern mechanical and electrical installations will provide improved energy use through more efficient plant and better controls, such as passive-infra red sensors and time-limited functions. Safe and secure management principles would be adopted by the operator to ensure the safety and perceived safety of its users and those living and working around the proposed development. The operator would further be expected to deliver carefully selected activity programmes that are reflective of the needs of local users and the neighbourhoods they represent. Provision would be reviewed regularly to reflect changes in requirements and ensure efficiencies in centre operations.

### **6.6 Implications for partner organisations?**

6.6.1 The proposed Coventry Indoor Facilities Strategy 2014-2024 and Coventry Aquatics Strategy 2014-2024 are partnership documents developed through consultation with a range of stakeholders.

6.6.2 Approving these partnership strategies for Coventry will confirm the strategic direction and priorities for sport in the city – developing a more active, inclusive and vibrant Coventry through positive experiences in sport. Approving these strategies will further show recognition of the wide range of benefits that sport and active recreation can bring to both individuals and communities.

6.6.3 Approval of these strategies will give confidence to external funders that the city has clear objectives and priorities for sport in the next ten years. This should assist partners in applying for external grant funding and will bring greater coherence in the links from sport to wider city agendas (e.g. tourism, health, jobs and economy, regeneration).

6.6.4 Notably, however, the loss of a 50m pool from the city would impact on the City of Coventry Swimming Club's Beacon Club status (assuming this is retained beyond the current funded period to 2017) and their ability to host long-course training and competition events in the city (including generating income from such events). The issues presented by the proposed loss of the 50m pool are highlighted in more detail of the appendices of the Coventry Sports Strategy 2014-2024 Cabinet Report.

6.6.5 From a public leisure perspective, current lease, grant and operational arrangements with the Coventry Sports Trust are due to expire in 2016, prior to the anticipated date of any new city centre provision. Arrangements for public leisure operations across all the sites covered by the existing agreement will need to be considered in the light of new city centre facility proposals and service concession arrangements.

6.6.6 Any implications for staffing arrangements across Coventry Sports Trust as a consequence of the recommended option would be the subject of proposals presented by the organisation/service concessionaire and would be managed independently by CST/the service concessionaire as the employer and potential employer of affected staff. These changes will be monitored for the purposes of ascertaining equalities impact.

**Report author(s):**

David Nuttall  
Jane Murphy

**Name and job title:**

Service Manager – Sports and Arts  
Strategic Finance Manager – Major Projects Finance

**Directorate:**

Place  
Resources

**Tel and email contact:**

Tel: 024 7683 2362 / 1291

Email: [david.nuttall@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:david.nuttall@coventry.gov.uk) / [jane.murphy@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:jane.murphy@coventry.gov.uk)

Enquiries should be directed to the above person.

<b>Contributor/approver name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Directorate or organisation</b>	<b>Date doc sent out</b>	<b>Date response received or approved</b>
<b>Contributors:</b>				
David Cockroft	Assistant Director, City Centre and Development Services	Place	27.06.14	04.07.14
Faye Cockayne	Major Projects Community Engagement Officer, Community Regeneration	Place	27.06.14	04.07.14
Jon Hunt	Development Manger – Voluntary Sector, External Funding and Volunteers	Place	27.06.14	04.07.14
Steve Wiles	Development Manager – Facilities and Contracts	Place	27.06.14	04.07.14
Steve Thomas	Senior Accountant, Major Projects Finance	Resources	27.06.14	04.07.14
Jenni Venn	Assistant Director, Policy Partnership and Performance	Resources	27.06.14	04.07.14
Katie Copson	Research Assistant, Corporate Research	Resources	27.06.14	04.07.14
Helen Lynch	Place and Regulatory Team Manager – Legal Services	Resources	27.06.14	02.07.14
Nigel Clews	Assistant Director, Property Asset Management	Place	27.06.14	04.07.14

Michelle Salmon	Governance Services Officer, Legal and Democratic Services	Resources	27.06.14	30.06.14
Mick Burn	Head of Procurement & Commissioning	Resources	27.06.14	04.07.14
<b>Names of approvers for submission:</b> (officers and Members)				
Phil Helm	Finance Manager (Place Directorate)	Resources	27.06.14	02.07.14
Christine Forde	Assistant Director Legal & Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer	Resources	27.06.14	07.07.14
Martin Yardley	Executive Director	Place	07.07.14	07.07.14
Councillor Abdul Salam Khan	Cabinet Member (Culture, Leisure, Sports and Parks)		07.07.14	24.07.14

This report is published on the council's website: [www.coventry.gov.uk/meetings](http://www.coventry.gov.uk/meetings)