

Public Document Pack



Democratic Services
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent CT16 3PJ

Telephone: (01304) 821199
Fax: (01304) 872453
DX: 6312
Minicom: (01304) 820115
Website: www.dover.gov.uk
e-mail: democraticservices@dover.gov.uk

21 September 2016

Dear Councillor

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT a meeting of the **DOVER LEISURE CENTRE PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP** will be held in the Council Chamber at these Offices on Thursday 29 September 2016 at 5.00 pm when the following business will be transacted.

Members of the public who require further information are asked to contact Kate Batty-Smith on 01304 872303 or by e-mail at kate.batty-smith@dover.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kate Batty-Smith", written over a white background.

Chief Executive

Dover Leisure Centre Advisory Group Membership:

T J Bartlett (Chairman)
P M Beresford
N J Collor
M D Conolly
P Walker
Mr P Ward

AGENDA

1 **APOLOGIES**

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 **APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

To note appointments of Substitute Members.

3 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** (Page 4)

To receive any declarations of interest from Members in respect of business to be

transacted on the agenda.

4 **MINUTES** (Pages 5-9)

To confirm the attached notes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26 July 2016.

5 **FACILITY MIX** (Pages 10-12)

To receive a briefing paper on the draft project brief for a spa facility Feasibility Study.

6 **PROCUREMENT OF CONSULTANT TEAMS**

To receive a verbal briefing on progress.

7 **REVIEW OF PROJECT PROGRAMME**

To receive a verbal briefing on the project programme.

8 **ENGAGEMENT WITH SCHOOLS**

To receive a verbal briefing on progress.

9 **LAND ACQUISITION**

To receive a verbal briefing on progress.

10 **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

To consider future meeting dates.

Access to Meetings and Information

- Members of the public are welcome to attend meetings of the Council, its Committees and Sub-Committees. You may remain present throughout them except during the consideration of exempt or confidential information.
- All meetings are held at the Council Offices, Whitfield unless otherwise indicated on the front page of the agenda. There is disabled access via the Council Chamber entrance and a disabled toilet is available in the foyer. In addition, there is a PA system and hearing loop within the Council Chamber.
- Agenda papers are published five clear working days before the meeting. Alternatively, a limited supply of agendas will be available at the meeting, free of charge, and all agendas, reports and minutes can be viewed and downloaded from our website www.dover.gov.uk. Minutes will be published on our website as soon as practicably possible after each meeting. All agenda papers and minutes are available for public inspection for a period of six years from the date of the meeting.
- If you require any further information about the contents of this agenda or your right

to gain access to information held by the Council please contact Kate Batty-Smith, Democratic Support Officer, telephone: 01304 872303 or email: kate.batty-smith@dover.gov.uk for details.

Large print copies of this agenda can be supplied on request.

Declarations of Interest

Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a Member has a new or registered DPI in a matter under consideration they must disclose that they have an interest and, unless the Monitoring Officer has agreed in advance that the DPI is a 'Sensitive Interest', explain the nature of that interest at the meeting. The Member must withdraw from the meeting at the commencement of the consideration of any matter in which they have declared a DPI and must not participate in any discussion of, or vote taken on, the matter unless they have been granted a dispensation permitting them to do so. If during the consideration of any item a Member becomes aware that they have a DPI in the matter they should declare the interest immediately and, subject to any dispensations, withdraw from the meeting.

Other Significant Interest (OSI)

Where a Member is declaring an OSI they must also disclose the interest and explain the nature of the interest at the meeting. The Member must withdraw from the meeting at the commencement of the consideration of any matter in which they have declared a OSI and must not participate in any discussion of, or vote taken on, the matter unless they have been granted a dispensation to do so or the meeting is one at which members of the public are permitted to speak for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the matter. In the latter case, the Member may only participate on the same basis as a member of the public and cannot participate in any discussion of, or vote taken on, the matter and must withdraw from the meeting in accordance with the Council's procedure rules.

Voluntary Announcement of Other Interests (VAOI)

Where a Member does not have either a DPI or OSI but is of the opinion that for transparency reasons alone s/he should make an announcement in respect of a matter under consideration, they can make a VAOI. A Member declaring a VAOI may still remain at the meeting and vote on the matter under consideration.

Note to the Code:

Situations in which a Member may wish to make a VAOI include membership of outside bodies that have made representations on agenda items; where a Member knows a person involved, but does not have a close association with that person; or where an item would affect the well-being of a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc. but not his/her financial position. It should be emphasised that an effect on the financial position of a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc OR an application made by a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc would both probably constitute either an OSI or in some cases a DPI.

Minutes of the meeting of the **DOVER LEISURE CENTRE PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Tuesday, 26 July 2016 at 5.04 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor T J Bartlett

Councillors: P M Beresford
M D Conolly
Mr P Ward
P Walker

Officers: Head of Finance
Principal Infrastructure and Delivery Officer
Principal Community and Leisure Officer
Democratic Support Officer

22 APOLOGIES

It was noted that there were no apologies for absence.

23 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that there were no substitute members.

24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that there were no declarations of interest.

25 MINUTES

The notes of the meeting of the Group held on 30 June 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

26 FACILITY MIX

The Principal Leisure Officer (PLO) referred Members to the briefing paper which summarised the likely impact that the provision of a spa facility would have on the cost, design and location of the leisure centre at Whitfield. If Members wished to take the idea further and obtain specialist advice, this was likely to cost in the region of £10,000. The Head of Finance confirmed that the cost of adding a spa would be in the region of £1.5 million which would require additional borrowing. However, it was estimated that a spa would generate £80,000 in annual revenue which would be sufficient to service borrowing of £1.5 million.

Councillor M D Conolly argued that, within the context of the entire project, the cost of the spa was relatively insignificant. He pointed out that four of the nine potential operators consulted had indicated an interest in operating a spa. A further three were potentially interested but required further information. Only two of the nine had indicated no interest, and one of these already operated a spa in Ramsgate. It was likely, therefore, that this operator viewed the spa unfavourably as it would be a competitor. In response to Councillor N J Collor, the Group was advised that, of the 558 responses received, only 17 had raised the issue of a spa facility or sauna/steam room improvements. However, it was acknowledged that the questionnaire had made no reference to the possible inclusion of a spa facility.

The Principal Infrastructure and Delivery Officer (PIDO) reminded Members that the majority of operators wanted the spa included in the first phase of construction. Potential operators had shown a very positive interest in Kent where most of them were not currently operating. It was therefore possible that they were being positive about the spa at this stage because they were seeking the business.

The Head of Finance added that the affordability of the project rested on how much providers were prepared to invest and what the Council could afford to put into it. The successful operator would pay the Council for running the facility; this would be predicated on how much revenue the operator estimated the centre was likely to generate. This payment would dictate how much the Council could borrow since it would be used to pay back the loan and interest.

Councillor P Walker commented that the operators appeared to be dictating what was going to be provided. He reminded Officers that the new centre was designed to cater for leisure as well as sporting activities. Whilst he recognised that there had to be a balance, it was essential that the Group considered different ideas and how a high standard of facility might be achieved for the benefit of the public. He was convinced that a spa would add depth and quality to the centre for what was a relatively modest amount when measured against the overall cost of the project. Councillor P M Beresford agreed that it was important that the new centre catered for leisure activities. Mr Peter Ward added that there was little competition elsewhere in the district in terms of spa facilities. The provision of a spa facility would build on the improvements that were needed to upgrade the existing leisure centre.

The PIDO advised that the provision of a spa constituted a 'nice to have' facility. On the other hand, the provision of sports facilities was based on evidence obtained from Sport England and governing bodies.

It was agreed that it be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for Property Management and Public Protection/Cabinet that a further report be commissioned from a specialist consultant to explore the addition of a spa facility.

27 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

The PIDO advised that there had been a large response to the consultation – 667 responses in total, mostly completed using the on-line survey facility. In summary, 88.4% of respondents supported a new leisure centre, with 69.4% favouring Whitfield as its location. 19% were opposed to Whitfield. The provision of a swimming-pool was the highest priority for 83% of respondents, followed by the health and fitness gym (41.9%), learner pool (28.1%) and sports hall (22.9%). Respondents had stated that 62% of them travelled to the current site by car, 20.8% on foot and 7.5% by bus. Following its relocation to Whitfield, indications were that 65.4% would travel by car, 13.3% by public transport and 11.2% on foot. Finally, 52.6% indicated that they would use the new centre more frequently.

Concerns had been raised about accessibility from the town centre, particularly by the elderly, and the difficulties of using public transport for wheelchair users. Councillor Collor advised that by the time the new leisure centre opened, buses would legally be required to transport wheelchairs. In any case, most buses currently operating were low-floor and could take wheelchairs. Councillor Walker reminded Members that plans were underway for a new rapid transport system linking the town centre to Whitfield. Mr Ward suggested that a walk-way should be

provided from the bus-stop outside Christ Church Academy to the centre. He also commented that comprehensive information should be included on the centre's website on how to get there by public transport. Officers advised that a comprehensive transport plan would need to be submitted with the planning application, and there was a meeting scheduled the following week with Kent County Council (KCC) for consultants and planners to start work on this.

Many consultees, including Vista Twisters, had raised concerns about the proposed reduction in the size of the sports hall. However, concerns appeared to be assuaged when the rationale behind it, particularly the increased use of schools' sports halls, was explained. Officers had worked very closely with all secondary schools (but one) in the district that were identified in the Council's Indoor Sports Facility Strategy (ISFS) as having the potential to provide public access to their sports halls. Officers were confident that the new sports hall provision would work; Christ Church Academy's sports hall was already open and being used by external groups and clubs.

Sir Roger Manwood's and Dover College were willing to work with the Council but there were particular complications for them which would need to be overcome. Dover Boys' Grammar School had received planning permission for a sports hall which, if public funding were secured, would have to be opened up to the local community as a condition of that funding. The PLO added that informal discussions at a recent meeting of the Kent Association of Leisure Officers had prompted debate around the capital and maintenance costs of facilities. Sports hall provision had been discussed, with debate around the possible future reduction of such provision and recognition of the benefits of working with schools to meet local needs. Schools identified in the ISFS were spread throughout the district and were therefore generally also more accessible to community users. In response to a suggestion by the PIDO, Members confirmed that they did not believe further investigation into the provision of a six-court sports hall was necessary, and a four-court hall should be progressed.

The PLO advised that most consultees at events had accepted why a 50-metre swimming-pool could not be provided when the reasons were explained to them. The Dover Gymnastics Club needed a large space which the new centre could not accommodate. However, the Council would work with the club to help find a suitable facility. Dover Squash and Racquetball Club had indicated its preference for three courts. In response, Officers had arranged to meet the bursar of the Duke of York's Royal Military School to discuss access to the school's squash facilities.

Overall, the consultation had elicited generally positive feedback. Nevertheless, Whitfield Parish Council was of the view that there should be more facilities, such as a 50-metre pool, and the Dover Society was in favour of a town centre site. There was general recognition that a new facility was needed, but some disquiet that it would be relocated to Whitfield.

It was agreed that the verbal report be noted.

28 DETAILED FEASIBILITY REPORT

Officers advised that the report required further refinement before going to Cabinet, not least to reflect the outcome of public consultation. It was acknowledged that a further report on the spa would delay overall progress, potentially by a couple of months. Councillor Conolly stressed that it was important to achieve the right leisure facility for the district, even if this meant a slight delay. In response to

questions, Members were advised that the issue of car parking would be considered at the next stage of the project, taking into account the feedback received during the consultation. There was a lack of trade parking at the business park, and it would be important to exclude non-users from the leisure centre's car park. It was emphasised that 250 was not a cap but rather the minimum number of spaces proposed. Finally, it was clarified that refinement of design plans would be progressed at the next stage of works. This would include the café and reception areas as it was recognised that further work was needed to improve these.

It was agreed that the update be noted.

29 LAND ACQUISITION

The Chairman advised Members that Cabinet had authorised the Director of Environment and Corporate Assets to commence negotiations on a parcel of land at Whitfield. Councillor Conolly added that negotiations had reached a stage where Heads of Terms had been reached and discussions had started on the future use of the existing leisure centre site.

It was agreed that the update be noted.

30 NEXT STEPS

The Group was advised that a report would go to Cabinet on 5 September and to the Scrutiny (Policy and Performance) Committee on a date to be confirmed. There would be a special Cabinet meeting on 20 September to consider any recommendations arising from Scrutiny.

It was agreed that the update be noted.

31 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Group was advised that the next meeting would be held on 29 September at 5.00pm. It was provisionally proposed that another would be held on 3 November at 5.00pm.

It was agreed to note that further meetings would be held on 29 September and, provisionally, 3 November 2016.

32 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

That, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the remainder of the business on the grounds that the item to be considered involves the likely discussion of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

33 FINANCIAL UPDATE

The Group received a presentation from the Head of Finance. Members were advised that the project would be financed through a mix of borrowing, grant funding, capital receipts and use of reserves. The current approved Medium-Term Financial Plan 2016/17-2019/20 included an allowance of up to £7 million to fund the project from earmarked reserves. Initial soft market testing with leisure providers had indicated that the new centre was expected to generate an improvement in the Council's revenue position which would be sufficient to service

additional borrowing to fund the project. In addition, it was anticipated that Sport England would contribute a grant of between £1 million and £1.5 million to the project.

The split of funding for the project would be determined as the project progressed, including consideration as to whether to utilise the maximum approved level of reserves and undertake a lower level of borrowing, or whether to undertake the maximum level of affordable borrowing and reduce the level of reserves used. Councillor Walker welcomed the briefing which gave him a degree of reassurance in respect of the financial position.

It was agreed that the update be noted.

The meeting ended at 6.28 pm.

Dover Spa Consultant Brief

Project Background

On 21 September DDC agreed to proceed with proposals for a new leisure centre and this will include the facility mix set out in table one below. It was also agreed to commission a specialist spa consultant to assess the feasibility of including a spa in the facility mix.

1.1 The proposed facility mix for Dover Leisure Centre.

Activity Area	New Leisure Centre
Main pool	8 lane 25m pool
Spectator seating	250 person capacity
Learner pool	15mx 8.5m with moveable floor
Sports hall	4 courts
Health & fitness	120 stations
Multi activity studio	2 x studios
Multi-purpose room (ground floor)	1 x room for meetings /parties/soft play/ crèche etc.
Spin studio	1 x studio
Squash court	2 x courts
Interactive climbing	Included
Small sauna and steam room	Included
2 Five a side football pitches (Outdoor 3G)	Included
Café	Included
Parking Spaces	250 minimum
Spa	Ongoing investigation

The Council is seeking proposals from suitably qualified consultants to complete the following scope of work:

Needs Assessment

- A desktop audit of existing facilities and possible future projects within the Dover catchment area to understand the scale and nature of competing facilities
- Assessment of supply and demand of facilities and recommendation on whether there is sufficient demand for a spa at the Whitfield site. This should take into account local demographics and test the extent to which the new facility would attract customers from outside of the district.
- Provide a clear understanding of the market position for a new facility in Whitfield. Members have been given an indicative budget of £1-1.5m. However, if there is a business case for a different level of investment, this should be brought forward.
- A clear rationale must be provided for the recommendation.

Definition of facility mix and project brief

- Provide recommendations on the most commercially viable facility mix for a spa at Whitfield
- Organise a site visit to at least one facility with a mix similar to that being recommended for Dover. The visits will be attended by officers, councillors and member of the consultant team.
- Provide a concise project brief based on the recommended facility mix and liaise with the Council's design team and cost manager to assist in the completion of, capital costs, revenue implications and concept designs, for example the implication on parking provision.
- Should the Spa operate as a discrete business or should its operation be integrated into the main leisure centre?

Revenue projections

- Complete detailed 10 year income and expenditure projections based on the recommended facility mix. These must be provided in Excel format, so they can be incorporated into the wider business case being prepared by the Council's consultant team.

Reporting and presentation

- Complete a concise summary report containing the following sections:
 - Introduction and project brief
 - Findings from the needs analysis
 - Recommended facility mix
 - Outcomes of income and expenditure projections
 - Conclusions and recommendations
 - Appendices.
- Complete a short presentation, summarising the findings of the report.

Outputs

- A summary report, as described above, in word format
- A short presentation summarising the findings of the report, in PowerPoint format
- Detailed income and expenditure projections in excel format.

Meeting attendance

- We anticipate the need for attendance at the following meetings:
 - project inception meeting at Dover District Council Offices
 - Site visits, location to be confirmed
 - Final report presentation at Dover District Council offices.

Project Timescales (TO BE DISCUSSED WITH PAG MEMBERS)

- Invitation to tender issued XX/XX/XX
- Tenders to be submitted by 5pm on XX/XX/XX
- Decision on award of contract XX/XX/XX

- Project inception meeting XX/XX/XX
- Draft report submitted XX/XX/XX
- Presentation of findings XX/XX/XX
- Final report submitted, following feedback from the Council XX/XX/XX.

Project Budget

- The Council has set aside a maximum budget £10,000.

Tender Information Required

We require a proposal containing, which includes the following information:

- A methodology describing how you will deliver each element of the work listed above.
- A fee proposal showing the number of consultant days and associated fees for completing each of the elements of work included in the methodology.
- CV's for key staff that will be delivering the study.
- A list of similar projects you have completed in the past 3 years, which have resulted in the development of new spa facilities.
- Short case studies for 3 projects that you have completed that are most similar to the project being proposed at Dover Leisure Centre. These should contain the name of the project, contact details for the client and a description of project and of the services provided.

Tender Evaluation

Tenders will be evaluated using a weighting of 80% quality and 20% price. The Council does not intend to hold interviews as part of the evaluation, due mainly to time constraints. However, should this be required dates will be circulated as soon as possible.