Affordability Conclusions

n/a	Rank
n/a Core Option	Description
-£2,276,491	Affordability Comparison with Option 1
This is the basis for all options. The funding gap for the core option is £2.276m	Recommendation

10	ø	00	7	ō	² 8	4	ω	Ν	4
50m pool with 500 spectator seats.	Additional 4 Court Sports Half	Confidence water area	Soft play (not staffed)	Full Spa (Ramsgate)	Toning tables	Small sauna and steam (poolside)	Full size 3G pitch	Clip and climb	2 x five a side football pitches (outdoor 3G)
-£7,680,487	-£2,193,210	-£1,214,501	£762,083	-£472,259	-£385,786	£38,890	£117,666	£268,716	£421,165
This option creates the largest affordability gap of all options. Do not include on grounds of affordability and no strategic need identified. It would result in over provision in terms of pool water and is aimed more at elite/competition swimmers. Dover is not currently identified as a priority for a 50m competition pool.	Do not include. Likely to have a negative impact on attordability of the project, increasing the affordability gap significantly. Provision of outdoor five a side pitches can mitigate the impact of the loss of 4 courts compared to the existing centre, as much of the activity that takes place in the half at peak time is five a side football.	Do not include on grounds of affordability and competition with the leisure water provision at Tides (Deal), which meets this need for the district better	Do not include on grounds of negative impact on affordability.	Do not include on grounds of affordability. This option presents a risk in terms of financial viability and should be regarded as a nice to have facility. Could be considered as a potential future phase / extension.	Do not include on grounds of affordability. Should only be included if the re is a specific and clearly identified need from a health and inclusion perspective Also, unlikely to be sustainable at both Tides and Dover Leisure Centre	Should include based on the improved affordability. Not a strategically important facility, so it perhaps should be regarded as a 'nice to have' facility.	The Council could provide this to meet a clear strategic need, though other organisations in Dover are considering provision of similar facilities. Suggest the Council works towards provision in partnership with another organisation via joint funding e.g. Dover Christchurch Academy possibly in partnership with football and rugby clubs.	Inclusion should improve financial viability significantly. It should be regarded as a 'nice to have' facility. There is a risk associated with providing such a specific activity area, if trends change in the future.	Include, as this has the most significant positive impact on affordability. Provision of outdoor five a side pitches can mitigate the impact of the loss of 4 courts compared to the existing centre, so important from a participation perspective.







