

ANNEX A

REPORT TO:	LEISURE SERVICES COMMITTEE	AGENDA ITEM:	9
DATE OF MEETING:	12 TH APRIL 2001	CATEGORY:	DEL
REPORT FROM:	TECHNICAL SERVICES MANAGER	EXEMPT:	Para.7
MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:	CHRIS MASON	DOC:	
SUBJECT:	ETWALL LEISURE CENTRE	REF:	cis7215
WARD(S) AFFECTED:	ETWALL, HILTON, HATTON, WILLINGTON, REPTON & NORTH WEST		

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 To update Members on the current situation with the bid to provide new facilities at Etwall and to agree the way forward with regard to progressing the project with the partnership group.

2.0 Content

2.1 Members are more than aware that the initial bid to the Lottery Sports Fund to provide new facilities at Etwall was unsuccessful. Correspondence has been exchanged with Sport England and with the consultants who assisted in the submission of the bid, on why the bid was unsuccessful and what can be done to rectify the problem.

2.2 In summary there are three main reasons why the bid was unsuccessful:

- Strategic Justification
- Value for Money
- Absence of evidence of Sport Governing Body support

Strategic Justification

2.3 Strategic justification relates to factors such as catchment, demand and the proximity of other facilities. When the project to provide new facilities at Etwall was first mooted the East Midlands Region Strategy for Sport and Recreation 'Beyond the Barriers' 1994-1998 and, before that, the strategy document 'Taking Shape', both recognised the need to provide a 2.5 badminton court sized sports hall in the Willington, Repton, Hatton, Etwall area. For a variety of powerful reasons, Etwall was identified as the most appropriate site.

2.4 Since these early 'desk top' studies, which were very limited by the level and complexity of data that could be evaluated, Sport England have been developing a computer based Facility Planning Model (FPM). While the FPM has been operational there has been a great deal of debate over the reliability of the information produced. In particular, the early FPM used 1996 data rather than forecasted future data and crude weightings were placed on facility types. Sport England have been working on refining the data for Derbyshire in conjunction with the Derbyshire and Peak Park Sports Forum. Conversations with the regional office of Sport England, indicate that it will be 3 to 6 months before new reliable data will be available from this source.

- 2.5 Sport England emphasise that the lack of 'strategic justification' was not the main reason for the bid being, initially, unsuccessful. However, in basic terms, the partnership are looking for the FPM run to firmly identify the need for the new facility at Etwall in its entirety. Without this confirmation there would be no justification for progressing the project as currently constituted.

Value for Money (Partnership Funding)

- 2.6 Similarly, while no weighting has been placed on the amount of capital sought from the Lottery Sports Fund, feedback indicates that this was a key factor in the bid being unsuccessful. No guidance has been received from the Lottery Sports Fund about the 'right' level of partnership contribution for bids of this type of bid (non-priority area). However, it can be safely assumed that if the project, as currently constituted, is re-submitted then there needs to be a greater contribution from the funding partners or new partners need to be involved in the scheme.

Absence of Evidence of Governing Body support

- 2.7 Again, it is difficult to place a weighting on the absence of this information in the bid being unsuccessful. Realistically, it is probably a great deal less important than the other factors. The information was not included in the bid package because of an oversight by our consultants. All that can be said at this stage is that the information would be included when and if the bid is resubmitted.

Proposed way forward for the Partnership

- 2.8 Set out below is a suggested way forward for the Joint Management Committee's consideration and for this Authority as lead organisation
- Strategic justification would appear to be the key factor in turning an unsuccessful bid into a successful one. It is therefore suggested that nothing is re-submitted until we have the outcome of the FPM run (could be 6 months away)
 - If this does not support the need for a sports hall at Etwall then it is suggested that feasibility work be undertaken into re-shaping the bid, based on a replacement swimming pool only using Sport England's standard design model together with any enhancements which might make the package more viable.
 - If it does support the need for the new facility at Etwall that the bid be re-submitted in its present form (with the level of funding sought from the Lottery Sports Fund reduced).
 - In the interim the project management group be reconstituted to firstly consider the proposed approach and to review the level of financial commitment made to the project by the agencies involved.
 - That other possible partnerships and funding arrangements be explored pending the outcome of the FPM run.
 - That the completion of documentation confirming sport governing body support be pursued through the project's consultants.

3.0 Staffing Implications

3.1 Pending the replacement of the Partnership Development Officer this Council's officer representation on the project management group will be the Facility and Development Manager. While it is difficult to quantify at this stage, this may have an impact on the delivery of other projects currently being managed by the unit.

4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 There are no new financial implications arising from this report. There may be some cost involved in obtaining the required information from the FPM run.

4.2 As part of the process of all of the funding partners reviewing their financial contribution to the scheme, it will be necessary for this Council to reconsider its own financial contribution.

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 Feedback from Sport England, both at regional and national levels, indicates 3 reasons why the project was not given stage 2 approval. Of the reasons given, there is little doubt that without strategic support there is little prospect of the project, as presently constituted, being re-submitted. Confirmation of strategic support is likely to be available in 3 to 6 months time.

5.2 Of equal importance, if the bid is re-submitted in its present form, is the need to reduce the level of funding being sought from the Lottery Sports Fund. To achieve this there needs to be an exploration of other funding opportunities and a review by all of the partners on their contribution to the scheme.

5.3 Detailed in the body of the report are proposals to be considered by Members for the way forward in the short term, for this Council as lead body and more importantly the Joint Management Committee.

6.0 Recommendations

6.1 That the contents of the report be noted by Members

6.2 That the 'way forward' as outlined above be approved and taken forward for consideration by the other funding partners

DERBYSHIRE & PEAK PARK SPORT & RECREATION FORUM:
FACILITIES PLANNING MODEL ASSESSMENTS
JUNE 2001

SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1 These Assessments are based upon two standard scenarios that investigate the extent to which the current provision of facilities satisfies the demand for sports halls and swimming pools from the current population. The scenarios assumed two levels of provision:-
 - A Core Public Supply of 20 Sports Halls sites and 20 Swimming Pools sites (Run 1)
 - The Core supply plus school facilities open to the public, comprising 48 Sports Hall sites and 31 Swimming Pool sites. No commercial facilities have been included (Run 2).
- 2 For practical reasons, the current population is that at 1996, the most recent of the Mid-Year estimates available.
- 3 This Assessment has been preceded by considerable effort to establish as accurate a facilities (supply-side) database as possible. This has taken time, during which decisions have been taken to build new facilities and to alter management arrangements at existing facilities. It is to be noted that one facility has been omitted, in error, from the database.
- 4 For Halls, the analysis suggests that:-
 - With only 20 sites (93 courts), Derbyshire (the Policy Area) has insufficient sports halls managed by local authorities to meet the level of demand placed upon them (Run 1). There is a shortfall of 83.4 badminton courts, equivalent to 21 sports halls
 - The inclusion of school facilities takes the level of supply to 48 sites (210 courts), leaving a shortfall of 22 courts/4.5 sports halls. This is a level at which it is difficult to justify further public provision (subject to further scenarios to be discussed subsequently)
 - In Run 1, there is an element of unmet demand beyond the catchment (30 minutes drive time) of any existing facility. This disappears when Run 2 supply is considered. This unmet demand may be a problem if the Run 2 supply becomes unreliable
 - Within catchments, there is a degree of unmet demand through trips being declined. This is a function of the distance-decay feature of the Model. Unmet demand comes largely from people who would wish to visit facilities, but can only go on foot and the nearest facility is too far away for the visit to be made. Consequently, they decline

to make the trip. Run 2 supply is well distributed and consequently it is difficult to see where any new facility could be located that will pick up anything other than a small amount of unmet demand on foot

- On a District-by-District basis, the supply and shortfall situation may be summarized as follows:-

District	Run 1		Shortfall Courts	Run 2		Shortfall Courts
	Sites	Courts		Sites	Courts	
Derby	2	14	23.5	12	8	4.6
Amber Valley	5	22	8.9	5	22	2.5
Bolsover	1	4	6.4	2	8	2.7
Chesterfield	2	10	8.7	4	18	3.0
Derbyshire Dales	1	3	7.3	3	12	2.3
Erewash	3	12	8.7	8	32	1.4
High Peak	2	7	5.4	7	25	1.7
N. E. Derbyshire	3	15	7.8	5	24	2.3
South Derbyshire	1	6	6.8	2 RUSTON GBLC	11	1.6
Policy Area	20	93	83.4	48	210	22.1

- The Policy Area accommodates demand from beyond its boundaries. The Forum, individual local authorities and facility managers will need to be sensitive to any changes in supply beyond these boundaries which could impact upon current levels of throughput viability
- Available facilities operate at comfortable throughput levels as a percentage of capacity (77%), aggregated district-by-district and site-by site. Anything in excess of 90% would be a cause for concern, as halls would be overused. Less than 70% is also a cause for concern, because of underuse.

5 For Pools, the analysis suggests that:-

- With 35 pools on 20 sites, Derbyshire has sufficient swimming pools managed by local authorities to meet the level of demand generated within the Policy Area (Run 1)
- Run 1 supply leaves little spare capacity, however, to accommodate visits from outside of the Policy Area (reflecting a lack of supply there, too) and most pools are operating at throughput levels beyond that regarded as busy, i.e. 50%+ throughput levels, the Policy Area average being 54%
- The inclusion of school-run facilities (Run 2) takes the level of supply to 45 pools on 30 sites, a point where there is little or no apparent justification for any additional provision. Capacity is 2.3 times the demand and the Policy Area average

throughput reduces to a comfortable 44%. Only marginally more demand is satisfied as throughput numbers actually fall, there being also more external supply. The Policy Area is, however, considerably dependent upon facilities managed by the education sector

- There is no unmet demand outside of travel catchments; no part of the Policy Area lies beyond 30 minutes drive time of any available facility
- There is an element of unmet demand through trips bring declined. This is all within catchment and largely from visitors on foot. Given the apparently well distributed location of current supply, it is difficult to see how additional provision could meet this small element of unmet demand, which aggregates into 1.8 standard-sized pools for the whole Policy Area – 377 sq metres in Run 2 (a standard pool is 212 sq metres)
- In both Runs, there is little marked difference between the available capacity in each district as a percentage of the Policy Area capacity and throughput (capacity used) as a percentage of the Policy Area. This suggests an even distribution of pools (albeit, overused in Run 1) and good choice for users, even though the choice is not always in the user's home district. It is also a function of the scenarios using unweighted data. Figures for individual sites show that that no pools are performing abnormally in comparison to the Policy Area
- On a District-by-District basis, the supply and shortfall situation for halls and pools may be summarised as follows:-

District	Run 1		Shortfall Sq Metres	Run 2		Shortfall Sq Metres
	Pools	Sq Metres		Pools	Sq Metres	
Derby	5	1333	117.0	7	1758	104.6
Amber Valley	5	1005	43.1	6	1355	33.9
Bolsover	1	162	55.0	1	162	52.9
Chesterfield	3	958	49.4	4	1098	43.9
Derbyshire Dales	4	1062	30.4	4	1062	29.5
Erewash	5	918	28.6	6	1118	24.5
High Peak	3	626	48.4	4	876	38.5
N.E. Derbyshire	6	1080	35.0	8	1360	30.7
South Derbyshire	2	600	23.3	5	1053	18.4
Policy Area	35	7744	430.3	45	9841	376.9

- In Run 2, the Policy Area accommodates substantial demand from beyond its boundaries (equivalent to 12.5% of throughput). Whilst this is useful for facility throughput and viability, facilities may be vulnerable if more convenient facilities are provided elsewhere. These may also take users from Derbyshire facilities. The

Forum, individual local authorities and facility managers will need to be sensitive to any changes in supply beyond the Policy Area boundaries which could impact upon current levels of throughput and viability.

- 6 Whilst the Assessment shows that Derbyshire is currently well served with facilities, both in numbers and in location, and that there are few obvious current needs for new facilities, it should be borne in mind that:-
 - the Assessment takes no account of the age, condition and relative attractiveness of existing facilities, and that,
 - the Assessment takes no account of future demographic change, e.g. population growth, age structure and new housing areas, nor does it take account of any changes in participation rates.
- 7 For halls, particularly, there is a heavy reliance on facilities managed by schools. Core public supply is clearly sufficient. For pools, core public supply seems sufficient, but at the expense of undesirably high throughput levels.
- 8 **The Assessment is, therefore, a base line position from which the Forum can consider the impact of changes, through various scenarios.** These scenarios can examine:-
 - the relative attraction of different types of facility management, such as local authority control and school control
 - the true contribution to core public supply of any commercial facilities (which have been excluded from this assessment)
 - the impact of age, closures, refurbishments, relocations, changes in management practice or changes in strategic priorities
 - the impact of demographic change, either at broad district level using the Registrar General's Population Projections or at a more detailed level of wards or enumeration districts
 - the impact of changes in participation rates emanating from sports development programmes and from governing body sports strategies
 - the impact of current known proposals emanating from local authorities, schools and community associations.
- 9 The Forum will doubtless wish to consider how it now moves forward with the Facilities Planning Model as one tool in the strategic decision-making process. The initial contract between the Forum and Sport England allows for two more scenarios per facility type. New scenarios beyond those numbers will be extensions to contract.

