

<u>MEETING</u> POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
<u>DATE AND TIME</u> TUESDAY 5TH SEPTEMBER, 2017 AT 7.00 PM
<u>VENUE</u> HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BG

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS	3 - 6

Kirstin Lambert; 02083592177 kirstin.lambert@barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Question Number	Agenda Item Number	Raised By	Question	Answer
1.	Item 7 – Capital Programme Update	Mary O'Connor	<p>An item for the P & R meeting of 1st December 2016, was "Barnet Copthall Leisure Centre: Diving Feasibility". On page 2 of this report</p> <p><i>The feasibility study shows that both options presented in this report to include a diving facility at a redeveloped Barnet Copthall Leisure Centre are unaffordable. The financial evaluation is based on the additional capital cost required which leads to borrowing costs becoming unaffordable and has a negative impact on the overall revenue position.</i></p> <p>The additional capital costs to include deep water provision and diving boards were £2,428,000 for Option 1 and £4,517,000 for Option 2.</p> <p>Now an additional £5,596,000 is required for the leisure centres without any deep water and diving boards. The decision to exclude diving was based solely on financial affordability, without considering all the non-financial benefits of a deep water pool with diving boards. Why are the leisure centres still considered affordable when an additional larger amount than required to include a deep water pool with diving provision is now required? Option 1 and Option 2 were rejected for</p>	<p>Throughout the project the council has reviewed the financial affordability of the rebuilding of the two leisure centres to replace the current Barnet Copthall Centre and replace Church Farm Centre with a new facility in Victoria Recreation Ground. The affordability modelling considers the capital cost, the cost of borrowing and the potential revenue that can be generated in order to pay back the borrowing. The schemes remain affordable despite the additional capital funding required based on annual revenue that will be generated through these new centres. Mass participation sports such as swimming make a positive contribution to revenue. .</p> <p>The feasibility study undertaken in 2016 found that the options to include a diving facility were unaffordable based on the additional capital cost required combined with it having a negative impact on the overall revenue and this still remains the case. The study was published as part of the Policy and Resources Committee papers. It would not be viable for the Council to borrow money in order to build a facility that cannot generate enough income to service the debt. The additional total cost of the 2 options was calculated based on both the capital and revenue impacts and was valued at £6,028,000 and £10,007,000 for options 1 and 2 respectively.</p> <p>In addition to financial implications, the feasibility study further demonstrates that the inclusion of diving would displace 332 swimming participants per week or 16,603 per</p>

Question Number	Agenda Item Number	Raised By	Question	Answer
			<p>financial reasons because, "<i>The financial evaluation is based on the additional capital cost required which leads to borrowing costs becoming unaffordable</i>".</p>	<p>year. The Sport and Physical Activity Needs Assessment Report (2012), Sport England Facility Planning Model (2015) and demand analysis indicated that there was a need as a minimum to maintain the current level of swimming provision at Barnet Copthall Leisure Centre, particularly given the projected population growth. It was noted that the pools at the current Leisure Centre are already uncomfortably busy.</p> <p>Maximising participation in sport and physical activity and reducing inactivity among Barnet residents is a key priority for the Council, as agreed in the Adults and Safeguarding Committee’s commissioning plan and Council corporate priorities. The Council has been able to secure additional capital funding for the construction of the two new centres from Sport England, which reduces the net additional funding required. The Council has secured this funding because the facilities in the two new centres encourage mass participation and address gaps identified in Sport England’s analysis of Barnet sport and physical activity provision.</p>
2.	Item 7 – Capital Programme Update	Mary O’Connor	<p>In Appendix 2 of the 'Updated Capital Programme', Park Infrastructure is a Capital Receipt for £623,000. In item 15 Business Planning 2017-20 of the P&R Meeting of 27 June 2017, the same amount appears as a Capital Receipt for Victoria Park Finchley - Master Planning.</p> <p>Why are these funds included in these Barnet</p>	<p><u>Why are these funds included within LBB’s accounts?</u></p> <p>As set out in section 5.3 of the Full Council report of the 4th of November 2014, Victoria Park Recreation Ground, including the Lodge, was transferred to the Council in February 1900, to be held on trust as a public ground for the purposes of the Recreation Grounds Act 1859 and is held on charitable trust.</p> <p>The Recreation Grounds Act 1859 required such land to be</p>

Question Number	Agenda Item Number	Raised By	Question	Answer
			<p>Council financial documents when these funds do not belong to Barnet Council? Is a meeting of Victoria Park Trust trustees required before any of these funds are allocated / spent?</p>	<p>held as "open public grounds for the resort and recreation of adults, and as playgrounds for children and youth, or either of such purposes".</p> <p>The capital receipt is held on a separate cost centre and is ringfenced to fund works within Victoria Park. Whatever decisions the Council makes it does so as the corporate trustee, rather than in its usual capacity as beneficial owner. In brief, this means that decisions taken must be in the best interests of the Trust and in accordance with the objects of the Trust.</p> <p><u>Is a meeting of the Victoria Park Trustees required before the funds can be spent?</u></p> <p>The Environment Committee, making decisions as corporate trustee agreed the following at its meeting of the 13th July 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that a master plan be developed for Victoria Park subject to a full consultation. • to request the release of the ring fenced funding to support the development and improvement of Victoria Park in line with the agreed Greenspaces Capital Investment Programme. • and delegated authority to the Strategic Director: Environment to procure appropriately qualified external support to develop the master plan for the site in

Question Number	Agenda Item Number	Raised By	Question	Answer
				<p>accordance with the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules.</p> <p>A meeting of the trustees is therefore not required before some of the funding is committed however the Council will fully consult on the Master Plan prior to carrying out any works within the park.</p>