

	<h2>Policy &amp; Resources Committee</h2> <h3>17 February 2015</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Title</b></p>	<p><b>Sport and Physical Activity Review Revised Outline Business Case</b></p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Report of</b></p>	<p>Kate Kennally, Strategic Director for Commissioning</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Wards</b></p>	<p>All</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Status</b></p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Enclosures</b></p>	<p>Appendix 1: Sport and Physical Activity Revised Outline Business Case</p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Officer Contact Details</b></p>	<p>Kate Kennally, Strategic Director for Commissioning  <a href="mailto:kate.kennally@barnet.gov.uk">kate.kennally@barnet.gov.uk</a>, 02083 594 808</p>

<h2>Summary</h2>
<p>The attached Revised Outline Business Case sets out the findings of the pre-procurement phase and reviews key deliverables, including the feasibility study, a procurement strategy, public health outcomes, consultation, and provides a recommendation for the next phase.</p> <p>The pre-procurement phase has built on evidence gathered to date and expanded this to refine what leisure centres the Council requires, where they might be located, how much they would cost to build and run, how much they could generate in revenue, and what a new leisure management contract should embody to ensure a significant contribution to the Council’s public health aims and objectives.</p> <p>The revised OBC links the council’s aspirations to Public Health England’s Public Health Outcomes Framework (PHOF) and shows how this contribution can be defined and measured. These outcomes will be placed at the heart of the new leisure management contract and will be integral to how the tenders submitted by prospective providers are evaluated and scored. During the next phase of the Sport and Physical Activity project this approach will be refined and moulded into a market leading and innovative procurement process.</p> <p>The feasibility study, undertaken by Re on behalf of the Council, indicates that the council should re-provision Church Farm and Copthall as a priority. Although Church Farm and Copthall are fully functional they are costly to run, have reached the end of their useful</p>

economic life and require immediate investment to bring them up to modern and cost-efficient standards. The capital investment required to re-provide these two leisure centres has been estimated as being £23.2m. The costs of the borrowing will be met by the predicted income from new leisure centres, capital receipts, Sport England Strategic Facilities Investment Fund and £3.4m from CIL through the Infrastructure Reserve. There is also a longer term opportunity to enhance the Council owned facilities at Finchley and Hendon Leisure Centres during the lifespan of the new management contract.

The Revised OBC proposes a refined list of facilities for the Council's leisure centres based on a needs assessment carried out by the council in 2012 and supported by the market research and consultation with 853 residents during this phase.

It is proposed that the procurement effort itself is split into two workstreams separating the construction process from the leisure management contract. This separation is possible due to the work done through the feasibility study, which has more clearly defined what the council wanted to achieve and what it is capable of achieving given the limitations of its leisure centre estate, and the current financial constraints.

## **Recommendations**

**That the Policy and Resources Committee**

- 1. Approves that the Danegrove Playing Field, Victoria Recreation Ground and Copthall sites are taken through to the next stage of the project for further public consultation and consideration by planning (section 4 Feasibility Study).**
- 2. Approves capital funding of £23.2m, including associated professional fees, for the re-provision of Church Farm and Copthall leisure centres. ( section 4 Feasibility Study and Affordability Analysis).**
- 3. Approves the use of £3.4m from CIL through the Infrastructure Reserve funding to contribute to the £23.2m capital costs required to fund the re-provision of Church Farm and Copthall leisure centres.**
- 4. Approves the use of capital receipts from the existing Church Farm site to contribute to the £23.2m capital costs required to fund the re-provision of Church Farm and Copthall Leisure Centres.**
- 5. Approves the commencement of the procurement work-streams featuring a competitive procedure with negotiation (a new procurement procedure) for the leisure centre management contract and utilising existing government construction frameworks for the design and build contract of Church Farm and Copthall leisure centres (section 9 procurement strategy).**
- 6. Delegates authority to the Commercial and Customer Services Director to enter into dialogue with the council to look at the possibility of using Schedule 40 of the Capita / Barnet partnering agreement to commission CSG to provide managing agent services, both for the existing leisure management contract and the new arrangement once it is procured (section 9 Procurement Strategy).**
- 7. Approves a maximum budget of £440k for the delivery of the pre-implementation phases of the project (Section 10.2.1)**

## **1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED**

- 1.1 The Revised Outline Business Case (ROBC) takes forward the OBC prepared in July 2014 and incorporates new information gathered by the project team as part of the feasibility study, the market research / consultation process, the council's public health outcomes and market and stakeholder engagement
- 1.2 The current leisure management contract with Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) to operate the council's five leisure centres at Cophall, Hendon, Burnt Oak, Finchley and Church Farm, expires on 31st December 2017.
- 1.3 This current arrangement does not deliver the health outcomes Barnet requires for its residents and, in a period of financial austerity, it does not offer the required services in the most cost effective manner.
- 1.4 Despite negotiations, most recently held between September 2013 and March 2014, the current provider, GLL, has not been able to offer the council any option to reduce the current management fee or to improve public health outcomes without having to commission additional activities above and beyond the existing contract terms.
- 1.5 In September 2011, Cabinet Resources Committee (CRC) approved the negotiation of terms with GLL for termination of the current Leisure Management Contract.
- 1.6 In October 2012, CRC approved the Sport and Physical Activity Strategic Outline Case, including the draft SPA Strategy Statement.
- 1.7 An Outline Business Case was approved by CRC in November 2013 to address the short term Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) savings gap and gave approval for the project to investigate a more sustainable, long-term solution for the leisure contract.
- 1.8 In June 2014, the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWBB) approved the establishment of the Fit and Active Barnet (FAB) Partnership Board and noted the Sport and Physical Activity (SPA) Strategy delivery plan.
- 1.9 In July 2014, the Policy & Resources Committee (P&R) approved an outline business case setting out a recommendation for a re-procurement of the leisure contract, starting with a feasibility study/pre-procurement phase in August 2014.
- 1.10 The previous Outline Business Case recommended a two stage competitive dialogue procurement process, and provided some high level costings on how much these re-provisioned facilities might cost. The current ROBC goes into detail around the specifics of the procurement process and more accurate costings of how the current leisure estate can be improved to increase the expected life of the buildings and better serve the council's residents.

- 1.11 The overall aim of the project is to procure a new contract for the operation and maintenance of the five leisure facilities, to improve the participation levels in sport and physical activity across the borough and to deliver sport and physical activity services at revenue neutral position to the council.

## **2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The reasons for the report recommendations are drawn from three main project workstreams;

### **2.2 Feasibility Study**

- 2.2.1 The council's leisure centres vary significantly in age with the oldest centres; Church Farm (constructed around 1960) and Barnet Copthall (constructed approximately 1975) now reaching the end of their economic lives. Recent work completed on the roof at Church Farm has given it an additional estimated three years of life, while major investment is required at Copthall to replace its aging tanks and plant room. These measures will provide only temporary fixes and will not overcome the inherent problems of both centres. Therefore, this report recommends the replacement of the centres with new facilities. Doing so now, will minimise the on-going revenue costs of providing five leisure centres and extend the life of leisure services provision in the Borough.

- 2.2.2 The project will re-provide the leisure centres at Church Farm and Copthall at the estimated cost of £23.2m. This takes account of indicative layouts, and is based on market trends for similar sized facilities.

- 2.2.3 The cost of construction will be fully funded from estimated income, £3.4m Infrastructure Reserve money, £500k from capital receipts, a potential £750k from Sport England Strategic Investment Facilities Fund and remaining leisure budget.

- 2.2.4 Lack of investment in the leisure facilities will result in increased operational costs and may make the whole portfolio less attractive to potential suppliers bidding for the council's leisure management contract.

### **2.3 Resident Consultation and Market Research**

- 2.3.1 The consultation and market research work showed that residents value the council's leisure centres but think that they could be improved. Swimming, particularly at Copthall, is important to residents as is the gymnastics provision at Hendon.

- 2.3.2 Finchley Lido is the council's most successful centre with significant support from residents for it to remain on its current site when the time comes to refurbish or re-provisioned.

- 2.3.3 All Church Farm workshop attendees (and members of the Women's Group) acknowledged that the current leisure centre site is too small to accommodate a modern facility, which was considered essential for the area. As such, they supported the centre's relocation - and none felt they would be sorry to see it

go. Danegrove Playing Fields and Victoria Recreation Ground received significant support from residents.

2.3.4 The recommendations in the Revised OBC are in line with the consultation and market research conducted during this phase.

## **2.4 Procurement**

2.4.1 The previous Outline Business Case recommended a comprehensive procurement exercise consisting of a two stage competitive dialogue process for the for the leisure management contract and three Design, Build, Operate and Maintain (DBOM) contracts, to cover the re-provision of the Church Farm, Finchley and Cophall centres.

2.4.2 The work done during this phase of the project has added more clarity to what the council wants to achieve and what it is capable of achieving moving the council to recommend the separation of the construction procurement from the leisure centre management re-procurement.

2.4.3 The proposed approach offers a shorter management contract, 10 years, and provides the council with specialist suppliers for each discipline. It would also remove the need for a lengthy and costly competitive dialogue process, maximise the potential income and allow potential suppliers to concentrate on innovative solutions that contribute to the council's public health outcomes.

2.4.4 The scale of both contracts means that the procurements must comply with the OJEU regulations.

## **3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED**

### **3.1 Re-Tendering the Management Contract with no Capital Investment**

3.1.1 If the current management contract is simply re-tendered the feasibility study estimates a potential annual management fee of £527k payable by the council to any new operator, giving a total commitment of £5.27m over a 10 year period. There is a further risk with this approach that the market would not be prepared to manage Church Farm in its current state as part of the leisure portfolio This option also cannot address public health outcomes in line with the councils aspirations, nor guarantee that there will be no closure of leisure centres as the required management fee of £527k per annum is in excess of the Council's available budget for leisure centres. This option was therefore dismissed.

### **3.2 Closure of Church Farm and Cophall Leisure Centres**

3.2.1 To reach a revenue neutral position without any investment the council would probably need to close Church Farm and Cophall, before the new management contract was re-tendered. This leaves the most popular leisure centre, Finchley, and the two most modern, Hendon and Burnt Oak to be part of the future leisure management contract. This severely restricts the council's

ability to deliver the desired public health outcomes that would enhance the health and wellbeing of Barnet residents. The option was dismissed.

### **3.3 Capital Investment Provided by a Supplier Through the Procurement Process**

3.3.1 The previous Outline Business Case had recommended a two stage competitive dialogue process and a Design, Build, Operate and Maintain (DBOM) contract, putting the risk of raising the required capital investment with the potential suppliers. This phase of the project has moved away from this recommendation for the following reasons;

- Any private sector developer seeking to borrow £23.2m to fund the capital investment into Church Farm and Finchley would need to borrow at commercial rates, probably 2% higher than prudential borrowing. The soft market testing has shown that potential suppliers would pass their borrowing costs straight through to the council, giving an additional cost of around £300k per annum.
- A DBOM contract would need to be 25 to 30 years or longer to enable the contractor to recover their investment and make a surplus. It is also likely that the income estimates would be smaller and suppliers might push for a profit (surplus) share rather than an income share.
- Competitive dialogue and a DBOM contract are lengthy and resource intensive by nature. Competition for this type of procurement is limited; initial soft market testing suggest that only 2-3 companies would have the financial capability or willingness to bid for this project.
- This type of procurement process focuses on suppliers who can deliver DBOMs rather than those who can specialise in helping the council achieve public health outcomes.
- Another option, previously considered, was for the council to borrow the entire capital sum and then lend it back to a potential supplier. This would put us back into the DBOM procurement with increased contract term and less focus on public health.

3.3.2 For these reasons the option of exploring supplier funded capital investment was dismissed.

## **4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION**

4.1 Pending approval by the Policy and Resources Committee of the recommendations within the ROBC the project will begin the pre-implementation and procurement phases as described in Section 10 of the business case.

## **5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION**

### **5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance**

5.1.1 The Corporate Plan 2013-16 sets out the following priorities:

- Promote responsible growth, development and success across the borough: the proposed re-provision of the council's leisure facilities will support growth

and create ‘destinations’ which integrate sport and physical activity with open and green spaces and places people want to go to.

- Support families and individuals that need it – promoting independence, learning and well-being: a new contract with a focus on sports development and public health measures will encourage people in Barnet to keep fit and active and therefore support their wellbeing as well as contribute to address issues such as social isolation.
- Improve the satisfaction of residents and businesses with the London Borough of Barnet as a place to live, work and study: the proposed re-provision of the council’s leisure estate will provide facilities that meet the needs of Barnet residents and that they can be proud of.

5.1.2 The project will directly support the themes of ‘wellbeing in the community’ and ‘how we live’ from the Health and Wellbeing Strategy through the delivery of the SPA Strategy by the FAB Partnership Board and the procurement specifications.

## **5.2 Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)**

5.2.1 The capital funding required to support the re-provision of Church Farm and Copthall leisure centres will be financed from the sources listed below:

	<b>£m</b>
Prudential Borrowing	18.55
Infrastructure Reserve	3.40
Sport England	0.75
Capital Receipt	0.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23.20</b>

5.2.2 Based on the estimations from the feasibility study, from 2017/18 the income from the re-provisioned leisure centres will contribute to the repayment and interest on the prudential loan with the remaining expenditure covered by the residual leisure centre budget. The table below illustrates the income and expenditure in an average year.

5.2.3 The underpinning financial model has been based on a cautious view and makes the following assumptions;

- Potential income resulting from any ‘new’ Finchley and Hendon sites is not included.
- The report has assumed that the £9.4m and £11.5m capital required to re-provision these centres will come from the respective developers of these locations.
- The PWLB borrowing is over 25 years and at a 4.5% interest rate.

- The costs associated with the works identified in the condition survey for Finchley, Hendon and Burnt Oak have been included. These should be incurred if there is no re-provision (assumption 1).

	<b>£'000</b>
<b>New Leisure Contract Income</b>	
Church Farm	(205)
Barnet Copthall	(415)
Finchley	(243)
Hendon	(83)
Burnt Oak	(125)
<b>Total (Income)/Expenditure</b>	<b>(1,071)</b>
<b>Condition Survey Repairs</b>	
Finchley	24
Hendon	121
Burnt Oak	111
<b>Total Condition Survey Repairs</b>	<b>256</b>
<b>Net Revenue before Loan Costs</b>	<b>(815)</b>
Loan payments	1,250
<b>Net Expenditure/(Income)</b>	<b>435</b>
Residual Budget	(419)
Use of Reserve	(16)
<b>Under/(Overspend)</b>	<b>(0)</b>

5.2.4 The project will deliver an estimated annual income stream of £1.071m from two new leisure centres at Church Farm and Copthall; which will be used to offset the cost of capital investment from prudential borrowing.

5.2.5 The table below shows expected financial benefits that the project will deliver. The savings are profiled against the current management fee. It should be noted that the Council has previously assumed these savings and therefore this project will deliver the Council's previously agreed revenue saving of £967,000 per annum for leisure provision from 2017/18.

	2017/2018 £'000 pa	10 year costs £'000
<b>Baseline leisure management cost</b>	1,386	13,860
<b>Current budget <sup>1</sup></b>	419	4,190

<sup>1</sup> excludes budget for insurance



<b>Projected net expenditure<sup>2</sup></b>	0	0
<b>Savings</b>	<b>967</b>	<b>9,670</b>

5.2.6 Non-financial benefits include a 15% increase in participation in sport and physical activity over the duration of the new contract; increased satisfaction from council-owned leisure centres; better used of green spaces and a more integrated offer across sport and physical activity

#### 5.2.7 **Cost for the Next Project Phase**

5.2.8 The costs shown in the table below represent costs required to complete pre-implementation phase and to procure a new leisure provider, totalling **£700k**. The amount required for the pre-implementation phase is for a further **£440k** to be funded from the Transformation Reserve, assuming that the £260k that remains unallocated from previous phases of the SPA project can be used to contribute towards the cost of next phase.

<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Resource</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Project management	Full-time	£65,000
Commercial lead	Full-time	£178,300
Procurement	Part-time	£125,000
Specialist Public Health England advice	Commissioned externally	£30,000
Specialist Leisure advice	Commissioned externally	£10,000
Specialist Legal advice (leisure management and D&B)	Commissioned externally	£100,000
Full public consultation	Part in house/ part commissioned	£80,000
Health & Safety due diligence	Commissioned externally	£5,500
Planning briefs & masterplan for Copthall	Part-time	n/a (costs covered in previous phase)
IT	Part-time	£15,000
15% Contingency	N/A	£91,170
<b>Total cost</b>		<b>£699,970 ≈ £700,000</b>
		<b>-£260,000 (underspend from pre-procurement phase)</b>
<b>One off Budget Requirement</b>		<b>£440,000</b>

5.2.9 Design and build costs - As outlined in previous sections, in order to complete the next phase there is a need to procure professional services to begin work

<sup>2</sup> the costs of borrowing and condition survey work has been offset by the estimated income, Transformation Reserves, capital receipts, SE funding and remaining leisure budget

on the design and build for Church Farm and Barnet Copthall leisure centres. After a procurement exercise, this work could start in second quarter of 2015. The project estimated that £3.03m is required to cover the cost of professional services. This cost has been calculated as a % of the total capital requirement (15% of £20,202,465 = £3,030,370), see table below;

<b>Facility</b>	<b>Capital (estimate)</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Professional fees <sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
Church Farm	£7,765,950		£1,164,893	£8,930,843
Copthall	£12,436,515		£1,865,477	£14,301,992
	£20,202,465		£3,030,370	<b>£23,232,835</b>

5.2.10 The committee should note that professional fees on construction projects vary from 9-15%, a revised capital costs will be presented to P&R in December 2015 once the project finalises designs for Church Farm and Barnet Copthall.

#### 5.2.11 Staffing

5.2.12 Any changes to officer roles as a consequence of the Sport and Physical Activity Team restructure will be subject to the council's Managing Organisational Change Policy to consult employees potentially affected.

### 5.3 Legal and Constitutional References

5.3.1 As part of the previous business case, the council commissioned legal firm Trowers & Hamblins to provide advice on the existing leisure contract with GLL.

5.3.2 If the Committee approves the recommendation to start a re-procurement, the council will need to comply with its Contract Procedure Rules (CPR)

5.3.3 Constitution, Responsibility for Functions, Annex A, sets out the terms of reference of the Policy and Resources Committee.

5.3.4 HB Public will advise on the procurement process and will draft the contract documents for both the Design & Build and the Leisure Management Services Contract as required.

5.3.5 HB Public Law has been consulted on this matter and its comments have been incorporated into the body of this report.

### 5.4 Risk Management

---

<sup>3</sup> Prices include VAT

- 5.4.1 The key risks relating to the recommended option are outlined below. A more complete list of risks and dependencies is included in the Revised Outline Business Case at section 10.9.
- 5.4.2 There are two high impact risks around the residents not supporting the SPA vision and the re-provision of Church Farm leisure centre. These will be addressed through the next phase of public consultation.
- 5.4.3 There are also no guarantees for achieving planning permissions for the re-location of Church Farm or the re-provision of Copthall. The risk this represents would have a high impact on the success of the project and has been partly addressed through the work already done in the feasibility study. Further work will be conducted as part of the development of Copthall masterplan and detailed planning briefs for Danegrove Playing Fields and Victoria Recreation Ground.
- 5.4.4 There are also risks around the procurement process attracting enough competition from the market. It is vital that the procurement process gets sufficient interest from the market to ensure a good competition for the leisure management contract. The work the council has done through the soft market testing has raised the profile of the council's upcoming procurement with the market. There will be further soft market testing with potential suppliers during the next phase of the project.

## **5.5 Equalities and Diversity**

- 5.5.1 The objectives of the project are to increase participation across all user groups and to ensure improved sport and physical activity provision for all residents in the borough.
- 5.5.2 The council and all other organisations exercising public functions on its behalf are required under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act; advance equality of opportunity between those with a protected characteristic and those without; promote good relations between those with a protected characteristic and those without. Barnet considers the impact of its proposals on the groups identified as protected characteristics in the 2010 Equality Act -Age, disability, ethnicity race and national origins, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, religion and belief sexual orientation.
- 5.5.3 The following other individuals and groups who might need extra help/can experience barriers and disadvantage are also included as relevant:
- Disabled people
  - Women
  - Carers
  - Lone parents
  - Unemployed people
  - Young people not in employment education or training
  - People with a low income

- 5.5.4 The council published its Strategic Equalities Objective as part of the 2013 – 2016 Corporate Plan. The objective is enshrined in the constitution and states that citizens will be treated equally, with understanding and respect; have equal opportunity with other citizens; and receive quality services provided to Best Value principles.
- 5.5.5 As part of the Outline Business Case, initial consultation and engagement was conducted with a sample of Barnet's residents with representatives from the varied communities and user groups within the borough, including residents with protected characteristics, to understand their needs and views on the current and future leisure service provision and to inform a desktop equality impact assessment (EIA).
- 5.5.6 This early equality analysis suggests that the outcomes of the project will not discriminate against any group and indicate a potential overall positive impact for the proposals. The proposals will also contribute to Barnet's strategic equalities objective by enabling all Barnet's residents to share the benefits of growth and improve life expectancy. Latest public health data (May 2014) shows the borough life expectancy for 2010-12 as Male life expectancy at birth as 81.4 years (2010-12 data) and Female life expectancy at birth as 84.5 years (2010-12 data). Men in Barnet live on average 2.2 years longer than the England average and women 1.5 years longer than the England average
- 5.5.7 Bespoke analysis using ONS Census data 2011 suggests life expectancy for BME groups is broadly in line with the national average and white population. This research shows the lowest life expectancy for Black Caribbean men, Bangladeshi men (77.13) and Pakistani women (80.77). Source Portrait of Modern Britain policy exchange.org.uk.
- 5.5.8 Public Health uses a slope index of inequality based on local deprivation deciles which suggests that men in the most deprived 10% of Barnet live on average 7.8 years less than men in the least deprived 10% of the borough. Women in the most deprived 10% of the borough live on average 5.6 years less than the least deprived 10% of the borough.
- 5.5.9 The current Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2012 to 2015) coordinates a range of different partner priorities. This recognises the particular needs of older people, younger people (particularly NEETs and Troubled Families), people with learning disabilities and mental health problems and people with a lower socio-economic status and all these groups can benefit from the sports and physical activity proposals.
- 5.5.10A rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) was also carried out as part of the previous Outline Business Case to evaluate the impact of the options put forward. The conclusions drawn from the rapid HIA were that the overall benefit of a re-procurement of the contract outweighs all other in terms of achieving sustainable, long-term and cost effective public health outcomes. If this option is approved, it is recommended that a full HIA is conducted in the next phase. A detailed HIA will provide valuable information into the effects of

any such changes on the local community especially the vulnerable groups.

5.5.11 The EIA is attached to the Revised OBC at Appendix 3. It is currently showing a significant positive impact.

5.5.12 Both the EIA and HIA will be updated in the next phase of the project to inform further decisions required by Members.

## **5.6 Consultation and Engagement**

5.6.1 As part of the pre-procurement phase the council carried out the third stage of consultation associated with the SPA project, including a market research exercise and an open online survey with 853 residents.

5.6.2 The purpose of this phase was to allow LBB to engage with, and listen to, members of the public about a wide range of important issues relating to sport and physical activity, including:

- current use of leisure facilities
- drivers and barriers to participation
- facilities mix for future council-owned leisure centres
- public views on receiving health services on site
- improvements to park-based activities
- testing scenarios for relocation options for Church Farm and Finchley Lido and
- leisure management alternatives.

5.6.3 SPA consultation was split into two streams, namely open consultation and market research.

- The open consultation included a borough wide online survey which was promoted through Engage Barnet website and the council's Communities Together network. Promotional posters were distributed at leisure centres and libraries. A paper copy of the survey was also available upon request. In addition, LBB worked in collaboration with Mencap to prepare and promote an easy read version of the survey.
- Market research exercise was carried out by Opinion Research Services (ORS), a company procured by the council for this purpose. ORS conducted a telephone survey; four area based workshops taking place in the catchment area of each centre; and four focus groups aimed at priority groups and those covered by protective characteristics. All participants were randomly recruited by researchers at the ORS Social Research Call Centre using a combination of Random Digit Dialling (RDD) and a purchased sample of mobile telephone numbers targeted at residents aged under 35. Targets were set for ORS research activities to ensure there was a cross section of the population, in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, faith and disability etc.

5.6.4 Findings from the SPA consultation exercise were used to inform the feasibility study report to ensure all options are thoroughly tested and key

decisions and appraisal of the potential options can be made in an informed manner.

- 5.6.5 The next, final phase of SPA consultation (planned for May 2015) will include full public consultation and stakeholder engagement.
- 5.6.6 Stakeholder management is outlined in Section 10.11. Public consultation is included in a high level timeline, Section 10.5
- 5.6.7 Finally, a summary of findings from consultation is presented below; see Appendix 5 for the full report.

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 6.1 Cabinet Resources Committee, 27 September 2011 (Decision item 15) – approved the negotiation of terms, with the Contractor, Greenwich Leisure Limited, for termination of the current Leisure Management Contract. <http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=151&MeetingId=456&DF=27%2f09%2f2011&Ver=2>
- 6.2 Cabinet Resources Committee, 18 October 2012 (Decision item 15) – approved the Sport and Physical Activity Strategic Outline Case, including the draft SPA Strategy Statement. <http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=4416>
- 6.3 Cabinet Resources Committee, 4 November 2013 (Decision item 5) – approved the Sport and Physical Activity Outline Business Case. <http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=5035>
- 6.4 Health and Well-Being Board, 12 June 2014 (agenda item 14) – approved the establishment of the Fit and Active Barnet (FAB) Partnership Board and noted the Sport and Physical Activity (SPA) Strategy delivery plan <http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s15393/Fit%20and%20Active%20Barnet%20Partnership%20Board%20and%20Sport%20and%20Physical%20Activity%20Strategy%20Delivery%20Plan.pdf>
- 6.5 Policy and Resources Committee, 21 July 2014 (agenda Item 8) – approved the Sport and Physical Activity Outline Business Case. <http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=692&MIId=7860>