

	<h2>Policy and Resources Committee</h2> <h3>16 December 2015</h3>
Title	The relocation and redevelopment of Church Farm Leisure Centre and the redevelopment of Barnet Cophall Leisure Centre
Report of	Commissioning Director, Adults and Health
Wards	All Wards
Status	Public
Urgent	No
Key	Yes
Enclosures	Appendix 1 – SPA Phase 4 consultation Appendix 2 – Health Impact Assessment Appendix 3 – Key Risks
Officer Contact Details	Andy Spriggs SPA project Commercial Lead andy.spriggs@barnet.gov.uk James Beck SPA Project Manager james.beck@barnet.gov.uk

<h2>Summary</h2>
<p>This paper sets out the recommendation and supporting evidence on where the Council should build its new leisure centre as a replacement for Church Farm, considering the two options of Danegrove Playing Field and Victoria Recreation Ground, as agreed at the Policy and Resources Committee in February 2015. The evidence set out in this report, from full public consultation, Health Impact Assessment, planning advice and initial design work supports Victoria Recreation Ground as the most suitable site.</p> <p>Building a new facility in Victoria Recreation Ground provides an opportunity to create a destination within the borough that integrates an indoor facility with an open space. The long term benefits of such an approach are to maximise health improvement outcomes and to provide real opportunities to increase participation.</p> <p>The recommended facilities mix agreed by Policy and Resources Committee in February 2015 for both sites, Barnet Cophall and the Church Farm replacement, has been endorsed by the most recent consultation.</p>

The report asks the committee to approve Victoria Recreation ground as the preferred location for the new Church Farm and approve the core facilities mix for both the New Church Farm and Cophall centres.

The report provides information on the consultation results and key milestones for the project.

Recommendations

That the Policy and Resources Committee

- 1. Approves the selection of Victoria Recreation Ground as the site for a new leisure centre to replace the existing Church Farm facility, based on evidence from the public consultation, Health Impact assessment, planning guidelines and feasibility (as set out in paragraph 2.14 of this report).**
- 2. Approves the core facilities mix for the new leisure centre in Victoria Recreation Ground, as set out in paragraph 2.17 of this report.**
- 3. Approves the core facilities mix for the new leisure centre in Barnet Cophall, as set out in paragraph 2.21 of this report.**
- 4. Notes the consultation findings in respect of the two potential locations for the re-provided Church Farm Leisure Centre. (Appendix 1)**
- 5. Notes the consultation findings in respect of the core facilities mix for the new leisure centre in Victoria Recreation Ground. (Appendix 1)**
- 6. Notes the consultation findings in respect of the core facilities mix for the new leisure centre in Barnet Cophall. (Appendix 1)**
- 7. Notes the findings of the Health Impact Assessment, as set out in paragraphs 2.6 – 2.8 of this report and at appendix 2.**
- 8. Notes the planned milestones for the next phase of the project. (Paragraph 4.1)**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1** In February 2015, the Policy & Resources Committee (P&R) approved a Revised Outline Business Case (ROBC) setting out recommendations for re-providing the Church Farm and Cophall leisure centres through a design and build process, together with a separate procurement for a replacement leisure management contract designed to improve the health and wellbeing of Barnet residents.
- 1.2** As a result of the ROBC, the Policy and Resources committee approved that the Danegrove Playing Field, Victoria Recreation Ground and Cophall sites were taken through to the next stage of the project, for further public consultation and consideration by Planning.

- 1.3 Since the ROBC was approved in February 2015, the Council has produced a Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Barnet, 2016 – 2020. The strategy highlights a number of mechanisms and outcomes where sport and physical activity can contribute to improving health and wellbeing in Barnet.
- 1.4 This report recommends which site should be taken through to RIBA Stage 2 design and thereafter the Council planning process and the facilities that both new buildings should contain.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The recommendations contained in this report on the facilities mix for the two re-provided leisure centres (Barnet Cophall and the replacement for Church Farm) and the location for the new facility in the north of the borough, to replace Church Farm Leisure Centre, are based on:
 - An updated feasibility study, with additional ecological and topographical surveys for each site.
 - Public consultation. The consultation was carried out using on-line and paper surveys, 12 drop-in sessions and a series of focus groups. The findings were compiled and analysed by Opinion Research Services (ORS) procured by the project to perform this function.
 - A Health Impact Assessment. This has been carried out by the Barnet Public Health team and assesses the potential health impact of the proposed new leisure centres, including both potential locations for the Church Farm replacement.
 - Planning briefs. These assess the planning constraints and issues for the Danegrove Playing Field and Victoria Recreation Ground sites.
 - Further design work. The Council continues to progress the design process and this work has informed recommendations on the suitability of the two potential sites for the re-provided Church Farm Leisure Centre.

Locations for the re-provided Church Farm Leisure Centre: comparison of Danegrove Playing Field and Victoria Recreation Ground

Consultation Conclusions

- 2.2. The majority of drop-in attendees and focus group participants favoured Victoria Recreation Ground. However, there was also some support for a new leisure centre on Danegrove Playing Field.
- 2.3. Results from the survey questionnaires show respondents had similar preference levels for either site. 35% supported Option A (Danegrove Playing Field - DPF) and 34% supported Option B (Victoria Recreation Ground -VRG).

24% had no preference for which site was used and 7% did not want anything to be built on existing green spaces.

- 2.4. Although the survey evidence shows a fairly even balance of opinion for either site, there was a clear steer from the drop-in sessions and focus groups in favour of building the new leisure centre at Victoria Recreation Ground due to the opportunities for a 'destination build', growing catchment and position as a community and family area.
- 2.5. Respondents were concerned about the impact of increases to traffic in the area around the new centre's location, regardless of which site was selected. However, consultation participants felt it would be more manageable at VRG.

Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Conclusions

- 2.6. Utilising the HIA toolkit, the Public Health team developed a scoring system for weighting overall positive and negative ratings for each of the sites. Developed to quantify resident's feedback, the positive/negative scoring gives a clear picture of residents' overall opinions on the health benefits and impacts from each site.
- 2.7. The final scoring system can be found in the full HIA at Appendix 2. The overall scores are below and demonstrate a stronger positive impact for VRG, along with a lower negative impact:
 - Danegrove Playing Field – Positive **(+ve 304)**, Negative **(-ve 58)**
 - Victoria Recreation Ground – Positive **(+ve 355)**, Negative **(-ve 30)**
- 2.8. Overall, participants felt that a new, modern leisure centre would have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of residents. In relation to the negative impacts, concerns raised were mostly in relation to increased traffic and levels of pollution (air/noise). In terms of comparison between the two sites, participants felt that a new leisure centre in Victoria Recreation Ground would be more beneficial than Danegrove playing field.

Site Analysis

- 2.9. Detailed site analysis during this phase has given more clarity to the construction costs as they apply both to Danegrove Playing Field and Victoria Recreation Ground. Each has constraints and advantages that can affect the cost of a build, but there are more significant issues at the Danegrove Playing Field site.
- 2.10. The most significant physical constraint of DPF is its topography. The site is on a natural slope down to Park Road. In order to build on this location, the ground will need to be levelled and a retaining wall constructed at an estimated cost of £1.8 - £2m.
- 2.11. The recommended facilities mix would also take up a large proportion of the DPF site. Although initial designs show that it could accommodate the

Council's requirements, discussions with planning officers have indicated that a building of this mass, or one which is built over two storeys, might struggle to achieve planning approval. There is also concern that due to neighbouring residential properties, disruption caused by the construction process would be an issue for the planning committee to consider.

- 2.12. A further constraint presented by the Danegrove site is its position on a busy crossroads. The site is on the corner of Cat Hill, which links the A111 and the A110. There have already been several accidents at this busy junction and it is likely that a new build would increase traffic in this area.
- 2.13. The Victoria Recreation Ground site is flat, well drained and does not have the physical constraints of DPF. Initial traffic surveys suggest that any traffic issues would be more manageable at Victoria Recreation Ground than Danegrove Playing Field.

Site Recommendation

- 2.14. Based on the evidence discussed in this report, the recommended site for the re-provided Church Farm Leisure Centre is Victoria Recreation Ground. Whilst both sites had support from residents in the quantitative survey results, there was a more positive assessment by participants of Victoria Recreation Ground from both the qualitative research and the Health Impact Assessment (HIA). The recommendation is also based on planning guidelines, build feasibility and costs.
- 2.15. The recommended site gives the Council the opportunity to integrate an indoor facility with a well-loved open space, supporting health outcomes and creating a destination that encourages increased participation in physical activity.
- 2.16. During this phase of the project, residents' concerns regarding increased traffic volumes have been identified. It is also clear that building on one of the Council's valued green spaces needs to be handled sensitively. These will be priorities for the project to address as it moves through the planning process.

Facilities Mix

Core Facility Mix for the re-provided Church Farm Leisure Centre.

- 2.17. The facilities mix proposed in the ROBC of February 2015 was supported by the public consultation conducted during this phase of the project. The recommended facilities mix for the re-provided Church Farm leisure centre therefore is:
 - 25m, 6 lane, community swimming pool
 - 13m x 8m learner swimming pool
 - Village change facilities
 - Café (circa 180 sq. m)
 - Fitness suite – 75 stations (350 sq. m)

- Flexible studio space (circa 230 sq. m)
 - Dedicated dry fitness change
 - Spectator viewing for both pools
 - Pool store, staff accommodation, admin space and plant room
- 2.18. There was almost universal support for cafés in the new leisure centres during the drop-in sessions and focus groups. They were seen as offering socialising opportunities for centre users and non-users. However, cafes were seen as a lower priority in the questionnaire results.
- 2.19. A sports hall is not recommended for inclusion at the re-provided Church Farm centre. The design work for both the Danegrove and Victoria Recreation ground locations indicates that the size of a sports hall would make including one on either of these sites difficult. There is insufficient room at Danegrove and at Victoria recreation ground, a sports hall would become too dominating a feature in planning terms.
- 2.20. The questionnaire responses showed that 65% of respondents would consider accessing library services from a leisure centre. Further work is being undertaken to explore the feasibility of this.

Copthall Core Facilities Mix

- 2.21. The facilities mix proposed in the ROBC of February 2015 was supported by the public consultation during this phase of the project. The recommended facilities mix for the new Copthall leisure centre therefore is:
- 25m, 8 lane, regional short course swimming pool (static floor) with spectator viewing area and poolside competitor seating
 - 25m, 6 lane, community swimming pool (static floor) with poolside spectator seating
 - 13m x 8m learner swimming pool (static floor)
 - Village change (subject to ASA / Sport England derogation)
 - Café (circa 250sq m)
 - Fitness suite – 110 stations
 - Flexible studio space
 - Dedicated dry fitness change
 - Timing room / managers office
 - Pool store, staff accommodation, admin space and plant room
- 2.22. For the proposed new Copthall leisure centre, the consultation survey ranked the 2 x 25m pools, learner pool and fitness centre/gym as the top priorities. Dance studios, sports hall and diving provision were medium priorities and a café and crèche, low priorities.
- 2.23. In the drop-in sessions and focus groups, studios and sport hall provision were ranked more highly and a café was seen as a significant enhancement to the wider Copthall site.

- 2.24. The aquatics programme at Copthall is a large and successful one. The majority of the programme focuses on school swimming sessions, learn to swim clubs and sessions involving the Barnet Copthall Swimming Club. Diving is a small proportion of the total programme.
- 2.25. The previous feasibility study concluded that the inclusion of diving would make the final scheme less affordable, as it would both increase capital costs and have a negative impact on income projections. Further work has shown that the inclusion of diving provision would increase the capital costs by £675,920. Swimming lessons are a more economically viable use of this water space whilst inclusion of diving would have a negative impact on income and hence overall affordability.
- 2.26. The earlier feasibility study indicated that whilst competitions could be held at Barnet Copthall due to the 5m platform, there are limitations to the current building, in particular the low ceilings, which mean competitions cannot be held. However, the primary limiting factor for clubs is the availability of dry side facilities, e.g. time in sports halls with dry diving boards on to crash mats, trampolines, wall bars and storage space. Without a 'dry side' at Copthall, the ability to operate competitive diving and training is limited, whilst other opportunities to participate in diving are sited at 'regional' facilities within a 5-10 mile radius of Barnet. On this basis it is recommended that diving provision is excluded from the facilities mix for the new leisure centre at Barnet Copthall.
- 2.27. The inclusion of a sports hall or spa facilities, whilst supported within the qualitative consultation, also represent significant capital investment. Visits to other similar sites and stakeholder discussions during this phase have shown that they have the potential to generate enough revenue to cover their capital costs. The overarching principal of this project has been to deliver services that are cost neutral to the Council. Work will be done during the next phase to assess if these facilities could be included in the final designs on a cost neutral basis.
- 2.28. The drop-in sessions and focus groups demonstrated some interest in a 50m pool instead of the 2 x 25m pool option. After discussions with stakeholders, leisure management companies and some reference site visits, the 50m option has been discounted for the following reasons:
- The Sport England Facilities Planning Model showed that the pools at Copthall are 'uncomfortably busy', with GLL, the current leisure management contractor, indicating that their swimming programme is greater than 90% utilised. A 50m configuration would lead to a reduction in the number of swimming lessons that could be held at any one time. This will decrease participation and affect affordability of the scheme.
 - The council is aiming to increase participation levels across all target groups a three pool configuration (2 x 25m and a learner pool) gives greater flexibility to provide a full aquatics programme that can accommodate competition, community and casual usage.

- Increased maintenance costs would be required for competitive as opposed to casual and learner swimming.
- Increased staffing costs would be incurred for the 50m option as a greater number of operational staff would be required to operate programme changes/adaptations.
- A 50m pool increases the cost of utilities and energy consumption rates. There is greater efficiency in providing a three pool programme structure.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1. The report has considered both DPF and VRG as potential sites for the re-provided Church Farm. DPF is not recommended on the basis on consultation and HIA results, planning constraints and build feasibility and costs.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1. Pending approval by the Policy and Resources Committee of the recommendations within this report, the project will begin working towards the key milestones detailed below.

Key milestone	Forecast Deadline
Leisure Management Procurement Launch Event	01/02/16
RIBA Stage 2 - Concept And Design Report Due	17/02/15
Assessment of Library/Sports Hall	16/02/16
SPA - Strategy Commissioned	13/04/16
RIBA Stage 3 - Detailed Design Report Due	06/05/16
Planning Submission	16/05/16
Cost Certainty & Final Costs	01/09/16
Construction Contract Award	16/09/16
Leisure Management Procurement Documents Sign off	01/10/16
Planning Decision	10/10/16
Leisure Management PQQ stage commencement	01/11/16
Start On Site	10/11/16
Leisure Management ITT Stage 1 commencement	01/02/17

Leisure Management ITT Stage 2 negotiation	15/04/17
Final Business Case P&R Approval	15/06/17
New Leisure Mgmt. Contract Award	21/06/17
New Leisure Mgmt. Contract Starts	01/01/18
RIBA Stage 6 - Handover And Close Out Begins	01/06/18
New Leisure Centres Open	28/10/18

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

Corporate Priorities and Performance

5.1. The Corporate Plan 2015-20 sets out the following strategic objectives in ensuring that Barnet is a place:-

- Of opportunity, where people can further their quality of life.
The proposed re-provision of the Council's leisure facilities will create destinations which integrate sport and physical activity with open spaces which people will want to go to.
- Where people are helped to help themselves, recognising that prevention is better than cure.
The new leisure management 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 addressing issues such as social isolation.
- Where services are delivered efficiently to get value for money for the taxpayer.
The proposed re-provision of the Council's leisure estate will provide facilities and services that residents will continue to value and that meet their needs whilst remaining affordable.

5.2. The project will directly support the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Barnet 2016 – 2020 and its commitment to increase wellbeing through participation in sport and physical activity across the borough.

5.3. Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)

Capital cost estimates

5.3.1. The feasibility study commissioned during the previous project phase suggested a best cost estimate for the two proposed new centres. Due to the high level nature of this estimate, and the volatility of the construction market, the study included a range of costs that the final construction could fall into. At P&R committee in February 2015, the committee approved a cost range from

£18m to £35m, with an initial budget set at £23.2m.

- 5.3.2. In this phase of the project, more detailed investigation into the sites and functionality of buildings has been considered, resulting in current cost projections still sitting in the previously predicted range. The current cost projection is £30.4m.
- 5.3.3. Benchmarking of the capital costs has been commissioned by the Council through an independent provider, FOCUS, to establish if these estimates are reasonable and comparable with competitive market prices. This benchmarking work will be undertaken at each of the RIBA stages as work progresses.
- 5.3.4. Sport England (SE) will be carrying out a full technical review of the project and conducting site visits at Church Farm, Victoria Recreation Ground and Barnet Copthall to provide expert input and assurance of the Council's work.
- 5.3.5. The project is still at the early stages in terms of design and is waiting for approval of the Victoria Recreation Ground site so that it can continue into RIBA stage 2 (concept design), followed by RIBA Stage 3 (detailed design) and RIBA Stage 4 (technical design). Construction work is scheduled to start in November 2016. If further capital budget is required, approval will be sought at this time.

Leisure Centre Income Predictions

- 5.3.6. The feasibility study estimated the potential income for each of the Council's five leisure centres and calculated the likely cost of running the individual facilities to create a model of the total average annual income that the Council could reasonably expect from the whole leisure estate. This assumed that the two new centres would become operational towards the end of 2018.
- 5.3.7. More information on predicted population increase and further research commissioned from Sport England have enabled the initial estimates to be revised, showing an increase in income levels, above those predicted in the original feasibility study.
- 5.3.8. The leisure management procurement will be key to delivering the predicted income, with a guaranteed annual income figure a condition of the new contract. Soft market testing will be carried out in early 2016, which the project will use to develop the income projections further.
- 5.3.9. The ROBC took the capital cost estimates and income predictions from the feasibility study and showed that, with CIL money, and prudential borrowing funded from income predictions, the Council could afford to build the two proposed leisure centres,
- 5.3.10. Updated financial analysis indicates that this is still the case, as increased capital costs can be offset by increased income of £1.5m per annum. Capital costs will be scrutinised with gateways at the end of each significant RIBA

stage. The Council will also work with partners and stakeholders to explore sources of external funding.

5.4. Social Value

5.4.1. The project will be beginning its procurement phase during 2016 at which point all social value implications, in accordance with the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2013, will be considered.

5.5. Legal and Constitutional References

5.5.1. Constitution, Responsibility for Functions, Annex A, sets out the terms of reference of the Policy and Resources Committee and states that 'if any report comes with the remit of more than one committee, to avoid the report being discussed at several committees the report will be presented and determined at the most appropriate committee. If this is not clear, then the report will be discussed and determined by the Policy and Resources Committee'.

5.5.2. In this case the report recommendations cut across the Adults and Safeguarding Committee, whose commissioning plan contains this project, and the Assets Regeneration and Growth committee. The SPA Revised Outline Business Case also gave a commitment to return to the Policy and Resources Committee at this phase of the project.

5.5.3. HB Public Law will advise on the procurement process and will draft the contract documents for the Leisure Management Services Contract as required.

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

5.6. Risk Management

5.6.1. The key risks relating to the recommended options are outlined in appendix 3.

5.7. Equalities and Diversity

5.6.1. The objectives of the project are to increase participation across all population groups and to ensure that improved sport and physical activity provision in the borough reflects the diverse needs of Barnet residents.

5.6.2. As part of this document, consultation and engagement were conducted with Barnet residents and discussions with community groups were carried out. The consultation process involved eight focus groups for residents with protected characteristics, to understand their needs and views on the current and future leisure service provision and to inform the equality impact assessment (EIA) for the project. The focus groups were: young people; leisure centre non-users; BME people; women; older people; people with

learning disabilities; deprived communities and people with physical disabilities.

- 5.6.3. The equality analysis suggested that the outcomes of the project would not discriminate against any group and indicate a potential overall positive impact of the proposals. The EIA will be reviewed at every stage of the project.
- 5.6.4. A full Health Impact Assessment was carried out during this phase and is detailed below in section 5.7.16 and at Appendix 2.
- 5.6.5. Both the EIA and HIA will be updated in the next phase of the project to inform future decisions by Members.

5.8. Consultation and Engagement

- 5.7.1. The purpose of the consultation conducted during this phase was to engage directly with the residents of Barnet to gather their views on: the facilities to be included in both new leisure centres; the location of the new facility in the north of the borough; and alternative services that people would consider receiving from their local centre e.g. library services.
- 5.7.2. The consultation took place between June-September 2015, involving: twelve drop-in sessions; eight focus groups; a twitter campaign; face to face meetings; fortnightly e-bulletins; local and targeted advertising; e-mails to leisure centre members; and an open online survey. 512 online and 446 paper questionnaires were completed. There were 365 attendees at the twelve drop in sessions and 80 participants in the 8 focus groups. The final consultation report also considered 8 written submissions, leading to a total of 1411 responses.
- 5.7.3. The delivery of the consultation was split into two streams: the open engagement was carried out by London Borough of Barnet (LBB); the independent opinion research and reporting was carried out by an external supplier - Opinion Research Services (ORS). The open engagement dealt directly with developing and delivering methods for residents to provide their opinions to LBB through the online questionnaire, paper questionnaire and drop-in sessions. ORS provided an impartial opinion gathering service to determine resident's opinions and thoughts on the proposals, which they collated and reported.
- 5.7.4. It should be noted that the findings from the drop-in sessions and focus groups (qualitative results) are described in greater detail within the narrative of the consultation (Appendix 1) and show participants' understanding of the topics explored during these events.
- 5.7.5. The results from the online survey and paper questionnaire (quantitative results) are represented in terms of percentage responses for each question option.

Health Impact Assessment

- 5.7.6. In order to ask relevant questions about the factors that have a direct and/or indirect impact on the health of individuals, Barnet Public Health (PH) team used the consultation drop-in sessions. This enabled the team to have face to face discussions and understand residents' views of how the leisure centre proposals would impact on the surrounding area and affect their own personal health and wellbeing.
- 5.7.7. The PH team devised a visual approach to gather opinion. They designed a chart that led participants to consider the positive or negative impact of a particular health related question when considering the impact of a new building in each of the proposed locations.
- 5.7.8. In each chart, thirteen key questions were asked, divided into four main criteria, to measure both the direct and indirect impact of new leisure centre for each of the proposed sites.

5.8. Insight

- 5.8.1 Insight information was used in the previous Revised Outline Business Case, which informed the consultation and communications planning for this phase.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Committee 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?CommitteId=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?CId=692&MId=7860>
- 6.6. Policy and Resources Committee, Tuesday 17th February 2015 7.00pm (Agenda Item 9) Sport and Physical Activity Review Revised Outline Business Case <http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=11370#mgDocuments>

Consultation Reports

- 6.7. **Phase 1 2012 – Needs assessment;**
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s16260/Appendix%20C%20-%20SPA%20Needs%20Assessment.pdf>
- 6.8. **Phase 2 2013 – ORS Final report-** https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/adult-social-services/sport-and-physical-activity-review/user_uploads/final-leisure-services-report.pdf
- 6.9. **Phase 3 2014 - ORS Final report**

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s21252/Appendix%205%20-%20ORS%20Consultation%20report.pdf>
- 6.10. **Phase 4 2015 - ORS Final report – Appendix 1**

https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/adult-social-services/sports-and-physical-activity-cf-copthall/supporting_documents/Barnet%20SPA%20Phase%204%20%20Final%20report%20v6.0.pdf
- 6.11. **Health Impact Assessment (HIA) 2015 – Appendix 2**

https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/adult-social-services/sports-and-physical-activity-cf-copthall/supporting_documents/CF%20%20HIA%202015%20Final.pdf
- 6.12. **SPA Project Key Risks – Appendix 3**