

## SCRUTINY BOARD (CITY DEVELOPMENT)

WEDNESDAY, 20TH APRIL, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Procter in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Atha, B Chastney,  
J Elliott, P Grahame, G Harper, J Jarosz,  
M Lobley, R Pryke, M Rafique and  
M Robinson

B Woroncow (Co-optee – non voting)

**162 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the call-in meeting.

**163 Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

**164 Apologies for Absence and Notification of Substitutes**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors D Atkinson and S Smith.

Notification had been received for Councillor P Grahame to substitute for Councillor D Atkinson and for Councillor B Chasney to substitute for Councillor S Smith.

**165 Call-in of Decision - Briefing Paper**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report regarding the procedural aspects of the call-in process.

Members were advised that the options available to the Board in respect of this particular called-in decision were:-

Option 1 – **Release the decision for implementation.** Having reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board (City Development) could decide to release it for implementation. If this option was chosen, the decision would be released for immediate implementation and the decision could not be called-in again.

Option 2 – **Recommend that the decision be reconsidered.** Having reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board (City Development) may decide to recommend to the decision maker that the decision be reconsidered. If the Scrutiny Board chooses this option a report will be submitted to the Executive Board.

In the case of an Executive Board decision, the report of the Scrutiny Board will be presented to the next available meeting. The Executive Board will reconsider its decision and will publish the outcome of its deliberations within the minutes of the meeting. The decision may not be Called In again whether

or not it was varied.

**RESOLVED** – That the report outlining the call-in procedures be noted.

**166 Call In - Garforth Squash and Leisure Centre**

The Head of Scrutiny and Member Development submitted a report, together with background papers, relating to a review of a decision made by the Executive Board on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011 in relation to 'Garforth Squash and Leisure Centre'.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Copy of the completed call-in request form
- Garforth Squash and Leisure Centre – Report of the Acting Director of City Development submitted to the Executive Board meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011
- Relevant extract of the Executive Board minutes of 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011

The decision had been called-in for review by Councillors A Lamb, D Schofield, B Anderson, C Fox and P Harrand on the following grounds:-

- A lack of clarity of aims and outcomes
- Insufficient information and lack of explanation of all the options considered and details of the reason for the decision taken by the Executive Board
- A lack of openness and transparency and concerns as to what was being proposed
- The 2000 plus named petition of local residents showing the level of local concern
- The lack of a business plan and opportunity to other possible providers
- Concerns about the overall process, particularly the level of detail in the Executive Board report

Councillors A Lamb and D Schofield attended the meeting and gave evidence to the Board as to why they had called this item in and responded to Members' questions and comments.

The following representatives were also in attendance:-

Councillor A Ogilvie, Executive Member with portfolio responsibility for leisure  
Martin Farrington, Acting Director of City Development  
Richard Mond, Chief Recreation Officer, City Development  
Mark Allman, Head of Sport and Active Recreation, City Development

In summary, the main points raised by Councillors A Lamb and D Schofield were the need:-

- The concerns about the overall process, particularly the level of accurate detail in the Executive Board report
- That discussions were ongoing with the School Partnership Trust regarding the lease and potential business plan of the Garforth Squash Club and Leisure Centre which, again, was not reflected within the Executive Board report
- That Garforth Squash and Leisure Centre was viewed as a valuable asset to the Community
- That, in view of the above reasons, the Executive Board report should be referred back for re-consideration

In explaining the reasons for the Executive Board decision, Councillor Ogilvie and officers made the following comments:-

- The need to progress a proposal for community asset transfer for Garforth Sports Centre resulting from a reduction in the sports budget for 2011/12
- The need to recognise that timing was an issue in securing the continuation of a community resource in Garforth
- To recognise that a business plan would be brought forward in due course

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Board Members be put to Councillors Lamb and Schofield, the Executive Board Member and officers on the evidence submitted.

In summary, the main areas of discussion were:-

- Clarification of the discussions to date between the School Partnership Trust and the Garforth Academy
- Clarification of the process to date, together with the involvement between the local Ward Member, the Trust and officers on this issue
- Clarification of the process in relation to the business plan and whether or not consideration had been given to introducing a Plan 'B' should the current proposals not go ahead
- Clarification of the Community Asset transfer process and the leasing arrangements
- Clarification of the future of the bodyline service provided at Garforth Squash and Leisure Centre
- Clarification of the heads of terms that had been drafted and shared with the School Partnership Trust and the reassurances sought that the terms were not similar to the PFI programme
- Clarification of the repairs required at Garforth Squash Club and Leisure Centre estimated to be £348, 650 and whether the Schools Partnership Trust would be responsible for these under the 'repairing obligation' set out in the Heads of Terms

Following this process, the Chair allowed officers and the Call-In signatories to sum up.

In conclusion, the Chair thanked Councillors Lamb and Schofield, together with Councillor Ogilvie and officers for their attendance and contribution to the call in meeting.

**RESOLVED-** That the report and information provided be noted.

**167 Outcome of Call-In**

Following consideration of evidence presented to them, the Board passed the following resolution:-

**RESOLVED** – That the decision be referred back to the Executive Board on the grounds that there were concerns that the School Partnership Trust (SPT) had not agreed to take on this facility, that there was no business plan submitted to Executive Board as to how the future service delivery at this facility for community use will be delivered, no reference to repair costs that will have to be incurred by the Council under the proposed Heads of Term before SPT take on the repairing obligation and that only a single organisation had been approached with a view to transferring the Council's asset.

(The meeting concluded at 2.50pm)