

# Leisure Centres Key Statistics 2010/11

Appendix A

	Year built	FTEs	Income 2010/11 Forecast £000s	Costs Note 5 £000s	Deficit excl. maint. £000s	Visits Note 6	Deficit per visit excl. maint.	Maintenance Note 4 £000s	Projected impact if closed (note 7)					LeedsCard 09/10	
									visits lost Note 2	Incomesaving lost income transfer £k	inc. saving per lost visit	"Extra" Visits	60+ Visits		
AIREBOROUGH	1967	31	827	899	-71	340,000	-£0.21	50	238,000	70%	319	£	1.34	8,682	18,399
ARMLEY (note 1)	2010	28	876	735	142	318,684			not estimated						
BRAMLEY BATHS	1904	19	384	516	-131	119,500	-£1.10	40	47,800	40%	362	£	7.57	9,054	8,639
EAST LEEDS	1985	23	304	646	-342	137,307	-£2.49	50	68,654	50%	494	£	7.20	9,649	7,389
FEARNVILLE	1980	25	451	661	-210	222,611	-£0.94	50	133,567	60%	390	£	2.92	14,060	7,898
GARFORTH	1970s	18	432	533	-101	135,000	-£0.75	30	67,500	50%	317	£	4.70	3,088	4,916
HOLT PARK	1976	25	517	792	-275	200,000	-£1.37	60	130,000	65%	456	£	3.51	12,460	12,836
JOHN CHARLES	2007	72	1,709	2,806	-1,097	854,320	-£1.28	100	598,024	70%	1,610	£	2.69	12,730	19,480
JOHN SMEATON	2007	28	788	795	-7	320,886	-£0.02	30	176,487	55%	361	£	2.05	9,618	9,473
KIPPAX	1973	18	280	534	-254	120,000	-£2.12	40	72,000	60%	366	£	5.08	4,002	7,647
KIRKSTALL	1983	25	655	799	-144	230,000	-£0.63	40	115,000	50%	472	£	4.10	14,134	13,032
MIDDLETON (note 3)	1970s	16	225	455	-230	116,000	-£1.98	40	58,000	50%	342	£	5.90	10,977	3,939
MORLEY (note 1)	2010	33	1,499	1,021	478	499,620			not estimated						
OTLEY	1974	2	97	137	-39	64,969	-£0.61	15	38,981	60%	78	£	2.00	n.a.	n.a.
PUDSEY	1928	33	728	805	-77	250,000	-£0.31	50	163,500	65%	329	£	2.01	11,327	19,022
ROTHWELL	1974	37	990	931	59	340,000	£0.17	60	238,000	70%	238	£	1.00	11,615	18,133
SCOTT HALL	1980	34	770	792	-22	350,000	-£0.06	40	245,000	70%	253	£	1.03	19,767	11,542
WETHERBY	1975	21	453	618	-166	191,000	-£0.87	40	152,800	80%	256	£	1.68	4,604	16,000
ALL SITES		488	11,986	14,473	-2,487	4,809,896	-£0.52	735						155,767	178,345

Note 1: PFI site figures are not comparable - they exclude unitary charge (including energy, maintenance and many running costs)

Note 2: some visits would transfer to other centres; this estimate is based on geography, known use patterns and experience elsewhere.

Note 3: Middleton figures are for the whole leisure centre, but the proposal is to close just the pool.

Note 4: figures are typical historic figures. Most centres need increasing maintenance to stay open.

Note 5: costs exclude maintenance and are 2010/11 forecast less savings projected from current staff review

Note 6: historic figure plus projected full year effect of ending free swimming schemes.

Note 7: Full year effect. It is not proposed to close Bramley, Garforth or Middleton, but this presentation allows like-for-like comparison.