

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration. In all appropriate instances we will need to carry out an equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment.

This form:

- can be used to prompt discussion when carrying out your impact assessment
- should be completed either during the assessment process or following completion of the assessment
- should include a brief explanation where a section is not applicable

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Sport & Active Lifestyles
Lead person: Helen Evans	Contact number: 07891 271769 0113 37 80311
Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment: 21st July 2017	

1. Title: Vision for Leisure and Wellbeing Centres 2017		
Is this a:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy /Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service / Function	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify		

2. Members of the assessment team:

Name	Organisation	Role on assessment team e.g. service user, manager of service, specialist
Helen Evans	LCC	Equality & client rep
Steve Baker	LCC	Business Manager - sport
Mark Allman	LCC	Head of Service - sport
Tim Quirke	LCC	Communications Manager - sport
Ian Waller	LCC	Sport Operations Manager
Gill Keddie	LCC	Development Manager - sport
Jill Gough	PPPU	Programme Manager

3. Summary of strategy, policy, service or function that was assessed:

The Sport and Active Lifestyles service delivers a broad range of activities and programmes to all (universal) as well as various targeted initiatives in leisure centre and community settings. The Sport and Active Lifestyles service currently operates 17 sites with 20 facilities and over 3.5 million people visit annually. In recent years the service as a whole has reduced its net cost significantly, (45% before National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR), through a combination of major staff restructures, closures of Leisure centres, Community transfer, increasing income and reduced hours of operation. The net cost of the whole service (which includes the development and business support functions) is £5.7m with total expenditure of £24.3m and an income target of £18.6m (including grants); the majority of income being from people who choose freely to use the service. Furthermore the controllable net managed budget (once PFI payments and NNDR is excluded) is now just £2.1m for the whole of the service.

The Vision for Leisure Centres was the strategy for the development of LCC leisure provision developed and endorsed by Executive Board in 2009. Many of the proposals have been developed, successfully enhancing leisure provision over the last 7 years – these include:

- opening of new leisure / wellbeing centres in Armley / Morley and Holt Park
- closure of Middleton pool and redevelopment of the site to provide dryside and outdoor facilities
- community asset transfer of Bramley Baths
- 10 centres now have Aspire day rooms
- Richmond Hill Recreation Centre closed 2015
- East Leeds Leisure centre closed 2011
- South Leeds closed 2010
- Scott Hall changing rooms refurbished
- Garforth Leisure Centre refurbished and operating as a racket sport centre of excellence

The Vision now requires updating to take into account changing trends in participation, available funding and LCC budget pressures.

Following extensive work with Sport England, a further update on the Vision for Leisure & Wellbeing Centres was taken to Executive Board in December 2016. The board resolved:

- (a) That a long term vision to secure a network of high quality, affordable, accessible and financially sustainable leisure and wellbeing centres (in particular public swimming pools) for the benefit of all the people of Leeds, be endorsed;
- (b) That the principles for determining the location of leisure and wellbeing centres be agreed, as follows:-
 - (a) on a main arterial route;
 - (b) in a town or district centre; and

- (c) co-located and in partnerships with schools, health services, day centres, libraries or other complementary community facilities;
- (c) That the Director of City Development be requested to bring forward detailed proposals in 2017 for two new Wellbeing Centres to be built: one in Inner East Leeds and one in Rothwell, and that approval be given for the provision of £100k to be made within the Capital Programme in order to support the feasibility studies to this end;
- (d) That approval be given for the hours of operation at Kippax Leisure Centre to be reduced to approximately 58 hours, to commence from April 1st 2017, and that the Director of City Development be requested to bring forward a feasibility report into the re-provision of a swimming pool within the catchment area.
- (e) That the realising of the capital receipt from the sale of the existing Kippax Leisure Centre be approved, and that approval also be given to bringing forward new investment proposals in line with the overall strategy, as set out within the submitted report;
- (f) That the need to support continued prioritised investment in the other existing leisure centres, in order to maximise income and usage, as set out within section 4 of the submitted report, be noted;
- (g) That approval be given to extend the existing capital provision for sport maintenance of £500k per annum for a further 3 years from 2017/18;
- (h) That a cross-party working group be established in order to ensure that moving forward all political groups are involved in the development of the vision.

Following detailed feasibility and options appraisal works, the proposals that will be taken to the September 2017 Executive Board will encompass:

Site	Revised Vision Proposal 2017	Rationale
Armley, Morley, Holt Park Active	Maintain	Well maintained new buildings, don't need further work over the next 5 years.
Aireborough LC	Phase 1 Wetside improvements Phase 2 Refurbishment of dryside facilities	Phase 1 Wetside refurbishment and inclusion of a community hub fully funded. Phase 2 will focus on attracting new users & improving net operating costs.
Fearnville LC	New Wellbeing Centre with outdoor facilities in the Inner East of Leeds. Close Fearnville LC once new site has been completed.	Inner East Leeds SC closed in original vision. Demand for pool space needed in the area currently and possibility to link up to a New School proposal in the Inner East area

John Charles Centre for Sport	Maintain but explore development of other revenue streams	Unique regional sport facility in Leeds. But relatively high running costs, need to continue to explore ways to reduce the overall cost of the facility and activities that are provided.
John Smeaton LC	Re-model with pool extension	Best performing site, demand for the site outstrips supply with proposed housing growth and the extension to pool is to take advantage of this further.
Garforth	Maintain	Garforth has undergone refurbishment and is currently performing well.
Kippax	Bring forward a feasibility report in 2017 into the re-provision of a swimming pool within the catchment area.	Kippax has high net cost per visit, but demand for swimming pool still needs satisfying in the area in the future. The savings from the reduced opening hours of Kippax LC are already included in the budget for 17/18. However the capital costs of re-provision of a pool sits outside this.
Kirkstall LC	Refurbish Wetside changing room	Refurbishment undertaken in some areas, but changing facilities poor which will affect the swimming experience and therefore income. To be developed through sport maintenance budget.
Middleton LC	Maintain and Install new Gym	Pool already closed, and refurbishment to dryside activities and outdoor facilities completed (£1m investment with support from Sport England). Subsidy level dropped, further development of the gym would decrease subsidy further.
Pudsey LC	Refurbish / replace	Condition survey being undertaken to ascertain value of refurbishing or replacing the centre.
Rothwell LC	New Leisure and Wellbeing Centre	Cost of refurbishment high and would require closure of the existing building for a significant period. It is therefore proposed to develop a new build facility and keep the existing site open whilst building the new site to maintain income levels and continuity of service. Integrate other council services where possible.
Scott Hall LC	Maintain but bring forward proposals for a new build site after	Refurbishment of wetside changing rooms completed. Good performing site in a good location but site constraints mean there is limited

	priority sites have been completed.	car parking and building and land constraints will limit the success of a refurbishment.
Wetherby LC	Maintain but explore further options to reduce subsidy level. Bring forward proposals after priority sites have been completed.	High demand for good quality health and fitness in the area. Potential to improve subsidy with development. However, site access issues increases the cost of the development and lowers significantly the potential benefits.

The new Vision for Leisure and Wellbeing Centres focuses on what defines a modern day Local Authority leisure centre and therefore is based on the principles of further integration, colocation and coproduction and building on the success of Holt Park Active. It will align closely with health, social care and wellbeing outcomes, as well as working in partnership with other services and stakeholders. Co-location of facilities and their contribution to wider social outcomes and tackling physical inactivity is at the heart of the new Sport England Strategy (Towards an Active Nation 2016). It is likely to heavily favour any applications for investment for new co-located Leisure/wellbeing Centres. This isn't anything new to the service with centres such as Holt Park Active being an example of how integrated services lead to a successful new development. Focusing on family leisure activities and moving away from an over focus on traditional sport forms will also be needed.

4. Scope of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment (complete - 4a. if you are assessing a strategy, policy or plan and 4b. if you are assessing a service, function or event)

4a. Strategy, policy or plan

(please tick the appropriate box below)

The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes and the supporting guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific section within the strategy, policy or plan	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide detail:

This is a follow up report to the 2016 Vision for Leisure and Wellbeing Centres that was endorsed by Executive Board

4b. Service, function, event

please tick the appropriate box below

	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------

The whole service (including service provision and employment)	
A specific part of the service (including service provision or employment or a specific section of the service)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Procuring of a service (by contract or grant)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please provide detail:	

5. Fact finding – what do we already know
 Make a note here of all information you will be using to carry out this assessment. This could include: previous consultation, involvement, research, results from perception surveys, equality monitoring and customer/ staff feedback.

(priority should be given to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration related information)

The Vision in 2009 involved a wide range consultation with the following groups:

- A citizens' Panel survey
- The distribution of 6,000 user surveys in Leisure Centres and Libraries
- 19 public workshops held in key leisure centres affected.
- Members of Parliament
- Town and Parish Councils
- The Youth Council
- The Equality Forum
- The Learning Disability Partnership Board
- Attendance at the Inner East, Outer East and Inner South Area Committees
- All other Area Committees
- Beeston Hill and Holbeck Regeneration Partnership Board
- Workshops for Garforth Community College and Brigshaw High School.
- Sport Leeds Board
- Sport England
- Primary Care Trust
- Gipton Residents' Association
- City Development Scrutiny Board
- Trade Unions
- Web site comment facility

The results of this consultation can be summarised as:

1. City-Wide Consultation

A number of consultees with a city-wide perspective fed back their views on the consultation process. These consultees included the Citizens' Panel, the Youth Council, Equality Forum, Sport England, a web site and Sport Leeds.

2. Citizens' Panel Survey

A citizens' Panel Survey was undertaken, which sought responses to the Council's draft proposals. The 1,000 person survey was selected as a way of receiving feedback from a representative sample of Leeds residents about the Council's draft proposals. Using statistical rules, the reports authors, QA research, are 95% confident that the research findings have a potential variance of no more than plus or minus 1%.

This feedback included both users and non-users of existing facilities. The Citizens' Panel survey received 755 responses, which is more than a 75% response rate. Of this figure, 48% of respondents had used a Leisure Centre in the last 12 months, leaving 52% non-users. Of the user group, 64% used Council facilities, 22% used private facilities and 14% used both Council and private centres.

Key points to highlight from this survey are as follows:

28% of respondents felt that the Council's Leisure Centres were of high or reasonable quality, with 43% stating average and 29% reporting that they felt the Council's facilities are low or very low quality. Such a high proportion (nearly one third) in the low and very low categories is a cause for concern.

87% of respondents feel that Council's centres should be of the highest quality. It appears, therefore, that the Council's facilities do not appear to meet the aspirations of the Leeds public.

When asked to rank their preferred location for Leisure Centres, the overall ranking from panel respondents was Town or District Centre first, close to a school or health centre second, on a main arterial route third and in a housing estate fourth.

When asked to choose between spending more on existing sites, or consolidating the existing facilities to improve quality, 66% of panel respondents favoured consolidating existing centres with 34% preferring to spend more on existing sites. From a general perspective, this outcome appears to support the general principle put forward to Executive Board for consolidating some centres. However, at the same time, when asked whether they would travel further to a larger, better quality centre only 31% agreed with this statement, with 43% against.

With reference to the proposals for specific leisure centres:

39% either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to provide a new facility for Kippax and Garforth, with 19% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

40% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to provide a new facility in place of East Leeds and Fearnville Leisure Centres, with 21% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

64% of respondents expressed no view regarding proposals to transfer the management of Richmond Hill Sports Hall to the community, with 24% in agreement and 12% against.

34% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with proposals to consolidate swimming provision in the Inner South Area at John Charles Centre for Sport, with 27% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

3. Youth Council

Consultation with the Youth Council indicated a general level of dissatisfaction with the quality of existing Leisure Centres, with cleanliness and maintenance cited as issues to address. In general, respondents indicated a desire to see bigger Bodyline Gyms, Leisure Water and there was an emerging consensus on the provision of larger sites.

In terms of the location of future centres, the need to take account of public transport routes was highlighted and a general agreement was reached over the principles presented by the Council for Centres to be located in Town or District Centres, on arterial roads, or adjacent to large complementary facilities. In addition, there was also general agreement with the draft proposals presented. However, this general agreement was also tempered by some concern raised that the Council would need to ensure that communities were not marginalised and steps may need to be taken to support deprived areas.

4. Equality Forum

The Equality Forum Working Group fed back their views on the Council's draft proposals. In general it is evident that disabled users have a number of concerns about the existing Leisure Centre provision in the city in terms of their quality. Issues at Holt Park, Armley, Kippax and Rothwell were highlighted specifically. Similar to the Youth Council, the Equality Forum also raised the need for locations to be accessible by bus and a preference for sites to be located on main arterial roads. The Equality Forum also supported proposals which resulted in Leisure Centres co-locating with health facilities. In summary, there was general support for the proposals outlined, however it was also acknowledged that further consultation was needed should the proposals be developed and refined further and to consider the implementation of proposals on a trial basis.

5. Sport England

Sport England provided written feedback to the Council's draft proposals. In summary, Sport England acknowledged that planning future leisure provision will require some 'tough decisions' by the Council and they fully support the steps taken by the Council to date. Sport England has also indicated a willingness to work further with the Council as it develops its strategic vision and they recommend that they re-run their Facilities Planning Model for Leeds to enable the Council to look in more detail at the availability of pools in specific parts of the city.

6. Sport Leeds Board

The Sport Leeds Board received a presentation on the Council's proposals at their meeting of the 1st October 2008. Written feedback was received from the Board's Chair which indicated broad support for the vision presented. The Board also recognised and supported the need to rationalise the number of facilities in the city. Notwithstanding this position, the Board also raised some concerns. Primarily, the Board would not want to see a net reduction in swimming lanes in the city and any proposals implemented would need to ensure that there was not a decrease in the learn to swim programme and other swimming development

initiatives. The Board also raised the need to consider school transport costs as part of any proposals developed. With these points in mind, the Sport Leeds Board suggested consideration of pre-fabricated pool construction at school sites and the potential for joint ventures with sports colleges and offered the opportunity for a small group of Sport Leeds Board Members to discuss these options with the Council further.

Sport Leeds also indicated a broad support in the voluntary sector for proposals for community management of Richmond Hill Sports Hall and the dry facilities at Middleton Leisure Centre, but stressed the need for the financial parameters of any proposals to be set at a realistic level.

7. Learning Disability Partnership Board

The respondents from the Learning Disability Partnership expressed a desire for facilities that better met their needs. In broad terms respondents agreed with the proposal for centres to be located in Town and District Centres, next to arterial roads and or schools/health centres. However, when asked about the specific proposals, respondents also indicated that they liked facilities to be close to their homes.

8. NHS Leeds

The NHS Leeds has provided written feedback to the Council's draft proposals, through the Director of Public Health in Leeds. Investment in the City's Leisure Centres is broadly welcomed as was the concept of well-being centres. Attention was drawn to the need to focus on the potential health inequality impact of the proposals especially in South Leeds and to ensure that this is effectively managed.

9. Trade Unions and Staff

GMB and Unison provided a joint initial response to the Council's draft proposals. The Unions indicated that they did not agree with the Council's proposals put forward and that they would require more time to consult fully with their members. Notwithstanding this response, the general feedback from staff briefings undertaken by officers has been largely positive with many staff keen to see investment in facilities.

10. Scrutiny Board (City Development)

The Scrutiny Board (City Development) considered the 2nd September Executive Board report at its meeting held on the 18th November, 2008. After considering the matter, the Board agreed to note the proposals for consultation on the draft vision for the Council's Leisure Centres.

11. Area Based Consultation

Area based consultation was undertaken in the form of Area Committees, user surveys, workshops and correspondence and meetings with local stakeholders.

12. Area Committees

Area Committee consultation was taken the form of visits to Inner East, Outer East and Inner South Committees and by requesting written feedback from the other seven committees in

the city. In terms of the visits to three Committees named above, Inner East Area Committee discussed whether investment in some current centres would provide optimum output, which to some extent links to the issues of centre quality and their location. However, the Area Committee also expressed a desire for fuller consultation on the matter and to ensure that consultation was made available to all. The Area Committee confirmed the desire to maintain a facility in the Inner East Area. The Area Committee also asked that any sites identified for a new facility be considered in consultation with public transport providers.

Outer East Area Committee expressed concerns that the consultation process undertaken was not inclusive enough and was being 'rushed'. Accordingly, the Committee resolved:

'That the Outer East Area Committee demand to be presented with proposals for further extensive consultation with residents of the Outer East Leeds area concerning Leisure Centres relevant to the area. Such consultation to include the provision of detailed information contained in the reports presented to the Area Committee and further information concerning the possible nature of any future re-provisions.'

Inner South Area Committee considered the Executive Board report of the 2nd September and provided a lot of feedback specific to the Inner South Area of the city. Particularly, the Committee indicated that the John Charles Centre for Sport was, in their view, not well located to meet community need and that the existing facilities at South Leeds Sports Centre and Middleton were 'fit for purpose' and met local need. The regeneration initiatives in both Beeston and Middleton were highlighted and there was concern that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on their delivery. The relative high levels of deprivation in the Inner South Area were also highlighted which resulted in low car ownership and health inequalities. Accordingly, the Committee felt that proposals needed to better consider the narrowing the gap perspective. The Committee also expressed a desire for a longer consultation period.

As a Member of the Committee, Councillor Congreve also wrote separately to outline his concerns, particularly in relation to the impact on the narrowing the gap agenda.

13. User Surveys

6,000 user surveys with pre-paid reply envelopes were distributed to all Leisure Centres and 11 libraries. In total 2,015 responses were received. Overall the responses to the user survey tend to contrast with the outcome of the Citizens' Panel survey. Key responses include:

98% of respondents have used a Leisure Centre in the past 12 months, of which 85% had used a Council facility.

36% of respondents felt that the Council's facilities were of high or reasonable quality, with 29% indicating they felt they were of low or very low quality. Again, nearly one third of respondents, many of whom are existing users, are unhappy with the existing quality of facilities.

86% of respondents felt that centres should be of the highest quality.

Overall respondents felt that their preferred location for Leisure Centres was Town and District Centres first, arterial roads second, alongside schools/health centres third and in housing estates fourth.

When asked to choose between a consolidation of the existing facilities to provide fewer, better quality facilities against the option of spending more on the existing facilities, the response is almost exactly opposite to the Citizens' Panel survey with a 71% preference for spending more on the existing sites and 29% in favour of fewer better quality facilities.

With respect to the Centre specific proposals:

27% were in favour of proposals for a new facility to replace Kippax and Garforth with 39% against.

23% in favour of a new facility to replace East Leeds and Fearnville with 42% against.

16% in favour of proposals for the transfer of Richmond Hill with 24% against.

17% in favour of proposals in South Leeds with 51% against.

It was therefore apparent that overall, respondents to the user survey did not support the centre specific proposals put forward by the Council, which contrasts with the outcome of the Citizens' Panel survey.

14. Leisure Centre Workshops

13 workshops were held focussing on the proposals that impact on centres in the Inner East, Outer East and Inner South areas of the city. Overall, attendance at these sessions was initially low and concern raised about the public's awareness. To seek to address this issue a further 6 workshops were scheduled and arranged at times convenient to Ward Members. Overall feedback from workshops indicated that:

- Leisure Centres are thought to be an integral part of the community.
- People believe that the Council should better promote its centres, rather than propose any closures.
- Most agree that centres need some level of refurbishment and this should be the priority.
- Closing leisure centres goes against the ethos of providing leisure facilities for all to encourage healthy lifestyles.
- There tended to be a feeling of distrust at the workshops, with a feeling that the Council already had plans in place.

15. Town and Parish Councils

All Town and Parish Councils in the Leeds City Council area were written to and asked to comment on the draft proposals presented to Executive Board in September 2008. In total 11 Town and Parish Councils participated in the consultation. The feedback was varied. Full support was received from East Keswick Parish Council for the refurbishment of Wetherby Leisure Centre as well as support from Collingham and Linton Parish Council and Wetherby Town Council. In addition, agreement in principle at this stage was received from Aberford and District Parish Council.

Scarcroft and Thorner Parish Councils highlighted the need to also focus on local voluntary facilities and not to develop new centres at the expense of grass roots, community sport. Alwoodley Parish Council outlined the lack of public facilities in their parish.

Ledston and Ledston Luck Parish Council did not support the proposals, but acknowledged the need for investment in facilities. Similarly, Allerton Bywater Parish Council did not agree with the proposals. Barwick in Elmet and Scholes Parish Council felt that Garforth and

Kippax centres were in a poor state of repair, however, they did not agree with the draft proposals feeling that a consolidation of existing provision would adversely impact on people with limited transport options. The Council went on to comment that should the proposals be taken forward the most important issue to ensure is that the range of leisure facilities that is currently available continues to be provided in any new facilities.

16. Garforth Community College

Officers were invited to undertake a consultation session with 300 Year 10 students at the Community College. The session identified a general level of dissatisfaction with the physical appearance of the facilities at Kippax. Comments received included:

'I don't like the pool as it is boring and dull'

'The Centre is old and unattractive'

The general views expressed identified a desire for more facilities for young people. In addition, whilst there was general, but not full, support for a new facility there was a need expressed to ensure that it was conveniently located and accessible by public transport. There was some concern expressed about consolidating two facilities into one.

17. Garforth School Partnership Trust

Representatives of the School Partnership Trust in Garforth asked to meet with Council Officers to discuss the draft proposals and written feedback has been received. The Garforth School Partnership Trust indicated that they feel they are in a unique position to contribute to the consultation over the draft plans to re-organise leisure centres in Garforth and Kippax.

18. Brigshaw High School

Officers facilitated workshops with 240 year 10 pupils at the School. The main feedback indicated a view that Kippax Leisure Centre was outdated and lacked facilities that would appeal to them. The majority, approximately two thirds of pupils, indicated that they did not use the current centre. There was some concern expressed if a new facility went to Garforth.

19. Web Site

Respondents to the Web Page tended to indicate a desire for better quality facilities. However, concerns were raised about a potential loss of water space and transport access issues to centres.

20. Members of Parliament

The MP for Leeds Central wrote to the Leader of the Council expressing concern at the proposals affecting Richmond Hill Sports Hall, South Leeds Sports Centre and Middleton Leisure Centre indicating (in his view) that particular communities are going to be most adversely affected by the proposals in comparison to others. At the time of writing, responses from other Leeds MP's are being sought.

21. Summary findings

The public consultation exercise undertaken has resulted in a wide range of feedback being received from a broad range of respondents interested in the provision of Leisure Centres in the City. In some respects there appeared to be a developing consensus in a number of areas. These areas included:

- A view that the public want high quality leisure centres and that they are valued, but too many respondents do not feel that the Council's existing provision meets their aspirations and are maintained well enough.
- A consensus between the citizens' panel and the user surveys that the top three locations for leisure centres were either Town and District Centres, arterial roads or adjacent to schools/health centres. Locating leisure centres in housing estates was the least favoured option by both groups.
- However, it was also clear that there is a divergence of views in relation to a number of the specific proposals put forward. In addition, it appeared that the divergence of views expressed is linked in part to the perspective of the respondents. Respondents from a city-wide perspective have tended to show greater levels of support for the Council's proposals. Conversely, where respondents were more likely to be impacted directly, they have responded less favourably to the draft proposals put forward.
- In some cases there was clear opposition to the closure of centres that people used on a regular basis, even if this might result in the development of a new facility. To some extent this position is understandable. Where facilities are used regularly by local people there is likely to be some resistance to change. However, the difficulty is that the Council cannot realistically provide Leisure Centres within easy travelling distance for everyone in the city and some areas of the city, such as Seacroft and Harehills, appear to be less provided for by the current network of facilities.
- Looking at the proposals specifically, it is apparent that the proposal to invest in Aireborough, Kirkstall, Pudsey, Wetherby and Rothwell Leisure Centres was supported as a means of improving the quality of leisure centre provision. In addition, their locations accord with the principles supported through the consultation.
- In terms of Fearnville and East Leeds Leisure Centres, it was evident that respondents in the local area would, overall, prefer investment in the existing facilities. The existing outdoor facilities at Fearnville would also need to form part of any further consideration.
- Similarly, in Kippax and Garforth there appears to be an acknowledgement that the facilities are in need of investment, particularly Kippax. However, at a local level there also appears to be an overall preference to retain the existing facilities. A number of respondents from Kippax tended to express a view that Kippax may lose out to Garforth, which would be a concern to them. However, feedback from Garforth College students and the Garforth School Trust are more generally supportive of the proposal to provide a single new facility.

In 2015, LCC worked with Sport Leeds on the development of the facility planning model and Facility Strategy for Leeds. This identified that: 'Retention and modernisation of the City Council swimming pool stock is Essential to meet the demand for swimming across the City as Leeds City Council is the main provider. In terms of the pools for potential redevelopment the needs and evidence supports the potential to look at Wetherby, Kippax, Kirkstall and Aireborough and Rothwell and Fearnville'.

As part of the Facility Strategy development, the ASA were consulted and concluded: 'The ASA would wish to work very closely with Leeds city council on the development of their facility strategy and how this is implemented into a fit for purpose portfolio of aquatic facilities to meet the needs of the entire community. Leeds has a good base stock of facilities and with the housing growth predicted there is a need for a next generation of facilities to build on this growth and provide for both the current and future demand. This is important if aquatics is to play the important role that it should in bringing benefits in health, social inclusion, sporting achievement and general wellbeing. Swimming is a life skill and one that is important to develop at a young age so that it can play a part throughout an individual's life.'

Further consultation will be carried out regarding specific projects within the Vision, as they become 'live'

The Sport England Facility Planning Model and Facility strategy works in 2015/16 have shown us:

Swimming Pools

- Current demand (8,490 sq metres) for pool space exceeds current supply (7,173 sq metres). With current projected housing and population growth, especially in the East, the demand for swimming will grow by 3.3% meaning there will be a shortfall of 1,600 sq metres of water space in Leeds in 2024.
- The highest unmet demand is in the East of Leeds around Fearnville LC and John Smeaton LC and also in the West around Kirkstall LC. Any reduction in supply would exacerbate this situation further as population levels grow.
- In terms of accessibility, the FPM analysis shows the key consideration for future pool provision should be in the East of the City where there is least provision at present and a substantial amount of new housing will be located in the future.
- The city has a relatively old public pool stock, with 10 of the council operated pools being built over 30 years ago.

Sports Halls

- Overall supply of Sport Halls in Leeds exceeds current and future demands with reasonable modern stock of sports halls largely down to a significant era of education sector provision of sports halls in the 2000 decade.
- There is an opportunity to increase supply by increasing access to sports halls on educational sites for public use at peak times.
- There is evidence for future provision to divest away from providing sport hall space and allow the education to pick up this requirement. This will then allow future provision to

concentrate on providing flexible income generating spaces moving away from traditional sports.

Health and Fitness Provision

- Health and Fitness provision is currently meeting demand largely due to a growth of low cost health and fitness operators coming to the City in recent times.
- There is a need for Leeds City Council to continue to provide but modernise its current health and fitness offerings to increase accessibility to those that don't or can't engage with the commercial sector provision.
- Demand for health and fitness facilities will grow in the East of the City in the future and capacity in the Fearnville and John Smeaton area will need to grow to meet this demand.

Councils typically provide leisure centres due to market failure, especially swimming pools. This failure is manifested mostly in the insufficient supply to meet the demand of the breadth of various aquatics disciplines and the provision of specialist facilities e.g. diving. By way of example the Council is by far the main provider of pool space for swimming lessons with 9,700 children currently on the Council's learn to swim programme. Furthermore the Council provides over 85% of all school learn to swim sessions in our venues for which the commercial/education sector have very limited offerings in this area. Therefore if the Council didn't provide the facilities/services there would in effect be unmet demand i.e. insufficient supply to meet need. There will also still be a need to continue to provide venues for swimming clubs and sports clubs as again there isn't plentiful supply of facilities available elsewhere or the commercial incentives for businesses to do so.

Ultimately in the context of Leisure centres, the council's core purpose should be to support those in most in need supporting the health and wellbeing of the city by providing access to activities which offer value for money and encourage participation. The provision of specialist facilities is also a unique element of this provision further illustrating the issue of market failure. For example working with British Diving (with their financial support) the City Council directly supports community and elite diving opportunities. The latter bringing gold medal success at Rio through Jack Laugher and Chris Mears and a huge amount of positive exposure for the city as a whole.

In health terms, inactivity is estimated to cost the city a minimum of £10.95m per annum (Sport England figure, which only includes major health issues, other costs for less minor health issues could nearly double this figure). With particular correlations between levels of inactivity, obesity and distinct inequalities in participation/health in different deprived areas of the city. Reducing these health inequalities is a major priority within the city and the network of Council Leisure and wellbeing centres can directly support our most deprived communities by providing places where people can be active and accrue the benefits of cardiac fitness. This point is further exemplified by the Director of Public Health's Annual report.

The development of fit for purpose leisure facilities will therefore also contribute significantly to the council's breakthrough project of 'Early Intervention and Reducing health inequalities', and directly contributes to the Best Council Plan indicator of 'Increase percentage of adult population active for 30 minutes once per week' by promoting physical activity.

Market Changes and Fitness Consumption Growth

The landscape continues to change and the fitness sector is extremely competitive. There has been a huge rise in the number of budget operators in the commercial health and fitness sector in Leeds, exploiting the most profitable areas of the fitness market. Health and fitness is critically important to the sport and active lifestyles service in terms of its budget and income, with increasing reliance on this income to underpin overall financial viability of the service whilst simultaneously helping to cross subsidise other more targeted/social outcome orientated services and activities that do not make a commercial return.

Furthermore there has also been diversification of consumer consumption patterns, with people taking part in different way. This includes for example more “personal challenge” leisure offerings such as outdoor activities, Parkruns, bootcamps and obstacle challenge to indoor activities such as trampoline parks, clip and climb and high rope adventures revolve around activities for families.

Venues in which people take part have also diversified with more activities taking places in church halls and community venues, closer to population groups, as well as more people also doing activities at home/outdoors through the growth of improved technology and health and fitness apps.

Consultation has already commenced on the Aireborough Leisure Centre scheme which has resulted in significant changes to the changing room and reception design;

- LGBT* representatives have highlighted a need to provide unisex changing and toilet facilities to ensure full integration into the site
- Female users have asked for more showers in cubicles to allow for modesty in a changing village environment.
- A changing places facility has been included in the design to allow ease of access for users with a disability.
- Work to provide a community hub has provided areas for groups and families to meet as well as for ‘non-sporty’ members of the community to access and use the leisure centre

Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information

Please provide detail:

Information relating to specific sites, which will be collected when a specific project starts

Action required:

Consult site users as the projects become live

Develop comprehensive stakeholder lists to ensure consultation is broad and covers all sectors of the community.

6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested

☒

Yes

☐

No

Please provide detail: As above

Action required:

The information found in 2009 still remains relevant. As the projects develop, then specific user consultation should be delivered, which is relevant to specific site developments.

7. Who may be affected by this activity?

please tick all relevant and significant equality characteristics, stakeholders and barriers that apply to your strategy, policy, service or function

Equality characteristics☒**Age**☒**Carers**☒**Disability**☒**Gender reassignment**☒**Race**☒**Religion
or Belief**☒**Sex (male or female)**☒**Sexual orientation**☐**Other**

(**Other** can include – marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, and those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being)

Please specify:

Stakeholders☒**Services users**☒**Employees**☒**Trade Unions**☒**Partners**☒**Members**☐**Suppliers**☐**Other please specify****Potential barriers.**☒**Built environment
services**☒**Location of premises and**☒☐

Information and communication		Customer care	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Timing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stereotypes and assumptions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cost	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consultation and involvement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial exclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	Employment and training
<input type="checkbox"/>	specific barriers to the strategy, policy, services or function		
Please specify			

8. Positive and negative impact Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers
8a. Positive impact:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New / refurbished facilities • More open and welcoming centres • Increased opportunities to attend activities • More accessible facilities to allow families, people with carers, people with disabilities and other equality characteristics to access leisure facilities • More opportunities for partnership working – ASC / libraries / education etc. to open the facilities to the communities • A contribution to the regeneration of communities
Action required:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep communities consulted and updated on the projects as they come up • Allow people to express their opinions and include them in the planning of the developments • Ensure the positive aspects of the developments are understood and embraced by local communities
8b. Negative impact:

- Perceived loss of facilities
- Disruption of services while works are carried out
- People do not like change
- Some people like the current centres being quiet so development would make them busy
- Council wasting money on these facilities when the money could be spent elsewhere
- Not everyone will get the specific facility they want

Action required:

- Keep communities consulted and updated on the projects as they come up
- Allow people to express their opinions and include them in the planning of the developments
- Ensure the positive aspects of the developments are understood and embraced by local communities

9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups/communities identified?

☒

Yes

☐

No

Please provide detail:

The facilities will be open to a wider range of users, thereby causing more of them to come into contact with each other

Action required: promote the strong points of the centres e.g. at Holt Park, some sports facilities were reduced to allow for additional facilities to cater for ASC users. Keep staff training updated to ensure the wider range of groups are catered for in a safe and fair way – e.g. safeguarding, disability awareness, equality training etc.

10. Does this activity bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other? (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)

☒

Yes

☐

No

Please provide detail: as no.9

Action required: as no.9

11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group at the expense of another? (e.g. where your activity/decision is aimed at adults could it have an impact on children and young people)	
<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Please provide detail: Some communities will be getting new or refurbished centres whereas others will be 'losing' facilities	
Action required: Ensure communications are clear and informative. Work to increase links between old and new facilities. Ensure transport links exist and are strong	

12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
Keep communities consulted and updated on the projects as they come up	Start of individual project - completion	Full consultation programme	Project manager
Allow people to express their opinions and include them in the planning of the developments	Start of individual project - completion	Full consultation programme	Project manager
Ensure the positive aspects of the developments are understood and embraced by local communities	Start of individual project - completion	Full consultation programme	Project manager
Ensure communications are clear and informative	Start of individual project - completion	Full consultation programme	Project manager
Promote the strong points of the centres e.g. at Holt Park, some sports facilities were reduced to allow for additional facilities to cater for ASC users	Start of individual project - completion	Full consultation programme	Project manager

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
<p>Keep staff training updated to ensure the wider range of groups are catered for in a safe and fair way – e.g. safeguarding, disability awareness, equality training etc.</p>	<p>Ongoing – increasing to opening of a new facility</p>	<p>100% staff trained in identified areas according to the target community</p>	<p>Quality & training manager</p>

13. Governance, ownership and approval		
State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment		
Name	Job Title	Date
Mark Allman	Head of Sport & Active Lifestyles	
Date impact assessment completed		21st July 2017

14. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions (please tick)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	As part of Service Planning performance monitoring
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As part of Project monitoring
<input type="checkbox"/>	Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board Please specify which board
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify)

15. Publishing	
<p>Though all key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council only publishes those related to Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions or a Significant Operational Decision.</p> <p>A copy of this equality impact assessment should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council. • The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions. • A copy of all other equality impact assessments that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record. <p>Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached assessment was sent:</p>	
For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent:

