

Report of: Director of City Development

Report to: Executive Board

Date: 14 December 2016

Subject: Vision for Leisure and Wellbeing Centres 2016

Are specific electoral wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of ward(s):		
Gipton and Harehills		
Rothwell		
Kippax and Methley		
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, access to information procedure rule number:		
Appendix number:		

Summary of main issues

1. The Sport and Active Lifestyle Service operates 17 leisure and wellbeing centres attracting 3.5m annual visits. These centres are a fundamental tool in delivering two Best Council Plan Outcomes; for people to enjoy happy, healthy active lives, and for people to have greater access to green spaces, leisure and the arts.
2. Of particular significance is that 85% of Leeds children learn to swim in our pools. Whilst other general commercial leisure offers are available, there is no commercial alternative for a universal learn-to-swim offer.
3. The service raises external income of c£18.6m per annum which, coupled with substantial efficiency measures, has reduced its Council subsidy over the last 8 years by 45% (in addition to meeting expenditure pressures, most notably energy). The main components of the remaining £5.7m subsidy are £3.9m for PFI payments and NNDR. The leisure market is substantial, and increasing revenue now offers us a much more significant contribution to sustainability than further costs reduction - although the latter does remain an ongoing focus.
4. In order to continue to drive the two Best Council Plan outcomes, and contribute to the Council's financial challenges, a revised medium to long term plan is essential. This report addresses that plan with particular consideration of the following key factors which are dealt with in more detail in the report:

- The use of targeted capital investments to improve customer experience and drive up income;
- The financial performance and condition of each site;
- Independent analysis of current and future supply and demand (including housing growth);
- Locality working including opportunities for further shared provision;
- The changing expectations of a modern leisure centre;
- The strengthening evidence base linking inactivity to poor health outcomes and the positive contribution that taking part in Sport can have to wider Council outcomes.

The proposals, if accepted, offer a strategic long-term plan for the service which builds on the previous 2009 Vision for Leisure Centres. The evidence-based recommendations include site closure, relocation of some services, major refurbishments and proposals for flexible new-builds using a combination of external funding, council capital funding and prudential borrowing based on increased revenue.

Recommendations

5. Executive Board is recommended to:

- i) Endorse 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;
- ii) Agree principles for determining the location of leisure and wellbeing centres as being; a) on a main arterial route, b) in a town or district centre, c) co-located and in partnerships with schools, health services, day centres, libraries or other complementary community facilities;
- iii) Request the Director of City Development 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 provision of £100k is made within the capital programme to support feasibility studies to this end;
- iv) Agree that, The hours of operation at Kippax Leisure centre are reduced to approximately 58 hours to commence from April 1st 2017, and requests the Director of City development brings forward a feasibility report into the re-provision of a swimming pool within the catchment area
- v) Approve the realising of the capital receipt from the sale of the existing Kippax Leisure Centre and bring forward new investment proposals in line with the overall strategy set out in this paper.
- vi) Note the need to support continued prioritised investment in the other existing leisure centres, in order to maximise income and usage, as set out in section 4;
- vii) Agree to extend the existing capital provision for sport maintenance of £500k per annum for a further 3 years from 2017/18.

1 Purpose of this report

1.1 This report outlines the current challenges in terms of investment in leisure centres and proposes a revised “Vision for Leisure and wellbeing Centres” for 2016 onwards. Given the direct correlation between the quality of existing leisure centre buildings and the ability of the service to attract and retain customers (and therefore income), the report will address remaining investment challenges within the context of strategic supply and demand, whilst simultaneously establishing the framework upon which the services’ future revenue budget can be set.

2. Background information

2.1 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 include support functions, NNDR and PFI charges) is now £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.

2.2 In 2009, Executive Board agreed the long term “vision for leisure centres”. This vision remains clear and largely relevant, however especially in a volatile external market and climate of austerity, the vision required updating with a focus on ensuring the retention of the core purpose which the City’s current leisure centres should fulfil, whilst at the same time exploring ways of reducing costs through investment and income generation. Ensuring the council is delivering a targeted offer to those in most in need and stepping in when there is market failure remains a core aim.

Table 1: 2009 Vision for Leisure Centre Proposals

Sites	2009 Proposal
Aireborough LC, Pudsey LC, Bramley Baths, Scott Hall LC, Kirkstall LC, Otley Chippendale, Rothwell LC , Wetherby LC	To bring forward detailed plans for capital investment to refurbish sites to improve quality and layout.
East Leeds SC and Fearnville LC	To replace sites with one purpose built wellbeing centre located close to A64 corridor.
Kippax LC and Garforth SC	To replace sites with one purpose built wellbeing centre to serve both communities.
South Leeds SC	Close
Middleton LC	Close the pool and consider the asset transfer of the dryside
Armley LC, Morley LC, Holt Park LC	PFI New Builds
John Charles CS, John Smeaton LC	Maintain

2.3 There have been numerous actions taken to ensure the 2009 proposals were delivered which resulted in East and South Leeds Sports Centres and Richmond Hill Recreation Centre closing, with Bramley Baths being successfully transferred to Bramley Baths & Community Ltd.

- 2.4 The Council has been successful in securing major investment in leisure and wellbeing centres in recent years, approximating £60m of PFI credits to fund three new build PFI projects. Armley and Morley Leisure Centre were built in 2010, followed by Holt Park Active in 2012. There have also been large refurbishments at John Smeaton, Middleton, Scott Hall and Garforth Leisure Centres. However, the refurbishment part of the 2009 Vision remains largely unfunded and incomplete along with no new site being built in the inner East area following the closure of East Leeds Sports Centre as originally proposed.
- 2.5 Evidence clearly tells us that continued capital investment is required just to maintain Leisure centre revenues, let alone increase them. In order to stay on course with budget targets the most likely options to not investing capital is to close centres (as income will decline without investment), or significantly reduce opening hours. Failing to invest (and not just in customer facing areas) will lead to increased costs in the longer term now that expenditure cutting options have largely been exhausted, with most sites now operating at above or close to break even. See impact of investment below in table 2.

Table 2: Illustrative impact of new/refurbished sites on income:

Leisure Centre	Gross Income Old Facility	Gross Income New Facility	Diff
Armley LC	£517,599	£990,247	+£472,648
John Smeaton LC	£439,883	£1,124,462	+£684,579

- 2.6 In February 2014, Executive Board approved a 3 year, £1.5m programme of sport maintenance budget aimed at protecting and increasing current income. This investment was welcomed and the service is now into the third year of the programme which has proved successful in improving the customer facing areas of the facilities and some behind the scenes investment too. However, the funding does not cover all the wider estate requirements and therefore the council is at risk of the improved sites slowly reducing in quality over time, eventually necessitating refurbishment or replacement. There are significant risks for the service going forward if it does not meet future maintenance requirements in terms of income and use protection (and growth) and from a reputational perspective. Furthermore maintenance funding helps ensure that the operating environment for both customers and staff is of the required health and safety standards. Funding for ongoing maintenance is a key requirement moving forward. Therefore there needs to be a continuation of the existing £500k per annum capital provision for general maintenance of Leisure centres.
- 2.7 The service has been working closely with Sport England, and funding was awarded by them to produce an updated Vision for Leisure Centres, building on an earlier iteration of Sport England's Facility Planning Model (FPM). This new work included a detailed review of current and future demand and supply as well as an exploration of what options exist for the existing stock to ensure they are fit for purpose whilst also identifying possible option to develop income streams to support the revenue budget.

The partnership with Sport England recognises that in the context of a city wide review some of the proposals will require external funding support in the future and therefore Sport England's input and support of the overall strategy is important.

3. Main issues

Why we provide Leisure Centres 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 e.g. learn to swim 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. 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.

- 3.2 Ultimately one of the key reasons for providing Leisure centres 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. Moving forward, the ability of our Leisure and wellbeing centres to address this issue is vitally important. But equally the location of our sites need to be in areas where they can maximise revenue streams from a broad range of users as there will always be demand from areas that aren't wholly located in areas of high deprivation that also require access to a public swimming facility. Therefore the council has to balance the pressures of meeting increasing demand, helping support those most in need and having a city wide delivery model that is financially sustainable in the long term. Furthermore we need to apply the substantial learning/insight we have about physical inactivity in order to ensure our new buildings, programmes and staff interactions encourage an even broader audience of participants.
- 3.3 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.
- 3.3 It remains the case that some of our older leisure centres are based on a somewhat outdated model of provision and requires a significant overhaul to improve and make relevant for the modern day needs. A modern day leisure and wellbeing centre needs to be both commercially orientated at a mass market but also seek to integrate/coproduce core essential services where possible to be hubs of the community (e.g. adult social care, libraries services, health centres). One such example is Aireborough Leisure Centre which was reported to Executive Board in November with the library service moving into a vacant area within the facility. This type of provision means the sites are able to attract a wider range of users that typically may not have used the other service before.

- 3.4 The provision of opportunities to learn to swim and take part in sport or physical activity programmes in our leisure and wellbeing centres supports a wide range of wider social and economic outcomes. Clearly being active leads to better health outcomes (mental and physical wellbeing), especially those that are from our most deprived communities, but equally it can support other council ambitions such as raising educational attainment levels; providing a hub for social interaction and cohesion (and working jointly with other services) ; and supporting economic growth e.g. through the provision of a network of facilities that support local communities and help project Leeds onto the world stage.
- 3.5 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 (item 14 on this agenda).
- 3.6 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. We know from the work undertaken as part of the Leeds Lets Get active scheme (offering free activities) that take up of sessions was the greatest in sites that served areas of highest deprivation. Furthermore we have learnt from those that have attended sessions that the way we interact with customers is vitally important. Our sites need to be welcoming with activities having a much broader appeal. First impressions are critical. This in turn flows through to our building design where the old "traditional" leisure centre will not do enough to attract new markets; people perhaps who feel a leisure centre isn't for them.

Market Changes and Fitness Consumption Growth

- 3.7 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.
- 3.8 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.
- 3.9 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 taking part in activities at home/outdoors through the growth of improved technology and health and fitness apps.

The Modern Leisure Centre

- 3.10 This 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). Officers have worked closely with Sport England to generate these proposals and are confident that the overall approach will help support the Government's strategic priority outcomes for Sport, namely, physical wellbeing, mental wellbeing, individual development, social and community development and economic development. This alignment is an essential element to any future funding bid to Sport England who 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 examples 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.

Current and Future Demand and Supply

- 3.11 The Facilities Planning Model (FPM) was commissioned through Sport England in order to undertake the assessment of current and future demand and supply. The exercise tested various closures/rebuild scenarios as well as taking into account future housing growth and population growth in Leeds.
- 3.12 The key messages from the FPM are that there is an identified need to invest into swimming pool provision and health and fitness provision in the East of the City to meet current and future demands. 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 that without change there will be a projected shortfall of 1,600 sq metres of water space in Leeds in 2024. There is a need to modernise current swimming and health and fitness facilities to meet demand across the City otherwise the supply gap will worsen. The FPM supports an approach of divesting away from providing traditional Sport Halls (where current supply outstrips demand given investment in school sites in particular) to provide new flexible forms of space to maximise on income generating activities and engage with harder to reach sections of the City. Further details can be found in Appendix 1.

Summary of current performance

- 3.13 Based on benchmarking data (supported through Sport England) the lesser performing facilities in terms of income generation, expenditure and visits are all of an older age where investment into the facilities has been minimal. These sites being Aireborough, Fearnville, Kirkstall and Kippax Leisure Centres with the latter performing the least best of the four overall. This is highlighted further with Kippax budgeted net deficit currently £177k per annum and a budgeted net cost per visitor of £1.72 compared to a Leeds average of £0.50. In the context of the

services budget strategy it is important to note that poorer performing sites have tended to be as a result of a combination of poor location, poor condition and in areas of high deprivation. Given the earlier reference in this report to the need to balance the social and commercial elements to our investment and disinvestment strategy the option of only using cost of service to reduce or radically change services has been discounted.

- 3.14 Income performance overall is strong in terms of income per m², especially in relation to swimming related activities (largely due to the growth in swimming lessons). Health and Fitness income has further opportunities for growth, by improvements to sales and retention systems, and this work is well underway working in partnership with the services commercial partner. Investment in marketing is essential given the levels of turnover. Further details can be found in appendix 2.
- 3.15 New facilities design will allow the service to be more creative in how it approaches staffing and other operational costs such as energy usage to ensure they are as efficient as possible using technological advances to facilitate better operations.
- 3.16 Alternative management option appraisals have been completed in recent times with the service with the service exploring the Trust option in 2010, however due to central support services the Trust option was not sustainable. Subsequent changes to legislation in relations to Trust receiving benefits in terms of NNDR and VAT make it less advantageous, if revenues savings are the only reason to explore this option. As the benchmarking information above shows the service is performing well and with investment the service can increase income further.

4 Proposals

- 4.1 As already indicated much of the original vision for leisure centres remains relevant; however moving forward the plans need redefining in the context of changing customer demands, future supply and demand, the move towards more integration/colocation/coproduction of services as well as, vitally, addressing the Council's overall revenue budget challenges.
- 4.2 The new vision will be guided by the following principles:
 - a) To bring forward schemes that improve the customer offer, increase participation, increase income and generate sufficient return on investment that can then support the Council's revenue savings targets over the next 3 years;
 - b) Continue the role out of brand new Leisure and Wellbeing Centres e.g. Holt Park Active;
 - c) Provide ongoing maintenance funding to protect existing customer income levels and ensure our buildings stay open and attractive;
 - d) Responding to future demand and supply pressures;
 - e) Ensuring where possible that the investment decisions are appropriately balanced taking into account health inequalities and not just swimming pool demand;
 - f) Reducing or removing services to meet revenue budget challenges and support future developments.

g) Bring forward new developments that limit the potential impact on the Councils revenue budget. In other words where new build proposals are brought forward existing buildings should remain open during construction.

4.3 The service has looked at each site, taking into account desired outcomes, budget challenges and the overall position in relation to supply and demand. Supported by Sport England, Appendix 3 outlines the initial site assessments taking into account the original vision. Appendix 4 then outlines an assessment of the potential financial impacts of developments based on indicative business plans again drawn with support from Sport England. The assessment indicates which developments would have the greatest returns on investment.

The proposed approach to the delivery of the new Vision for Leisure Centres

4.4 Proposal 1 - New Leisure and Wellbeing Centres:

4.5 It is proposed that the Council supports the development of 2 new Leisure and Wellbeing centres. These new centres will be located at a site in the Inner East as well as in the outer East at Rothwell. Both developments will seek to integrate/collocate services and bring about a step change in provision developing further the model of Holt Park Active.

Inner East Leeds Leisure and Wellbeing centre

4.6 It is proposed to build an integrated Leisure and Wellbeing centre with collocated services (e.g. school and adult social care). The estimated costs of the Leisure and Wellbeing centre pending detailed feasibility work could be in the range of £10-14m with a modern take on leisure centre incorporating, for instance, new adventure family activities, a café and multi-use spaces whilst maintaining the swimming pool and gym facilities. Recognising that this catchment serves areas of high health inequality this development will bring to fruition the original aspiration to build one new leisure and wellbeing centre in the Inner East of the City following the closure of East Leeds Leisure Centre and will locate the facility in a strategically significant area. It is proposed to undertake the detailed feasibility work in 2017. The existing Fearnville Leisure Centre would remain open until any new facility was completed meaning there will be no service reduction or loss of income.

Rothwell Leisure and Wellbeing Centre

4.7 It is proposed to build an integrated Leisure and Wellbeing Centre with collocated services with adult social care and other services. Refurbishing the existing facility was explored, however, taking into account the loss of income with the closure of the site to undertake the developments and the limitations of the current building layout it is more advantageous to replace the facility. The existing facility is of strategic significance and ideally located with good access to the road network. The development of the new facility would take place adjacent to the existing Rothwell Leisure Centre to ensure that there is continuity of service and no loss of income whilst the facility is built.. The scheme could cost in the region of £10-14m which will maintain the swimming pool and gym facilities, whilst also incorporating new adventure family activities, further co-location and flexible space that moves away from the traditional leisure centre model. The learner swimming pool is proposed to have more water play elements to help with introduction to water..

4.8 Proposal 2 - Replacement Swimming Pool Kippax

4.9 Kippax Leisure Centre currently runs at a budgeted deficit of £177k for financial year 2016/17, equating to a subsidy per visit of £1.72 based on 2015/16 user figures of 102,784. The average subsidy per user for similar sports centres with swimming pools is £0.50. Consequently, it is evident that the operational cost of Kippax relative to its use falls some way below the performance of comparative centres in Leeds. With the pressing need to make immediate savings in the Council's budget in 2017/18 as outlined in the 'Medium-term Financial Strategy 2017/18 to 2019/20' September Executive Board report it is proposed to reduce the hours of operation of the existing Kippax Leisure centre to approximately 58 hours per week as from 1 April 2017. It is estimated that this will save £80k per annum. It is anticipated that this proposal should be able to retain at least 75% of existing users and we are confident that all school swimming can be accommodated either at Kippax or nearby pools. This said Executive Board will have noted from the Facility Planning Model work that as a consequence of housing growth, projected demand for swimming in the East of Leeds is likely to grow by 2024 and the provision of a new, fit for purpose swimming pool in this area will be required to meet projected demand. It is therefore proposed that officers explore options for the re-provision of additional water space in the catchment area within the context of the proposed developments at Rothwell, Inner East Leeds (proposal 1 above) and John Smeaton (proposal 3 below). At this stage it is not possible to say precisely what type of development would satisfy potential demand, but it is likely to take the form of a 4-6 lane community pool, ideally collocated with another service or school. Operating costs would have to be cost neutral. It is further proposed that should the new development be sited away from the existing Kippax site that the capital funding from the sale of the land on which Kippax leisure centre is located is realised for investment towards the development of this Vision.

4.10 To minimise the impact of this proposal as much as possible every effort will be made to work with those impacted users of the facility to find suitable locations for them to carry on their activities. One of the priorities for the Council is for people 'Enjoy happy, healthy, active lives' and it will be our target to ensure there is minimal impact from this decision of activities levels in this area. We will relocate impacted users to neighbouring swimming pools and sports halls where possible and work to identify alternative locations where needed.

4.11 Proposal 3 Refurbishment: Commercial focus:

4.12 Part of the rationale for the development of leisure centres is to make investments that provide a good rate of return and that can then support the services revenue budget strategy between 2017 and 2020. Proposals here focus on a range of potential developments such as modernising the dryside activities offered at Aireborough leisure centre, a new gym at Middleton Leisure Centre and enhancing the swimming provision at John Smeaton Leisure Centre. Indicative business plans suggest that combined investments totalling £4.5m could yield a net annual surplus after the costs of borrowing of over £200k. It is proposed that more detailed work now commences to develop detailed business cases for investment. Given the Council's budget position these proposals should be developed and implemented as a matter of priority.

4.13 Proposal 4 General Refurbishments: Maintain income levels

- 4.14 The review of the Vision for Leisure centres clearly identified the need for continued investment in all Leisure and wellbeing centres in order to maintain the buildings in good working order. This is not always customer facing areas but includes basic issues such as Mechanical and Engineering aspects (e.g. warm showers/good water quality), as this can directly impact on attendances and therefore income. The proposal therefore is to ensure that there is a continuation of the current £500k per annum from the council's capital programme for maintenance work. A priority site for development from this fund would include Kirkstall Changing rooms in the first instance as these are currently in a very poor condition.
- 4.15 Further details of future plans for all the leisure centres not covered in these proposals can be found in appendix 3.

5 Corporate considerations

5.1 Consultation and engagement

- 5.1.1 This review of the vision for Leisure and wellbeing centres builds upon the previous comprehensive consultation that formed the basis of the original vision. The updated proposals have been developed in conjunction with Sport England and other key stakeholders. Subject to agreement of this report further consultation will take place in order to develop more detailed proposals for each individual development.
- 5.1.2 With regards to Kippax Leisure Centre specifically, a consultation plan will be implemented to ensure key stake holders including elected members, staff, current users and the public are consulted on the reduced hours to mitigate as much as possible against the impacts.

5.2 Equality and diversity / cohesion and integration

- 5.2.1 A full screening has been carried out with main findings being to (full report in appendix 5):
- 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.
 - 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.
 - Ensure communications are clear and informative. Work to increase links between old and new facilities. Ensure transport links exist and are strong.
 - Ensure communication with the Kippax area is strong and links with other facilities on offer. Keep informed of progress of the proposed new pool as further information is available.

5.3 Council policies and best council plan

5.3.1 The Best Council Plan 2015 – 20, updated for 2016/17 underlines the aim of the city to tackle poverty and reduce inequalities. The role of a leisure centre is clear in the reduction of the health inequalities found across the city and the participation in sport and active lifestyles being a contributing factor to reducing this gap. Currently the cost of inactivity to Leeds annually is £10.95m.

5.3.2 Outcomes included in the Best Council Plan include:

- Enjoy happy, healthy, active lives (and as illustrated within the Director of Public Health's annual report; item 14 on this agenda)
- Enjoy greater access to green spaces, leisure and the arts

5.3.3 These objectives are supported through the proposed improvements to the Leisure Centre stock by ensuring the longevity of the facilities in key locations across the city and by providing light, airy and welcoming spaces that people want to use and exercise in and that provide accessible spaces to people who currently cannot use the centres due to their outdated design. Linking to the

5.3.4 This in turn also supports the following 2016/17 priorities:

- Supporting communities and raising aspirations
- Preventing people dying early
- Promoting physical activity
- Supporting healthy ageing
- Enhancing the quality of our public realm and green spaces

5.4 Resources and value for money

5.4.1 The service has been successful in reducing its net deficit (from £10.3m in 2008/09 to £5.7m in 2016/17, a reduction of 45%), whilst simultaneously absorbing inflationary pressures of around £4.3m. Since 2008/9 the service has increased its income generation (excluding grant income) by 14.6% which equates to £1.8m. This is despite reducing operating hours and closures of leisure centres.

5.4.2 Between 2017-2020 the service has identified further significant budget efficiencies and savings. However to realise these savings much depends on the proposals identified in this report being delivered. This specifically relates growth of income through investment in building improvements (£225k net of borrowing) as well as the proposal to reduce hours at Kippax (£80k). Any further efficiency saving materialised through the development of the 2 new Leisure and Wellbeing centres (potentially over £500k pa) would support borrowing to undertake further developments and could form part of the overall funding package.

5.4.3 In terms of the medium term development of the service officers will seek to bring forward detailed funding proposals which will be based on a mix of:

- Partner funding
- Capital Receipts (sale of Kippax Land)
- Council capital resources
- Supported borrowing based on the reinvestment of revenue savings realised.

5.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

5.5.1 None known but the legal team will conduct all relevant searches on the facilities prior to commencement of any work.

5.6 Risk management

5.6.1 A risk register will be maintained for each project and will be updated as necessary. As highlighted in the report to do nothing will result in the continued decay of the Council leisure centre stock and therefore the continued reduction in user numbers and income for the Council.

5.6.2 The proposed development works will protect income and enhance the facilities for users as well as attract further users in the future in order to ensure the viability of the service is secured. The proposals also help the service meet its health and safety obligations for customers and staff

6 Conclusions

6.1 In 2009, Executive Board agreed the long term vision for leisure centres. This vision remained clear, however especially in a climate of austerity; the vision required updating with a focus on retaining the core purpose of what the City's leisure centres should fulfil whilst at the same time exploring ways of reducing costs through investment and income generation. The report outlines that despite considerable pressures on the Council's budget there remains scope to make sensible investments that meet wider council outcomes, austerity challenges and responding to future demands.

7 Recommendations

7.1 Executive Board is recommended to:

- Endorse 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.
- Agree principles for determining the location of leisure and wellbeing centres as being; a) on a main arterial route, b) in a town or district centre, c) co-located and in partnerships with schools, health services, day centres, libraries or other complementary community facilities
- Request the Director of City Development 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 provision of £100k is made within the capital programme to support feasibility studies to this end.
- Agree that, The hours of operation at Kippax Leisure centre are reduced to approximately 58 hours to commence from April 1st 2017, and requests the

Director of City development brings forward a feasibility report into the re-provision of a swimming pool within the catchment area.

- v) Approve the realising of the capital receipt from the sale of the existing Kippax Leisure Centre and bring forward new investment proposals in line with the overall strategy set out in this paper.
- vi) Note the need to support continued prioritised investment in the other existing leisure centres, in order to maximise income and usage, as set out in section 4.
- vii) Agree to extend the existing capital provision for sport maintenance of £500k per annum for a further 3 years from 2017/18.

8. **Background Documents**¹

8.1 None.

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

Appendix 1: Supply and Demand Analysis

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.

Appendix 2 Condition and Performance of Leisure Centre Analysis

Key parts of the leisure centre portfolio have received significant investment in recent years which has resulted in the remodelling or re-provision of some centres. However, notwithstanding the investment that has been made, there remains a sizeable investment needed to ensure the leisure centres are fit for purpose for the future.

Based on benchmarking data (supported through Sport England) the lesser performing facilities in terms of income generation, expenditure and visits are all of an older age where investment into the facilities has been minimal. These sites being Aireborough, Fearnville, Kirkstall and Kippax Leisure Centres with the latter performing the least best of the four overall.

Income performance overall is strong in terms of income per m² and is stronger at the more recently built centres, although Scott Hall, built 40 years ago, also performs very well which supports the view if we invest into the facilities they will see improved performance as Scott Hall underwent a part refurbishment in 2009/10.

Investment in marketing is essential given the levels of turnover and historically levels of funding for marketing have been reduced too much. Failing to invest in effective marketing is counterproductive and therefore the service will continue to invest in innovative marketing including initiatives such as the partnership it has with Alliance Leisure to help grow and develop income through improved sales techniques and campaigns.

The benchmarking data highlights a particular strong performance for swimming across the city with very high performance in terms of use per square metre and income at most of the facilities apart from Kippax. This is supported further with developments to the Learn to Swim programme which now has just under 10,000 children learning to swim each week at the facilities.

Health and Fitness income has further opportunities for growth, by improvements to sales and retention systems, and this work is well underway working in partnership with the services commercial partner Alliance Leisure. In order to increase further participation by attracting new inactive people further pay and play and levels of membership, investment in replacement of existing equipment and investment in new facilities will be required. The impact a new facility has in terms of increased income in health and fitness been identified above in table 2. Projected budget savings in this area, working with Alliance, will move the service into very favourable performance comparisons with the best in sector.

New facilities design will allow us to be more creative in how we approaching staffing and other operational costs such as energy usage to ensure they are as efficient as possible using technological advances to facilitate better operations.

Appendix 3 Initial site assessments taking into account the original vision

Site	Original Vision	What has been done.	Revised Vision Proposal	Rational	Cost Estimate £m
Armley, Morley, Holt Park Active	PFI New Builds	3 PFI new builds have been completed	Maintain	Well maintained new buildings, don't need further work over the next 5 years.	-
Aireborough LC	Refurbish	Maintained but including new dry changing rooms.	Phase 1 Wetside improvements Phase 2 Refurbishment of dryside to provide family activities	Phase 1 Wetside refurbishment specifically referenced within this report and is fully funded. Phase 2 will focus on Family activities to attract new users improve net operating costs.	1.7
Fearnville LC	New Leisure and Wellbeing Centre	Maintained	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 proposals in the Inner East area.	10-14
John Charles Centre for Sport	Maintain	Maintained but refurbishment to dryside changing rooms.	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	Maintain	Maintained	Re-model with pool extension, larger gym, and new AGP pitch	Best performing site, demand for the site outstrips demand with proposed housing growth and the extensions to pool and gym are to take advantage of this further. New budget Gyms recently opened in area have heightened competition.	1.4

Kippax/Garforth	New Wellbeing Centre	Garforth received some refurbishments to the Sports hall funded through badminton England. Kippax Maintained	Reduce the hours of operation at Kippax Leisure Centre to approximately 58 hours to commence from April 1st 2017, and brings forward a feasibility report in 2017 into the re-provision of a swimming pool within the catchment area. Maintain Garforth	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 assumed in the budget for 17/18. However the capital costs of re-provision of a pool sits outside this. Usage during hours of closure can be relocated to other leisure centres with capacity (Fearnville, Garforth, Middleton, and Rothwell.) Garforth has undergone refurbishment and is currently performing well.	3-5
Kirkstall LC	Refurbish	Maintained – with work undertaken to pool hall and reception areas.	Refurbish Wetside changing room	Refurbishment undertaken in some areas, but changing facilities poor which will affect the swimming experience and therefore income.	0.25
Middleton LC	Close pool and asset transfer dryside.	Pool closed and refurbishment to the remaining building.	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.	0.46
Pudsey LC	Refurbish	Maintained	Refurbish wetside changing, Food and Beverage offering and wellbeing suite	No work undertaken since the 2008 Vision. There is a need to refurbish the changing area and the location of the facility lends itself well with a Food and Beverage offering. The development of a wellbeing suite will attract more users and greater income.	0.65

Rothwell LC	Refurbish	Maintained .	New Leisure and Wellbeing Centre	<p>Cost of refurbishment high and would require closure of the existing building for a significant period.</p> <p>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.</p>	10-14
Scott Hall LC	Refurbish	Maintained with some refurbishment work to wetside changing areas.	Maintain but bring forward proposals for a new build site after priority sites have been completed.	Refurbishment of wetside changing rooms completed. Good performing site in a good location but site constraints mean there is limited car parking and building and land constraints will limit the success of a refurbishment.	-
Wetherby LC	Refurbish	Maintained but with refurbishment to entrance and reception area.	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.	-

Appendix 4 potential financial impacts of developments

Site	Current operating position (2016/17) (£)	Operating projection following investment (£)	Total Annual Financial Gain (£)	Capital Cost (£m)	Additional annual visits	Financial Return on Investment (%)
John Smeaton Leisure Centre	(202,000)	(525,000)	323,000	1.42	255,000	227
Aireborough Leisure Centre*	151,000	(79,000)	230,000	1.70	109,000	135
Middleton Leisure Centre	80,000	24,000	56,000	0.46	59,000	122
Pudsey Leisure Centre	(58,000)	(132,000)	74,000	0.65	33,000	114
Fearnville Leisure Centre	219,000	(81,000)	299,000	11.0	204,000	68
Rothwell Leisure Centre	(93,000)	(411,000)	318,000	11.7	244,000	68
Kippax Leisure Centre*	177,000	0	177,000	3.0	0	98
Kirkstall Leisure Centre	175,000	160,000	15,000	0.25	7,000	60
TOTAL	449,000	(916,000)	1.5m	30.1	911,000	

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: 2243184
Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment: 1/9/16	

1. Title: Vision for Leisure and Wellbeing Centres 2016
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 rep
Steve Baker	LCC	Business Manager
Mark Allman	LCC	Head of Service
Tim Quirke	LCC	Communications

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, the proposals for the revised Vision for leisure & wellbeing centres are changed little from the 2009 proposal, but more detail is possible:

Site	Original Vision	What has been done.	Revised Vision Proposal	Rational	Cost Estimate £m
Armley, Morley, Holt Park Active	PFI New Builds	3 PFI new builds have been completed	Maintain	Well maintained new buildings, don't need further work over the next 5 years.	-
Aireborough LC	Refurbish	Maintained but including new dry	Phase 1 Wetside improvements	Phase 1 Wetside refurbishment specifically	1.7

		changing rooms.	Phase 2 Refurbishment of dryside to provide family activities	referenced within this report and is fully funded. Phase 2 will focus on Family activities to attract new users improve net operating costs.	
Fearnville LC	New Leisure and Wellbeing Centre	Maintained	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 proposals in the Inner East area	10-14
John Charles Centre for Sport	Maintain	Maintained but refurbishment to dryside changing rooms.	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	Maintain	Maintained	Re-model with pool extension, larger gym, and new AGP pitch	Best performing site, demand for the site outstrips demand with proposed housing growth and the extensions to pool and gym are to take advantage of this further. New budget Gyms recently opened in area have heightened competition.	1.4
Kippax/Garforth	New Wellbeing Centre	Garforth received some refurbishments	Reduce the hours of operation at	Kippax has high net cost per visit, but demand for	3-5

		to the Sports hall funded through badminton England. Kippax Maintained	Kippax Leisure Centre to approximately 58 hours to commence from April 1st 2017, and brings forward a feasibility report in 2017 into the re-provision of a swimming pool within the catchment area. Maintain Garforth	swimming pool still needs satisfying in the area in the future. The savings from the reduced opening hours of Kippax LC are already assumed in the budget for 17/18. However the capital costs of re-provision of a pool sits outside this. Usage during hours of closure can be relocated to other leisure centres with capacity (Fearnville, Garforth, Middleton, and Rothwell.) Garforth has undergone refurbishment and is currently performing well.	
Kirkstall LC	Refurbish	Maintained – with work undertaken to pool hall and reception areas.	Refurbish Wetside changing room	Refurbishment undertaken in some areas, but changing facilities poor which will affect the swimming experience and therefore income.	0.25
Middleton LC	Close pool and asset transfer dryside.	Pool closed and refurbishment to the remaining building.	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	0.46

				gym would decrease subsidy further.	
Pudsey LC	Refurbish	Maintained	Refurbish wetside changing, Food and Beverage offering and wellbeing suite	No work undertaken since the 2008 Vision. There is a need to refurbish the changing area and the location of the facility lends itself well with a Food and Beverage offering. The development of a wellbeing suite will attract more users and greater income.	0.65
Rothwell LC	Refurbish	Maintained.	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.	10-14
Scott Hall LC	Refurbish	Maintained with some refurbishment work to wetside changing areas.	Maintain but bring forward proposals for a new build site after priority sites have been completed.	Refurbishment of wetside changing rooms completed. Good performing site in a good location but site constraints mean there is limited car parking and	-

				building and land constraints will limit the success of a refurbishment.	
Wetherby LC	Refurbish	Maintained but with refurbishment to entrance and reception area.	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 examples 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: The 2009 Vision for Leisure Centre is being updated	

4b. Service, function, event please tick the appropriate box below	
The whole service (including service provision and employment)	<input type="checkbox"/>
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:	

<p>5. Fact finding – what do we already know</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(priority should be given to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration related information)</p> <p>The Vision in 2009 involved a wide range consultation with the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 reprovisions.'

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 deprived areas in 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.
- With respect to Richmond Hill Sports Hall there was a high level of neutrality expressed about the proposal to transfer the centre's management to the community. In particular there has been largely no arguments put forwarded advocating a reconsideration of this proposal. On this basis, it is proposed that these proposals are developed further. It will have cognisance of the English Table Tennis Association's current use of the facility.
- 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.
- With respect to South Leeds, at a local level the facilities appeared to be valued by their users. However, whilst acknowledging these points, it is also the case that South Leeds Sports Centre and Middleton Leisure Centre have the lowest user levels of any leisure centres in the city with the exception of Chippendale Pool in Otley.

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 it's

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

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.

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

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender reassignment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex (male or female) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sexual orientation | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 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

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services users | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employees | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partners | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Members | <input type="checkbox"/> Suppliers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other please specify | | |

Potential barriers.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Built environment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Location of premises and services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information and communication | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 |

Financial exclusion

Employment and training

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:

- 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:

- 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)

Yes

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		

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	
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 .	
A copy of this equality impact assessment should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:	
<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. 	
Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached assessment was sent:	
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: