

CABINET (LEISURE CENTRE) COMMITTEE**12 June 2017****Attendance:**

Councillors:

Griffiths (Chairman) (P)

Ashton (P)

Warwick (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Gottlieb (P)

Laming (P)

Huxstep (P)

Prince (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Hutchison

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bell, Hiscock, Horrill, Scott and Tait

1. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillors Huxstep and Warwick declared disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of agenda items due to their roles as County Councillors. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, they remained in the room, spoke and voted (Councillor Warwick only) under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

At the discretion of the Chairman, other Councillor contributions and public participation were taken at the end of the meeting (following consideration of all reports) and contributions from Councillor Hutchison and Lorraine Gozra were heard at that time, and summarised below.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hutchison was encouraged by the discussions and responses given during the meeting. However, she remained concerned about the proposals for the Urban Design Framework (UDF) and in particular, her perceived lack of consideration of the former depot site. In response, Committee Members emphasised that the UDF

would include the wider area, including the depot site, Garrison Ground and King George V playing field. Whilst it might not be possible at this stage to detail exactly what the depot site would be used for in the future, the UDF would gather input on what people wished to see happen there and any concerns they might have.

Lorraine Gozra expressed concern about the additional proposals for a running track and trampolines (see Minute relating to consideration of Report CAB2942(LC) below) as she believed it was not appropriate to keep adjusting proposals for the centre. She also expressed concern and some confusion about the proposals for the Urban Design Framework and its timing in the process.

3. **WINCHESTER SPORT AND LEISURE PARK UPDATE REPORT**
(Report CAB2942(LC) refers)

The Chairman introduced the Report and highlighted the various discussions and consultations that had taken place to date. She emphasised that the proposals were to provide a facility for everyone to access for both leisure and sport facilities. The status of the King George V playing field would be confirmed and the Council would give notice that the Garrison Ground would be removed from the SHLAA list following its purchase by the Council (from Tesco) once this is considered as part of the Local Plan Review.

The Committee received a presentation from Stride Treglown architects outlining the proposals for consultation on the future of the Bar End area, including a Sport and Leisure Park. A representative from LA architects was also present. Copies of the presentation are available on the Leisure Centre project page of the Council's website:

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning/major-sites/leisure-centre-project/>

The consultation events would commence on 23 June 2017 and would include notification to local residents and leaflet drops. An on-line survey would be launched, with hard copies of the questionnaire available at the various "drop-in" sessions.

Following the presentation, representatives from Stride Treglown and LA architects responded to questions from Members, as summarised below.

- The list of consultants procured by the Council, as set out on Page 4 of the Report, would increase as the scheme progressed. This would include a landscape consultant and a sustainability consultant in due course.
- Due to the nature of leisure centre buildings, it was unlikely to be completely carbon neutral. However, the intention was that the building design would minimise energy use and also conserve as much energy as possible. In addition, different forms of "green energy" would be examined. Receipt of BREEAM Excellent Rating for this type of building was not always the best way of assessing a building's carbon emissions.

- The nature of the consultation questions would enable respondents to raise any matters they considered to be important, which might not be directly relevant to the specific area of work. However, these wider comments could be fed into the Urban Design Framework (UDF) work.
- The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) would identify consultees (although individual responses would be anonymised) and provide a summary of comments received.
- The first consultation proposed for June was a listening session exploring the site as whole. The second consultation would develop the strategy for an UDF for the site and would also start to develop proposals for the building itself. The emphasis of the third stage would probably shift to the design of the building and the fourth stage would involve a public exhibition and consultation immediately prior to submission of a planning application.
- In response to some Members' queries, the architects acknowledged the importance of the former depot site in relation to the proposals. However, focus was more on how the land could be integrated into the proposals and it was not essential that the exact future purpose for the depot site was known at this stage.

In response to comments made by some Members present regarding the condition of the existing leisure centre, the Chairman emphasised that this was outside the remit of the Committee. The Corporate Director (Service Delivery) advised that Officers and, where required, Cabinet would continue to monitor the requirement for any expenditure for repairs on the existing centre and consideration of future use.

One Member requested that a Report be submitted to a future Committee meeting on the various different procurement methods available to the Council for a project of this type, including advantages and disadvantages for each. The Corporate Director (Service Delivery) advised that the Council's external project managers and cost consultants (MACE) should be involved in the production of this report.

In response to questions, the Chairman confirmed that the proposed facility mix had been produced following consultation in 2015 with various interested parties and had been agreed by Cabinet. It was a starting point for the consultation but there was the potential for future minor adjustments, subject to consideration of budget implications.

With reference to Paragraph 11.8 of the Report (the approved facility mix), the Chairman stated that suggestions had been received for inclusion of an indoor running track within the grounds and a trampoline facility. The Corporate Director (Service Delivery) advised that it was a matter for the Committee to decide whether the overall facility mix could be extended to include either or both of these additional elements. It was not possible to consider these two elements in isolation. He also highlighted that the proposed facility mix had been agreed by both Cabinet and Council but there might be an opportunity at a later stage, following consideration of the business case, to include these additional facilities. During discussion, one Member emphasised that there

was currently an eight lane running track in the area which could be brought up to international standards with the addition of other facilities.

Following further discussion, it was agreed that neither proposals be included within the existing facility mix at this stage but they could be re-examined at an appropriate point in the future if considered necessary.

With regard to the queries raised in Paragraph 11.9 of the Report regarding the proposed future use of a 50m pool, the Chairman highlighted that a meeting had been arranged between the architects and local swimming groups. The Committee agreed that the decision be deferred to until after this meeting had taken place and be delegated to the Corporate Director (Services Delivery) in consultation with the Chairman.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decision on the clarification of the proposed uses of the 50m pool (as set out in Paragraph 11.9 of the Report) be delegated to the Corporate Director (Service Delivery), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing.

2. That a Report be submitted to a future Committee meeting outlining the possible procurement options available to the Council for this project.

4. **WINCHESTER SPORT AND LEISURE PARK RISK REPORT**
(Report CAB2943(LC) refers)

One Member expressed concern about the number of items in the Risk Register where the current risk score was rated as “Likely” (namely Risk Numbers 1, 5 and 11 in Appendix 1 to the Report). The Corporate Director (Service Delivery) explained that a cautious approach had been taken to assessing the current risk score, for example because all the necessary information was not yet available to the Council. However, the further actions proposed reduced the Residual Risk Score to “Unlikely” in each of these entries. The Corporate Director advised that the format and terminology in the Risk Register had been approved by Councillors. The Committee agreed that the current format be retained but that a key be provided for future reports explaining the terminology used.

The Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) confirmed that MACE had been consulted in the preparation of the Risk Register. MACE would also be operating a Construction Project risk register in due course.

In response to Members’ questions, the Corporate Director (Service Delivery) confirmed that a full business case would be undertaken for the new centre,

including consideration of its “Unique Selling Point” to differentiate it from other nearby centres (for example, the new leisure centre at Eastleigh).

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the content of the risk register be noted.
2. That an updated risk register be reported at each meeting of this Committee and that any risk escalation or new risks arising in the intervening period be raised with the Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing.

5. **WINCHESTER SPORT AND LEISURE PARK TIMETABLE**

(Report CAB2944(LC) refers)

The Chairman emphasised that the timetable included a number of gateway points and timings of future meetings of the Committee had been arranged accordingly. However, it was possible for additional Committee meetings to be arranged as and when required.

In response to questions, Mike Lawless (LA Architects), acknowledged that the proposed timetable was tight but potentially manageable. He emphasised the importance of decision-making at appropriate points of the project, as detailed by the gateways in the timetable. Graham Stephens (Stride Treglown) highlighted that the project would also have to respond to external factors, such as changes in Government guidance on Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs). The Corporate Director (Service Delivery) advised that the assumption was that an EIA may be required and that local factors might mean that the planning process could take longer than outlined in the timetable.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director (Service Delivery) advised that a 2020 completion date was proposed because it was acknowledged that the existing centre was deteriorating, although measures would be undertaken to ensure it remained safe to operate. In addition, it was assumed that Members did not wish the existing centre to close prior to a new centre opening. He confirmed that a full business case would not be available until Gateway 4, as it could not be finalised until tender prices had been formally submitted. However, investigations and analysis would take place prior to this point to minimise the risk of the project being unable to proceed at this late stage.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted.

6. **WINCHESTER SPORT AND LEISURE PARK PROGRAMME REPORT**
(Report CAB2945(LC) refers)

The Chairman highlighted that MACE had been involved in the production of the Report.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 4.30pm and concluded at 6.30pm.

Chairman