

**THE CABINET**  
**3<sup>RD</sup> MAY 2012**

Present:	Councillors:	
	Ray Dawe	Leader
	Roger Arthur	Deputy Leader and Efficiency & Resources
	Andrew Baldwin	The Environment
	Jonathan Chowen	Arts, Heritage & Leisure
	Helena Croft	Communication, Special Projects & Horsham Town
	Ian Howard	Living & Working Communities
	Roger Paterson	The Local Economy
	Sue Rogers	A Safer & Healthier District

Also present: Councillors: John Bailey, John Chidlow, Leonard Crosbie, Malcolm Curnock, Duncan England, Frances Haigh, David Holmes, Brian O'Connell, Kate Rowbottom, Claire Vickers

EX50 **RECORD OF THE MEETING OF 26<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2012**

The record of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2012 was approved as correct and signed by the Leader.

EX51 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

EX52 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

EX53 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

(i) Mr Keith May asked the following question:

*Can Councillor Chowen confirm that the construction of an outdoor track, under Options 5 & 7 of the Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre Business Case report, is not dependent on finance coming from outside sources and would be financed entirely from the sale of the land on which the current track is located?*

The Cabinet Member for Arts, Heritage & Leisure replied as follows:

*As identified by the consultants in the outline business case, an athletics track is a 'desirable' rather than 'essential' provision and as such the council will need to ensure that external funding sources are sought to support any investment that the Council makes in providing a new outdoor track. We are looking for external funding and the user groups could help us to identify these sources. We are in difficult financial times and external funding would make the possibility of replacing the running track greater. However, this is all subject to consultation.*

EX53 Public Questions (cont.)

Mr May asked a supplementary question seeking clarification that, if external funding was not available and Options 5 or 7 were chosen, would an outdoor athletics track be funded from the money raised from the sale of the existing track.

The Cabinet Member replied that this would depend upon the results of the consultation.

(ii) Mr Tony Johnson asked the following questions:

*(a) Please explain why, particularly in 2012 when the United Kingdom is hosting the world's biggest sporting event, is this council considering putting residents at a disadvantage by removing the only publicly accessible athletics track in the district, taking the district from the present situation, where it equals the national average supply of number of lanes per person (0.05) to a position where it would be below the national average?*

*(b) How can this council justify proposing the sale of the land that the Athletics Track is currently housed on for around £10 million, keeping that money and then seeking external funding for a replacement athletics track?*

The Cabinet Member for Arts, Heritage & Leisure replied as follows:

*(a) The Council has no intention of removing the outdoor athletics track in 2012 and has confirmed that use will continue until the preferred option is delivered*

*The provision of an athletics track cannot be justified as 'essential' based on guidance from UK Athletics which identifies that provision should be based on one floodlit 6 lane synthetic athletics track per 250,000 population within a 20 minute drive time (45 minutes in rural areas); taking account of athletics tracks in neighbouring authorities (Crawley/Worthing) this criteria is met. However, it is recognised that the loss of the track at Broadbridge Heath would significantly impact on local athletic clubs and casual users*

*(b) If that is the decision that is taken we will try to justify it but, at the moment, no decision has been taken. We are now going out to public consultation. Tonight's meeting, the representations we've seen tonight and letters in the paper are all part of that consultation process and will help to formulate our opinion. At the moment all options are open and we must keep it that way throughout the consultation process.*

(iii) Ms Elspeth Turner asked the following question:

*Can Councillor Chowen please give an indication of whether under Options 5 & 7 Horsham District Council would support the building of an Indoor athletics facility, built adjacent to any proposed outdoor track, if sufficient funds are found from outside sources?*

EX53 Public Questions (cont.)

The Cabinet Member for Arts, Heritage & Leisure replied as follows:

*The council is keen to investigate funding contributions for the outdoor track and on top of this would welcome additional total funding for the provision of indoor athletics facilities, which would ideally be located adjacent to the outdoor track.*

Ms Turner asked a supplementary question as to whether the Council put any value on the intangible benefits of having such a resource as an indoor athletics facility.

The Cabinet Member replied that the report showed that the Council did value the intangible benefits of these facilities, including its impact on the health and wellbeing of residents and the greater good of the community, and if funding for an indoor facility could be obtained, it would be welcomed. In any event the existing facilities would be available for at least the rest of the current year and the Council was still looking at what would be happening after November.

(iv) Mr Paul Kornicky asked the following question:

*Of the Financial Models in the OBC (Outline Business Case) only Option 1 seems to budget specifically for any of the work to be undertaken on the existing BBHLC as identified in the recent Condition Survey. All other Options (other than 2 & 3) would require BBHLC to be open for business until at least January 2016.*

*Please confirm which category D (Bad – Life Expired &/or serious risk of imminent failure) items identified in the Condition Survey can be safely left for around 4 years?*

*In particular will the infamous BBHLC roof not be repaired? I do of course accept that a 'patch-up' repair may well now be more appropriate.*

The Cabinet Member for Arts, Heritage & Leisure replied as follows:

*The financial modelling reflects true time based comparisons. Option 1 is the only option that requires ongoing full maintenance in line with the requirements of the Conditions Survey. Other options (excluding 2 and 3) are based on the cost of re-provision and incorporate lifecycle maintenance costings.*

*Based on the decision of the Council a full assessment will be made of all critical maintenance items and those that are deemed to be necessary to ensure the safe and effective operation of the Centre will be undertaken.*

*Option 1 would require the complete replacement of the roof. To keep the current Centre open prior to the construction of a new facility it will be necessary to undertake 'patch' repairs as you suggest.*

EX53 Public Questions (cont.)

Mr Kornycky asked a supplementary question enquiring whether that meant the options requiring temporary maintenance, perhaps to January 2016, would not incorporate the specific Category D items identified in the conditions survey.

The Cabinet Member replied that the Council had been careful not to prejudge the outcomes of consultation process and at present the minimum was being done to keep the building safe, to enable everyone to enjoy it as much as possible. However, planning now needed to start on how the building would be handled in the light of the conclusions of the consultation.

(v) Mr John McLaughlin asked the following question:

*The report prepared by the Consultants makes very little reference to Horsham and Arun Badminton Club, other than that they are going to Collyers. This statement is not true for all sections of the club as Collyers will only be available after 4.30pm.*

*We would like to know what facilities will be made available for the Daytime players, who comprise about one third of the Club membership and will these facilities be made up to the same standard as the Daytime sections have been used to. The Daytime sections have been told by the Club's negotiator that:*

*"Right now there is NO agreement in place, and no terms even tentatively agreed, we merely have a working agreement to continue to pursue these various relationships to strike a deal that makes all parties happy. So, that being said, right now there are no cast iron guarantees on anything".*

*The Options favoured by the Council only make reference to a 2 court badminton hall which is not suitable given our current usage and membership and would also be far too small for use as a multi-purpose sports hall.*

*None of the favoured Options make provision for a permanent facility for a very successful badminton club. Surely it is irresponsible to only consider a 2 court option and leave consideration of expanded facilities to totally separate negotiations rather than part of the overall package?*

The Cabinet Member for Arts, Heritage & Leisure replied as follows:

*The badminton club currently uses a three court hall. The business case identifies that the club is at capacity and requires a four court hall in order to develop and attract governing body funding. This can be instantly achieved at Collyers and this has been the subject of ongoing negotiations. This is only part of the solution and it is recognised that there are limitations for daytime users during school term time at Collyers; however there is identified capacity at both the Holbrook Club and Southwater Leisure Centre that could accommodate daytime club users.*

EX53 Public Questions (cont.)

*The provision of a two court badminton hall (with daytime availability) in the new Centre, as recommended by the consultants, is based on identified need and would supplement the provision at Collyers, Holbrook and Southwater – thus giving the club access to a significantly greater number of courts.*

Mr McLaughlin asked a supplementary question, indicating that the daytime badminton players had visited the Holbrook Club to look at their facilities and had concluded that they were not suitable.

The Cabinet Member replied that this type of feedback would inform the consultation process and that there might be some funding available from the governing body for badminton to improve the facilities at the Holbrook Club.

**REPORT BY THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ARTS, HERITAGE & LEISURE**

EX54 **The Future of Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre – Business Case**

Three members of the public addressed the Cabinet on this item, referring to:

- the unique nature of the Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre as a single venue for a variety of activities including sports and fitness, dance and exercise classes, a quality particularly appreciated by the 50+ club users;
- the inadequacy of other suggested facilities to accommodate 50+ club activities in their entirety;
- the inadequacy of the proposed new facilities to accommodate 50+ club activities plus other activities such as school holiday activity clubs;
- the exclusion of the joint user group from the identification of options;
- lack of choice of centre set-up in the four options proposed for consultation;
- the inadequacy of the minimal facilities proposed in the consultation options;
- the proposed independent promotion of a 'People's Choice' option;
- the population basis used for the scale of the proposed re-provision of leisure facilities;
- the statistics used to identify a theoretical oversupply of sports halls in the area.

The Cabinet Member for Arts, Heritage & Leisure reported that, following Council's approval in December 2011 of the undertaking of further work to determine the future viability of leisure provision at Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre, FMG Consultants and Strategic Leisure Limited had been appointed in February 2012 to prepare a Business Case to inform future decision making.

The Business Case had now been completed and was presented for consideration. In summary it comprised:

- A re-evaluation of the current and future leisure needs of residents in the area/district

EX54 The Future of Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre – Business Case (cont.)

- Analysis and identification of essential and desirable leisure facilities based on need
- Consideration of new additional leisure provision which was expected to be delivered in Spring 2015/2016 and was to be provided as part of the developer contribution (S106) from Countryside Properties in Broadbridge Heath
- A recent land valuation of the whole leisure site, including individual valuations for each sub-area across the site. The site had been divided into three areas/phases: Phase 1 (current Athletic track), Phase 2 (current leisure centre building, including multi-use games areas), Phase 3 (Horsham Indoor Bowls Club site)
- Reference to the emerging draft planning brief for the Broadbridge Heath Quadrant
- Identification and scoping of nine options with supported detailed financial information determining viability and evaluation criteria
- Recommended options (4-7), including a preferred option (Option 6) for consultation

The four options were as follows:

**Option 4.** The provision of a new leisure centre on land immediately south of the existing indoor bowls club. It would provide 'essential' facilities with a two court sports hall, 30 station fitness gym (including free weights), catering via vending machines and would maintain the eight rink Bowls Club in its current location. Other activities would be relocated to alternative sites or provided through developer contributions. This option would release capital receipts estimated to be £13.98m. Transition arrangements would need developing for football pitch provision. Estimated capital cost to build £1.81m.

**Option 5.** As Option 4 above but including provision for a new 'desirable' athletics track in an alternative location. Transition arrangements would need developing for football pitch and athletics provision. This option would release capital receipts estimated to be £12.87m. Estimated capital cost to build £2.96m.

**Option 6** The provision of a new leisure centre on land immediately south of the existing Indoor Bowls Club. Providing 'essential' facilities with a two court sports hall, 30 station fitness gym (including free weights), cafe and a new six rink Bowls Club as part of the new leisure centre. Other activities would be relocated to alternative sites or provided through developer contributions. This option would, in time, release all three phases of the capital receipt estimated to be £15.1m. Transition arrangements would need developing for football pitch provision. Estimated capital cost to build £4.85m.

**Option 7.** As Option 6 above but including provision for a new 'desirable' athletics track in an alternative location. Transition arrangements would need developing for football pitch and athletics provision. This option would release capital receipts estimated to be £14.03m. Estimated capital cost to build £6m.

EX54 The Future of Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre – Business Case (cont.)

All options assumed that the Countryside Properties S106 land would come to the Council in two phases in Spring 2015 (one hectare south of the existing Indoor Bowls Club) and Spring 2016 (additional three hectares south of the current leisure centre). This would provide the required land for a centre and a range of new facilities such as football pitches, sports pavilion, multi-use games areas and a skate park. Transition arrangements would be required to ensure seamless football pitch provision and, depending on which option was agreed, could also apply to the athletics track, although land had yet to be secured for this.

It was noted that, until alternative sites were forthcoming, these facilities would remain in their existing location with the current centre remaining open.

The Cabinet Member indicated that, if his recommendations were approved, the options would be published for consultation, including two staffed public exhibitions of the options and the use of new media and local newspapers.

Other Cabinet Members spoke in support of the proposed consultation, which would help to inform the final decision regarding the Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre and leisure provision in this area of the District.

Other Members addressed Cabinet welcoming the consultation; querying the statistics and calculations within the consultant's report; questioning the proposed reduction in facilities and reliance on private provision; referring to the re-provision of the athletics track; suggesting that the Council was looking for financial gain from the site and that there should be a cost-neutral policy for leisure facilities; requesting the inclusion of options 8 and 9 in the consultation process; the lack of availability of funding from sporting bodies; referring to the need to ensure the availability of facilities for all including the disabled and unemployed; and requesting that facilities across the District should benefit from any financial gain from the existing site.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the consultants recommended Options 4-7 be published for public consultation, alongside the draft Broadbridge Heath Quadrant Planning Brief, between 5th May and 5<sup>th</sup> June 2012.
- (ii) That a decision on the future of leisure provision at Broadbridge Heath be made by the Council on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2012, based on the outcome of the public consultation.

EX54 The Future of Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre – Business Case (cont.)

- (iii) That the relevant chapter of the 'Leisure Futures Report' adopted by Cabinet on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2011 be updated in the light of the findings of the Business Case (assessment of need).

REASONS

- (i) It was agreed on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2011 that no final decision would be made about the future of Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre until a detailed Business Case was prepared and consulted on.
- (ii) Additional research on the assessment of leisure need had taken place as part of the Business Case production which had identified that the Leisure Futures report needed to be updated with regards to these findings.

**REPORT BY THE CABINET MEMBER FOR LIVING & WORKING COMMUNITIES**

EX55 **Draft Broadbridge Heath Quadrant Planning Brief**

The Cabinet Member for Living & Working Communities reported that the Broadbridge Heath Quadrant Planning Brief had been prepared alongside the detailed business case relating to the future of Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre, in accordance with the decision of the Council on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2011.

The primary aim of the Planning Brief was to put in place a set of clear principles for any potential future development of the Broadbridge Heath Quadrant site, based on the Council's findings, aspirations and priorities for the area.

The Draft Planning Brief had been discussed at an informal meeting of his Strategic Planning Advisory Group on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2012. If approved at this meeting, the draft Planning Brief would be published for consultation alongside the business case between 5<sup>th</sup> May and 5<sup>th</sup> June 2012. Any responses received would be subject to consideration by officers and Members and incorporation into the final version, as appropriate.

The Planning Brief would then be submitted to Council on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2012, for consideration alongside the business case.

Other Cabinet Members spoke in support of the report and referred to the value of the Broadbridge Heath Quadrant in relation to both the future of the retail sector and income generation for the Council.



EX55 Draft Broadbridge Heath Quadrant Planning Brief (cont.)

Other Members addressed Cabinet referring to the involvement of the County Council; the need for consultation with businesses in town; changes in the retail sector; and the need to ensure that any development of the Quadrant would not impact detrimentally on Horsham town centre.

RESOLVED

That the Draft Broadbridge Heath Quadrant Planning Brief be published for a public consultation from 5<sup>th</sup> May 2012 to 5<sup>th</sup> June 2012, alongside the business case relating to the future of the Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre, subject to any minor editorial amendments being agreed by the Cabinet Member for Living and Working Communities.

REASONS

- (i) It was agreed at the meeting of Council on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2011 that no final decision would be made about the future of Broadbridge Heath Leisure Centre until a detailed business case relating to the future of centre and a planning brief for the Broadbridge Heath Quadrant be prepared for consultation.
- (ii) Horsham District Council is keen to work with and have ongoing dialogue with the District's communities and to try and incorporate local ambitions within its strategies wherever possible. Although it cannot guarantee to deliver all of these aspirations, the Council would like to establish what is important to communities.

EX56 **SCRUTINY & OVERVIEW COMMITTEE – MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET**

There were no matters currently outstanding for consideration.

EX57 **FORWARD DECISION MAKING PLAN**

The Cabinet received a schedule detailing the revised forward decision making plan.

RESOLVED

That the Forward Plan of Key Decisions be noted.

EX57 Forward Decision Making Plan (cont.)

REASON

To comply with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 and the Council's Constitution.

The meeting closed at 7.10pm having commenced at 5.30 pm.

LEADER