

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Report of: Assistant Director Community

To: Performance Monitoring Panel - 3 March 2015

(Author: Riana Rudland – Community Development and Health Manager)

Subject: Leisure update report

Purpose: To provide an update on the work undertaken regarding the future provision of Leisure Services

Recommendation:

- 1) That members note the contents of the report.

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 The Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel set up a Members Task Group in January 2014 to provide recommendations for both the short and long term provision of leisure services within the district. Following a report of the Task Group to Cabinet on 7 October 2014 it was resolved:

- a) That at present the interim report of the Leisure Task Group be noted for the work undertaken to date, but the recommendations not be accepted; and
- b) That the Corporate Management Team look at the interim report and the issues raised within the discussion of it, that this be fed into the work of the Task Group, and that a further report be presented to the Cabinet in due course.

1.2 As a result of the Cabinet meeting a report was presented to the Corporate Management Team (CMT) identifying strategic issues relating to future provision of leisure services. The view of the Corporate Management Team was that the development of a full Business Case should form part of a wider transformation programme that is currently being developed for the Council but that an analysis of new and existing data should be completed immediately.

1.3 Following the Cabinet meeting local media expressed an interest in surveying the public to gauge their views on leisure provision. This was undertaken in November 2014 and this report seeks to inform members of the outcome of that work. In addition, members were keen to understand how previous research conducted in the district could be utilised. This information has been used as a comparison for the more recent data.

1.4 **Responses** - The survey run in the local media comprised of questions relating to usage, membership, standards, facility mix, desired facilities, and satisfaction. There were 127 responses received of which 111 of those who responded were current members of the facilities. Of the 127 responses received 63% indicated they were Castle Sports Complex users, 21% pool users, 14% used both facilities and 2% didn't state either way.

1.5 **Satisfaction** – Respondents were asked to score 5 areas in terms of their level of satisfaction with each. Each area was scored from 1-5 with 5 being the highest level of satisfaction. The results for each area were:

- Customer Service with a score of 4.29,
- Value for money with an average score of 4.15,
- Programming / Activities on offer scored an average of 3.91
- The facilities / equipment on offer scored 3.64
- Cleanliness at the sites scored an average of 3.31.

Overall, of the 127 respondents, 107 stated that they would recommend the facilities to others. Of those who stated they would not recommend the facility to others, 79% would not recommend the pool.

1.6 **Usage** – When asked which facilities respondents used, the largest proportion stated they used the Fitness suite (34%), Group classes / Aerobics (17%), café (14%), and Personal training (13%).

1.7 **Desired changes** – The survey gave respondents the opportunity to identify ‘desired changes’. The results of this are detailed below:

- Additional Parking – 50% of respondents indicated this as a desired change
- Improved access – 16% of respondents indicated this as a desired change
- Facilities on one site – 38% of respondents indicated this as a desired change
- Different opening times – 9% of respondents indicated this as a desired change
- Wider range of facilities on offer – 36% of respondents indicated this as a desired change
- Improved condition of facilities – 59% of respondents indicated this as a desired change
- Change in membership / pricing – 19% of respondents indicated this as a desired change

1.8 **Additional Comments** – Respondents were given the opportunity to make additional comments in addition to the points covered in the survey. These comments fell in to 36 categories which included improved facilities, free wi-fi, cleanliness, compliments relating to staff, and car parking as well as specific comments relating to potential future options, site locations and specific sports club matters.

139 of these additional comments were received, and of these most comments fell over two categories – ‘New build / on one site’ and ‘Improve Condition’ with a total of 35% of the comments made relating to these areas. Other frequent comments related to facilities being outdated and the cleanliness of the facilities.

1.9 Comparing this data to previous data collected by the authority in August 2007 is problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly the sample size in the recent survey is not great enough to produce statistically significant values and therefore may not represent an accurate picture. Furthermore, the data was collected from specific groups of people, i.e. those who receive and read the local paper and users of the facilities who were also encouraged to respond.

1.10 It should also be noted that the data previously collected by the authority is almost 8 years old and therefore may also be unreliable. However the sample size used in 2007 was 728 and this research, while dated, does provide a wider opinion of the community as the

methodology used ensured a mix of feedback from a broader cross section of the population, different age groups, users and non-users.

- 1.11 The 2007 data suggests that at that time only 23% of the total sample felt it was important to provide a new leisure centre in South Holland, the recent data suggests this figure may now be higher. In 2007 64% of people identified that the most important feature of a facility would be a swimming pool and 17% a sports hall. Only 6% felt a gym was a priority. 35% of the sample back in 2007 felt improvements to the existing facilities were important.
- 1.12 Within the 2007 sample, 120 were users of the facilities (with more than half of these being users of the pool). Of this group 2/3rds stated they would use the centre more often if it were improved and over half drove to the centre.

2.0 **OPTIONS**

- 2.1 To note the contents of the report
- 2.2 Do nothing

3.0 **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 This report is for information only. This analysis will form part of the development of a Business Case as part of the Council's Transformation Programme currently under development.

4.0 **EXPECTED BENEFITS**

- 4.1 The data analysis (while not statistically significant) does provide useful insight into customer and resident opinion regarding future provision of Leisure Services.
- 4.2 The methodology used in original data collection provides a good basis on which to base further research.
- 4.3 Whilst recent data is limited, it provides a good starting point for the development of a full Business Case.

5.0 **IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 **Carbon Footprint / Environmental Issues**

- 5.1.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

5.2 **Constitution & Legal**

- 5.2.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

5.3 **Contracts**

- 5.3.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications at this time however the management contract with the existing provider is due to end in June 2018.

5.4 **Corporate Priorities**

- 5.4.1 Links to new Corporate Plan priority '*To have pride in South Holland by supporting the district and residents to develop and thrive*', and the specific Critical Activity '*Lead, enable*

and co-ordinate the provision of a range of local community and leisure facilities that improve education health and wellbeing’.

5.5 **Crime and Disorder**

5.5.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

5.6 **Equality and Diversity / Human Rights**

5.6.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

5.7 **Health & Wellbeing**

5.7.1 Links to new Corporate Plan priority ‘*To develop safer, stronger, healthier and more independent communities while protecting the most vulnerable’* and the Critical Activities ‘*Work with partners to remain active, participative, and live independently within the community’* and ‘*Lead and support the South Holland Health and Wellbeing Partnership to address key local health, care and wellbeing issues’.*

5.8 **Financial**

5.8.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications at this stage.

5.9 **Risk Management**

5.9.1 The recent data sample is not large enough to provide statistically significant sample on which to base assumptions, however it is a useful starting point for further development.

5.10 **Staffing**

5.10.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

5.11 **Stakeholders / Consultation / Timescales**

5.11.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications other than those covered in the main body of the report.

6.0 **WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED**

6.1 All

7.0 **ACRONYMS**

7.1 CMT – Corporate Management Team

Background papers:- None

Lead Contact Officer

Name and Post: Riana Rudland, Community Development and Health Manager

Telephone Number: 01362 656300

Email: riana.rudland@breckland-sholland.gov.uk

Key Decision: No

Exempt Decision: No

This report refers to a Discretionary Service

Appendices attached to this report: None