

CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Thursday 21 July 2011

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillors Price (Chair), Cook, Coulter, Lygo, Smith, Tanner and Timbs.

20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Bance, McManners and Turner.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

22. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Full written questions with answers were distributed at the start of the meeting.

A document from the Head of City Leisure outlining the Council's position on various claims made in a paper presented to the Full Council meeting on 11 July 2011 by the Save Temple Cowley Pool Group was also distributed at the start of the meeting.

The documents referred to above are appended to the minutes.

Nigel Gibson was given 3 minutes to address the Board. He highlighted various points on why the Save Temple Cowley Pools Group believed the closure of the Temple Cowley Pool was wrong and unjustified.

23. COMPETITION STANDARD SWIMMING POOL

The Head of City Leisure and Parks submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) recommending approval of the tender for the construction of a competition standard swimming pool adjoined to Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre.

The Head of City Leisure and Parks gave a presentation to the Board summarising how the proposed pool in Blackbird Leys fitted in with the overall aims and objectives of the City-wide Leisure strategy.

Peter Sloman, Chief Executive, spoke about the detail of the new pool in Blackbird Leys, particularly focusing on cost, affordability and risk to the Council. On the public questions he said that full answers had consistently been given to the questioners and he would not be authorising more officer time to answer questions on the subject in future.

Councillor Coulter, Board Member for Leisure, summed up the reasons why he believed the Board should approve the recommendations in the report. He said that the proposed new pool presented the best opportunity for all residents of the

City and that the alternative of keeping Temple Cowley Pool would be too costly and risky to the Council.

Resolved to:-

- 1) Approve the construction of the competition standard swimming pool adjoined to Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre and an increase in the contingency provision of £350k to cover risks, in particular; the implications of ground works and the Town Green application;
- 2) Delegate authority to the Executive Director of City Services, in consultation with the Head of Law and Governance, to award the construction contract to Willmott Dixon;
- 3) Delegate authority to the Executive Director of City Services to amend the contract with Fusion Lifestyle to include the management of the new competition standard swimming pool, subject to the agreement of satisfactory terms; and
- 4) Instruct officers to implement a decommissioning plan for Temple Cowley and Blackbird Leys Pools.

24. FUTURE ITEMS

Nothing was raised under this item.

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 6.15 pm

Responses to questions regarding the competition standard pool City Executive Board, 21 July 2011

A high number of the questions that have been asked about the competition standard pool cover the same or very similar points and many of which have been previously answered. To prevent repetition and to enable the full picture to be presented we have grouped responses together and provided background references. Where questions range across issues they are covered under each relevant heading.

Question from Paul Hernandez

- 1) How and where is Oxford city council going to find the extra finance to fund the new pool at the Blackbird Leys Leisure centre?

Questions from Alex Stonor

- 2) Why demolish a popular, well-equipped, accessible, health conscious sports facility, used by rich and poor people from all cultures, able and disabled, when 1000s of Oxford residents and users have begged you not to?
- 3) Why has this issue justified the use of snide and unconstitutional methods by those who are trusted to follow procedure and represent the needs and desires of the community?
- 4) What if the new centre doesn't draw the crowds expected/hoped for? It will be tough when it is a profoundly less accessible facility to ensure popularity and use. Aren't you taking a big risk with essential health and leisure resources if this proves to be the case?

Questions from Charlotte Barrow

- 5) Given that the Council says that it is convinced that the case has been made for closing the Temple Cowley Leisure Centre and the existing Blackbird Leys pool, and building a new pool in Pegasus Road, what does the Council consider to be the reasons that they have failed to convince so many members of the public - including many, many Council Tax-payers?
- 6) Are they concerned that they are failing to convince so many people?
- 7) Are the costs of a sauna and movable floor included in the budget of £8.5m?

- 8) Referring to question 3: if so, since they were not included at the beginning, what has been removed from the budget to accommodate their cost?
- 9) Referring to question 3, if not, why not?
- 10) Why is no steam room included? For people with respiratory problems, a steam room is generally infinitely preferable to a traditional sauna.
- 11) What steps have the Council taken to make it clear to the public that 'the sauna' at BL will be just a sauna, whereas 'the sauna' at TC is a sauna and a steam room - i.e. that there will not be a steam room?
- 12) A FOI request has shown that the pillar at TC which is currently surrounded by scaffolding would cost £31,000 to repair, while the Council has hitherto claimed that the cost of that repair was a major part of their figure of £2m+ (I note the exact amount over £2m seems to vary) for vital repairs - will they please explain how they can refer to that main figure as being a large part of the sum?

The issue with the concrete pillar is indicative a far greater structural concern.
- 13) The same FOI request revealed that the £2m+ included repainting lines in the car park - this has now been done, so what is the correct figure now?
- 14) Why will you not meet members of the public to discuss the figures, estimates etc that they have compiled? In particular, why will you not consider and discuss the information which lies behind the £3m figure the Save Temple Cowley Pools campaign puts forward?
- 15) The Council have claimed that TC is subsidised to the tune of half a million pounds - where does that show in the most recent accounts? How does that tie up to the fact that a FOI request has shown that the only spending on leisure, across the city, is now, I believe, £7,000 p.a.?
- 16) How many visits are there to use the main or learner pools at TC, per year?

*Usage data is not split between main and learner pools.
Fusions' estimates are that this is around 90,000 visits per year.*

17) How many visits are there to the sauna at TC, per year?

Fusions' estimates are that this is around 24,000 visits per year.

18) How many visits are there to the current BL pool, per year?

BLP is a small 4 lane 17m pool. The usage at the site last year was 28,326 visits.

19) Combined with the 200,000 visits I understand there to be to the current BL Leisure Centre, do the figures in your replies to the previous 3 questions amount to more or fewer than the estimated 400,000 who will visit the combined BL Leisure Centre and new pool? If fewer, how can you justify depriving many people of an opportunity to exercise and maintain their health?

20) I have had a written response to a question in which Councillor Coulter stated that the new pool will be accessible to a wider user audience - what is the value of that when the new attendance figures are estimated at 400,000 and there are figures available - perhaps contradicted by your replies to question 15 above - to suggest that current usage is 450,000?

21) In the same response, Councillor Coulter refers to the fact that 'the temperature of the new facility will be in line with industry standards' - I have not disputed that; however, if it is a competition pool then the temperature will be lower than e.g. Ferry or Barton pools, and considerably lower than the Blackbird Leys pool it is to replace; were Blackbird Leys residents made aware of this when they were canvassed or, for the single resident who turned up, at the meeting held in Blackbird Leys last summer?

22) Referring to Appendix 1, paragraph 6 under Item 5 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, are you aware that while Blackbird Leys had 'users' at the focus groups, Temple Cowley users were never formally or widely consulted by either of the two individuals you claim represented them? For example, one of them holds the email addresses of a number of users (the TC Users' Group) but this is not available to others and was never used to solicit opinions or views. That being so, how can you claim to have had fair representation (whatever the views) of current users of Temple Cowley Pools and Gym?

- 23) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, the reply to Question 5 states 'it is clear that people in Blackbird Leys welcome the idea of the new pool being built there' - what is the detailed evidence for that statement?
- 24) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, the phrases 'the Council have balanced...views' and 'carefully weighed' are frequently used: what is the process by which such balancing and weighing has been done?
- 25) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how you balanced views under question 7?
- 26) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how you balanced views under question 8?
- 27) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how you balanced views under question 14?
- 28) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how you balanced views under question 7?
- 29) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how you balanced views under question 23?
- 30) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how you balanced views under question 78?
- 31) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how what you mean by stating that you 'carefully weighed the significance of the petitions and other representations received with the other factors' views under question 88?
- 32) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please

give details of how you 'weigh petitions' , as per your answer to question 93?

- 33) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how you 'carefully weigh' the views of the public, as per your answer to question 108?
- 34) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details as to what you mean when you imply that petitions are 'carefully weighed' in your reply to question 109?
- 35) Referring to the Public Questions asked under Item 3 of the Agenda for the CEB meeting on 22nd June, would you please give details of how you 'carefully weigh' the views of the public, as per your answer to question 113?
- 36) Given the fact that it is clear that there is very considerable opposition to the Council's plan to close Temple Cowley Pools and the current Blackbird Leys pool, and to build a new pool elsewhere in Blackbird Leys, why does the Council not hold a referendum on the matter, consulting Council Tax-payers and users? That might result in them making more effort to persuade people of the merits of their argument - possibly an uphill battle after well over a year of prevarication and evasion but I am not alone in my opposition being in part because I am told it's what will happen, with no explanation of why alternative, and popular, plans won't (apart from the fact that a small majority of councillors disagree with said plans); this could be your chance to get more people on your side: why not take it?
- 37) When canvassing for the May 2010 elections, Cllr Malik said on the doorstep that there was no point in discussing the future of Temple Cowley Pools because it was all settled - does the CEB condone such a view?

We have no knowledge of these alleged comments, in line with the council's constitution this is a matter for CEB to determine.

- 38) Referring to the previous question (33): if no, what does the Council propose to do about it?

See answer 36

- 39) Referring to question 33: if yes, how can that possibly be justified?

40) At the last CEB meeting I enquired, under Item 3 of that agenda, about the canvassing in Blackbird Leys and was told in a written response that I must ask those who had canvassed; in answer to a further request, Cllr Price gave me the names and addresses of those who had undertaken the canvassing - why was that simply not provided in the first place? Is the CEB not aware that it is evasive behaviour of this sort that is antagonising so many people?

It is never the intension of officers, or members to act in manner that could be perceived to be evasive. Cleary there is a high volume of information that is being requested and it can take a period of time to provide it.

41) Referring to the question 36 (in two parts): I know that I am gullible enough to have been persuaded by the Council's arguments had it not so quickly become apparent that no questions would be answered in a straightforward and honest way - are you surprised that there is such a strong sense of 'no smoke without a fire' about this whole business? (The 'fire' being a strong sense that there are ulterior motives ([perhaps one, perhaps several] to the decision to close two pools and build a new one elsewhere, so that the minds of the Labour councillors were made up well over a year ago and the best interests of the citizens of Oxford, workers in Oxford, residents of both Temple Cowley and Blackbird Leys and the users of all the facilities at both sites were never properly considered.)

See answer 39

Question from Sue Pennington

42) Please can someone explain to me exactly why, despite considerable opposition from local people, the council is pressing ahead with plans to close Temple Cowley pool? Were you not elected to represent us and work on our behalf?

Questions from Linda Eshag

43) Please explain why you are in such a hurry to commit this huge sum of money for one pool in Blackbird Leys without first ensuring that funds are available to keep both swimming pools functioning ie those in Temple Cowley and Blackbird Leys, and firmly committed, to keep both facilities open?

44) Please could you provide clear costings for the refurbishing of both Temple Cowley Pool and Blackbird Leys as it seems that the public need time to consider the full facts clearly presented,

before making a final commitment to an expensive new capital project?

Questions from Hazel Hobbs

- 45) Why has the council never offered a referendum to the people of Oxford, particularly to those immediately affected by the proposed closure of Temple Cowley Pool facilities, when having received the largest petition in Oxford on any issue against the closure? In other words, why is the council so close minded to as the wishes of those people the taxpayer - who pay their salaries and wish to be heard?
- 46) Should the close of Temple Cowley Pool go ahead, what plans do the council have for the resultant land mass thus vacated?

Questions from Hans Edwards

- 47) If 12,000 signatures on a petition opposing the closure of Temple Cowley pool does not represent enough of the residents of Oxford, could those councillors in favour of the closure state specifically how many signatures would be enough to keep it open?
- 48) When asked previously 'can Oxford City Council tell me what they plan to do with the (Temple Cowley Pool and Gym) site ', the answer given was that 'the city council has no plans at present for the future of the site'. In answer to a separate question regarding costs of the new pool, the City Council states that the new pool will be funded by capital receipts from the Temple Cowley site.
- 49) If there are no plans for the future of the Temple Cowley site, how do you know you can use its capital receipts to fund the new build?
- 50) The City Council states that it has had the Temple Cowley site land valued. Having a piece of land valued is not the same as having received the money from its sale. There is no guaranteed purchaser of the land, is there?

The land has not yet been marketed.

Question from Steve Pottinger

- 51) The latest Council accounts declare a figure of under £1million to carry out all back maintenance at both Temple Cowley Pool and the existing Blackbird Leys swimming pool. Why, then, do the Council continue to claim the maintenance backlog at Temple Cowley alone is £2.3million?

Property colleagues have checked the capital programme and cannot identify the £1m that is referred to.

- 52) Why should the council be spending millions of pounds on another swimming pool, when we have perfectly good pools in both Blackbird leys and Temple Cowley?

Question from Anna Melland

- 53) Why is the Council pushing for a new pool in Blackbird Leys which is neither cost effective (or carbon effective) nor what people want?
- 54) Why are they not listening to the people of Oxford and choosing to invest in Temple Cowley swimming pool instead?

Questions from Louise Webberley

- 55) You have previously implied that city councillors carried out door to door canvassing in the Temple Cowley area to ascertain what the residents in the Temple Cowley and Cowley area feel about the potential closure of Temple Cowley pool. You did not satisfactorily provide any statistics for this in a previous question relating to this. Please could you tell me the names of the city councillors that carried out door to door canvassing in the Temple Cowley and Cowley area?

Cllr Malik.

- 56) What is the point of consulting with the residents of Oxford, if you just pay lip service to their view point? Is the Oxford Labour party in serious danger of becoming increasingly complacent, undemocratic and out of touch with the opinion and needs of the population in which it is here to serve? Do you not consider that a petition with 12,000 signatures represents a sizeable number of the population opposing the closure of the pool?
- 57) What is your true estimate of the cost of refurbishing both Temple Cowley and Blackbird Leys pools? Could you please provide an approximate figure as this was not satisfactorily answered in a previous response you gave in relation to this question?

Questions from Nigel Gibson

- 58) The report supporting agenda item 4 states at paragraph 1.2 that a full business case was considered at CEB in October 2010. Can you confirm that that is the financial basis for arguing that the proposed new swimming pool in Blackbird Leys should

be built, with the subsequent closure of Temple Cowley Leisure Centre and Blackbird Leys Swimming Pool?

The September 2010 report and accompanying feasibility study built on the January 2010 outline business case. These documents along with the tender work have enabled the recommendations to be made.

- 59) The report supporting agenda item 4 refers to a business case considered at CEB in October 2010. In that October 2010 report, paragraphs 9.16 and 9.17, the figures supporting closure of Temple Cowley Leisure Centre and Blackbird Leys Swimming Pool show a cost to the Council under the Fusion contract of £360k and £114k respectively for both financial years 2010/2011 and 2011/2012. However, the Council Accounts for 2009/10 (Note 6.30 Long term contracts) show that payments to Fusion in total (ie for operation of all Leisure facilities) is £409k in 2010/2011 and £237k in 2011/12. Can you please explain in detail, and using numbers as appropriate so that your answer is unambiguous and cannot be open to interpretation or further questioning, the difference between the costs shown in the report and the annual accounts?

The reason for the difference is that the £409,000 excludes utility costs that are directly paid by the council due to our large energy contract.

- 60) At Full Council last week, I made an address summarising the position with respect to the proposed build of a new swimming pool being considered under Agenda item 4. A note with unclaimed authorship was inserted after my address in the Council Briefing Note, page 11, challenging some of the points I have made consistently over the last. A key factor in considering the affordability of this vanity project is the current costs, over which there appears to be considerable confusion. Can you please explain the statement in the Council Briefing Note to last week's Full Council, where on page 11 it states that Temple Cowley Pools is subsidised by the Council by just over half a million pounds a year, including a detailed breakdown of this figure?

- 61) Under section 3.3 of the report supporting Agenda item 4 you state that guaranteed maximum price is £7,148,000 excluding fees and contingencies. However, in the report to CEB dated 1st April, you state that the maximum price is £6.5m. Can you please explain why the price has increased?

- 62) Given that the NPV cost of the proposed new pool was £16.5m before the inclusion of the items listed under section 2.2 of the report for Agenda Item 4 and the increase in guaranteed

maximum price from £6.5m to £7,148,000, what is the current NPV cost?

- 63) What is the carbon footprint impact of building the proposed new pool in tonnes CO2 equivalent?
- 64) Section 4.2 of the report supporting Agenda Item 4 states that the new contract will provide savings on operating costs of over £300,000 a year. Previously the Council has stated that all operating costs for leisure facilities are transferred to Fusion through their outsource contract. Can you please explain this apparent discrepancy?
- 65) Assuming you proceed with Option 1 in Section 5 of the report with Agenda Item 4, can you please describe the “fantastic legacy” you foresee in spending over £16m on a 25 metre, non-Olympic swimming pool for which there is no demand in Blackbird Leys?
- 66) According to the Council’s published figures, building the proposed new pool and closing Temple Cowley Leisure Centre and the existing Blackbird Leys swimming pool will result in a decrease in leisure participation in East Oxford of at least 12% - can you please explain how this consequence of building a new pool and closing two centres for which there is obvious, immediate and current demand will be either a “fantastic legacy” or “excellent publicity”?
- 67) Option 3 in Section 5 of the report with Agenda Item 4 is to retain both Temple Cowley Leisure Centre and the existing Blackbird Leys swimming pool. Your own figures show that the existing usage at Temple Cowley Leisure centre and the existing Blackbird Leys swimming pool is over 250,000 visits a year, and Cllr Timbs announced in CEB earlier this year that Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre had over 200,000 visits a year, a total of over 450,000 visits per year for the combined centres. Since the forecast for the Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre and the proposed new pool is only 385,000-400,000 visits, why would option 3 not meet the Council’s strategic objective for increasing leisure participation?
- 68) Option 3 in Section 5 of the report with Agenda Item 4 is to retain both Temple Cowley Leisure Centre and the existing Blackbird Leys swimming pool. Given that both facilities can be refurbished and improved for £3m, and that would also retain leisure usage of over 450,000 visits a year compared to the proposed new pool, how and why does this option not meet the Council’s strategic objective of overall cost effectiveness when compared to the £16m+ cost of Option 1?

69) Is this the final decision to close Temple Cowley Leisure Centre?

Please see recommendation four.

70) In respect of Section 7 of the report with Agenda Item 4, what is the cost in terms of greenhouse gas emissions in tonnes CO2 equivalent of building the proposed new pool, and will that be reported under the council's CRC (and if so, how?)?

71) What will be the estimated increase in greenhouse gas emissions in tonnes CO2 equivalent to the city of Oxford as a whole from the increase in traffic occasioned by the closure of Temple Cowley Leisure Centre and the opening of the proposed new swimming pool in Blackbird Leys?

72) When does the council anticipate closing Temple Cowley Leisure Centre?

73) Given that the council has been repeatedly unable to make its case to the general public, and has not established that there is a demand for a new pool in Blackbird Leys (compared to either a refurbishment or rebuild in or around Temple Cowley), will CEB consider a fourth option, to pause for reflection, take further views from the public, critically investigate how Temple Cowley Leisure Centre and Blackbird Leys Swimming Pool could be refurbished and improved for £3m, and then establish a full rationale and business case in an open and honest manner that the voters of Oxford can understand and support?

74) Section 11.4 of the report supporting Agenda Item 4 considers the potential effect of a Town Green application. Given that the main reason why a Town Green application succeeds is that a green space has been used for recreational purposes for over twenty years, and that Blackbird Leys Park clearly has been used in that way for much longer, what robust and authoritative defence does the council think it can raise?

In the event that an application for Town Green status is properly made in regard to Blackbird Leys Park, the Council will not be required to disclose the nature of its opposition to the application until the appropriate time in the process. However, an applicant for Town Green status for any land will find that they will need to establish much more than simple usage for "recreational purposes" for over twenty years. Other factors are of crucial importance in any determination of an application, and the Council is confident that in this particular case any application can be quickly defeated.

75) Section 11.4 of the report supporting Agenda Item 4 considers the potential effect of a Town Green application. What advice has been received from which leading counsel? What information did the council provide, and what position did you ask them to determine?

In this regard, the Council is under no obligation whatsoever to disclose the privileged legal advice it has received (in this case from Queen's Counsel), and it has no intention of so doing at this point.

76) Why is the likelihood of a Town Green application and its impact not shown on the Risk Register?

Section 11.4 details the council's view on the Town Green. It is also detailed in appendix one in the risk action plan as CEB-006-CL.

77) Why is the likelihood of a Judicial Review and its impact not shown on the Risk Register?

A Judicial Review might be commenced in regard to practically every Council decision taken, but where the Council is confident that all due process has been observed it would be unreasonable to take particular steps to seek to mitigate the risk.

78) According to the latest figures available from the Council, the Planning Application 11/00242/CT3 states that 15 new job vacancies will be created for staff at the proposed new swimming pool, and that Fusion will be taking on 5 trainees. Will the Council confirm that of the 45 or so staff currently employed at Blackbird Leys Swimming Pool and Temple Cowley Leisure Centre, only a maximum of 10 will be offered jobs at the new facility?

The combined staffing at the two centres is 26 Full Time Equivalent. Fusion will offer staff currently employed at the two facilities the opportunity to transfer to vacancies within the Oxford leisure portfolio. This would include opportunities at a new facility.

79) Why will you not acknowledge that you cannot possibly know what the cost of a new swimming pool will be over its intended 25 year lifespan, and that there is less certainty in a brand new building than one that has already stood in place and constant use despite your lack of investment in maintenance for 25 years?

80) Will you recognise that when you compare like for like that the proposed new 25m swimming pool at Blackbird Leys has a

forecast carbon footprint of 300 tonnes of CO2 equivalent pa plus at least 1800 tonnes of CO2 equivalent as part of the build, whereas using the Fusion report from the last Scrutiny committee meeting Temple Cowley Leisure Centre swimming pools and diving pool carbon footprint is less than 200 tonnes CO2 equivalent pa?

81) Why do you persist in asserting that public transport access is easy to Blackbird Leys, when Director for City Services, Tim Sadler, admitted at the Mace report presentation meeting in August 2010 that the ideal place for a leisure centre was by the transport hub in Temple Cowley, precisely where Temple Cowley Leisure Centre is operating successfully now despite the Council's lack of investment?

82) When does the Council anticipate starting work on the proposed new pool?

If approved works would commence works as soon as all final matters are concluded.

Questions from Jane Alexander

83) Why do you persist in refusing to provide sufficient information for an open and honest debate, and only provide biased and poorly researched information relating to your intention to proceed with your vanity project in Blackbird Leys such as the commentary on page 11 of the Council Briefing Note issued for the Council Meeting on Monday 11th July.

84) What work has already started on the site of the proposed new swimming pool?

Surveys.

85) When the Save Temple Cowley Pools Campaign team of experts, and the Green Party with its access to similar expertise, provide a solution for leisure in East Oxford for only £3m, why does the Council persist with an option of much higher cost ie £16m+ and rising?

86) Can you please confirm that the Council has never actually consulted with the general public to ask them what demand there is for a new, 25m, non-Olympic swimming pool at Blackbird Leys?

87) In previous conversations with both your experts Mace and also the leisure department, it has been confirmed that the intended life of the proposed new pool is only 25 years, as this is the lifespan built in to these type of facilities nowadays. Can you

please explain where you got the figure of 60 years from, as put forward in your commentary on the address given at the last Full Council meeting? What evidence do you have that such a facility will last for that long if you really believe it, when your own reports, including the Mace report from August 2010, state that Temple Cowley Leisure Centre is 'mid-life' and in 'fair' condition?

Question from Madeline and Duncan Brewer

88) Why is the council ignoring the health needs of the over 60's and of young families to have a pool in the Cowley, East Oxford, area that is accessible by public transport and that can easily be visited by people who do not have a car and who want to use public transport?

Question from Peter Wilkinson

89) I note with dismay that the S106 contribution for the Lambourn Road development is to be used to part fund the proposed new swimming pool at Blackbird Leys. My question is in three parts:

a) Why is one of the poorest communities in Oxford being "robbed" to support this monument to folly and maladministration when the money could so usefully be deployed to improve the local amenities in Rose Hill?

b) What is the value of the Lambourn Road S106 contribution?

c) Why has this not been mentioned by our ward councillors at the Rose Hill Regeneration Partnership or the Rose Hill Tenants' and Residents' Association?

a/b) There is a legal agreement for the developer contribution sum of £4,620 from the Lambourn Road development to be used against 'indoor sports provision'. The new proposed pool will attract usage from residents within Rose Hill.

c) Approval is subject to the recommendation being accepted by CEB.

Question from David Jackson

90) At the last CEB meeting on the 22 June, over 120 public questions were asked and written responses provided. Due to the high number of questions and public interest in the issues, it is not unreasonable to assume that the CEB members sought help or assistance from Council official in the preparation of the responses. How of the responses were provided directly from CEB members without the help or assistance of Council officials? (NB: For the absence of doubt, reviewing, authorizing

and agreeing a response that has been drafted by a Council official does not count as a direct response from a CEB member. If the CEB member drafted the initial substantive response and then worked with Council officials on its review and publication, this would count as a 'direct' response.)

Officers will normally write a draft response to questions received by the City Executive board, these are then reviewed by the responsible Executive Member before the response is published.

- 91) At a recent resident's association meeting on the 12 July, Cllr Malik stated that it was inconceivable that Council officials could ever publish information not based on facts as all publications needed to be sanctioned by the Legal department. This applies in particular to all publications at Full Council meetings. On that basis he stated a number of times that if residents of Oxford disagreed with publications from the Council on factual grounds, he was not going to challenge the publication. He further advised residents to sue the Council if they believed that publications were misleading and factually incorrect as it was not his role to challenge factual inaccuracies in Council documents. What process should residents follow to seek and obtain clarification of facts and should this include the suing the Council as advised by a Councillor?
- 92) For the current financial year, what are the budgeted costs (Capital, Revenue and any other that you use categorises) to run Temple Cowley Fitness Centre?
- 93) For the previous financial year, what were the actual costs (Capital, Revenue and any other that you use categorises) to run Temple Cowley Fitness Centre?
- 94) For the previous financial year, what were the actual costs (Capital, Revenue and any other that you use categorises) to run and operate the Fusion contract?
- 95) For the answers to 87 to 89 above, does the response include any subsidy (e.g. for free swimming/access) that will continue once the proposed new pool at BBL is built?
- 96) For the answers 87 to 89 above, how do these vary for the next 7 years?

Questions from William Clark

- 97) Is it the intention of the city council to increase the size of the parking facility beyond that outlined in the planning application, to accommodate the proposed increased footfall?

98) How will the construction traffic access the site?

Construction traffic will approach the site from Watlington road B480 via the junction of the A4142 and there after via Cuddesdon way and finally onto Pegasus Road. Surrounding Roads have 20mph speed restriction also road humps. Access to site through the existing car park which is also an access for the adjacent college.

99) How will the current infrastructure cope with the increased work traffic?

There is a full access plan in place to reduce the impact of construction traffic.

Question from Richard Firth

100) Considering the high costs, debatable benefits and lack of public support for the new pool and leisure facility in Blackbird Lees, and the strong support for keeping and improving the current facilities, why is the Council apparently determined to act contrary to what would be a popular and cheaper course of action?

Question from Vim Rodrigo

101) Is the builder's contribution towards environmental improvements in Rose Hill under section 106 secured through the Lambourn Road development to be used for funding of the Blackbird Leys Pool? I hope that the above is not true and that you can assure Rose Hill residents that the s106 monies will be used for projects in Rose Hill"

See answer 89

Affordability

Questions covered; 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 60, 63, 67, 78, 84, 99

The total cost of the pool is £8,880,000 as shown in appendix three of the report. The capital budget was agreed by council on the 21st February 2011 which included £8.5 million for a new pool adjoined to Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre.

It is funded from a capital receipt of £1.5m from the Temple Cowley site. No decision has been taken on what the land would be used for, so a prudent figure has been assumed. The remaining £7m is funded from borrowing; it is likely we will reduce the borrowing by using capital receipts.

In the main the borrowing is paid back over a 20 year period from the savings the council makes from closing Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool. When we add back in the running cost for the new pool of around £150,000 we make a saving of just over £300,000 per year to fund the borrowing. This option only works at Blackbird Leys as we; own the land, we can adjoin a pool to a dryside facility enabling operating savings, we make the savings from closing two costly facilities and we attain a capital receipt from the land at Temple Cowley.

These figures exclude the costs the council will no longer have to pay for the repair and maintenance backlog at Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool which is around £2.6m and the ongoing building costs at Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool which averages around £110,000 per year at Temple Cowley alone. All the repair and maintenance costs for the new pool are included in the operating costs.

Following the planning consultation we added in additional elements (section 2.2 of the CEB report) which increased the costs. While we have worked hard to bring the costs down and retain the high quality through robust procurement the costs are above the original budget. £140,000 of the costs are for dryside works such as a new soft play area that can be covered using repair and maintenance monies and there are also some developer contributions that can be used towards the scheme which makes the pool affordable.

The increased costs means that the net present value for the scheme (which is in essence the time value of money) increases by £660,000 over to the 20 years period. This prudently assumes that we borrow all bar the capital receipt from Temple Cowley Pools, by using further capital receipts we hope to significantly reduce the net present value.

The moveable floor has always been part of the scheme as shown in appendix one of the outline business case agreed by CEB on the 1st of September 2010.

Background documents;

The outline business case agreed at CEB on the 13th of January 2010 includes the project cash flow over 20 year in appendix two.

The feasibility and business case agreed at CEB on the 1st September 2010 Award of the contract to construct a new competition standard pool, CEB 21st July 2011.

Access

Questions; 80, 87, 96

The new pool is designed to be a city wide facility and while it is advantageous for those who can walk to the site the location is accessible from across the city.

The new proposed facility is very accessible at only approximately 1.6 miles from Temple Cowley Pools and is just 480 metres from Blackbird Leys Pool. There is good access by public transport and through the cycle network. There are also approximately 10,000 people within a 10 minute walk.

Neither Blackbird Leys Pool nor Temple Cowley Pools meet modern disabled access standards. Perhaps the most notable example is that neither site has wheelchair access to the first floor.

The council's commitment to health can be seen with our commitment to build a high quality pool, rather than just close Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool and our targeted concessions and recently expanded free swimming programme.

Background documents;

Travel plan – council's website

Outline business case – 13th Jan 2010

Consultation pages of the councils website

Running Costs

Questions; 14, 41, 42, 51, 52, 53, 59, 63, 91, 92, 93, 95, 99

The council pay Fusion Lifestyle a set annual fee for operating all the centres. The only increases are if we add in new elements such as free swimming, or reduction can be made through improvement works such as the new gyms. The maintenance costs for the old sites (Blackbird Leys Pool, Temple Cowley Pools, Hinksey Pools and the Ice Rink) have remained with the council and are also additional costs above the management fee.

The operating cost at Temple Cowley is £360,000.

The property costs at Temple Cowley over the past four years have averaged at £110,000 per year.

Additional costs are the council's costs to support the contract.

This equates to just over £500,000 per year at Temple Cowley Pools.

The backlog maintenance costs at Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool is in excess of £2.6m

Background documents;

Condition survey

Consultation and transparency

Questions; 3, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 42, 51, 52, 53, 82, 85, 90, 99

The council has at all times acted in an open transparent manner and in line with our protocols; our consultation web pages give answers to the questions

we have been asked and a wide range of consultation events have taken place with numerous meetings having been held with stakeholder groups and individuals.

<http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decLP/ConsultationonLeisureFacilities.htm> We have promoted this widely (as shown on the website) including displaying updated display boards in every leisure centre.

The consultation showed that a sauna was preferable to a steam room. Our leisure operator also advised that saunas have greater usage.

The standard operating temperature of the new pool will be in the same operating range as Ferry Leisure Centre and Barton Leisure Centre.

The September 2010 CEB report and business case detailed the officer balanced view on this mater. -

http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decCD/committeemeetings.htm?commiteeld=2_City%20Executive%20Board.cmt. Key factors reviewed have been access, cost, demand, carbon and sustainability. Elected members have then engaged further with the community and officers have continued to meet with a representative focus group to ensure a balanced view is attained.

If a member of the public wants clarification on a particular fact then they should speak to their local councillor, or contact the relevant council officer.

Referendum and Petitions

Questions; 2, 5, 6, 23-34, 35, 41, 44, 56, 55, 99

Councillors are aware of the views within the City including those who want to save Temple Cowley Pools and have to balance these carefully with all of the factors that they have to consider including; attaining a wide section of public opinion, cost, affordability, accessibility and sustainability before coming to a conclusion as to what is in the best interests of tax payers across the city.

The Councils constitution makes clear how we deal with such matters.

Background documents;

The council's constitution

Demand and Participation

Questions; 4, 42, 51, 52, 18, 19, 53, 64, 65, 66, 67, 82, 87, 99

There is a need and demand for a 25 metre competition standard pool in Oxford. The new pool will be city wide facility that is accessible and attracts children and young people, families through to older people and those learning to swim through to those swimming competitively.

The proposed new pool offers more than Temple Cowley Pools and the existing Blackbird Leys Pool. It has a floating floor which gives greater flexibility in programming sessions, has a large teaching pool and a toddler fun pool for families with small children. The new pool will provide much improved access for those with limited mobility and those with disabilities.

The 400,000 usage projection was supplied in the first half of the financial year 2010/11 by Fusion Lifestyle, a social enterprise with charitable status, and has used their extensive expertise to assess the demand for the pool. Fusion are very confident that the pool will achieve its projected targets. Since then, the usage for Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre has done significantly better for the year 2010/11 with a 36% increase above the target (approximately 40,000 increase) to approximately 160,000 in 2010/11, combining this with the figures put forward by the save Temple Cowley Pools group would mean this is similar to the new facility at 410,000 visits in total. However, although Temple Cowley Pools has had an unexpected increase in usage in 2010/11, its figures for the first quarter of 2011/12 are already 17% down on last year and if this trend as expected continues, or there are unplanned closures then again the new facility would demonstrate a higher level of projected usage. It is also important to note that Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool risk unplanned closures which would have a marked impact on participation.

Background documents;

CEB report and Outline Business Case January 2010

CEB report September 2010

<http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decLP/ConsultationonLeisureFacilities.htm>

Condition

Questions; 12, 41, 42, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 68, 71, 84, 86, 99

While both Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool have served their communities for many years, keeping them open is not sustainable. Temple Cowley Pools has many problems; e.g. a corroding support pillar which has been propped up with scaffolding since 2008. The diving pool has now been closed since 2002 and the pool tank is showing signs of failure. Unusually, all the three pools at Temple Cowley are interlinked, this means we still have to heat and treat the water in the closed diving pit. The design of the facility means that the pool plant is unable to cope when the external temperature falls in winter, this results in sessions having to be cancelled.

The council is planning a managed closure of both sites and replacing them with a high quality, city wide facility. While we intend to keep both sites open until the new pool opens, if there is a high cost maintenance failure then we would need to ensure that undertaking the works provided value for money.

While we have continued to undertake some small scale works other problems continue to arise. At present we have issues with air handling, air conditioning and humidity. Unfortunately as is the nature of facilities at the end of their life maintenance issues are increasing rather than reducing.

The main key items such as the building structure and pool tanks have a life span of approximately 60 years. Cladding and mechanical and electrical items have an approximate life span of approximately 15-30 years.

Extensive work has been undertaken on the project over the past three years, it would not be best use of tax payers' money for further work to be undertaken when there is such a compelling case.

The £3m save TCP option - In August 2010 when this figure was proposed our lead consultants met with the Save Temple Cowley Pools group to gain a better understanding of their proposal. They evaluated the limited information presented and while it was commendable to see the work that had been undertaken the proposal was viewed as having no substance. By undertaking the £2.3m of works in the maintenance backlog at Temple Cowley Pools it is estimated that there would be only seven years of additional life. The majority of this work would also not be visible to the public.

The September 2010 feasibility study explored various costed options at Temple Cowley Pools. For a relatively low standard refurbishment enabling 25 years of life the expenditure at Temple Cowley was £6.37m and £10.07m for a reasonable standard of refurbishment and remodelling. This work would result in the closure of TCP for approximately 18 months. Both the £6.37m and £10.07m options are risky with a high likelihood that further problems are found when works are undertaken.

Background documents;

Condition survey

Carbon

Questions; 42, 51, 53, 62, 69, 70, 79, 99

The council's figures show that Temple Cowley Pools has the highest carbon footprint of all the existing Leisure Centres at 866 tonnes carbon dioxide per annum. If both Temple Cowley Pools (866 tonnes of carbon per annum) and Blackbird Leys Pool (137 tonnes of carbon per annum) were closed, with the new pool (projected 283 tonnes of carbon per annum) opening adjoined to the existing leisure centre (410 tonnes of carbon per annum) in Blackbird Leys then there would be a net saving to the Council of 720 tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum.

Oxford City Council also aims to achieve BREEAM "very good" rating for the new pool and is close to developing one of the first BREEAM "excellent" pools in the country.

Embedded CO₂ of construction has not been used as a monitoring/assessment tool to date for any of the existing Council's leisure buildings. Modern construction materials/approaches are likely to be less carbon intensive than in previous years when other centres were constructed. The Natural Resources Impact Assessment – Supplementary Planning Document has been followed for this project in regard to the proposed installation of a Biomass boiler, which will meet the 20% onsite renewables requirement)

The Council has invested in liquid pool cover technology and variable speed drives on pool circulation pumps at Temple Cowley Pools as part of the Council wide Carbon Management programme and has observed energy savings with these approaches. It is agreed that further CO2 savings could be achieved with a mechanical pool cover at the building leading to further savings when the pool is not in use (e.g. during night time). However this would not make significant impact on the overall high energy and maintenance running costs of the building and the site would still remain one of the highest CO2 emitters in the estate.

Background documents;

Energy Bureau figures

Natural Resource Impact Assessment

CEB report September 2010

“Inaccuracies” in the address	“Factual” position	Save TCP ‘Reality’	Response from OCC on ‘Save TCP reality’
<p>Why spend £16m on a 25 metre pool when £3m will refurbish and improve two facilities enabling them to remain open for 20 years</p>	<p>1. The cost for the new pool is £8.5m (this includes fees and contingencies).</p>	<p>1. MISLEADING: The ‘actual’ cost of the proposed new pool is unknown (see later on how the costs have already risen) – a budget has been declared of £8.5m, but the council has included additional cost items (such as sauna, moveable floor) not in the original budget and kept the top figure the same, refusing to explain how this could happen.</p>	<p>1. The capital programme approved £8.5m of funding for the new pool adjoined to Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre. The report of the 21st gives the total cost excluding contingencies, which covers the risk, of £8.177m. Additional funding has been found to for contingencies taking the potential scheme cost to £9.23m, of which £1.88m is met from the sale of the land at Temple Cowley and planning obligations making the net cost to the council £7.34m.</p>

<p>2. The 16m figure includes the cost of borrowing.</p>	<p>2. MISLEADING: The 16m figure is the council's, and is actually the Net Present Value (NPV) calculated over the 25 year intended lifespan of the pool. This figure was presented last year at a press conference held by the council, along with an NPV figure for rebuilding TCP, as a way of misleading the public into thinking that rebuilding will be much more expensive than the new build. The council has never presented a proper business case to the public showing this figure so there is no way of knowing the assumptions, which may be completely unrealistic.</p>	<p>2. The £16m was used as an expression of the net present value figure of the scheme including the cost of borrowing, fees payable to Fusion and the construction costs. This is only helpful in the context of the options appraisal. Some of these figures have changed now that the tenders have been received. The sum covers the total estimated costs over 20 year of operation. The gross cost of the scheme is £9.23m and £7.34m net of capital receipts and planning contributions.</p> <p>Evidence: CEB report Jan 2010, CEB report Sept 2010 and August Feasibility Study.</p>
<p>3. The construction cost for the pool itself is £6.5m-7m.</p>	<p>3. NOT TRUE: A paper was presented to the City Executive Board in April recommending Willmott Dixon as lead contractor, with a price of £6.5m. In the report going to CEB on 21st July the figure has already gone up to £7.148m, higher than the £7m top figure claimed by the council.</p>	<p>3. The fixed price is marginally higher than the range given but is still within the budget for the scheme, which has also now included additional dryside elements and additional contingencies have been added.</p> <p>Evidence: This is clearly shown in the CEB report 21st July 2011.</p>
<p>4. It is therefore the £6.5m-7m figure that the</p>	<p>4. NOT TRUE: the £6.5m-7m figure is inaccurate (see above). The £3m figure includes all borrowing and was agreed</p>	<p>4. The finance department have only noted that the £3m figure in the Green budget is part of their overall proposal. Our view is</p>

	<p>£3m should be compared with.</p> <p>5. The maintenance backlog at TCP alone is £2.3m.</p>	<p>by the Council Finance Department as part of the Green Party Budget. So over 25 years, the proposed new pool would be at least £16m, while the TCP costs would still be £3m.</p> <p>5. MISLEADING AND UNTRUE: the council originally claimed that £2.6m was needed for vital repairs and that there would be minimal visible improvements. They repeatedly implied that a major cost would be repairing the column in the middle of the pool area that currently has scaffolding around it. The council refused to give a breakdown of this figure, and we had to use Freedom of Information to get a complete list. This revealed that the column would cost only £31k to repair, and the total included items such as repainting the car park lines, which we do not consider a vital repair. The latest Council accounts declares a figure of under £1m to carry out all back maintenance at both TCP and the existing BBL swimming pool.</p>	<p>that £3m would be the minimum to meet the repairs backlog, it does not represent the amount needed for a full refurbishment which would be in the range of £6-10m.</p> <p>Evidence: Repair and maintenance backlog break down for TCP and BLP.</p> <p>5. Council officers have supplied the breakdown of maintenance costs previously to the save TCP group, the maintenance costs total £2.3 at Temple Cowley Pools alone. The council's corporate assets service has revisited the £0.3m estimate for Blackbird Leys Pool which they are advising is now substantially higher due to the survey being completed in 2008.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>6. By spending £3m on these sites there would be minimal visible improvements to the customer.</p> <p>7. The lifespan would not be extended by 20-25 years, only seven.</p>	<p>6. MISLEADING: The council has never spoken to us directly about what a £3m spend would comprise, so cannot possibly be in a position to comment – our figure has been compiled through research and discussion with experts who focus on and specialize in refurbishment and eco-restoration. And certain elements, such as the remodelling of the reception area, have been agreed by MACE as accurate estimates.</p> <p>7. MISLEADING: The council has never spoken to us directly about the possible extended lifespan, so cannot possibly be in a position to comment. However, the council's own reviews state quite clearly that carrying out necessary maintenance will extend the life for another 20+ years. The council's own MACE report states that TCP is "mid-life" and in "fair" condition.</p>	<p>6. The Council met with the save TCP group on the 25th Aug 2010 to look at what their £3m scheme comprised and no substantive evidence was presented. Evidence: Meeting minutes from 25th Aug 2010 with save TCP group.</p> <p>7. The feasibility study did explore various costed options at Temple Cowley Pools. To extend the lifespan by 25 years the expenditure at Temple Cowley alone was £6.37m for a relatively poor standard refurbishment and £10.07m for a reasonable standard of refurbishment/ remodelling (p.9 Feasibility Study) This work would result in the closure of TCP for 18 months and both options are high risk with a high likelihood that further problems are found when works are undertaken. Evidence: August 2010 Feasibility study</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>8. The new pool would have a lifespan of approximately 60 years not the 25 years that Mr Gibson has stated</p>	<p>8. UNTRUE: The MACE consultants have admitted that the proposed new swimming pool is only designed for a 25 year life.</p>	<p>8. The main key items such as the building structure and pool tanks have a life span of approximately 60 years. Cladding and mechanical and electrical items have an approximate life span of approximately 15-30 years.</p>
<p>The council claims that TCP costs over half a million to run</p>	<p>9. Temple Cowley Pools is subsidized by the council by just over half a million pounds a year.</p>	<p>9. UNSUBSTANTIATED ASSERTION: In our early discussions with the council, they claimed an annual running cost of over £600k – on further examination it became apparent that (a) these costs included over half a million in staff costs and (b) they were the last reported figures before the Fusion contracted started. Under the Fusion contract, a single figure is paid by the Council each year for Fusion to operate all leisure facilities, including staff costs. An FOI request revealed that the only cost of leisure to the council is the Fusion contract. We have requested clarification on what comprises this claim of half a million pounds, and await an answer</p>	<p>9. Jan 2010 - Report and Outline Business Case to CEB. Within the outline business case it referred to the actual figures for the net subsidy for Temple Cowley Pools (TCP) when it was within the operation of the Council in 2008/9. This was highlighted as approximately £540K on page 9. This report also highlighted that it would be expected that Fusion would be able to make efficiencies on this figure in the future but that it would still be high cost.</p> <p>The Council pays a set amount each year to Fusion and we do not break this sum down per centre. Fusion are clearly aware of the operating costs of TCP and have confirmed this is of a commercially sensitive nature. However, after pressure from the Council Fusion agreed for some limited information to be released to help us in being transparent. This information included the usage projection for the new proposed pool and existing leisure centre of 375,000-400,000. It also included some information on operating costs for TCP and Blackbird Leys Pool that were included in the report below.</p> <p>September 2010 - There are a number of tables in section nine of this report that show the operating cost of TCP to be reduced to £360K, however this figure does not include maintenance</p>

<p>The Greens have agreed a budget with the head of finance that would keep the pool running for the next 25 years</p>	<p>10. The Head of Finance has only agreed the proposed budget; it is not his role to review the impact that the proposed expenditure will have.</p>	<p>10. AGREED, but MISLEADING. So the Greens have agreed a budget with the head of finance – this is not an ‘inaccuracy’ in the address, so should not be included in the left-hand column. In order to comment on whether that figure would keep the pool running for 25 years the council would need to appreciate what would be done for the £3m and as discussed above the Council is not in a position to comment</p>	<p>and management/support service overheads. With these figures added in it gives the operating cost at the site at approximately £500K.</p> <p>Evidence: CEB Report Jan 2010 and Outline Business Case. CEB report September 2010.</p>
<p>10. The Council met with the save TCP group on the 25th August 2010 to look at what their £3m scheme comprised and no substantive evidence was presented. We are happy to see the costed breakdown of the £3m. As stated above when this was reviewed by Mace the advice they gave the council was that it has no substance.</p> <p>Evidence: Meeting minutes from 25th Aug 2010 with save TCP group.</p>			

<p>TCP is energy efficient</p>	<p>11. Temple Cowley Pools has by far the highest carbon footprint of our leisure centres.</p>	<p>11. AGREED but MISLEADING – and it offers a wider range of facilities than any other leisure centre, including a diving pool, gym, sauna, steam room and exercise studio. What the council fails to recognize is that its own figures show that TCP is the most energy efficient wet/dry leisure centre, based on the independent measurements shown on charts at each centre. And in terms of carbon emissions per square metre, it is the most efficient of any leisure centre.</p> <p>The council is deliberately confusing reducing carbon emissions by closing facilities and reducing amenities for the public with reducing carbon emissions through genuine improvements in energy efficiency. This would be so easily and quickly achieved at TCP by simply installing pool covers, reducing evaporation by 85% and providing a real increase in energy efficiency.</p>	<p>11. The Display Energy Certificate referred to was incorrect and has since been corrected and reissued giving a more representative rating for Temple Cowley Pools. The electricity consumption in the incorrect DEC was entered as ca 330,000kWh by the independent assessor for the 365day period used for this DEC assessment. The actual consumption is approximately 1,300,000kWh at the site leading to the incorrect DEC rating.</p> <p>The Council has invested in liquid pool cover technology and variable speed drives on pool circulation pumps as part of the Council wide Carbon Management programme and has observed energy savings with these approaches. It is agreed that further CO2 savings could be achieved with a mechanical pool cover at the building leading to further savings when the pool is not in use (e.g. during night time). However this would not make significant impact on the overall high energy and maintenance running costs of the building and the site would still remain one of the highest CO2 emitters in the estate Evidence: Display energy certificate (DEC) for Temple Cowley pools and DEC comparison.</p>
--------------------------------	--	--	--

	<p>12. TCP has numerous design and building fabric problems.</p> <p>13. TCP would not be more energy efficient than a new modern pool.</p>	<p>12. MISLEADING – not clear what point is being made. The state of the building is a consequence of the Council actively refusing to invest in maintenance of TCP over the last ten years.</p> <p>13. MISLEADING and UNTRUE – the council is comparing a complete leisure centre with a small pool. The council has claimed that the proposed new pool will generate about 300 tonnes CO2 equivalent pa. It has not provided the carbon cost of building the proposed new pool, which will be about 1800 tonnes CO2 equivalent.</p> <p>Fusion presented figures to the Council's Scrutiny committee recently on energy usage at the different leisure centres. From this, it is possible to deduce the carbon footprint of the TCP swimming and diving pool, which is 180 tonnes equivalent pa. And this is without pool covers that would prevent 85% of the energy lost from evaporation, that the council has refused to invest in (on an 11 month payback) over many years. So using</p>	<p>12. The Council has invested approximately £441,000 in Temple Cowley Pools in the last four years. Evidence: Repair and Maintenance Spreadsheet 2011.</p> <p>13. Embedded CO2 of construction has not been used as a monitoring/assessment tool to date for any of the existing Council leisure buildings. Modern construction materials/approaches are likely to be less carbon intensive than in previous years when other centres were constructed. The Natural Resources Impact Assessment – Supplementary Planning Document has been followed for this project in regard to the proposed installation of a Biomass boiler, which will meet the 20% onsite renewables requirement) Evidence: http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Direct/65335adoptionNRIASPD.pdf</p> <p>The council's figures show that Temple Cowley Pools has the highest carbon footprint of all the existing Leisure Centres at 866 tonnes carbon dioxide per annum. If both Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool were closed, with the new pool opening adjoined to the existing leisure centre in Blackbird Leys then there would be a net saving to the Council of 720 tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum. Evidence: Energy bureau validated figures spreadsheet.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>There is no demand for a pool in Blackbird Leys</p>	<p>14. The new pool is proposed to have a biomass boiler, modern energy efficiency measures and a combined heat and power unit. The design of the new pool is classed as very good in relation to environmental adaptations and the current design is close to being one of a handful of sites nationwide that are classified as excellent.</p>	<p>the Council's own figures, the TCP pools are more energy efficient than the proposed new pool.</p> <p>14. ACCURATE but MISLEADING. We have no issue with the claims for the new pool, although the effect of the claimed ability to alter water temperature for different users on the carbon footprint has never been explained.</p> <p>A recent assessment of TCP pointed out that the relatively new boiler did not need replacing, but a combined heat and power unit could be fitted at zero cost if necessary. Other 'green' improvements would form part of the £3m refurbishment.</p> <p>Whatever is claimed for the proposed new pool, it would be built on green space, would have a significant carbon footprint as part of the build, and would generate significantly higher carbon emissions in operation than the TCP swimming pool does at the moment.</p>	<p>14. Embedded CO2 of construction has not been used as a monitoring/assessment tool to date for any of our existing Council leisure buildings. The Natural Resources Impact Assessment – Supplementary Planning Document has been followed for this project in regard to the proposed installation of a Biomass boiler, which will meet the 20% onsite renewables requirement) Evidence: NRIA http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Direct/65335adoptionNRIASPD.pdf</p> <p>The council's figures show that Temple Cowley Pools has the highest carbon footprint of all the existing Leisure Centres at 866 tonnes carbon dioxide per annum. If both Temple Cowley Pools and Blackbird Leys Pool were closed, with the new pool opening adjoined to the existing leisure centre in Blackbird Leys then there would be a net saving to the Council of 720 tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum. Evidence: Energy bureau validated figures spreadsheet.</p>
<p>There is no demand for a pool in Blackbird Leys</p>	<p>15. While the new pool would be a city wide</p>	<p>15. MISLEADING – very MISLEADING. When this usage figure was announced at the Scrutiny</p>	<p>15. At the scrutiny meeting it was confirmed that the usage figure was for the entire building, not just for the pool element. This was followed up in an e-mail to Nigel in October 2011.</p>

	<p>facility our research shows that the facility would receive in the region of 400,000 visits a year.</p>	<p>meeting in October 2010, it was implied that the figure related specifically to the proposed new pool. We asked a number of times for an analysis of this figure. A clarification was eventually offered – this figure is a desk-based assessment carried out by Fusion (without talking to the local community or anywhere else in Oxford), and is for the total attendances at both the Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre and the proposed new pool.</p> <p>In comparison, we accept that current usage at both TCP and the existing Blackbird Leys swimming pool is about 250,000 visits a year. Councillor Timbs announced in a CEB meeting earlier this year that the Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre annual attendance is now over 200,000 visits a year.</p> <p>So, the current total visits is 200,000 + 250,000 = 450,000 whereas the forecast for the proposed new pool and existing leisure centre is 400,000 – what the council is planning will result in a drop in leisure usage of over 10% - why is the council spending £16m to drop leisure usage?</p>	<p>Fusion Lifestyle are experts within the Leisure industry and there is nothing to suggest lack of confidence in their projected usage figures.</p> <p>The 400,000 usage projection was supplied in the first half of the financial year 2010/11. Since then, the usage for Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre has done significantly better for the year 2010/11 with a 36% increase above the target (approximately 40,000 increase) to approximately 160,000 in 2010/11, combining this with the figures put forward by the save TCP group would mean this is similar to the new facility at 410,000 visits in total. However, although Temple Cowley Pools has had an unexpected increase in usage in 2010/11, its figures for the first quarter of 2011/12 are already 17% down on last year and if this trend continues the new facility would demonstrate a higher level of projected usage. It is also important to note that the new facility would be sustainable, in comparison to the old facilities where there is a risk of unplanned closures. Evidence: Usage figures 2010/11 and 2011/12.</p> <p>A consultation overview has been completed and is demonstrated on our website. It is clear that there is committed support for the proposed new pool in Blackbird Leys. Evidence: Consultation overview (on Councils website).</p>
--	--	---	--

<p>The existing facilities have over 450,000 visits a year</p>	<p>16. While we continue to work hard to increase participation we have certainly not been this successful. The combined usage of both TCP and BLP last year was 256,000</p>	<p>There is no published evidence from the council that there is a demand in Blackbird Leys for a new pool, or that there is a demand anywhere in the city for a new pool in Blackbird Leys.</p>	<p>This is the same answer as questions 15. Evidence: Usage figures 2010/11 and 2011/12.</p>
<p>30 staff would be cut</p>	<p>17. We are planning for zero redundancies. This will be a managed process with staff transferring to the new pool, or vacancies at other sites. Fusion are taking on five apprentices and have created new posts in the</p>	<p>16. UNTRUE. The council should check its own published information – it really has been as successful as we said in the address. As stated above, the usage at TCP, BLP and the Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre is over 450,000 visits a year</p> <p>17. MISLEADING – there are approximately 45 staff employed by Fusion at TCP. According to Section 19 of the Planning Application for the proposed new pool (ref 11/00242/CT3), there is a proposed increase of staff of 15. Subtracting one from the other provides the 30 staff cuts.</p> <p>Read the words carefully in the council statement – they may be planning for zero redundancies, but they have no control over this process – Fusion are the employers. Taking on five apprentices means that there will only</p>	<p>Fusion will offer the 26 Full time equivalent staff currently employed at TCP and BLP and on a permanent contract, the opportunity to transfer to vacancies within the Oxford leisure portfolio. Evidence: Client report minutes:</p>

<p>The costs are not capped and they will skyrocket</p>	<p>contract.</p>	<p>be 10 actual vacancies. ‘Vacancies at other sites’ – note there is no reference to location – are these sites in Oxford? Fusion can offer staff vacancies at sites away from Oxford where staff do not want to travel and so will no longer work for Fusion. There will thus be zero redundancies and staff cuts.</p>	
<p>The costs are not capped and they will skyrocket</p>	<p>18. The operating costs are capped, the only changes would be changes we request to service delivery, or reductions in the fee from continued improvements in the centres</p>	<p>18. UNTRUE – there is no contractual agreement with Fusion for a fixed price for the 25 year life of the proposed new pool, so the costs cannot be said to be ‘capped’ – the build price has already risen by over 10% before work has started on the proposed new pool - there is no certainty on costs and the Council should not try and claim that there is. And there is no publicly available supporting business case, so the Council is being less than open and transparent on costs.</p>	<p>Fusion Lifestyle have given the council a price to operate the facility until 2019.</p>