

# Agenda Item 4

## Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

### Results of recommendations made between June and November 2012

<b>Financial Out turn 2011/2012</b>			
<b>Recommendations from the committee meeting – 25<sup>th</sup>. June</b>			
<b>Scrutiny Recommendation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Considered by</b>	<b>Date</b>
All carry forward requests are supported noting the comments in paragraph 4 of the report.	Noted	City Executive Board	4 <sup>th</sup> . July
To request that the £0.5m surplus is placed in reserves and its use considered during the up and coming budgetary process rather than earmarking it at this stage for capital.	Agreed with amendment.  This money will be placed in an earmarked capital reserve. All reserves are reviewed as part of the yearly budgeting process.	City Executive Board	4 <sup>th</sup> . July
To ask Board Members and Senior Officers to consider the effects of delays in recruitment on services and plans and allow for any “catch up” required within future planning.	Agreed with amendment  All service pressures have been considered. The effects of delayed recruitment are being considered as part of workforce planning.	City Executive Board	4 <sup>th</sup> . July
<b>Treasury Management Performance 2011/2012</b>			
<b>Recommendations from the committee meeting – 25<sup>th</sup>. June</b>			
<b>Scrutiny Recommendation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Considered by</b>	<b>Date</b>
The Committee agree with the proposed changes to the	Noted	City Executive Board	4 <sup>th</sup> . July

Treasury Management Strategy for 2012/2013 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the limit invested in MMFs to £20m.</li> <li>• Add Police Authorities to the counterparty list.</li> </ul>			
For the City Executive Board to keep under active review the effects of “Right to Buy” within the HRA Business Plan. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Income streams.</li> <li>• Our ability to be flexible within the funding of the capital programme to allow us to use all capital receipts from sales.</li> </ul>	Agreed	City Executive Board	4 <sup>th</sup> . July
<p><b>Fusion Leisure Contract – 2011/2012 Performance against target</b></p> <p><b>Recommendations from the committee meeting – 25<sup>th</sup>. June</b></p> <p><b>Full report and full response at Appendix 1</b></p>			
<b>Scrutiny Recommendation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Considered by</b>	<b>Date</b>
To seek confirmation via the Partnership Board that the living wage is being paid to staff and confirmation when it will also be paid to any sub-contractors working in Fusions run sites in Oxford.	Confirmation received.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
To see the subsidy position for each leisure centre including capital investments made.	Not agreed. See full response.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
To seek clarification of what share of the £1.3m surplus made by Fusion would be re-invested in the Oxford City Contract and how this would be used within leisure centres and/or services.	Not provided. See full response.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
To see the ideas and proposals	Provided in the	Board Member	24 <sup>th</sup>

from the Partnership Board to further increase participation with a particular emphasis on outreach work within target groups.	Annual Service Plan.	for Leisure	October
To see Fusion's suggestions on encouraging better utilisation of our centres.	Provided in the Annual Service Plan.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
To request that for the future participation is also shown as a percentage of the population in each postcode area and if possible to include all visitors to allow for a more meaningful comparison of the figures.	Agreed.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
To provide information on the various outreach projects across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost</li> <li>• Objectives</li> <li>• Targets</li> <li>• Outcomes</li> </ul>	Agreed. Available at the yearly review by scrutiny.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
To request further information on the methodology used for measuring satisfaction and the process for auditing and checking the quality of the results.	Agreed with amendment. Under review at present.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
To raise the issue of repairs and maintenance at the Partnership Board and for standards to be monitored. To report back on how monitoring is to happen.	Agreed. See response in full text.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
Request that the Board Member respond to the local Ward Member for Marston on what the Council's leisure offer for residents in his ward.	Agreed.	Board Member for Leisure	24 <sup>th</sup> October
<p><b>Changes to Business Rates</b></p> <p><b>Recommendations from the Finance and Performance Panel – 28<sup>th</sup>. August</b></p>			

<b>Scrutiny Recommendation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Considered by</b>	<b>Date</b>
The Finance and Performance Panel of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee felt that the levy being 82% was too high and noted that this would form part of the City Council's response to the current Government consultation.	Noted	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
<b>April to June 2012/13 – Quarter 1 Corporate Plan Performance</b>			
<b>Recommendations from the Finance and Performance Panel – 28<sup>th</sup>. August</b>			
<b>Scrutiny Recommendation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Considered by</b>	<b>Date</b>
To request that the indicators for a Vibrant and Sustainable economy be reviewed as the Panel felt that it was not clear if the Council's policies were sufficient enough to fully capture a vibrant and sustainable economy as it felt that only have 3 indicators were not sufficient.	Agreed	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
<b>Asset Management Plan</b>			
<b>Recommendations from the Asset Panel – 24<sup>th</sup>. August</b>			
<b>Scrutiny Recommendation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Considered by</b>	<b>Date</b>
Welcomed the inclusion of most of the recommendations highlighted to the Deputy Leader in March 2012 and that the latest version was clearer due to improved formatting. However it was felt that some sections did not require the amount of detail included;	Noted	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September

at it was not necessary to detail all of the previous achievements going back to 2009;	Refused. This was included as a response to a scrutiny recommendation and has merit as it is to show the journey taken.	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
A list highlighting the changes made following the end of the consultation would be beneficial;	This is included as a list.	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
The design of the document allowed for improved navigation and was presented in a professional way.	Noted	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
Foreward – Page 5, final paragraph – Clarification is required on the delivery of the 112 affordable homes, how these homes will be funded and the numbers to be delivered for each of the next three years;	Agreed with amendment.  Clarification on wording given.	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
Section 1 – Review of 2009 Asset Management Plan, Pages 8, 9 and 10 – These are not necessary and should be removed as these relate to the previous plan;	Refused. This was included as a response to a scrutiny recommendation and has merit as it is to show the journey taken.	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
Section 2 – Portfolio Objectives and Overview, Page 11 – Objective 2 – The wording is unclear and would read better as “We want all our property to be efficiently managed”;	Agreed with amendment  Clarification on wording given.	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
Section 2, pages 11 and 12 – The tables showing Operational assets ranked by condition do not make sense and so should be removed;	Refused  This is required for benchmarking	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
Section 4 – Asset Strategy – A separate asset class is required to cover ‘countryside’ assets,	Agreed with amendment	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September

including Port Meadow, the other SSSI's and parks which should also be included. There is no mention of these assets in either class 4.1 or 4.10;	No change now but will consider as part on a coming asst class review.		
Section 4 – Asset Strategy – 4.2 Allotments – The first paragraph should be amended to include at the end ' <i>and further details will be found in the emerging Green Space Strategy</i> '; the second paragraph should be deleted as the Green Space Strategy has not been agreed;	Agreed with amendment.  Clarification provided.	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
Section 4 – Asset Strategy – 4.5 Community Centres – Amend the fifth paragraph to read ' <i>The Council will establish occupational leases with community groups to formalise responsibilities. These leases will typically be between one and three years, noting that none size will not fit all and the Council will consider granting Community Association long-leasehold interests (or asset transfers) where the following criteria are met:</i> '	Refused	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
Section 6 – Capital Programme, Page 31 – further clarification is required with regard to the paragraph titled 'Homes and Communities Agency Affordable Homes Programme' and S106 Planning Obligations requirement to contribute to affordable housing as this is in the process of being changed;	Agreed with amendment.  Slight clarification provided.	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
Appendix 3, point 17.2 – should be amended to read ' <i>Where the Council implements rent reviews and lease renewals, it will seek to establish the highest market rental value supported by comparable evidence, to preserve the capital value and</i>	Refused	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September

<i>income flow of the portfolio subject to other relevant requirements of the Asset Management Strategy such as maintaining the agreed balance of uses of the Covered Market’;</i>			
Appendix 3, point 19, page 51 - Tenant Associations – This should be deleted in its entirety as the meaning of the section is unclear and appears to cut across the responsibilities of the Neighbourhoods and Communities Team;	Agreed with amendment.  Clarification provided on the direction of this point to Commercial Tenants	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
The following typographical errors require correcting:  (i) Section 6, page 32 – last line of the second paragraph, delete ‘a’ and insert ‘an’ before the word amount and delete the full stop at the end of the final bullet point;  (ii) Section 7, page 33, point 7.1 – In the final line the word ‘city’ needs correcting to ‘City’;  (iii) Appendix 1, page 38 – too many m’s in Emissions.	Agreed	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
<b>Youth Ambition Programme</b>			
<b>Recommendations from the Youth Ambition Panel meeting 10<sup>th</sup>. September</b>			
<b>Scrutiny Recommendation</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Considered by</b>	<b>Date</b>
That a clear outcome framework for this programme is set now. This should include long term aims and short term measures and targets towards those aims. This framework should provide for links to each investment made through both expectations	Agreed	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September

for the individuals involved and overall.			
That the steering arrangements for the project are concluded as a matter of urgency to allow for clear focus.	Agreed	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
A minimum of a three year programme is set that has a mixture of sustainable provision and space for one off activities linked to clear need and outcomes. These principles should be pass ported into the consideration of all matched or grant funded activities that are commissioned.	Agreed	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
To have robust and clear commissioning processes that ensure programme providers share our ambitions, have the skills to deliver and can demonstrate they have the pathways and trust of the communities and individuals we want them to work with.	Agreed	City Executive Board	12 <sup>th</sup> . September
<b>Parking in Parks – Signage and Monitoring</b>			
(1) Allocate additional funding to allow for improved signage at the car parks adjacent to parks, better explaining the charges:  (2) Continue to monitor the charges and to undertake a review within the next six months.		City Executive Board	5 <sup>th</sup> December



**Report of: The Value and Performance Committee - 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012**  
**To: Councillor Van Coulter, Board Member for Leisure**

**Fusion Leisure Contract – 2011/2012 Performance against target**

The Committee would like to thank Councillor Coulter for attending the meeting and presenting an informative and interesting report. The Committee had a full and constructive debate and would like to highlight the following comments and make the following recommendations. The committee requests that Councillor Coulter respond as soon as possible to the committee Chair – Councillor Mills.

**Comments and Recommendations**

**Finance**

- (1) Are all Fusion staff and contractors paid the living wage?

RECOMMENDATION: To seek confirmation via the Partnership Board that the living wage is being paid to staff and confirmation when it will also be paid to any sub-contractors working in Fusions run sites in Oxford.

- (2) Subsidy figures shown do not include capital costs. The committee were interested to know what the outcome for subsidy would be if they were. Views were expressed that the savings in revenue may be taken and replaced by increases in the capital expenditure as required as part of the contract.

RECOMMENDATION: To see the subsidy position for each leisure centre including capital investments made.

- (3) The issue of Fusion's charitable status and its profits were discussed at the meeting along with how any surpluses were ploughed back into the business.

RECOMMENDATION: To seek clarification of what share of the £1.3m surplus made by Fusion would be re-invested in the Oxford City Contract and how this would be used within leisure centres and/or services.

**Participation, utilisation and satisfaction of facilities**

- (4) Increases in visitor numbers seemed to have reached a plateau. What can be done to encourage more users into the leisure centres or have we gone as far as we can?

RECOMMENDATION: To see the ideas and proposals from the Partnership Board to further increase participation with a particular emphasis on outreach work within target groups.

- (5) Utilisation at our leisure centres is not evenly spread. Some centres are crowded whilst others are under used. What can Fusion do to encourage use of under-utilised centres?

RECOMMENDATION: To see Fusion's suggestions on encouraging better utilisation of our centres.

- (6) The pie charts demonstrating participation by area are a good start but don't give a complete picture on either the representation within the population or the total of visitor numbers.

RECOMMENDATION: To request that for the future participation is also shown as a percentage of the population in each postcode area and if possible to include all visitors to allow for a more meaningful comparison of the figures.

- (7) The effects and success of the various outreach work was not clear. Increases in participation were very obvious across target groups but the links between this increase and outreach schemes was not obvious.

RECOMMENDATION: To provide information on the various outreach projects across:

- Cost
- Objectives
- Targets
- Outcomes

- (8) Satisfaction levels are very high at 97%. Views were expressed that this seemed almost impossibly high. Information was requested on the methodology used to measure satisfaction and how results were audited by the Council.

RECOMMENDATION: To request further information on the methodology used for measuring satisfaction and the process for auditing and checking the quality of the results.

- (9) The majority of repairs and maintenance is delivered by Fusion within the contract. Views were expressed that these are not always done well or in a timely way.

RECOMMENDATION: To raise the issue of repairs and maintenance at the Partnership Board and for standards to be monitored. To report back on how monitoring is to happen.

(10) The issue of leisure provision in the Marston area was raised.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Request that the Board Member respond to the local Ward Member for Marston on what the Council's leisure offer for residents in his ward.

Authors: Pat Jones and Mathew Metcalfe on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Email: [phjones@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:phjones@oxford.gov.uk) , [mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk)  
Tele: Pat – 01865 252191, Mathew – 01865 252214

### **Value and Performance Scrutiny answers to leisure questions and a background to the contract**

Recognising that we have a number of new members this introduction provides some background on the leisure improvement journey to assist members in their scrutiny role.

Pre 2009 the leisure service was performing poorly with high costs (£2.14 subsidy per user), regular unplanned facility closures and significant staffing problems. Following an intense year of service improvement we entered into a leisure contract with Fusion Lifestyle in March 2009 which has been a catalyst for vast improvements in performance and cost savings of £660,000 per year in our leisure centres.

When setting the contract the following key principles were agreed:

1. A social enterprise that mirrored our values
2. A partnership approach
3. Bespoke solution for Oxford
4. High degree of local engagement
5. Improvements and innovation encouraged
6. Significantly lower revenue costs
7. Risk transferred
8. Council retain control of buildings and core pricing

The council were keen to focus upon outcomes and set the contract up to monitor how they were achieved, as opposed to monitoring the inputs.

### **Progress**

The service has embedded a culture of continuous improvement and through QUEST and the National Benchmarking Surveys has thorough external challenge. Additional to this Fusion Lifestyle have an array of systems to monitor and drive improvement.

The transformation in our leisure centre can be seen with:

- 250,000 more visits each year than when the contract started
- Satisfaction is at 96%
- Five leisure centre have achieved QUEST (the industry's quality management system)
- Ferry Leisure Centre – in 2012 received the National Benchmarking Service award for finance and efficiency
- Subsidy per user is now just 65p and reducing – the national average is £1.81 (Association of Public Service Excellence)
- Fusion's commitment to reduce carbon emissions by 5% year on year and carbon initiatives to reduce CO2 per visit.

The contract is overseen by the Leisure Partnership Board, which is the guiding body for developing the annual service plan. This board includes senior council and Fusion Lifestyle officers, two councillors, a lead for young people, older people, a user group representative and the primary care trust. The governance of the contract has been externally audited and found to be very robust.

The scrutiny arrangements for the contract were set in 2009 just after the contract had been agreed. As service levels have continually improved it was expected that the level of scrutiny would reduce and a focus would be on areas where the contract was not performing. This has not been the case; the volume and level of information has in fact continued to increase.

The council's Leisure Manager is the sole client officer; the role is to ensure the contract is delivered in accordance with the specification, to encourage new opportunities that support the council's agenda and to be the council's point of contact. This is done through marketing, carbon and client communication meetings, along with site visits. The Leisure Manager is also the service lead officer for performance management and investors in people. The workload to develop the increasing level of data for the scrutiny report is four days for the client officer, plus one and a half days for Fusion Lifestyle.

Scrutiny are asked to think though how they use the officer resource, a few options are:

- Scrutinising the annual service plan; this requires minimal officer time
- Reducing the number of reports to annually from every six months
- Having focus areas where scrutiny believe there is a failing; this could be as and when, six monthly or annually.
- To become involved in user groups and or undertake mystery visits.

By reducing the data collection time demands on officers they will be able to invest this time into driving forward continued improvements in leisure rather than collating significant volumes of data.

**Answers to questions from the 25 June 2012, Value and Performance Scrutiny meeting.**

**To seek confirmation via the Partnership Board that the living wage is being paid to staff and confirmation when it will also be paid to any sub-contractors working in Fusion run sites on Oxford.**

Response:

With effect from 1 April 2012 and throughout the remainder of the term of the Principal Contract, Fusion are ensuring that all staff employed or otherwise engaged by Fusion Lifestyle in the delivery of the Oxford Leisure Service are paid on a basis which at least meets the "Oxford Living Wage" specification, as set by the Council from time to time.

**To see the subsidy position for each leisure centre including capital investments made.**

The reason that the subsidy per user excludes capital is that this is a consistent measure that shows direction of travel and it can also be benchmarked. If for example we build a new facility, or undertake a development then the capital cost would be weighted to a particular year and the data provided would not be meaningful.

**APSE data collection guidelines note:** *Capital costs are excluded from performance indicator calculations.*

Finance officers are pulling together some figures, but they have concerns about the value of these and the potential for misinterpretation.

**To seek clarification of what share of the £1.3m surplus made by Fusion Lifestyle would be re-invested in the Oxford City Contract and how this would be used within leisure centres and/ or services.**

Response:

As part of Fusion Lifestyle's risk management strategy a level of reserves are agreed with their Trustees that they hold on their balance sheet.

These reserves underwrite the financial security of the company against the impact of disaster or other unforeseen events. In the short term the £1.3 million surplus from 2011 will support Fusion Lifestyle's reserves targets.

As they go through each year Fusion Lifestyle review with their client's, investment opportunities in the particular contract. If it is agreed to proceed with a particular opportunity, Fusion Lifestyle then discuss the best source of funds with the client which in turn could be from their own reserves.

**To see the ideas and proposals from the Partnership Board to further increase participation with a particular emphasis on out reach work within target groups.**

Response:

The annual service plan sets out Fusion Lifestyle's aims and objectives in respect of the delivery of leisure services on behalf of the Council. The plan describes underpinning strategic objectives and sets out action plans in respect of those strategic objectives.

The contents of the plan, once agreed with the Partnership Board, are submitted to the Council's Executive Board and then communicated to staff, customers and other stakeholders.

Nine strategic objectives are identified in respect of participation; this includes increase in participation by target groups (i.e. those under 17 and over sixty years of age, disabled users, women and girls, users from BME groups and those residents in the most deprived wards in the City).

Six strategic objectives are identified in respect of sports and community development.

The ongoing review and monitoring process incorporates management scrutiny, monthly update reports, monthly meetings between key representatives of the Council and Fusion Lifestyle, quarterly Partnership Board and Leisure Steering Group meetings, with a formal review in advance of the annual service planning process.

The 2013/14 planning process has commenced, with the Partnership Board requesting additional strategic objectives to be considered. These include:

- Educational attainment
- Employability
- Youth ambition.

**To see Fusion Lifestyle's suggestions on encouraging better utilisation of our centres.**

Response:

The above text explaining the annual service plan process applies to the question. Utilisation has increased by 250,000 visits since the contract began and getting more people active is the primary focus of the contract. This ranges from continually improving programming and improving the services offered.

**To request that for future, participation is also shown as a percentage in each postcode area and if possible all visitors to allow for a more meaningful comparison of the figures.**

Response:

Working with the Council's Social Research Officer it is possible to provide this information; it would though take up additional officer's time to do so.

It would be better to use the 2011 Census data to do this, which is due to be published by the end of November 2012.

Postcode data is obtained from Fusion Lifestyle's membership/ loyalty card database. Membership uptake equates for around 70% of users in our leisure facilities, and continues to grow. The vision is for all users to hold a form of membership or loyalty card.

It is not feasible to consistently obtain non-member postcode for each visit made to facilities. It is possible to demonstrate the percentage of visits by members and non-members.

### **To provide information on the various outreach projects.**

This detail is provided in the six monthly performance reports to the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee, the most recent report being 25 June 2012.

Fusion Lifestyle are working through the data (cost, objectives, targets and outcomes) from outreach projects and we expect this to be included in the Client performance report that we will receive in November 2012. In short the objectives are all to try to get more people active, with particular focuses on the targets in the Annual Service Plan e.g. getting more young people active, reducing health inequalities.

A summary of some of the outreach projects:

- Hosting of a General Practitioner exercise on referral instructor course; resulting in new Oxford Fusion Lifestyle employees becoming qualified in delivering the gym based health and well being offer.
- Fusion Lifestyle secured funding from the 'Fit as a Fiddle' initiative resulting in additional 50 plus sessions being introduced in Badminton, Zumba Gold dance, seated activities and learn to swim activities. 'Fit as a Fiddle' is a nationwide programme, supporting people aged of 50 plus with physical activity, healthy eating and mental well-being.
- In partnership with Oxford United Football Club and MIND, Fusion Lifestyle is running a mental health awareness and fitness project in the local community. MIND is the leading mental health charity for England and Wales that promotes and protects good mental health for all.
- Fusion Lifestyle supports National Obesity Week in partnership with Oxfordshire Primary Care trust and the Oxfordshire Weight Loss service (OWLS), and hosted OWLS at Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre.
- Fusion Lifestyle has secured funding to employ an Oxford City Active Women coordinator. Active Women is a new three year project being driven by Sport England to get more women from disadvantaged

communities, and more women caring for children, playing sport. The sessions are specifically designed for local women and aim to make it as easy as possible to participate.

- Sportivate is a lottery funded programme that gives 14 to 25 years olds access to six-week courses in a range of sports. The programme is aimed at those not currently choosing to take part in sport in their own time, or is doing so for a very limited amount of time, and will support them to continue to playing sport in their community. Sportivate is fully inclusive and targets participants across this age group, including young people who have a disability, males and females and people from BME groups.
- Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre is one of two Oxfordshire leisure facilities to be selected to run a pilot scheme to increase participation for social users, with the scope of the project being to increase the usage, quality and consistency of the experience of leisure facilities by social care users. A multi agency steering group has been established to drive this project with partners including Oxford City Council, Fusion Lifestyle, Oxfordshire County Council – Adult Social Care, West Oxfordshire District Council and The Oxfordshire Sports Partnership.

**To request further information on the methodology used for measuring satisfaction and the process for auditing and checking the quality of results.**

Overall customer satisfaction is measured by means of Fusion Lifestyle's 'Please Tell Us What You Think' customer feedback scheme; using the percentage of excellent/ good/ satisfactory responses received against nine performance headings.

Fusion Lifestyle are developing broader ways to measure satisfaction and next year will be returning to the Council a proposal to make understanding satisfaction more relative.

Current satisfaction across Fusion Lifestyle's portfolio of contracts is 94%, for Oxford facilities it is 96%.

**To raise the issue of repairs and maintenance at the Partnership Board and for standards to be monitored. To report back on how monitoring is to happen.**

The Executive member raised the issue of repairs and maintenance at the Partnership Board in June 2012.

The Council and Fusion Lifestyle have agreed a level of performance standards detailed in the 'Table of Standards'. These demonstrate the requirements and any rectification period required where performance may not be achieved. Failure to rectify may result in a default with deductions on a sliding scale made from the management fee paid to Fusion Lifestyle.



The Council has on-line access to Fusion Lifestyle's facility management system 'Basecamp'. This is a twice daily mechanism of facility inspections completed by staff to ensure standards are maintained and where not, requirements for action are reported.

Council Officers complete planned and unplanned visits across the seven leisure facilities, measuring against the agreed 'Table of Standards'.

Monthly client performance reports are received from Fusion Lifestyle and reviewed at monthly meetings between Council and Fusion Lifestyle Officers. The Facility management strand of the report includes the percentage:

- compliance for Basecamp inspections completed
- of scheduled cleaning tasks completed
- Scheduled Planned Preventative Maintenance completed.

Commentary is provided in the reports to demonstrate reasons for non-compliance and the rectification action being completed.

Additionally, facility management is reported at the quarterly Partnership Board meetings.

**Request that the Board Member respond to the local ward Member for Marston on what the Council's leisure offer for residents in his ward.**

In summary the leisure offer for residents in the ward include:

- Free to use multi-sport outdoor venue called 'adiZone'.
- The Community Arena boasts an artificial turf pitch with floodlights, offering a year round, all weather facility for football. In addition to the 3G pitch, 6 netball courts are available on site, which provides the city with its first very own dedicated netball courts.
- StreetSports programmes are delivered at Northway.
- Multi Use Games areas are provided at Croft Road and Northway.
- Children's Play Area.
- Women's exercise class with free crèche provision.
- Sports pitches.
- Fifty hours of free swimming to those aged under 17 years of age and living in the City.
- Targeted free swimming lessons (during and out side of school hours).
- Leisure membership offer including an affordable Bonus Concessionary offer to those in receipt of eligible benefits.

**To: Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee**

**Date: 27<sup>th</sup> November 2012**

**Report of: Head of Law and Governance**

**Title of Report: PARKING IN PARKS – SIGNAGE AND MONITORING**

**Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To allow the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee to note its recommendations prior to these being submitted to the City Executive Board on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

**Key decision? No**

**Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Mark Mills**

**Executive lead member: Councillor Colin Cook**

**Recommendation(s):**

The Scrutiny Committee is asked

- (a) To note its decision to disagree with the call-in:
- (b) To recommend the City Executive Board to:
  - (1) Allocate additional funding to allow for improved signage at the car parks adjacent to parks, better explaining the charges:
  - (2) Continue to monitor the charges and to undertake a review within the next six months.

**Introduction**

1. The Chair of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee called-in the decision of the City Executive Board on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2012 made following a review of charging for parking in parking areas adjacent to parks.
2. The reason for the call-in was that in making the decision consideration should have been given to:-
  - (i) The impact on neighbouring areas.

- (ii) The balance between revenue from charges and penalties.
  - (iii) Whether there are other factors in play which might be distorting the comparison of user numbers.
3. Following a debate during which the Committee heard from local residents who lived close by parks car parks, the Committee agreed to disagree with the call-in, but to make two recommendations to the City Executive Board on funding for better signage and for continued monitoring.

**Name and contact details of author:-**

Mathew Metcalfe on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee  
Democratic and Electoral Services Officer  
Law and Governance  
Tel: 01865 252214 e-mail: mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk

**List of background papers: None**

**Version number: 1**

This page is intentionally left blank