

APPENDIX B – VISION FOR SPORT & FITNESS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Best Value Review for Sports and Fitness has focused primarily on:

- The Council's Leisure Centres that are managed by Fusion.
- The in-house sports development team.
- The in-house Strategic Commissioning and Development team.
- Sports facilities in parks, and Council sports grounds managed by third parties.

The key findings of the Review:

- There is room for improvement in the strategic direction of the Service and the extent to which the Service is provided in partnership with other agencies.
- There is a good level of satisfaction with the services generally and an expectation that the Council will continue to provide sports and fitness services to the residents of Southwark.
- There needs to be improvement in the standard, maintenance and cleanliness of facilities, particularly in Leisure Centres but also in our parks and sports grounds.
- Ethnic minorities are well represented among customers of leisure centres, but we continue to struggle to reach other target groups, notably older people and young adults.
- Performance indicator trends for leisure centres show Southwark's net cost per swim/visit is high and actual usage is low. There has been progress made in improving our performance compared with other Boroughs, however even these improvements leave us short of the bottom quartile of London boroughs in terms of high unit costs and a long way short of the best performers.
- Sports development appears to be cost effective, with increasing numbers of attendees at sessions, good contact with and use by schools and a national reputation for work with young people with disabilities. The community infrastructure for sport remains under-developed however.
- We need to increase the level of information and profile so residents can become more aware of the services on offer and how to access them.

The proposed **way forward**:

- The Council is committed to continue to be a significant provider and funder of sports and fitness services.
- Sports facilities, particularly leisure centres, have been a low priority for capital investment over a number of years. We do not want to close any facilities, therefore we need to find ways of managing existing facilities in a manner that is efficient, cost effective and sustainable. We also wish to take on the regeneration opportunities provided to us. The recommended approach therefore is to:
 - Commit to a long-term capital investment approach for **leisure centres** on the basis of selecting Fusion to provide the necessary capital investment and continue to manage the centres subject to confirmation by specialist consultant's that this represents the greatest benefit and least risk for the Council.
 - Retain the **sports development** function in-house.
 - Develop Council and community management partnerships for facilities in **parks**.
 - Work in partnership with sports clubs based at the **sports grounds** to significantly improve their quality, make them more accessible, more cost-effective in the long-term

Resource Implications for the Service:

The total cost of the Service in 01-02 was £2.7m.

- There are a range of budget options that are set out in section 7.0 of this document for the consideration of Members.
- At this stage the preferred option for 2003-04 is a 5% saving through increased efficiency.

Best Value Review of Sport & Fitness

VISION

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Best Value Review Process

The Best Value review for the Sports and Fitness service began in February 2001. This document presents a Draft Vision for the Service that has been derived from:

- A rigorous **challenge** exercise, including an external challenge exercise from stakeholders.
- An independent **comparison** exercise, where we compared ourselves with service providers in other local authorities, private fitness providers and not-for-profit sports organisations.
- A comprehensive **consultation** exercise, undertaken with staff, partners, users and non-users of the services provided by and on behalf of the Council.

The overall aim of this Review is to critically assess whether the current management arrangements and the development structure for sport, fitness and other active recreation are as efficient, effective, economical and equitable as they could reasonably be.

2.0 Service Features and Budget

2.1 Background

The total direct revenue expenditure for the services in scope in 2001/02 was just under £2.7m. This and the current year's expenditure and income is summarised below.

Main focus of the Review	Features	Gross Expenditure 2001-02	Gross Income 2001-02	Projected Expenditure and income for 2002-03
Strategy Commissioning & Development (SCD) Unit	<p>SCD is primarily responsible for ensuring that front-line services and facilities and strategies and plans for sport in Southwark represent good value for money, are effective in meeting local need and reflect Council's priorities and key objectives.</p> <p>Our main areas of responsibility are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 x indoor and outdoor Leisure Centres. • 8 x Sports Grounds. • The strategic, borough wide planning, procurement and co-ordination of resources and services and the development and improvement of facilities for our 12 priority sports. <p>SCD comprises 4 full-time staff.</p>	<p>£279,278 includes:</p> <p>£177,000 - Staff. £85,000 - R&M. £17,000 - Other running costs.</p>	£90,000	<p>Expenditure £290,883 – includes:</p> <p>£185,255 - Staff. £88,000 - R&M. £17,400 - Other running costs.</p> <p>NB. Staffing costs Includes head of Parks & Sport salary. This has been stripped out of SCD's running costs for 2003/04, which therefore reduces to £247,452 (Staff-£141,824).</p> <p>Income: 100,000.</p>

Leisure Centres (Fusion)	<p>The management of leisure centres was transferred from the Council to Fusion (a non-profit distributing organisation) in 2000/01. Fusion manages the Leisure Centres on the Council's behalf under an annual grant agreement and long-term property leases.</p> <p>The centres involved are: Camberwell Leisure Centre, Dulwich Leisure Centre, Elephant & Castle Leisure Centre, Peckham Pulse Seven Islands Leisure Centre, Southwark Park Athletics Track and Herne Hill Velodrome.</p>	£2.028m Grant to Fusion.	N/A (not an income to the Council although income is approx £4m.)	<p>£1.875m Grant to Fusion.</p> <p>A new, 3 year funding agreement for 2002 to 2005, provides Fusion with a guaranteed but annually reducing revenue grant. This is more cost effective for the Council and allows Fusion to plan further ahead.</p>
Sports Development Team	<p>The team works in primary and secondary schools, alongside sports clubs and in parks, leisure and community centres. It encourages and develops sport from 'first taste' to competition level and raises funds for sports development activities.</p> <p>The team consists of a core of five full time staff supported by 20 sessional coaching staff. Costs for this service include staffing costs, small grants and an operational budget.</p>	<p>£221,049 this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £141,817 - Staff • £32,512-Other running costs. • £46,720 - Grants 	£90,000 (income to sports clubs, schools etc for additional sports activities).	<p>Expenditure £231,520 includes:</p> <p>£148,800 – Staff</p> <p>£36,000 – Other running costs.</p> <p>£46,720 - Grants</p> <p>Income: £100,000. Income to sports clubs, schools etc, not income to SD team.</p>
Sports facilities in Parks.	Sports facilities in parks include pitches and changing rooms - these are managed by the Councils Parks service.	<p>£96,700 (Pitches in parks/grounds maintenance)</p> <p>£10,000 (Repair & Maintenance of changing rooms)</p>	£16,924	<p>Expenditure £99,601 (Pitches in parks/grounds maintenance)</p> <p>Income: TBC</p>
Sports Grounds.	Sports grounds either owned or leased by the Council and are managed by "resident", voluntary sports clubs. The figures opposite are subject to confirmation as not all the budgets for these sites are currently held or managed by the Parks & Sports Division. The full financial implications are therefore unclear at this time. Steps are being taken to address this.	£50,000	£42,114	<p>Expenditure: £52,000</p> <p>Income: £45,000</p>
TOTAL:		£2,685,027	£239,038	<p>Projected Expenditure: £2,549,004</p> <p>Projected Income: £148,500 + income from parks</p>

3.0 Findings from the Best Value Review

3.1 Overall Service

Results from specific Best Value consultation shows that, users in general noted a good level of satisfaction with the sport and fitness services currently being provided by the Council and through Fusion. However show that there is room for improvement in the following areas:

- The standard of the facilities offered (provided in Leisure Centres, Schools, Southwark Parks) - users noted that some facilities were better than others.
- The level of maintenance and cleanliness of Leisure Centres.
- The availability changing rooms in Southwark parks.
- The level of service provision to young people, more should be done to engage this group.
- The level of information about services that are available and how to access them.

Recent results from the MORI Residents Survey also show that net satisfaction of all residents with sports and leisure services has increased significantly. In 1998 and in the year 2000 net satisfaction for sports and leisure facilities was 6% and has now moved to 24%. More specifically net satisfaction amongst users has risen from 27% in the year 2000 to 48% in 2002.

On an area basis results show a major improvement in the North of the Borough and the highest level of satisfaction in the Centre East. When gauging responses based on ethnicity, the only group where net satisfaction has decreased has been residents of an Asian descent. The greatest increase in net satisfaction has been from Black residents. Residents aged between 25-34 and 35-54 have shown the greatest increase in net satisfaction.

3.2 Leisure Centres

Since the transfer of Leisure Centres to Fusion the overall cost to the Council has been reduced by approximately £650,000 (a large part of it is because Fusion is exempt from NNDR). This later saving of £350,000 is now built in to the base budget. Fusion's grant has fallen from £2.028m in 2000/01 to £1.875 in 2002/03 through efficiency savings and increased income. A recently negotiated 3-year funding agreement will reduce the grant to just under £1.7m, a saving of almost £250,000 (12%) over the period.

There are currently no national performance indicators for the Service. The Audit Commission performance indicators are no longer actively gathered, and there are some concerns about the varied interpretations made by different Councils of what makes up these figures. Southwark does still however collate the figures for comparison with previous performance. The following table shows Southwark's performance compared to the 2000-01 percentile figures for other London Boroughs and all of England.

	Number of swims and other visits per 1,000 population (includes dual use facilities)		The net cost per swim/visit (excludes dual use facilities)	
	99-00	2000-01	99-00	2000-01
ALL ENGLAND				
Average	6,018	6,102	£1.33	£1.39
Median	5,819	5,900	£1.10	£1.14
75 th Percentile	7,297	7,388	£1.75	£1.83
25 th Percentile	4,354	4,371	£0.73	£0.76
London boroughs				
Average	5,222	4,905	£1.37	£1.55
Median	4,569	4,118	£1.14	£1.07
75 th Percentile	6,295	5,994	£1.66	£2.37
25 th Percentile	3,323	3,317	£0.79	£0.81
Specific Comparator London Boroughs				
Camden	8,049	7,422	£0.68	£0.71
Haringey	4,099	4,102	£2.54	£2.47
Lambeth	3,067	3,800	£3.83	£3.54
Newham	4,569	4,535	£1.98	£3.21
<i>Southwark</i>	<i>3,501</i>	<i>3,985</i>	<i>£4.51</i>	<i>£3.31</i>

Analysis of the performance indicators shows that Southwark's net cost per swim/visit is high and actual usage is low. There has been progress made in improving our performance compared with other Boroughs.

More detailed Interpretation of the results of the information provided in the table above is included in sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of this document.

Further to this information we have recently undertaken for the second time, a comprehensive survey of Leisure Centre users and management performance as part of the Sport England Benchmarking Service (SEBS). This up-to-date information allows us to make comparisons with our own performance in 2000/01 and with other boroughs participating in the Survey. The main conclusions from the available performance information is outlined below:

3.2.1 Financial Indicators

Trends show:

- The net cost per swim/visit for Southwark has fallen from £4.51 in 1999/2000 to £3.31. This £3.31 figure is still well above the entry point of the bottom quartile at £1.83 and more than double the cost of the London average of £1.55.
- National Trends for net cost per swim/visit show a slight increase from £1.33 in 99-00 to £1.39 in 2000-01. They also show a slight increase in the number of visits per 1000 population from 6018 to 6102. However, London authorities have shown a reduction in the number of visits from 5222 to 4905. Southwark's performance does show an improvement in performance compared to National and London trends – specifically that comparator group looked at as part of this compare phase of the Review.
- Financial indicators from the SEB Survey show that compared with national benchmarks, Southwark Leisure Centres have high operating costs and income. Indicators show low maintenance and repair costs per sq. meter and total operating costs per visit.
- Fusion has graduated to the top 75% quartile for 35 of Sport England's national benchmarks for financial performance, including cost recovery, net subsidy/visit and income per head of staff.

We have made some projections for 2002-03. We expect the net cost per swim/visit to fall to £2.99, through further cost effectiveness. Fusion's increasing efficiency has allowed their revenue grant to be significantly reduced in 2002/03 (£150,000) at the same time as increasing visits. This still leaves us in the bottom quartile of London boroughs in terms of high unit costs. The evidence for this suggests that it is mainly because visits to our Leisure Centres are significantly lower compared with top performing authorities and because our Leisure Centres are not very modern and accessible. Significant capital investment is needed to make them even more cost effective in future.

3.2.2 Utilisation Indicators

Trends show:

- The number of swim/visits per 1000 population for Southwark has risen from 3501 in 1999/2000 to 3985 in 2001/02. However, the 3985 visits are still well below the performance of the best 25% of authorities (at 7,388), but above the performance of the bottom 25% of London authorities at 3317. Further to this, Southwark is 20% below the London average.
- Utilisation indicators from the SEB Survey show that compared with national benchmarks, key annual visitors per sq meter are low. Also, the percentage of total programmed time available for use but not used was median 50%.
- Usage figures are increasing. There were 951,020-recorded visits to Leisure Centres in 2001/02, over 5% more than the previous year.

We have made some projections as to our performance for 2002-03 and we expect the number of swims/visits per 1000 population to increase to 4381 (based on a population of 232,000). Regarding actual recorded visits we are expecting a further increase of a 5% in 02-03 bring actual visits to approximately 1,000,000.

3.2.3 Access Indicators

Results from the SEB Survey show that despite the high use of visits by discount card holders including the unemployed, key target groups, in particular the 11 – 19 age group, social groups D & E and the 60+ are under-represented, all falling in the bottom 25% benchmark. Visits by ethnic minorities were better represented falling in the median 50% benchmark.

3.2.4 Satisfaction Indicators

Trends show:

- According to MORI, net satisfaction with Leisure Centres has jumped from 6 to 24%.
- Cleanliness remains an issue for customers particularly in changing rooms and reception areas.
- Customers continue to be generally satisfied with certain aspects of the service most notably staff helpfulness, particularly at Dulwich, the Pulse and Seven Islands. Accessibility has also improved.

One of the reasons public satisfaction has increased is the improved quality of facilities. There has been investment of £750,000 in Dulwich Leisure Centres, Seven Islands and Southwark Park Sports Complex. Fusion has done this at its own cost. Further to this Fusion has been awarded the Charter Mark for all its Centres and is considering seeking accreditation by Quest (Sport England's National quality standard for sports facilities).

3.2.5 Areas For Improvement

Even though the Service has made significant progress in the areas outlined above, it is still expensive compared to other Boroughs and our Leisure centres need to become more cost effective if they are to be sustainable in the long term. As for reducing the cost of the service, Fusion's capacity to absorb a reduction in their revenue grant by almost £250,000 over the next 3 years (recently negotiated agreement) is a clear sign of their commitment and ability to continue improving efficiency. On the income side of the equation, a significant increase may only be achievable by substantial capital investment to improve the quality of facilities. This would increase and sustain the appeal of the service and visitor volume and frequency. Improved and modernised facilities would probably be a good thing as far as our customers are concerned who we hope would become even more satisfied with the service. Also, more modern facilities should have wider appeal and be more accessible. This way we hope to increase visitor numbers generally and in particular by high priority groups, who we are currently under-represented.

As well as improving our facilities we need to develop other ways of attracting and retaining customers in what is increasingly becoming a very competitive market. Modern, better quality facilities will give the service a definite advantage as will creative and targeted marketing. Ideas include rebranding and restructuring the Leisure Card scheme to make it more relevant, accessible and attractive to more people and diverse groups in the community. Other ideas include cross-borough marketing initiatives with other local authorities such as a multi-borough leisure card scheme and cross boundary sport development programmes.

3.3 Sports Development

The Review has confirmed, particularly through the consultation process, that the Sport Development Team is an effective and valued service in the community. The success of the service is dependent on good internal and external contacts and partnerships.

There are currently no independent measures of performance for sport development services. Sports England's QUEST system of quality assurance and benchmarking for sport development has only recently been launched and comparative data was not available at the time of writing. There are however indications that by its own previous standards the service is performing effectively and efficiently. We know that:

- Use is increasing - there were nearly 80,000-recorded visits to sessions organised by the Sport Development Team in 2001/02, an increase of 20% on 2000/01.
- The service is more cost-effective, the net expenditure per visit for all sessions is £2.28 in 2001/02, compared with £2.72 in 2000/01.
- 100% of secondary schools and 75% of primary schools in the Borough have used the services of the sport development team (e.g. coaching or competitions).
- 60% of schools have now completed TOP's training (i.e. raising standards of sports teaching by school teachers in schools).
- The service has been hailed nationally as an example of best practice for the work that it does with young people with disabilities.
- Southwark scored 11th position in the London Heathrow Youth Games in 2002.

- Due to the low level of sports club activity, the Sports Development team has been actively establishing sports clubs within the borough. The 12 Target Sports Strategy, which is a programme based on developing key sports in conjunction with sports clubs in the Borough has been very popular.
- The team has raised approximately 100% additional income when compared to 2001.

Further to this, the Sport Development Team is Investor in People accredited, and recently received the coveted QUEST award, Sport England's National Quality mark for Sport Development Services.

As for key areas for **improvement**, current evidence suggests that the community infrastructure for sport needs strengthening to be more sustainable in the long term. Key to this is increasing the number, effectiveness and range of voluntary sports clubs and the number of qualified coaches and standard of tuition. This is a significant task, which requires more effective co-ordination and smarter use of resources for sport in Southwark. We aim to achieve this by working more closely with key strategic partners such as Sport England and Governing Bodies of Sport and local groups and organisations including Millwall Community Scheme and SAVO. We will aim for a more effective role in key local strategic partnerships such as the LSP and Sport Action Zone.

3.4 Sports Facilities in Parks and Sports Grounds

Sports facilities in the main parks and sport grounds present the Service with a great challenge.

In our **parks**, the sports pitches and changing facilities do not meet modern standards. Sports pitches are used informally and are vulnerable to over or inappropriate use. Striking the right balance between the need for informal, casual use and organised sport is a testing challenge. For example, if the pitches were fenced off to protect their quality for formal competitive sport there may be a loss of amenity for other park users.

There is evidence that the need in Southwark for organised sport is not currently being met. There are over 200 Football, Cricket, Rugby and Hockey teams based in the Borough. A minority has guaranteed, regular access to good quality facilities but the majority have choices between pitches in our parks, going out of the borough to access services or missing out completely. Also, the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) recommends a minimum standard for outdoor space and play space per 1,000 population. For the Borough to meet the minimum standard for outdoor sport space would require 920 acres to be provided. Currently, the Borough's outdoor sport space totals approximately 240 acres - just one quarter of the recommended amount. The Review concludes that we need to find a strategy for realistic provision of pitches of sufficient quality. There are constraints however with the Parks Services' ability to spend on sports provision given the need for this service to invest in more fundamental areas such as general grounds maintenance and repairs and maintenance of play areas and hard surfaces.

The majority of the Council's eight **sports grounds** are in a poor condition and need significant modernisation. Their condition means that they cannot sustain the levels of use demanded of them and their contribution to opportunities to play sport and improve standards is significantly under-realised. They are currently managed by outside organisations from the voluntary and education sectors. These organisations do not have the capital resources necessary to significantly improve the facilities and this is severely restricting their ability to expand and improve their operation so that there are more opportunities for more people to join in and play sport.

In terms of **improvement**, we know that 'best performing authorities' work hard to improve the standard of and access to open spaces such as sports pitches and sports grounds. The evidence suggests that a potentially feasible way of achieving this in Southwark may be through developing stronger and more effective partnerships with organisations with whom we share a similar vision for sport development. We must also be sure that these partnerships can manage these facilities effectively and according to local need, and that they are willing to share responsibility for improving facilities and obtain significant capital funding from outside sources. A process is currently underway for doing this with one of our sports grounds and there are similar plans for the others.

For Parks, it may be even more challenging to improve sports facilities and adopt more sustainable management arrangements.

There is a creative scheme underway for Burgess Park. This involves obtaining significant capital funding (which has been partially achieved) from outside non-commercial sources and a new and hopefully more sustainable management structure involving a partnership of local tennis, cricket and rugby clubs the Parks Service and Sport Development Team. This may provide a blueprint for the other sports facilities in Parks.

3.5 Strategy, Commissioning and Development (SCD) Role

The SCD or client function and development role was also covered by the Review. SCD is not a front-line service. Its main role is to ensure that front-line services and facilities for sport provide maximum value for the people of Southwark and the Council. Its remit covers: 8 Leisure Centres and 8 Sports Grounds; The strategic, borough wide, planning, procurement and co-ordination of resources and services for our 12 priority sports, and the development and improvement of facilities for sport.

The role of SCD has changed and evolved considerably in recent years. Before the end of compulsory competitive tendering (CCT), SCD's main role and pre-occupation was commissioning, administering and monitoring the old CCT contracts for Leisure Centres. SCD now has a more diverse role, a greater range of responsibilities and volume of outputs, as shown over the page.

- Negotiating and administering funding and service contracts & agreements and leases with providers.
- Negotiating performance targets with service providers.
- Systematic and evidence based monitoring, evaluation and review of all our services and facilities.
- Facility management (we will continue to manage Surrey Docks Watersports Centre until a more appropriate arrangement is found).
- Procuring management services and capital investment for leisure centres.
- Planned, programmed, routine and emergency maintenance of 8 leisure centres and 8 sports grounds.
- Development, management and implementation of capital projects for renewing or adding new sports facilities, including conducting feasibility studies, preparing business plans, obtaining funding and public consultation.
- Leading the Borough's strategic planning and steering group for sport.
- Leading the Borough's Cricket Partnership group and strategic development of cricket in Southwark.
- Regular liaison with key external stakeholders and other partners.

SCD's core expenditure budget for 2002/03 is £290,883. This will reduce to £247,452 in 2003/04 due to a recent restructure and the loss of a principal manager's post.

The continuous improvement in leisure centres and sport development in Southwark that is highlighted by the Review is evidence that SCD is carrying out its strategic responsibility for maximising value from these services in an effective manner.

As for **improvement**, the Review shows that there are areas where SCD could be more effective. These include investment and improvement in the quality of Leisure Centres, the Borough's sports grounds and sports facilities in Parks and a stronger and more sustainable infrastructure for Sport Development in Southwark. These challenging priorities will have significant resource implications. This suggests that SCD may need to work even smarter if it is to continue to be effective in fulfilling its existing role, outlined above and the priorities coming out of the Best Value Review.

The Review also suggests the need for a new strategy for sport in Southwark. It was 1998 when the current strategy was created. During the intervening years national and local agendas and priorities for sport have moved on and so must we. A key question for us to address is how can we become more effective at enabling the management, provision and development of sport to grow, get stronger and become more sustainable in the community? The answer may lie in structural adjustments in the Sport & Parks Division. For example a merger of SCD and Sport Development Team might help to give us greater cohesion and sharper focus. We may also need to develop new or improve existing skills relating to strategic development and management of sport. SCD will have the task of leading the process for creating a new strategy for sport.

4.0 Strategic Issues¹

4.1 Key Strategic Issues

There exists and are emerging **national directives** and strategies for sport that the service needs to take account of. The Government has recently set out its vision and objectives for sport nationally. The Sport Strategy – A Sporting Future For All - was published in April 2000 and an implementation plan published in March 2001. The main aims of the Strategy are to increase participation in sport (by all sections of the community - particularly children) and raise standards of performance at the highest levels. The priority identified in these documents is to meet the needs of excluded groups, particularly children and young people on an increasingly widespread and sustained basis, through participation in sport. We believe that the Sports and Fitness Services provided by this Council can make a significant contribution to the meeting Government's requirements for sport. The Service also contributes to wider **Council objectives** for health and well-being, education and lifelong learning, social inclusion and community safety.

Our ability to meet national directives and Council objectives are limited by the following:

1. The **age poor condition of most of our sports facilities** severely limits their public appeal and consequently their level of use. The long-term viability of these facilities diminishes the longer these facilities are operating without significant improvements. Our older leisure centres are close to becoming unsafe for public use and sports facilities in parks and sports grounds fall well short of modern standards. Consultation results showed that peoples' perception of the condition of facilities on offer is one of the key disincentives for non-users who might otherwise become users.

If the Council is to maintain and improve the quality of our current portfolio of sports facilities to match rising customer expectations and needs, then this will require **significant capital investment**.² It is anticipated it will cost £1m to meet health and safety requirements in the first year; and up to a further £5m to meet landlord responsibilities; and a putative £20m over the next few years to make these centres fit for the 21st Century. We are realistic that the Council's capital programme is unlikely to be a significant source of resources as it is assumed that sports facilities will continue to be a low priority for this Council. However, we are aware that there are good opportunities for capital investment particularly for leisure centres through a partnership approach and through regeneration opportunities. This is explored further in section 5 below.

2. We have considered the option of reducing the **number of Leisure Centres**. However, there is evidence of growing need for our Leisure Centres and closing them will not help us to meet the national and council objectives as outlined above. The leisure centres need modernising for long-term viability and so we have asked an external expert to assess the current management and investment options and recommend the most efficient and effective one for the Council. These include Fusion, the private sector and investment opportunities such as Public Finance Initiatives (PFI) and Public Private Partnerships (PPP). We also found that more and better use could be made of other facilities in the Borough. These include existing Council facilities on housing estates, schools grounds and halls and other community facilities. Schools in particular are likely to have a key future role as community sports venues. New, high quality sports facilities are planned at Kingsdale and Charter School and others that have recently been awarded funding from the New Opportunities Fund. These facilities will be accessible to the local community in accordance with a commitment to the principles of community involvement and participation and in order to be sustainable in the long term. Options for achieving this are set out in section 5.1 of this document.
3. The level of **accessibility** of sports and fitness services and facilities has emerged as a key issue for this Service. Even though evidence shows that participation levels are on the increase, we know that services are not managing to reach all those groups identified as a priority for the Council. The decreasing subsidy from the Council is increasing the commercialisation of the Service.

¹ Through the Challenge Phase of the Best Value Review, evidence was provided as to the Corporate and Council objectives that the Service works towards and the needs met by the service, this information is summarised in Appendix One.

² Refer to Appendix Two for a full breakdown of the capital investment needs.

4. However, there will always have to be some balance between encouraging socially excluded groups and individuals and achieving a service that has the means to attract a wide cross-section of the community (and thereby create cross-subsidy). Cross-subsidy means that the less well off are subsidised by the better off and that there is also a level of surplus that allows the service to develop and keep pace with modern standards. It is a fine balance and one that is difficult to model. To improve accessibility we know that we Council needs to find more than one way of reaching and encouraging priority groups to participate in sports and fitness activities. Encouraging more sports development activities through the sports development team may be a key-way of achieving this. To be successful in encouraging access to our services we have improve the standard of our facilities within the Borough.
5. Further to that raised in 3 above, we know that a key barrier to accessing our services for socially excluded people is **affordability**. There has to be a high level of marketing and motivational work to encourage these groups to take charge of and maintain their physical well-being. This depends on resources and can be funded by cross-subsidy with the aim is to achieve a balance that maximises the benefit to those most in need. There also opportunities for **increasing the income** of the services particularly for sport development through accessing external funding, but also through charging users (particularly schools) for the services provided as is common in other Boroughs of a similar nature to Southwark.
6. One of the critical factors in achieving or addressing all of the points raised above is for the Service to take a lead role in promoting and delivering a more **joined-up approach** within Council. This is particularly relevant for those services provided by Education (Youth Service and Play & After School Service) but also more widely with Housing and Social Services. We need to investigate opportunities for jointly meeting Council objectives for inclusion and development of the community. We can do this by making the best use of existing facilities owned or managed by other Council departments. Developing existing and exploring new ways of **working with key agencies** such as the Health Sector (e.g. via PCG's) will also be a key factor in reaching the community so that we can meet joint objectives. This approach also presents the Council with an opportunity to reach audiences and users not we have not managed to reached to date. Further to this, there are opportunities for the Council to develop and explore areas where services can be delivered in **partnership with the community**. All of these approaches are explored in section 6.0.
7. Despite recent improvements in service provision in Leisure Centres, costs remain significantly higher than other comparable authorities. In order to achieve the long-term security of sports and fitness services in the Borough it is **imperative that these costs are reduced** over the short, medium and long term. The way we achieve this is outlined in section 5.5.

The key strategic driver for the Sports and Fitness service has been the Leisure Strategy (1998-2003), this document was underpinned by the sport development plans. This Review will enable us to produce a **specific sports and fitness strategy** for the Borough that will be linked to the Council's current priorities and will take account of those points 1-6 above. The strategy will also link into the Cultural Strategy (currently being drafted).

5.0 Options for Service Delivery

The following represent management options for sports and fitness services. The option chosen will also provide reference to improvement in customer care, reaching priority groups and driving down costs. These actions are reflected in the implementation plan in section 6.0.

5.1 Leisure Centres

The future management and investment options for our Leisure Centres are as follows:

1. **Longer-term, capital investment linked agreement with Fusion.** Fusion is the current provider of the Service, and has already built up a considerable amount of knowledge about the local market and needs and how to serve them effectively and efficiently. Fusion has proven they can deliver significant improvements to the service while at the same time increasing efficiency and reducing the cost of the service. As an independent, charitable trust Fusion are eligible for capital funding from non-commercial as well as commercial sources. They have shown they can raise capital finance (£750,000 in two years) to improve facilities, even on the basis of its current relatively short-term agreement with the Council. This approach means that the Councils repair and maintenance risk will be transferred to Fusion.

The funding agreement would mean that the Council agrees to a 20-year lease, in return for significant, guaranteed capital investment from Fusion. This option does require long-term financial commitment from the Council. Fusion is one of the future procurement options that are currently being assessed by the consultants.

2. **Long-term, capital investment linked agreement,** with an alternative provider from the **private sector.** With a new operator the Council may have the benefit of a fresh approach and new ideas. It would however mean that there would be a disruption to service in the short to medium term as the new operator takes over and comes to understand the needs of the local market.

As with the option above, this approach would require a long-term financial commitment from the Council in order to guarantee significant capital investment. However, a private sector operator may have an ability to arrange significant capital finance at competitive rates. On the other hand a private sector partner may cost the Council significantly more in Council Tax of £350,000 per year (Fusion are exempt) and share dividends of between 5 and 10% of profit. Further to this, Fusion would be entitled to legally challenge an early termination of their current agreement and seek compensation, which may be significant.

3. This option would be similar to that above, but could be provided by an **alternative provider** from the not-for-profit sector. As well as the current significant financial advantages (e.g. exemption from NNDR) a bigger and more established version of Fusion may have more ability to access capital finance at competitive rates. Larger economies of scale may also provide greater efficiency and cost effectiveness. Greenwich Leisure Ltd (GLL), for example, manages Leisure Centres in Greenwich and the London Borough of Newham. GLL has substantial relevant professional experience and expertise and knows the sport and fitness market well. Their relationship with Fusion may rule them out but there may be others.

It is the **preferred option** of the Project Board to select an option that represents a long-term capital investment approach. Given that the options described above will require a considerable amount of expenditure over a long period of time, we need to make sure that we have the right option. There is also an opportunity for the Council to review its current contractual arrangements with Holmes Place, who are based at the Pulse, to make better use of the significant revenue surplus they are experiencing and to use this revenue to cross subsidise or develop other services.

We have commissioned an external expert to provide high-level advice regarding the Councils' strategic options and depending on the agreed way forward, assist in developing the most suitable investment arrangement. Their main tasks include:

- An assessment of the cost of the various options.
- An assessment of the value for money of the options and their affordability.

- A cost benefit and comparative analysis of the various options over their life including the risks inherent in each.
- Develop an appropriate financial model, and
- Prepare a business case and procurement strategy.

It is expected that this work will be completed and reported at the end of January 03.

Another option is for Fusion to continue to manage facilities according to the existing agreement with the Council. This would mean Fusion would continue to operate 7 of the Council's sites under a 3-year funding agreement and 10-year leases with break clauses. However, in light of the potential service delivery outcomes that can be provided by the options in 1 to 3 above, this option has not been progressed any further.

5.2 Sports Development

The service delivery options for sport development are as follows:

1. Continue with **in-house service delivery** through the Sport Development Team. This approach has been very successful at engaging young people through sport. The team's success has relied on developing good and lasting relationships within the community, particularly with schools and with the Council's partners, such as the Police and across Council departments. Maintaining the same approach will allow the sport development team to continue in their successes in securing external development funding from Government and commercial sources.
2. Transform the existing Sport Development Team into an **independent trust** with charitable status grant-aided by the Council. This approach has been implemented successfully in Croydon, and they have been able to meet the objectives of the Council for social inclusion, regeneration etc. This approach would still require a guarantee from the Council to resource core staffing. External trusts have some ability to attract funding that a Council cannot access. The approach is heavily dependent on reliable sponsors and the capabilities of partners/board of trustees to deliver resources and services. With this approach the Council may miss out on opportunities for joined up working within the Council, such as with Youth Services, Play & After school etc.
3. **Transfer** the sport development function **to Fusion**. Fusion are an established independent community trust with existing support mechanisms for payroll, personnel etc. already in place. Fusion have identified an interest in developing the capacity to support sport development. The disadvantage of this option is that the commercial imperatives that Fusion needs to follow may impact on the delivery of sport development. As noted in option 2 above, there may be missed opportunities in joint working with other Council departments who are in contact with the same customers.

Other options were considered such as externalising the service to an external private provider. Also considered was a variation of the Fusion option, this would mean that the sport development would be a discrete and autonomous arm of the existing Trust but be able to draw on the existing operator for developmental support.

Option 1, of keeping the sport development team in-house is the **preferred option** of the Project Board, given the previous success of the sports development team and the risks associated with the alternative options. The sports development service as currently provided is welcomed in the community – but the service provided is currently fairly generic. Clarifying and formalising priority work areas and targeted groups will aid development of the sport development service. The arrival in the near future of School Sports Co-ordinators in Southwark schools may be an opportunity for the Sport Development Team to consider re-prioritising resources that are currently allocated to schools. Also, fundamental to this option is the need to sustain links with sports clubs and partners. There is also a need to find ways to reduce the fragmentation of sport development and leisure centre activity, this can be achieved by enhanced planning and integration between each service.

5.3 Sports Facilities in Parks and Sports Grounds

5.3.1 Delivery Options For Sports Facilities In Parks:

The service delivery options are as follows:

1. **Continue with existing management arrangements and seek capital funding to finance improvements.** There are funding sources for improving sports facilities in parks. These include the Sports Lottery Fund, Football Foundation and New Opportunities Fund. There are risks. Competition is fierce and the Council may have to provide some match funding. It may be necessary therefore to prioritise development. This be could according to local need and priority neighbourhoods. There would be additional management and maintenance costs for Parks Services to sustain the quality of the improved facilities, which may not be sustainable in the long-term.
2. **Council and community management partnerships.** The issues raised (in point 1 above) concerning facility improvements, funding and prioritisation also apply to this option. The main difference is that voluntary sector sports clubs would have a management role. This would potentially make the facilities and services more viable, sustainable and cost effective in the long-term. A scheme such as this is currently in development for Burgess Park and there are similar plans for Peckham Rye and Dulwich Parks.
3. **Discontinue the provision of organised sport in parks.** In theory this option would allow revenue savings of approximately £90,000, which could be available to improve maintenance of dedicated sports grounds. In reality, this option would probably be highly unpopular with the sports community in Southwark and local schools, many of who do not have access to their own sports facilities.

The **preferred option** would be to progress the Council and community management partnerships, as raised in 2 above there have been some successes with this approach recently.

5.3.2 Delivery Options For Sports Facilities In Sports Grounds:

The service delivery options are as follows:

1. **Strengthen existing community management partnerships.** We anticipate working in partnership with sports clubs based at the sports grounds to significantly improve their quality, make them more accessible, more cost-effective and sustainable. SCD would work alongside to provide expertise and support where necessary, including obtaining funding and managing the development process. The SCD Unit is currently working on such a scheme with Bacon's College local football club to regenerate Mellish Fields & St Pauls Sports Grounds and has similar plans for the other grounds. There are however risks to this approach. The development process requires specialist expertise and has significant resource implications. Many of our partner organisations have limited access to resources and may rely heavily on the Council's assistance. Also, obtaining significant capital finance from non-commercial sources (e.g. Sport England) is increasingly competitive. A spread of funding partners may be a more achievable approach.

Also, our partner organisations would need longer-term leases from the Council, in order to be an acceptable risk in the eyes of funding partners. Performance slide is a typical risk of long-term management agreements and business tenancies. The Council could protect against this with legally binding output and performance targets and rigorous, systematic monitoring arrangements. This would help to ensure:

- The highest possible standards of service.
 - Significant and measurable contributions to sport development.
 - Accountability to the Council for all aspects of performance, and.
 - Equality of opportunity for community access.
2. Theoretically, **selling off the sports grounds** that the Council owns would provide significant capital receipts. It would also free up management resources within SCD. In reality the cost-benefits appear to be highly unfavourable. An attempt to sell off Southwark's public sports grounds would probably be highly controversial and politically unsustainable. Government policy is against it, unless it enhances green space and sporting provision.

The commercial value, viability and appeal of the sites may be significantly undermined by their location, being designated as Metropolitan Open Land and the attendant planning restrictions. Local opposition to loss of green space and sports provision would probably be substantial. Green space is highly valued by the public³ as are outdoor sports facilities, which are already in short supply in the borough. There may be a reasonably good case for arguing for selective selling off of sports grounds for reinvestment in much needed improvements in sports facilities in parks and sports centres. With the exception of Greendale, which occupies a prime commercial location, there is unlikely to be a significant market for the reasons described above.

3. Withdrawal from current lease agreements. The Council leases two sports grounds from the Dulwich Estates. These are sub-let to local voluntary sports clubs. They currently have rent free occupancy, which the Council subsidises at an annual cost of £25k. In theory the Council could return it's leasehold. The clubs could then take up the leases and raise the funds to improve the sites. The Council would save £25,000. In reality, the clubs could not afford the rent and without a base and regular use of facilities would risk collapse. Also, unless a replacement tenant could be found the Estates could legitimately claim rent for the remainder of the term. A more positive and considered approach may be to pursue option 1 above and review the Council's tenancy when the leases expire in several years time.

The **preferred option** will be to strengthen existing community management partnerships for the reasons set out in option 1.

5.4 Complementary Approaches

The following approaches will complement the preferred service delivery options outlined in sections 6.1 – 6.3.

The Council presently has **12 Target Sports** that are supported by development plans and operated as Council facilitated sports partnerships. The idea with these target sports and associated clubs is for the Council to develop them to the point where they become self-sustaining and then replace them with new sports. The length of time it takes for groups to become self-sustaining will vary according to the sport and the infrastructure available.

The Council may wish to increase the provision of sport and fitness through formalising the **dual use of facilities** located in schools, housing estates and youth clubs. Through the Best Value process we have found that those identified as 'best performers' are not reliant on service delivery through Leisure Centres and make good use of other facilities in the community. In the past there has been a variable amount of success for this type of approach, it has been difficult to secure and maintain support and access to those facilities from those who are charged with their management. Therefore there may well be a need for formal agreements may need to be developed so as to ensure sustained access to the facilities and minimise potential conflicts particularly around the cost of entry and the maintenance of those facilities.

5.5 Driving Down Costs and being more cost effective.

It will be possible, once the procurement options outlined in 5.1 - 5.3 have been verified to make further progress in reducing unit costs year on year. For example:

- Our leisure centres should become less costly to maintain and run if they brought into a far better condition and more energy efficient.
- If improved and modernised, our leisure centres, sports grounds and facilities in parks should attract more visitors more often and income.
- Better, modern facilities should be less labour intensive to run and make more cost effective use of staff.

Targets will be need to be set for the short, medium and longer term, and kept under annual review.

³ We know this from MORI residents surveys and thru the Parks Best Value Review.

6.0 Draft Vision for the Future of Sports and Fitness Services

The overall vision for Sports and Fitness services is to:

- Deliver sports and fitness within the Borough within the framework of dedicated sport and fitness strategy that is based upon the principles and findings of this Best Value Review.
- Develop more effective and sustained links between:
 - ⇒ Other Council departments who work with our identified priority groups;
 - ⇒ Key partner agencies, such as Health the Metropolitan Police and adjoining borough councils;
 - ⇒ Community groups, such as private sports clubs;to help us deliver our sports and fitness strategy.
- Enable community groups to develop and run their own sports and fitness activities where practicable.
- Provide cost effective and high quality sports and fitness facilities and services.
- Provide relevant services that are affordable to priority groups identified by the Council.
- Aim to be in the top 25% of authorities in London by the year 2006.

The associated actions and targets to support this Vision are outlined in the table over the page.

6.1 Draft Implementation Plan and Service Targets

Objective	Action	Sub Activity	Target	Lead Role/ Responsibility
<p>Create a new Strategy for sport in Southwark.</p>	<p>1. Develop a new 5-year strategy for Sports and Fitness services, linked to stretched targets.</p>	<p><i>Short Term:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a new sports and fitness strategy that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Takes account of the findings of the Best Value Review. - Sports and fitness objectives the Council is working towards. - Identifies priority sports, development objectives and methods and the people we most want to reach. - Takes account of current National strategies and objectives for sport and balances them with local priorities and need, in particular neighbourhood renewal and social and economic regeneration. - Takes account of the objectives, priorities and roles of other key stakeholders and identifies ways of maximising opportunities for partnership working and plans for doing this. - Sets out priorities and plans for improving sports facilities in Southwark, including parks, sports grounds, leisure centres, schools and the voluntary sector in an integrated way. - Builds on proven methods and previous successes. - Is clear about how the Service can/will improve links across Council departments to enable joint delivery of services. - How the community can help deliver sports and fitness activities with a view to developing their own capacity. • Undertake a 'mapping exercise' that identifies the public, private and community facilities in the Borough, their catchment and any gaps in provision. <p><i>Medium to Long Term</i></p> <p>Revise strategy as needs change and partnerships are developed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft strategy completed by May 2003 • Consultation on strategy August 2003 • Action plans for delivering strategy developed by October 2004. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete by December 2003 	<p>SCD Unit/ Sports development team/Parks Service</p> <p>SCD Unit</p>

<p>Make the strategic planning and management of sport by the Council more effective and efficient.</p>	<p>1. Review the management structure and sports functions within Sport & Parks Division.</p> <p>2. Undertake a skills audit.</p>	<p><i>Medium Term:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being a more effective enabler for sport in Southwark may be incompatible with the existing structure within Sport & Parks. This currently consists of separate strategic management (SCD) and operational units (Sports Development Team). It may be necessary to consider merging these in order to fulfil the requirements of the review. This may be considered as part of the process of creating a new strategy for sport (see above). There may also be a need for new or improved skills in strategic management and development of sport to be more effective in the enabling role. This will also come under the umbrella of creating a new strategy for sport (see above). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same time scales as above. Same time scales as above. 	<p>SCD/Sport Development Team.</p>
<p>Develop services in partnership with key stakeholders.</p>	<p>1. Develop sport and social education programmes in partnership with internal and external stakeholders aimed at high priority groups.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope opportunities, support and resources for new-targeted programmes/services and confirm areas of need and priorities. Key stakeholders/partners include 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 03 - Pilot strategic Youth Diversion Programmes at Leisure Centres; Midnight Basketball, Time and Talents Youth Outreach and Volunteer Scheme and 'Drop-in' Project. 3 Projects, 30-40 young people in each. September 03 - Pilot strategic project aimed at integrating refugees and asylum seekers into mainstream sports development programmes and Leisure Centre services. 1 Project, 35 people. 	<p>SCD/Fusion/YOT/Southwark Police Priority Area Team/YOT/Youth Service.</p> <p>SCD/Fusion/Social Inclusion Unit/Community Involvement & Development Unit.</p>

<p>Improve the quality of services in, and access to Leisure Centres.</p>	<p>1. Formally Assess the Procurement Options for Leisure Centre Management and Capital Investment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake full cost benefit analysis of the options for the Council. • Report to Members on preferred option, with associated implications. • Complete a detailed action plan. • Identify measurable performance improvements and targets for inclusion in any new, investment linked, management agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed by January 2003 . • Report to Members by January 2003 • . Subject to outcome of assessment. • As above. 	<p>SCD</p>
	<p>2. Continue to plan and co-ordinate a cost-effective approach to repair and maintenance of Leisure Centres.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awaiting outcome of technical assessments of Leisure Centres. • Develop and install an effective Planned Preventative Maintenance Programme for all Fusion facilities to improve facility quality. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a 3, 6 & 12 month plan for 2003 that includes all maintenance contracts, R&M works, site developments. - Monthly schedule of contract obligation and schedule of works. - Pro-active approach to all plant/systems/R&M. - Ensure that all areas of the facility are in working order and maintenance plans improve their 'life' and performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisional R&M programme agreed for 2003/04 by January 2003. • By mid Jan 03 	<p>SCD Fusion</p>
	<p>3. Identify and oversee implementation of creative solutions for addressing anti-social behaviour and crime.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-ordinate a review of management systems, procedures and policies; staff expertise and training needs; physical systems for controlling customer access and opportunities for working in partnership with outside agencies with similar agendas and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By November 2003, establish steering group, priorities and action plan for a pilot scheme for reducing incidents of anti-social behaviour and crime at Peckham Pulse. Group to consist of SCD, Youth Service, YOT, Police, Peckham Street Wardens and service providers. 	<p>SCD Unit, Youth Service, Police, Community Safety Unit.</p>
	<p>4. Maximise access to Leisure Centres by clubs and groups in the borough that can make a key contribution to our priorities and development of the 12 focus sports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest priority for the allocation of space and time will be given to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gymnastics. - Swimming. - Basketball - Athletics - Netball - Volleyball. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme of access and club use for 2003/04 to be agreed with Fusion by January 2003. 	<p>Sports development team</p>

	<p>5. Increase access to Leisure Centres by excluded, high priority groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the drop-in service at Peckham Pulse for young people in need of support with personal and social issues and challenges. • Develop the exercise referral scheme for Southwark. • Develop the range of health related services offered to meet the health needs of the community established through consultation. • Provide a drop in service for older people in need of support with health issues and provide services like osteoporosis and diabetes testing, exercise advice and support, nutritional advice, and advice on where and how to access other services in the borough. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding source/s confirmed by early 2003. Other targets are subject to above. • Scheme full to capacity and retention on scheme high. Create behavioural and lifestyle change in ways that prevent the onset of CHD. 2003. • More people accessing health information and taking preventative action to manage or treat various conditions. • Full to capacity in terms of sessions attended. Behavioural and lifestyle changes and more active older people making measurable improvements to their quality of life. 2003. 	<p>Fusion</p>
	<p>6. Increase number of visits to Leisure Centres and regular users.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesign the Leisure Access scheme to make it more relevant, accessible and attractive to more people and diverse groups in the community. • Scope and develop, where feasible, cross-borough marketing opportunities with other local authorities. Options include a multi-borough leisure card scheme and cross boundary sport development programmes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% increase in number of Leisure cardholders by 2004. • Scoping exercise completed and feasible options identified for development by April 2003. Development plan underway by May 2003. 	<p>Fusion/SCD. Fusion/SCD.</p>
	<p>7. Improve the quality of Leisure Centres and increase the breadth of their appeal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver wide ranging investment plan to improve the standard of amenity at <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Camberwell - Dulwich - Seven Islands, and - Southwark Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £10m investment plan delivered January 2003 – December 2005 	<p>Fusion</p>
	<p>8. Encourage access for target groups through pricing policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue and extend programme of discounted prices to support access for target groups: U-19s, 60+ and economically disadvantaged. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discounts - Promotions - Free access - Extend to therapies and swimming courses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise inclusion and integration to continue to achieve 10%+ year on year attendance growth. • January 03 and on-going. 	<p>Fusion</p>

Vision Document – For Member Approval

	<p>9. Raise and sustain the quality of services at Leisure Centres according to national and measurable standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out programme to deliver ongoing and continuous improvement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISO9000-2000 - Quest management systems and possible accreditation - BEM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO 9000-2000 Jan 2003 • Quest Q2 – Q3 2003 • BEM 2002-3003 	<p>Fusion</p>
--	--	--	---	---------------

	<p>10. Improve the quality of service and facilities with a focus on cleaner sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An effectively managed contract cleaning system with correct specification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved cleaning audit scores • Reduced customer feedback re; cleanliness issues. To be delivered by the end of November 2002 	<p>Fusion</p>
	<p>11. Review present staffing structure. Develop training programmes for staff.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review staffing levels per site, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of staffing - rota's vs. usage , and - work schedules • Deliver comprehensive training plan to all staff to improve customer care and service delivery standards. • Implement new training and development entry schemes for new recruits. To include management training and apprenticeships – aim to offer local youth employment; Reduce need for agency staff; improve quality standards and services. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of January 2003. • 2003 and ongoing (18 month rolling training plan). • Underway and ongoing. 6 Management trainees qualified by 2004. 12 Apprentices qualified by 2004 	<p>Fusion</p>
	<p>12. Develop a more effective method and systems for internal monitoring and improvement of management performance.</p>	<p>Develop an internal management information system that enables all operational elements of the business to be measured, analysed and improved. Identify critical success factors and ensure they are regularly measured against agreed targets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective and consistent reporting on business and service related PI's. • Improve business efficiency of all departments by Jan 2003. 	<p>Fusion</p>
	<p>13. Develop communications strategies to specifically reach all target groups (community and commercial) and stakeholders.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase overall attendance by 20%. 2004. 	<p>Fusion/SCD</p>

<p>Improve the level of access to sport development activities</p>	<p>1. Introduce a pricing policy as a method of increasing sports development activities</p>	<p><i>Short Term:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce a pricing a policy that is based on the principle of maximising income while at the same time maximising and encouraging access to sport by excluded groups. This means charging, where the market can sustain the charge without excluding potential participants, simply to cover the marginal overheads. It also means having an option not to charge where, for example, there is external subsidy and no additional cost to the Sport Development Team. <p><i>Medium to Long Term:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the impact of the pricing policy on use and participation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce April 2003 Introduce standard unit cost of 50p potentially rising to £1. 	<p>Sports development team</p>
	<p>2. Develop voucher scheme for low-income families to access the school holiday sports programmes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vouchers providing free access to football and tennis schemes distributed through play, after school and focus groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 200 additional children able to access holiday programmes in 2003 where price would have been a barrier. 	<p>Sports development team</p>
	<p>3. Maximise funding from external sources for the development of sport</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set annual fund raising target, this may be funds direct to the Council or to any of its partners. Secure funding to develop out of school opportunities (i.e. from NOF). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target of £100,000 for 2003/04. Future targets reviewed annually. 	<p>Sports development team</p>

<p>Continue improve the quality of the sport development services</p>	<p>4. Develop more effective methods for recording performance and keeping records.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and enhance systems for recording and monitoring user numbers and demographics. • Introduce customer care assessment systems and an IT solution to recording all activities and linking them to budgetary issues. • Select and use appropriate Sport England performance indicators. • Continue to support the London Youth Games. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 03 • Gain a position of between 5th and 10th place and to regularly win the Inner London Trophy. 	<p>Sports development team</p>
	<p>5. Ensure an action plan for continuous improvement of the sports development service is in place.</p>	<p>Implement the actions in the QUEST Action Plan (this is the key mechanism for improving customer services and linking sports development activities to the Council's core strategies).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plan in place Nov 02. • Improvements for QUEST housekeeping visit Sept 03 • Achieve QUEST-highly commended in 2004. 	<p>Sports development team</p>
	<p>6. Encourage and facilitate local sports clubs to become accredited with Sport England's kitemark or Governing Body quality assurance scheme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All grant aided clubs and those occupying a Council Sports Ground to achieve or be working towards the Sport England kitemark or Governing Body equivalent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 clubs to achieve club mark in 2003 	<p>Sports development team</p>
	<p>7. Improve the current programme of coach education in high priority, focus sports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete audit of qualified coaches operating in Southwark and determine training needs according to current national standards in child protection, first Aid, and working with people with disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2003, 7 coaching for teachers courses and 2 level 1 coaches increased to level 2. 	<p>Sports development team</p>
	<p>8. Improve methods and systems of marketing and communication.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a Sports directory – containing info on sports clubs in the borough, Leisure Centres, Sports Grounds and facilities in parks published and distributed through schools, Council information routes and Southwark Life. • Disability directory updated and distributed to groups and individuals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First drafts of Sports and Disabled Directories completed April 2003. • Final by 	<p>Sports development team</p>

<p>Improve the quality of facilities sports grounds</p>	<p>1. Formalise community management agreements with sports clubs based at Sports Grounds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aim to improve quality of services and facilities by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An agreed and legally binding set of recognised standards and measurable targets for the management of the facilities and provision of sport. An agreed facility development, improvement and investment plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisional management agreements and development plans in place at all sites by mid-2003. May be adjusted to take account of outcome new sport & fitness strategy later in year. 	SCD Unit
	<p>2. Continue to develop approved scheme to regenerate Mellish Fields & St Pauls Sports Grounds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial feasibility study completed and development proposal subject of consultation process, now underway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> £1.3m capital funding from outside partners confirmed by May 2003. Scheme completed by late 2004 (subject to funding). 	SCD Unit
<p>Improve the quality of sports facilities in parks</p>	<p>1. Continue support for development of approved schemes to regenerate Cricket, Football & Tennis facilities in Burgess Park.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish new management structure and cricket development plans for new cricket facility. Progress schemes to upgrade Tennis, Football and changing facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New management structure, systems, marketing and services in last stages of preparation by Autumn 2003. Cricket facility to go live in summer 2004 (funding obtained). Bids submitted by Jan/Feb 2003. Next stage and time frames subject to the outcome. 	SCD Unit
	<p>2. Formally assess current condition of all sports pitches and other facilities in Parks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish current condition, feasible and cost-effective remedies and financial implications for facility development strategy (see above). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematic analysis of existing primary data (earlier technical surveys) by December 2002. Need for contemporary technical assessments TBC. 	SCD Unit/ Parks Service

<p>Improve the facilities for focus sports.</p>	<p>1. Continue developing planned scheme to upgrade athletics facilities at Southwark Park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options appraisal identified preferred development and estimated capital costs. Awaiting confirmation of priorities and extent of funding available from funding partners, UK Athletics and Sport England. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner's response will determine plans and time frames. 	<p>SCD Unit/ Parks Service</p>
<p>Continue to develop and support focus sports.</p>	<p>1. Develop, establish & continuously monitor and improve a long-term, sustainable scheme to provide Southwark Schools with high quality cricket coaching.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year round programme of, independently funded and managed cricket coaching at local venues. Partnership venture with regional governing body of cricket, local cricket clubs and schools. Significant contribution to schools' objective to provide more high quality PE. Target children and young people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 1 of a three-year scheme scheduled to commence in January 2003. First year targets of 40 schools and 1,500 10-14 year olds. 	<p>SCD</p>
	<p>2. Establish a long-term and sustainable programme of coach education in cricket.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing programme of education and training in cricket coaching, club management and cricket development and child protection, aimed at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southwark schoolteachers. Parents & carers of young people involved in cricket Existing cricket coaches. Cricket club players and other members. Youth workers. Further/higher education students. Southwark community police unit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project partnership group formed in November 2002 and funding proposal submitted to London Active Cricket Partnership and Activate by December 2002. Priorities and plan of action subject to above. 	
<p>Continuous improvement – all services</p>	<p>1. Continuous improvement, and implementation of the findings of the best value review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge conference - combine with the Parks conference Continued benchmarking, including annual survey of Leisure Centre customers . Annual report to value for Money Group, if requested Regular meeting with the lead exec member Establish an implementation and monitoring group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annually Ongoing Annually Quarterly Meeting once a month initially (first yr), reduced frequency thereafter 	<p>All</p>

7.0 Resource Implications

7.1 Budget Options – Short Term

Budget for 2002-03: £2.55m (Excluding non-discretionary items, e.g. Asset Rents). Budget Options for year 2003-04.

	3% saving	4% saving	Saving & cuts of 6%	Saving & cuts of 10%
Features	This option would represent a 3% saving by increased efficiency. Total savings = £75,000	This option would represent a 4% saving through increased efficiency. Total savings = £110, 000	This option would represent a combination of efficiency savings and a budget cut totalling 6% in value. Total savings = £164,000.	This option would represent a combination of efficiency savings and a budget cut totalling 10% in value. Total = £252,000
Savings from	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Fusion’s annual revenue grant in 2002/03 by £75,000 in 2003/04. <p>NB. Under a three-year funding agreement, negotiated earlier this year, the 2002/03 grant was reduced by £50,000 as an efficiency saving. Further agreed reductions through improved efficiency are £75,000 in 2003/04, referred to above and a minimum £100,000 in 2004/05.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Fusion’s annual revenue grant from £1,875 in 2002/03 by £75,000 in 2003/04. Transfer of Surrey Docks Water Sports Centre to a not-for-profit organisation would result in savings of approximately £35,000, subject to negotiation. <p>NB. Under a three-year funding agreement, negotiated earlier this year, the 2002/03 grant was reduced by £50,000 as an efficiency saving. Further agreed reductions through improved efficiency are £75,000 in 2003/04, referred to above and a minimum £100,000 in 2004/05.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Fusion’s annual revenue grant from £1,875 in 2002/03 by £75,000 in 2003/04. Transfer of Surrey Docks Water Sports Centre to a not-for-profit organisation would result in savings of approximately £35,000, subject to negotiation. <p>NB. Under a three-year funding agreement, negotiated earlier this year, the 2002/03 grant was reduced by £50,000 as an efficiency saving. Further agreed reductions through improved efficiency are £75,000 in 2003/04, referred to above and a minimum £100,000 in 2004/05.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Sports Development or SCD Team budgets by £54,000. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fusion’s annual revenue grant from £1,875 in 2002/03 by £75,000 in 2003/04. Transfer of Surrey Docks Water Sports Centre to a not-for-profit organisation would result in savings of approximately £35,000, subject to negotiation. <p>NB. Under a three-year funding agreement, negotiated earlier this year, the 2002/03 grant was reduced by £50,000 as an efficiency saving. Further agreed reductions through improved efficiency are £75,000 in 2003/04, referred to above and a minimum £100,000 in 2004/05.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Sports Development or SCD Team budgets by £54,000. Further reduction of Fusion’s grant by £88,000 in 2003/04.
Income From	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Risks/Benefits of Option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This saving will be found from greater efficiency and pose no detrimental impact or risk to the existing service. Stretching performance targets enhance potential for even greater effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fusion took over management of SDWC on 1st July 2003, in accordance with a short-term agreement until 31st December 2003. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SD teams budget is mostly for staffing an already lean structure. A reduction would reduce capacity to meet the growing need, particularly schools, or sustain the high quality of service and risk undermining its proven value and cost-effectiveness. SCD’s budget is also mainly for staffing an already lean structure and an insufficient sum for repair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing Fusion’s grant by a further £88,000 in 2003-04 may risk the reduction of service or closure of one or more of the less economically viable leisure centres. This is likely to be Southwark Park Sports Complex, Elephant & Castle or Camberwell Leisure Centres. SPSC attracts less visitors but has one of only two publicly accessible floodlit, synthetic

			<p>and maintenance of Leisure Centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction in staffing would risk undermining the Council's ability to drive through the necessary improvements in service quality and cost-effectiveness highlighted by this review. • Reduction in R&M would add to the risk of impending closure of certain facilities because of safety concerns. 	<p>sports pitches and the only athletics track in the borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local schools may be particularly affected as would local sports clubs and would risk leaving many people with no feasible alternatives and unmet needs. Also, this facility is vital to developing sport in Southwark, a borough that already lacks sufficient and adequate facilities for sport. • Also, Fusion would be entitled to legally challenge an attempt by the Council to revise the existing funding agreement. We risk being unsuccessful and undermining the Council's good reputation and relationship with Fusion and service users.
--	--	--	--	---

7.2 Budget Options – Medium to Long Term

The cost of the Service will need to decrease. The procurement option chosen will provide us with an ability to set challenging targets from year 2004 onwards.