

additional papers 1

Executive Committee

Wed 29th Sept
2010
7.00 pm

Committee Room 2
Town Hall
Redditch



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Access to Information - Your Rights

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000, has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

Your main rights are set out below:-

- Automatic right to attend all Council and Committee meetings unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Automatic right to inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect minutes of the Council and its Committees (or summaries of business undertaken in private) for up to six years following a meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect lists of background papers used in the preparation of public reports.
- Access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting.
- Access to a public register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc.
- A reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports relating to items to be considered in public must be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council and its Committees etc.
- Access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned.
- Access to a summary of the rights of the public to attend meetings of the Council and its Committees etc. and to inspect and copy documents.
- In addition, the public now has a right to be present when the Council determines “Key Decisions” unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Unless otherwise stated, all items of business before the Executive Committee are Key Decisions.
- (Copies of Agenda Lists are published in advance of the meetings on the Council’s Website:
www.redditchbc.gov.uk

**If you have any queries on this Agenda or any of the decisions taken or wish to exercise any of the above rights of access to information, please contact
Ivor Westmore
Committee Support Services**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: 01527 64252 (Extn. 3269) Fax: (01527) 65216
e.mail: ivor.westmore@redditchbc.gov.uk Minicom: 595528**

Welcome to today's meeting.

Guidance for the Public

Agenda Papers

The **Agenda List** at the front of the Agenda summarises the issues to be discussed and is followed by the Officers' full supporting **Reports**.

Chair

The Chair is responsible for the proper conduct of the meeting. Generally to one side of the Chair is the Committee Support Officer who gives advice on the proper conduct of the meeting and ensures that the debate and the decisions are properly recorded. On the Chair's other side are the relevant Council Officers. The Councillors ("Members") of the Committee occupy the remaining seats around the table.

Running Order

Items will normally be taken in the order printed but, in particular circumstances, the Chair may agree to vary the order.

Refreshments : tea, coffee and water are normally available at meetings - please serve yourself.

Decisions

Decisions at the meeting will be taken by the **Councillors** who are the democratically elected representatives. They are advised by **Officers** who are paid professionals and do not have a vote.

Members of the Public

Members of the public may, by prior arrangement, speak at meetings of the Council or its Committees. Specific procedures exist for Appeals Hearings or for meetings involving Licence or Planning Applications. For further information on this point, please speak to the Committee Support Officer.

Special Arrangements

If you have any particular needs, please contact the Committee Support Officer.

Infra-red devices for the hearing impaired are available on request at the meeting. Other facilities may require prior arrangement.

Further Information

If you require any further information, please contact the Committee Support Officer (see foot of page opposite).

Fire/ Emergency instructions

If the alarm is sounded, please leave the building by the nearest available exit – these are clearly indicated within all the Committee Rooms.

If you discover a fire, inform a member of staff or operate the nearest alarm call point (wall mounted red rectangular box). In the event of the fire alarm sounding, leave the building immediately following the fire exit signs. Officers have been appointed with responsibility to ensure that all visitors are escorted from the building.

Do Not stop to collect personal belongings.

Do Not use lifts.

Do Not re-enter the building until told to do so.

The emergency Assembly Area is on Walter Stranz Square.

Declaration of Interests: Guidance for Councillors

DO I HAVE A "PERSONAL INTEREST" ?

- Where the item relates or is likely to affect your **registered interests** (what you have declared on the formal Register of Interests)

OR

- Where a decision in relation to the item might reasonably be regarded as affecting **your own** well-being or financial position, or that of your **family**, or your **close associates** more than most other people affected by the issue,

you have a personal interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare the existence, and nature, of your interest and stay**

- The declaration must relate to specific business being decided - a general scattergun approach is not needed
- **Exception** - where interest arises only because of your membership of another **public body**, there is no need to declare unless you **speak** on the matter.
- You **can vote** on the matter.

IS IT A "PREJUDICIAL INTEREST" ?

In general only if:-

- It is a personal interest **and**
- The item affects your **financial position** (or conveys other benefits), or the position of your **family, close associates** or bodies through which you have a **registered interest** (or relates to the exercise of **regulatory functions** in relation to these groups)

and

- A member of public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably believe the interest was likely to **prejudice** your judgement of the public interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare and Withdraw**

BUT you may make representations to the meeting before withdrawing, **if** the public have similar rights (such as the right to speak at Planning Committee).



Executive

Committee

29th September 2010

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

<p>4. Minutes (Pages 69 - 80) Chief Executive</p>	<p>To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on the 8th September 2010. (Minutes attached)</p>
<p>8. Pitcheroak Golf Course - Operational Options (Pages 81 - 90) Head of Leisure and Cultural Services</p>	<p>To consider a review of the operation of Pitcheroak Golf Course over the previous 18 months and the options for future provision. (Report attached)</p> <p>All Wards</p>
<p>9. Arrow Valley Countryside Centre - Contractual Arrangements (Pages 91 - 98) Head of Leisure and Cultural Services</p>	<p>To consider specific options for the contractual arrangements for the Arrow Valley Countryside Centre. (Report attached – Appendix available via the Council's website and as a hard copy in Group Rooms)</p> <p>All Wards</p>



Executive

Committee

8th September 2010

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Carole Gandy (Chair), Councillor Michael Braley (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Juliet Brunner, Greg Chance, Brandon Clayton, Malcolm Hall, Gay Hopkins and Debbie Taylor

Also Present:

Councillors Kath Banks, Andrew Brazier and Derek Taylor

Officers:

C Audritt, R Bamford, J Bayley, H Bennett, K Dicks, C Felton, S Hanley, T Kristunas, J Pickering, S Powell, Jim Prendergrast, I Ranford, D Taylor, L Tompkin and A Walsh

Committee Services Officer:

I Westmore

55. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Jinny Pearce.

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Greg Chance and Debbie Taylor declared personal and prejudicial interests in Item 15 (Church Hill District Centre – Redevelopment Report) as detailed separately at Minute 69 below.

57. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair advised that the following item of business, scheduled on the Forward Plan to be dealt with at this meeting, had been rescheduled to a later meeting:

- Review of Financial Regulations

The Chair also advised that she had accepted the following matter as Urgent Business:

.....
Chair

Item 14 – Budget Guidance and Timetable 2011/12

(Not on the Forward Plan for this meeting and not meeting the publication deadline)

58. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee held on 28th July 2010 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

59. LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP TASK AND FINISH GROUP - FINAL REPORT

The Committee received the final report of the Local Strategic Partnership Task and Finish Group, as approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Members welcomed the report and were happy to endorse the recommendations contained therein, with the exception of that pertaining to the funding of a full-time post. On this issue Members did not feel that they were able to consider such a financial commitment in isolation from the overall budget setting process.

RESOLVED that

Recommendations 1-8 detailed in an interim report endorsed previously on 17th March and approved by both the Executive Committee and the Redditch Partnership Management Board, as detailed in Appendix 8 to the report, be noted; and

RECOMMENDED to the Redditch Partnership that

Monitoring: ensuring that the Redditch Partnership is subject to regular overview and scrutiny by Councillors:

- 9) there should be pre-scrutiny of each new Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee;**
- 10) there should be a full review and audit of each completed SCS by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee;**
- 11) the Redditch Partnership and SCS should be subject to six-monthly monitoring sessions by the Committee;**

Operational: suggestions for improving the future work of the Redditch Partnership and the next SCS:

- 12) the next SCS should have fewer, more focussed targets (perhaps four – six) which are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound;
- 13) for the foreseeable future, the SCS should contain targets relating to health and educational inequalities in Redditch;
- 14) the priorities within the SCS should reflect residents' priorities (as identified through consultation) and also dovetail with those of the Worcestershire Partnership; and

RESOLVED that

- 15) the comments made in respect of the LSP requiring the support of a full-time permanent Partnership Manager reporting directly to the Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships be noted but the matter be subject to consideration alongside other budget bids as part of the budget setting process.

60. BUILDING CONTROL - FEES AND CHARGES

Officers reported that they were seeking the introduction of additional charges for building control services in order to offset the cost of Officer time and in order to increase customer satisfaction overall. The introduction of such charges was broadly in line with what other local authorities were undertaking.

It was noted that these changes would create additional work for Officers in the short term but that this could be absorbed by the current levels of staffing. The longer term benefit would be in tidying up a considerable number of outstanding applications.

RECOMMENDED that

implementation of additional charges for building control services be approved as follows:

- 1) for retrospective Completion Certificates for archived applications as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report;
- 2) for processing the withdrawal of applications as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report; and

- 3) **for processing the transfer of obligations to a third party including the re-direction of inspection fees and issue of copy documents as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.**

61. IRRECOVERABLE DEBTS

It was noted during the course of the debate that no further routine quarterly reports on the write-off of irrecoverable debts were to be submitted to the Executive Committee following a decision taken at Council in August.

Officers undertook to respond to Councillor Braley as to whether the damage inflicted upon void properties constituted criminal damage.

RESOLVED that

the debts totalling £54,754.90 as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report be written off as irrecoverable.

(During the consideration of this item, Members discussed matters that necessitated the disclosure of exempt information. It was therefore agreed to move to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on the grounds that information would be revealed which contained the personal details of individuals. There is nothing exempt in this record of proceedings, however.)

62. DECENT HOMES CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND ASBESTOS REMOVAL

Members were pleased to note that monitoring of capital spend was being undertaken rigorously and, in particular, that the spending on asbestos removal had been incorporated into the current report.

It was noted that a number of properties had had their work deferred owing to the review of the Sheltered Housing Stock as it was not considered a good use of resources to undertake the work in advance of decisions being taken on the future categorization of various schemes.

Officers provided an update to members on the course of action followed in those cases where tenants refused access to the property. Where there was not a health and safety concern there was no right for the contractor to enter the property. There was an increasing requirement on the tenants concerned to sign documentation detailing their wish not to have the specified works carried out.

RESOLVED that

the contents of the report be noted.

63. REVIEW OF REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL'S SHELTERED HOUSING STOCK - CUSTOMER FEEDBACK UPDATE

Further to earlier decisions to agree in principle the proposals submitted to previous meetings of the Executive Committee and Council, Officers informed Members of the outcome of the period of information sharing with tenants which had taken place over recent weeks.

A number of responses had been received from tenants, which were included in the papers presented to Members. It was contended that no substantially new issues had arisen during this process but tenants seemed appreciative of the time that Officers had spent going over the proposals with them.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) **Officers findings now be considered conclusive and the matter progress through Full Council on 20th September, 2010; and**

RESOLVED that

- 2) **sufficient consultation and opportunity for interested parties to feed back on the outcomes of the Review of Sheltered Housing have taken place; and**
- 3) **in order to achieve the desired outcomes included in the Action Plan of the Older Persons Housing and Support Strategy, as approved by Full Council on 18th September 2009 the thoughts of interested parties be noted but proposals as approved by the Executive Committee on 28th July 2010 remain unchanged.**

64. QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE MONITORING - QUARTER 1 - APRIL TO JUNE 2010

The latest quarter's performance figures for key aspects of the Council's performance across a range of services were considered.

Members were generally happy with the trends in performance and in the manner of presentation. One issue that was highlighted was the performance against the recycling target (NI 192) where it was noted that problems with contamination at a new County facility was leading to increased rejection rates across the districts.

RESOLVED that

the update on key performance indicators for the period ending June 2010 be noted.

65. QUARTERLY BUDGET MONITORING - QUARTER 1 - APRIL TO JUNE 2010

The latest budget monitoring report submitted to Members was considered by the Committee.

RESOLVED that

the report be noted.

66. QUARTERLY MONITORING OF THE BENEFITS SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN - QUARTER 1 - APRIL TO JUNE 2010

Officers provided an update on the performance of the benefits service. The service was generally making progress across the range of objectives identified in the Benefits Service Improvement Plan with the Council on target to receive the maximum possible subsidy.

The current financial climate had led to an expansion of the work for the service as people were taking on low paid work but were still requiring additional benefits besides. The most recent data on overpayment recovery was brought to the attention of Members, demonstrating that this area was beginning to show signs of improvement.

RESOLVED that

- 1) the report be noted;
- 2) the secondment of the Improvement Plan Project Officer be extended until 31st March 2011; and
- 3) £11,950 be allocated from the balance of Department of Works and Pensions monies received in 2008/09.

67. QUARTERLY MONITORING OF FORMAL COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS - QUARTER 1 - APRIL TO JUNE 2010

The Committee considered the most recent information on the monitoring of complaints and compliments. Members were informed that the Stage One complaints referred to at Appendix 1

represented fourteen separate individuals with complaints as opposed to multiple complaints by fewer individuals.

RESOLVED that

the update on complaints and compliments for the period April-June 2010 be noted.

68. BUDGET GUIDANCE AND TIMETABLE 2011/12

Members received an update on the process that was to be followed to enable development and consideration of the forthcoming financial plan. Members were particularly interested to hear of the recruitment of a budget jury.

RESOLVED that

the timetable be noted.

(This report had been accepted as a matter of Urgent Business – not on the Forward Plan and not having met the publication deadline – and was considered at the meeting as such, with the approval of the Chair, in accordance with the Council's constitutional rules and the powers vested in the Chair by virtue of Section 100 (B) (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972 to agree to matters of urgency being discussed by reason of special circumstances.

In this case the special circumstances were that the information, which was not available at the time of the agenda going to print, was required to be considered at the present meeting in order that the earlier milestones on the timetable might be reported to Members prior to these milestones being attained.)

69. CHURCH HILL REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

[During consideration of this item Members discussed matters that necessitated the disclosure of exempt information. It was therefore agreed to exclude the press and public prior to any debate on the grounds that information would be revealed relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Prior to consideration of this item, and in accordance with the requirements of Section 81 of the Local Government Act 2000, Councillors Greg Chance and Debbie Taylor declared personal and prejudicial interests in view of their positions on the Management Board of Redditch Co-operative Homes]

70. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members received the minutes of recent meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It was noted that the Council was still in the process of developing its procedures for dealing with petitions following the implementation of the new Petitions Scheme, including those dealt with through the Overview and Scrutiny Process.

RESOLVED that

- 1) the minutes of the meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 14th July, 22nd July and 4th August 2010 be received and noted;

Bus Pass Scheme: County Provision – Update

- 2) a motion be put to full Council on 9th August 2010 asking that a letter be sent to the Department of Transport expressing concern about the lack of detailed information regarding funding for concessionary fares in 2011;
- 3) the Executive Committee request that the Member of Parliament for Redditch be requested to make representations on behalf of the Council to the Department for Transport regarding funding for concessionary fares in 2011;

Council Flat Communal Cleaning Task and Finish Review – Monitoring – Consultation Update Report

- 4) no further action on consultation regarding cleaning of communal areas in Council properties take place unless groups of residents in properties, not currently included in the cleaning contract, approach the Council for a cleaning service;

Petition – Against Anti-Social Behaviour in Lowlands Lane Park

- 5) a multi-agency approach be adopted to discourage drinking and anti-social behaviour in Lowlands Lane Park

71. MINUTES / REFERRALS - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, EXECUTIVE PANELS, NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUPS ETC.

There were no minutes or referrals under this item.

72. SHARED SERVICE BOARD

The Committee received the minutes of the most recent meeting of the Shared Services Board.

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Shared Services Board on 19th August 2010 be noted.

73. ADVISORY PANELS - UPDATE REPORT

RESOLVED that

the report be noted.

74. ACTION MONITORING

RESOLVED that

the report be noted.

75. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED that

under S.100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matters on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act, as amended:

Irrecoverable Debts (as detailed at Minute 61 above); and

Church Hill District Centre – Redevelopment Report (as detailed at Minute 69 above).

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 10.05 pm

.....
Chair

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS APPRAISAL FOR PITCHEROAK GOLF COURSE

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Gay Hopkins
Relevant Head of Service	John Godwin

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

The following report outlines the performance of the 18 month trial operating arrangements for proposals for Pitcheroak Golf Course with the Hereford and Worcestershire Golf Partnership, and offers some proposals for the future Management arrangements at Pitcheroak Golf Course.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to **RESOLVE** that

- 1) the contents of the report be noted; and
- 2) Members consider the following options and determine which option to **RECOMMEND**:-
 - a) Option 1 - To extend the arrangement with the Worcestershire Golf Partnership for a further 12 month period to work up a medium/long term operating solution, to commence negotiations immediately; and

carryout a service review of the non-golf directly related elements of the operation;

OR
 - b) Option 2 - Advertise in the wider market for the management of the Golf Course;

OR
 - c) Option 3 - To bring the management of the course back in house to Redditch Borough Council Leisure and Cultural Services

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 As part of the 2008/09 Budget Strategy Offers were charged to with closing the Pitcheroak Golf Course. After working with members an alternative

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

management arrangement for the course was investigated and implemented for an 18 month trial period with the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Golf Partnership (H&WGP).

- 3.2 As a result of the alternative management operational partnership the incumbent Golf Professional took voluntary redundancy and the current caterer's term was extended until the 31/09/2010 to accommodate the trial.
- 3.3 The catering and bar franchise was due to be re-tendered prior to the commencement of the trial operating period of the H&WGP. The decision was taken to extend the current operators term until the partnership could be evaluated.

4. KEY ISSUES

- 4.1 The following information is a review of the performance of the Herefordshire & Worcestershire County Golf Partnership from 11/05/2009 to 31/09/2010 compared to the previous "in-house" operating period of 01/04/2008 to 31/03/2009.

18 months Partnership Performance in Comparison to the National Context

- 4.2 The following data sources have been used to support the information supplied below: Redditch Borough Council, Sports Marketing Research, European Golf Union, Birmingham City Council and Herefordshire and Worcestershire Golf Partnership.
- 4.3 The national average throughout the country is showing an 8% reduction in golf club memberships. At Pitcheroak there were 62 members of Kingfisher Golf Club (resident club) in 2009, and this has now increased to 260 (419% increase) in 2010. This is higher than the average membership for all public and private courses Worcestershire (average figure of 250 members).
- 4.4 30% (67) of members at Pitcheroak are under the age of 30 years, compared to the Midlands and National average of 11% for each courses total user group. This is a key statistic for the future development of the sport. Prior to the new management arrangements only 5% 4 of Pitcheroak users were under the age of 30 years.
- 4.5 The partnership is working in all 39 local schools and is actively engaging 780 children in golf. Prior to the new management arrangements only 5 local schools were actively delivering golf to a maximum of 100 school

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

children. The aim of the partnership is work with the established school groups to deliver clear player pathways to the resident Kingfisher Club to establish them as regular players.

- 4.6 The total number of rounds of golf played for 2009/10 increased by 13% (15,037 rounds) compared to a national decrease of -1%.
- 4.7 The club ran two free of charge open days in 2010 which yielded 87 new members contributing to the figure above
- 4.8 From a starting position of 2 junior members in 2009 the partnership has increased this number to 30, with 6 (20%) of these being girls, which is above the average club membership figure of 2.5% for Worcestershire.

Future Options for Pitcheroak Golf Course

Option 1 - Extension of current arrangements for a further 18 month period

- 4.9 The current arrangement has seen a consistent increase in income and usage compared to the "in-house" provision of 2008/09. However the ambitious income targets set have not been achieved. This can be attributed a falling National market for golf and the direct impact that the weather has on use.
- 4.10 Re-tendering of the café and bar would need to be undertaken with the emphasis on increasing rental income and providing a complementary service that supports the Partnerships Developments aspirations.
- 4.11 The completion of a service review for the whole service would yield some further operational savings, although these can not be specifically determined at this time.
- 4.12 A new Service Level Agreement would need to drawn up to accommodate any new operation.

Option 2 - Full Open Market Procurement for Pitcheroak Golf Course

- 4.13 A full and open procurement exercise would require an extension to the current arrangements to allow a full procurement exercise to be undertaken.
- 4.14 Full market testing has the potential to yield significant savings. However the overall potential savings can not be determined at this time as a full

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE****29th Sept 2010**

operational specification would dictate the level of financial commitment required from Redditch Borough Council.

- 4.15 An independent service provider would require a minimum of a five year term. Redditch Borough Council would require a Full Repairing Lease on the building and grounds, with a complementary Management Operational Contract.
- 4.16 A residual cost of approximately £31k would remain with the Council in relation to support service and capital costs.

Option 3 - Revert the Service Back to an In-House Service Provision

- 4.17 In-house provision would increase the service deficit by approximately £40k per annum.
- 4.18 An in-house service provision would be unlikely to sustain the level of development which is currently provided as was the case prior to the existing trial.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial position over the last 2 years is as follows;

	2008/9 Actual^a	2009/10 Actual^b	2010/11 Budget^c
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Expenditure/Costs^d	192	218	199
Income^e	:77	87	121
Deficit	115	131	79

Notes to Table:**a) 2008/09**

During 2008/09 the service was provided 100% in house by the Council. Expenditure included the cost of service provision including all directly employed staff, premise costs and other support provided to the course by our officers.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

b) 2009/10.

During 2009/10 the new management arrangements were implemented in September 2009 and the costs include the redundancy payments made (£17k) to staff.

c) 2010/11

The budget for 2010/11 reflects minimal staffing provision (£6k - cleaners) employed direct by the Council. In addition there are significant premise costs that are the responsibility of the Borough.

d) Expenditure

The expenditure for the service includes all costs relating to staff employed by the Council, landscaping, business rates and energy costs together with the professional management fees paid and other support services provided by Council officers to the service.

e) Income

The income targets have not been achieved for the last 3 years due to a number of issues including; course closure days resulting from extreme weather conditions and a general downturn in this leisure activity. The course suffered the worst winter weather conditions for 30 years. It is anticipated that the actual income for 2010/11 will be £100k and therefore show a shortfall of £21k to the income target.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no specific legal implications other than normal property and employment related legislation.

7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

It is viewed that whatever option is recommended it will be viewed as a "key decision" and will require consideration by full council.

8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

The Council's objectives are underpinned by the aim of being a "well managed organisation".

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

**9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY
CONSIDERATIONS**

There is a sustainability issue if the Option 3 is the preferred choice. Options 1 and 2 provide no adverse impact on Risk or Health and Safety grounds.

10. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

All Options provide no adverse impact on customers.

11. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

There are no equalities and diversity implications in this report.

**12. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET
MANAGEMENT**

12.1 Option 1 – It is expected that the service review will provide greater value for money. There are no Asset Management implications. In addition there would have to be clarification on the procurement process for a long term solution.

12.2 Option 2 - Value for Money would be determined by the content of lease.

13. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON IMPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY

There are no climate change, carbon implication and biodiversity implications in this report

14. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

Option 3: Will require Redditch Borough Council to carry out a service review and provide a new staffing structure to meet the operational and service needs of running the day to day operation of the course.

15. GOVERNANCE/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

15.1 Option 1: A more robust number of performance measures/ indicators should be built into any future management agreement and these should be measured on a quarterly frequency and monitored as part of the Councils Client Management responsibility. These should adopt a balanced scorecard approach and contribute to the

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

Council Corporate Indicators, as well as the department's indicators.

15.2 Option 2: As per option 1.

15.3 Option 3: Same as option 1, but in house responsibility

16. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING SECTION 17 OF CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

There are no current issues however this position would need to be re-assessed if there was no on-site operator. Consideration would include some minor works to the perimeter of the ground, Shuttering of external windows, doors etc. and procurement of a security monitoring service for the facility.

17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

There are no Health inequality implications in this report.

18. LESSONS LEARNT

N/A.

19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

There have been no additional stakeholder engagement in the concerning the options outlined in this report.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	
Chief Executive	
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	Yes
Executive Director – Leisure, Cultural, Environmental and Community Services	
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services	
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships	
Head of Service	
Head of Resources	
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	
Corporate Procurement Team	

21. WARDS AFFECTED

All Wards

22. APPENDICES

N/A

23. BACKGROUND PAPERS

N/A

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: John Godwin
E Mail: john.godwin@redditchbc.gov.uk
Tel: 01527 64252 ext: 3248

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

**ARROW VALLEY COUNTRYSIDE CENTRE –
CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr Gay Hopkins
Relevant Head of Service	John Godwin
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

To consider the specification format for the alternative management arrangements for the Arrow Valley Countryside Centre.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that

the specification format for the tendering process for the alternative management arrangements be approved.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 On the 17/2/2010 the Executive Committee recommended Option Four of the independent report undertaken by the Rural development Services UK Limited, on the possibilities for the future development and operation of the Arrow Valley Countryside Centre. This decision was later approved at Full Council on the 29/03/2010:

Option 4 Private Sector Centre Management: medium term lease for commercial facility management with Council service level agreement.

- 3.2 The four key outcomes of option 4 were developed through discussions with Councillors, Officers and Users and these can be summarised as follows;

- (a) Reduce the cost of the Centre to the Council
- (b) Secure existing public access and improve access for Redditch Residents
- (c) Retain main activity programme
- (d) Maintain the wider public benefits the Centre brings

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

4. KEY ISSUES

- 4.1 Members requested Officers not to go down a Service Level Agreement route but contractually compel any new Operator to a specific contract agreement with Key Performance Indicators.
- 4.2 Officers propose the following contractual arrangements for any potential operator:
- 4.3 The prospective operator will be responsible for the Centre and its immediate surrounds on a long term **Full Repairing Lease** to an organisation to develop commercial activities compatible with the park environment in tandem with some specific Council service requirements, delivered through a contractual **Management Agreement (MA)** attached to the base.
- 4.4 The Contractor managing the Centre would be free to run a range of commercial activities suitable to the space in return for private investment in the facility. To allow an adequate return on investment a minimum 10 year lease period with annual reviews and three year break points is proposed, where either party can terminate the arrangement.
- 4.5 The mix of activities in and around the Centre, over and above those required by the Authority, would be the responsibility of the Contractor. There will be some synergy in developing activities that relate to the play areas and the family market and developing new services (e.g. bike and boat hire, private function hire) that add to the overall offer.
- 4.6 The lease would include responsibility for the full maintenance of the building and area within it's cartilage including the small play garden by the Contractor. This should complement the "Green Flag" status of the Park.
- 4.7 The **MA** will require the retention of a catering service as an important part of the public offer (although this could be sub-let if necessary) and public access to the toilet facilities. The café area could be extended into the current interpretation and retail space and / or to the top floor for private dining and functions, to improve operational efficiency and to increase capacity. The opening times should match the timing of the Park events programme and public demand.
- 4.8 The **MA** will require the provision of year-round water-sports activities for children and youths (although this could be sub-let if necessary).

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

- 4.9 Provision will be made at the entrance for an information point for the Park to retain the Centre's role as an orientation point for Park users.
- 4.10 The Authority will maintain the adjacent play area, the surrounding park environment, the lake and the car parks. The Authority will continue to run and promote regular large scale events in the Park. However, the Contractor will be encouraged to be a close partner within event development and run additional events.
- 4.11 The issue of staff transfer from the Authority to the Contractor requires further discussion between the parties involved.
- 4.12 In conclusion, the aim is to bring the whole of the Centre under one management operation on a long term lease which will allow for much greater cohesion between the catering, waterfront, environmental and community activities and events programme.
- 4.13 A copy of the draft specification is detailed in appendix 1
- 4.14 As part of the decision notice from the 29/03/2010 full council meeting Officers were charged with changing the name of the site from the Arrow Valley Countryside Centre to the Arrow Valley Visitor Centre. Officers request to members that the timing of the name change to co-inside with the start of the Alternative Management Arrangements as will have the following benefits;
- (e) Re-launch the site in the press to stimulate greater public use
 - (f) Help establish the new operator in the eyes of general public
 - (g) Offers a possible cost shared opportunity

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council spends £204K in funding the centre. Officers will aim to save an estimated £75k following the revised management arrangements. This will be dependant on the value of submissions received and any savings generated will be built into the budget review process for 2011/12-2013/14.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no specific legal implications other than normal property and employment related legislation.

7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

It is viewed that whatever option is recommended it will be viewed as a “key decision” and will require consideration by full council

8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

Well Managed Organisation

9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

Any risk and health and safety considerations will be address at the procurement stage and through a robust Management Agreement with key performance indicators for the potential operator.

10. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

There are no adverse customer implications arising from this report

11. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

There are no equalities or diversity implications arising from this report.

12. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET MANAGEMENT

12.1 Value for Money implications – the objectives of the Alternative Management Arrangements of the site include; reducing the cost to the Council and maintain the public benefit. These issues are key in delivering value for money to our residents in providing quality services at a reasonable costs.

12.2 Procurement – The Alternative Management Arrangements is being pro-actively procured with the aid of the Procurement Team.

12.3 Asset Management – The Estates Department will draw up the building lease in accordance with their normal operating and control procedures

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

13. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON IMPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY

There are no specific climate change, carbon implications or biodiversity implications arising from this report

14. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

All Redditch Borough Council staff have been consulted on the proposals together with the potential impact. The Human Resources team are involved in all issues in relation to staff.

15. GOVERNANCE/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

All governance and performance management implications will be address at the procurement stage and through a robust Management Agreement with key performance indicators for the potential operator

16. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING SECTION 17 OF CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

There are no community safety implications arising from this report

17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

There are no health inequality issues arising from this report

18. LESSONS LEARNT

18.1 The public were originally involved in the consultation process around the development of the independent report and the development of the various options. However the public were later excluded from the whole content, due to the restricted, and not for publication status of the report.

18.2 Officers will (with approval of members) offer formal feedback in future to consultative bodies, but redact any sensitive information to avoid any possible negative implications at a later stage

19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The Arrow Valley Park Forum Group has been consulted on the initial proposal and have received regular updates at the forum meetings. The

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE****29th Sept 2010**

group have also met with the leader of the council to discuss the Alternative Management Arrangements

20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	
Chief Executive	
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	Yes
Executive Director – Leisure, Cultural, Environmental and Community Services	
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services	
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships	
Head of Service	
Head of Resources	
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	
Corporate Procurement Team	

21. WARDS AFFECTED

All wards

22. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Arrow Valley Countryside Centre, Alternative Management Specification.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

**EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

29th Sept 2010

23. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Executive Committee Report, 17/02/2010 and Full Council Report,
29/03/2010 – ARROW VALLEY COUNTRYSIDE CENTRE – REVIEW OF
ALTERNATIVE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Ray Cooke
E Mail: ray.cooke@redditchbc.gov.uk
Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3248

