CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURAL SERVICES AND SPORT

Venue: **Eric Manns Building, 45 Moorgate Street, Rotherham. S60 2RB**

Date: **Tuesday, 29th June, 2010**

Time: **10.00 a.m.**

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.

2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 15th June, 2010 (Pages 1 - 10)

4. DC Leisure Contract Monitoring Report 2009/10 (Pages 11 - 26)

5. May Revenue Budget Monitoring Report (Pages 27 - 35)

6. Tennis Court Hire Charges (Pages 36 - 37)

7. Proposed Merger of Town Centre Events and Marketing Groups (Pages 38 - 41)

8. Exclusion of the Press and Public
   The following item is likely to be considered in the absence of the press and public as being exempt under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended March 2006) (information relates to finance and business affairs):-

9. Tender Report - Boston Castle (Pages 42 - 61)

CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURAL SERVICES AND SPORT
Tuesday, 15th June, 2010

Present:- Councillor St. John (in the Chair) and Councillor Falvey.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor License.

F8. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 1ST JUNE, 2010

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member held on 1st June, 2010 be signed as a true record.

F9. NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES/MEMBERSHIP OF PANELS AND SUB-GROUPS ETC. 2010/11

Consideration was given to the appointment of members to various Working Groups, Panels and Outside Bodies for the 2010/11 Municipal Year.

Discussion ensued on the memberships on various outside bodies and sub-groups, particularly relating to South Yorkshire Forest, South Yorkshire Joint Committee on Archaeology, South Yorkshire Sports Partnership, Play Pathfinder Project Board, Rother Valley Country Park Members' Steering Group

Resolved:- (1) That the following appointments be made:-

ROTHERHAM ARTS CHARITY/ROTHERHAM ARTS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Trustees:- Councillors Smith and Walker (Cabinet Member, Economic Development, Planning and Transportation and Senior Adviser);
Councillor St. John (Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport);
Councillor Swift (from Regeneration Scrutiny Panel);
together with Elenore Fisher, Cultural Services Manager and Lizzy Alageswaran, Principal Officer, Community Arts.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE FOREST

Members' Steering Committee:- Councillor Sangster and Wyatt.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE FOREST ENVIRONMENT TRUST LTD.

Councillor Sangster.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARCHAEOLOGY

Councillors St. John and Falvey.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARCHIVES

Councillors St. John and Falvey and the Cultural Services Manager (or an officer from Archives and Local Studies).

SOUTH YORKSHIRE SPORTS PARTNERSHIP

Councillor St. John (plus support from Mr. Steve Hallsworth, Acting Director of Culture and Leisure Services).

SWINTON LOCK ACTIVITY CENTRE

Councillor Doyle (Ward 16 (Swinton)).

TREETON COMMUNITY CENTRE, PLAYING FIELDS AND MEMORIAL SCHEME COMMITTEE

Councillors Littleboy and Swift.

YORKSHIRE LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION

Councillor St. John, Cabinet Member, together with Elenore Fisher, Cultural Services Manager and Bernard Murphy, Manager, Library & Information Service.

BOSTON CASTLE PROJECT BOARD

Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport, Councillor St. John (Chair);
Advisers, Cultural Services and Sport, Councillors Falvey and License;
Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Transportation Councillor Smith;
Senior Adviser, Economic Development, Planning and Transportation, Councillor Walker;
Councillors Hussain, McNeely and Wootton (Ward No. 2 (Boston Castle)).

CLIFTON PARK RESTORATION PROJECT BOARD

Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport, Councillor St. John – (Chair);
Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Transportation, Councillor Smith;
Senior Adviser, Economic Development, Planning and Transportation, Councillor Walker;
Advisers, Cultural Services and Sport, Councillors Falvey and License;
Cabinet Member for Children & Young People's Services, Councillor Lakin;
Cabinet Member for Community Development & Engagement (also Ward 2 Boston Castle), Councillor Hussain;
Ward Members from Ward No. 2 (Boston Castle) and Ward No. 12

(Rotherham East) – Councillors Ali, Dodson, Kirk, McNeely and Wootton.

PLAY PATHFINDER PROJECT BOARD

Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport, Councillor St. John (Chair);
Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Transportation, Councillor G. Smith;
Councillor Atkin, Chair, Wentworth North Area Assembly;
Councillor Dodson, Chair, Rotherham South Area Assembly;
Councillor Johnston, Chair, Rotherham North Area Assembly;
Councillor Parker, Wentworth Valley Area Assembly;
Councillor G. A. Russell, Wentworth South Area Assembly;
Councillor Swift, Chair, Rother Valley West Area Assembly;
Councillor Havenhand (Substitute Councillor Falvey), Rother Valley South Area Assembly;
Councillor Whysall, Chair of Regeneration Scrutiny Panel.

ROTHER VALLEY COUNTRY PARK MEMBERS' STEERING GROUP

Cabinet Member Economic Development, Planning and Transportation, Councillor Smith together with Karl Battersby, Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services, and Steve Hallsworth, Acting Director of Culture and Leisure Services, plus three representatives from Oak Holdings.

ROTHERHAM LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK MEMBERS' STEERING GROUP

Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport, Councillor St. John

TOWN CENTRE EVENTS GROUP

It was proposed that this group would merge with the Town Centre Marketing Group and become the Town Centre and Events Marketing Group. Membership and Terms of Reference were yet to be confirmed. A report was to be brought to Cabinet Member in the near future.

2012 LEGACY PROJECT BOARD

The Mayor, Councillor R. McNeely (2010/11)
Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport, Councillor St. John (Chair)
Advisers, Cultural Services and Sport, Councillors Falvey and License
Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Planning and Transportation, Councillor Smith
Senior Adviser for Economic Development, Planning and Transportation, Councillor Walker
Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, Councillor Lakin
Advisers for Children and Young People, Councillors Havenhand and

Currie
Councillor Fenoughty

(2) That membership of the South Yorkshire Forest and South Yorkshire Forest Environment Trust Ltd. stay the same at the present time and that the position and advice regarding the appointment of members to the Boards be received in due course.

(3) That clarification be sought on the membership of the Rother Valley Country Park Members' Steering Group and whether this could be extended to include the Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport.

F10. CUSTOMER CARE – 1ST JANUARY TO 31ST MARCH, 2010

Consideration was given to a report presented by Emma Hill, Customer Services Standards Co-ordinator, which detailed performance statistics for Quarter 4 (January to March, 2010), against the Customer First Charter and suggested recommendations for improvement where necessary.

A brief summary was provided on performance statistics which were considered positive within Culture and Leisure showing a 100% target for letters acknowledged and responded to from the public within three working days and 95.4% of telephone calls being answered within seven rings, as opposed to 94% for the Directorate overall.

It was also noted that all complaints, comments and compliments for Environment and Development Services were monitored through the Siebel system and which saw an increase in the number of complaints received during this time period predominantly due to the inclement weather conditions experienced at the beginning of 2010. The rise in complaints was mainly around missed waste collections and missed theatre performances.

Resolved;- That the current performance be noted.

F11. CLOSED CEMETERY MEMORIAL MANAGEMENT

Consideration was given to a report presented by Jim Staveley, Development Officer (Land and Communities), which sought approval of the proposed new Closed Cemetery Memorial Safety Policy and the associated programme of safety inspections in Council maintained Closed Cemeteries.

'Closed' cemeteries or churchyards were those which have been closed by an Order in Council and were no longer used for burials. As a closed cemetery operator and manager, Culture and Leisure Services was required to have systems in place to control the risks to their employees, contractors, volunteers and members of the public from cemetery memorials such as headstones and from other elements like trees, walls and paths. Responsibilities are set out in the Local Authorities Cemeteries

Order 1977 (LACO), Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 (HSWA74), and Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations, 1999.

The main element in closed cemeteries requiring assessment and management were memorials such as headstones. Other cemetery buildings were not the Council's responsibility, but remained the responsibility of the churches. This report focused on memorials because of the potential severity of the risk of unsafe headstones. Other assets that Culture and Leisure were responsible for, including trees, boundary walls, footpaths and grass, were to be considered in a separate policy.

Culture and Leisure have consulted with neighbouring local authorities, including Doncaster and Barnsley, to examine how they managed their closed cemeteries. Poor execution of testing by some local authorities in the past highlighted the need to ensure that memorial testing was done in a sensitive way and was well communicated.

Ownership of memorials such as headstones remained with the family of the deceased and so there was a requirement to communicate with memorial owners and the community where memorials were found to require maintenance. Reasonable effort should be made to contact the family of the deceased. This may be difficult in the case of closed cemeteries where monuments typically dated from between 1750 and 1950. Only when there was an identified immediate risk of serious injury should action be taken without this step.

The testing of headstones could be an emotive activity if not properly communicated and the rationale explained. To avoid this and to ensure the work was done in a sensitive way, Culture and Leisure proposed to adopt the protocols used by Dignity plc for communication and inspections in Rotherham's open cemeteries. These protocols were formulated by the Council's Cemeteries prior to out-sourcing, and were tested in 2005 by the Local Government Ombudsman, who deemed them to be fair and reasonable.

Due to the number of sites and headstones and the lack of specialist skills and machinery/equipment in-house, it was proposed that that Glendale Countryside, who maintained Rotherham's open cemeteries, operated by Dignity for Rotherham Council, would be appointed to do this. The estimated cost of this work was below the threshold set by Council Standing Orders requiring competitive quotations to be obtained. Glendale's operatives were experienced in all aspects of cemetery management and have particular experience in headstone testing in Rotherham. It was proposed that they would be contracted to test all headstones in the closed cemeteries, and also to make safe any headstone found to be 'immediately dangerous' (Priority 1) at the time of inspection, which would typically mean laying the headstone down.

Memorials identified as not an immediate danger to the public, but not fully stable may need action to make them stable in the longer term

(Priority 2). Notices would then be fixed to such monuments and the grave owner requested to contact Culture and Leisure Services to arrange repairs. A follow-up inspection would be made within 12 months. If no contact had been made or repairs carried out on re-inspection, then the headstone would be made safe by laying down or dismantling. Memorials found to be stable (Priority 3) would require no action. After initial testing and follow up inspections, all headstones would need to be tested again in five years time.

Laying down or dismantling of headstones has been identified as the most affordable means of making memorials safe and mirrors management on Rotherham's open cemeteries, where grave owners (or other interested parties) do not present themselves to pay for repairs.

Discussion ensued on the sites of closed cemeteries and clarification sought on the one on Constable Lane. Its status could not be confirmed and would be investigated further.

It was noted that those headstones that required attention following inspection could only be repaired by an accredited stone mason.

Reference was also made to the publicity material and press releases about closed cemetery inspections and it was suggested that the most appropriate local media notifications be considered for each cemetery in turn in consultation with the appropriate Area Assembly.

Resolved:- (1) That the proposed new Closed Cemetery Memorial Safety Policy be approved for implementation by Culture and Leisure Services.

(2) That officers in Culture and Leisure Services be instructed to proceed with the commissioning of memorial testing in Rotherham Council-maintained Closed Cemeteries.

F12. REVENUE OUTTURN REPORT FOR 2009/2010

Consideration was given to a report presented by Nichola Stretton, Finance Manager, which detailed the performance against budget for the Environment and Development Services Directorate revenue accounts for the 2009/10 financial year.

The unaudited outturn position showed a balanced budget. This was a £246,000 improvement on the reported February, 2010 budget monitoring position.

At the close of the 2009/10 financial year the Environment and Development Services Directorate produced an outturn which showed a balanced budget against a net revenue budget of £45,557,837.

The under spend position on Culture and Leisure Services had been achieved by:-

- The moratorium on non-essential spend and managed staff vacancies throughout the Service.
- The late opening of Aston Library and under spends on the Libraries Materials fund contributed towards containing pressures within Library Services.

The Service also managed to contain pressures within the following areas:-

- Costs associated with the Clifton Park contract which remained incomplete as a result of UCS Civils going into administration (£60k site security and fees).
- Reported pressures on the Theatre budget due to staff cover costs.
- Costs associated with membership of South Yorkshire Archives.

The under spend (£24,270) on WREN funded Third Party Payments was requested to be carried forward to ensure committed projects could be completed.

A carry forward of £10,000 was also requested to cover the expected, but delayed legal costs in relation to Bar Park transfer.

Discussion ensued on the proposals to transfer Bar Park to Rotherham and the need for a further report on the liabilities and annual maintenance/upkeep of this asset and on the future of WREN funding.

The hard work of staff in the profiling of budgets across the Culture and Leisure Service was acknowledged as was how the service had been managed within the resources available.

Discussion ensued on the operational costs for the mobile lending libraries and information provided on the current situation where one driver had left and the discussions taking place with Streetpride to ascertain if there was a way forward in order to deliver this service.

It was also noted that information had still not been received regarding the outcome of the Libraries Accreditation Inspection.

Resolved:- (1) That the unaudited outturn position for the Environment and Development Services Directorate Revenue budgets for the 2009/2010 be noted.

(2) That Support be given to the recommendations made to the Strategic Leadership Team and Cabinet to approve the carry forward requests contained in this report

(3) That this report be referred to the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel for information.

(THE CHAIRMAN AUTHORISED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM IN ORDER TO PROCEED WITH FEEDBACK FROM THE CONSULTATION PROCESS)

F13. ROTHERHAM GREEN SPACE STRATEGY - CONSULTATION AND FINALISATION

Consideration was given to a report present by Phil Gill, Green Spaces Manager, which set out details of the consultation on the Green Space Strategy which had taken place with a range of stakeholders. Principal issues arising from this, along with proposed responses, were set out in the report with changes having been made to the Strategy document as a result. Subject to these being agreed, the Strategy could now be forwarded to Cabinet for formal adoption.

Findings are also presented from a pilot study which explored how sites that could be surplus to requirements might be dealt with.

The consultation draft of the Green Spaces Strategy was approved by Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development Services on 16th February, 2009. A programme of consultation then started in June, 2009 and continued through to March, 2010. This period was longer than originally planned due to staff shortages through the second half of 2009.

A wide range of stakeholders have been invited to comment on the Strategy, including Elected Members, park friends groups, parish and town councils, activity groups, statutory and non-statutory environmental bodies, local partners, major green space land owners, Council officers, neighbouring local authorities and local residents. A good number of responses were received, with most of the responses being largely supportive of the proposed vision, aims and objectives of the strategy, with a number of suggested amendments. The main issues arising were summarised and were set out in detail as part of the report, but focused on:-

- Improvements in parks should be backed by funding for ongoing maintenance.
- Emphasis on the importance of safety measures in green spaces.
- Concern about possible loss of green space.
- The role of green spaces in adapting to climate change should be more strongly emphasised in the Strategy.
- What more can be done to control dogs in parks?
- It is important to manage green spaces for biodiversity as well as other functions.
- The Strategy needs to consider more fully possible future green space needs and supply, including for example school sites.
- What approach to take to standards on non-Council owned green spaces?
- Ideas to increase/ support working with volunteers and Parks Friends

Groups.
- Developing the role and training of Rangers as 'ambassadors' for green spaces.
- Provision for older teenagers.
- Green space access standards.
- Rating of outlying green space sites.
- Site specific comments e.g. new sites, suggested changes to site boundaries, requests that sites be deleted or added to the list of green spaces.

Proposed responses to these issues were provided, but in many cases this included minor revision of the Strategy text to state more clearly how such issues would be addressed. In a very small number of cases, changes have been made to the scope and content of the Strategy in response to comments. For example, some requests were received for specific sites to be added or removed from the Strategy and, where appropriate, these changes have been made. A request was also received for more detail to be given about how to calculate the amount of new green space that should be provided in new housing developments where demand could not be met by existing green spaces. Consequently, a formula had been proposed for creating 16 square metres per person expected to live in new homes.

A pilot study had been undertaken to guide the development of a process for the assessment of candidate sites for possible change of use and to assess their suitability for such treatment. This examined audited sites in Rawmarsh. Further work was undertaken to identify smaller maintained green spaces (i.e. less than 0.2 hectares size). Principal conclusions of this study were:-

- Few of the audited sites could be disposed of without leading to gaps in coverage (based on the proposed five minute walking distance standard)
- However, reduction in the size of certain sites might be an appropriate way forward
- A large number of smaller sites was identified, and a survey methodology proposed for assessing the landscape value of these
- Considerable officer time would be needed to implement the proposed assessment process to green spaces across the borough.

Further thought was being given to how this work might be carried out as part of the implementation of the Green Space Strategy.

Discussion ensued on the uncertainty surrounding the housing targets given the change in Government, public use of school green spaces, green space sizes and provision for older children (post 13).

Resolved:- (1) That the proposed consultation responses be approved and fed back to consultees

(2) That a further report be taken to Cabinet seeking Members' endorsement and adoption of the finalised Green Spaces Strategy.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	**Meeting:**	Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport
2.	**Date:**	29th June 2010
3.	**Title:**	DC Leisure Contract Monitoring Report 2009/10
4.	**Programme Area:**	Environment & Development Services

5 Summary

5.1 This report summarises key data related to the performance of DC Leisure (DCL) against the PFI contract during 2009/10 with reference to:

- The Sport England National Benchmarking Service
- Quest Quality Management Accreditation
- Community and Corporate Plan Themes
- Customer Comments
- Contract Monitoring Arrangements

6. Recommendations

6.1 That the content of this report is noted by the Cabinet Member

6.2 That the Cabinet Member agrees to receive a Contract Monitoring report against the PFI leisure contract at six monthly intervals.

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 National Benchmarking Service

DCL are required by contract to subscribe to the Sport England / Sheffield Hallam University *National Benchmarking Service* (NBS) which provides an annual analysis of facility performance against a set of performance indicators concerned with access (e.g. by local 'priority groups'), financial issues, utilisation and user satisfaction. Performance comparisons are made across facility 'family groups' as determined by facility size, type and geographical location and are ranked by quartile position against each indicator.

NBS surveys and data returns were completed at Aston Leisure Centre, Rotherham Leisure Complex and Wath-upon-Dearne Leisure Centre during September 2009 and the final reports published in December 2009. Maltby Leisure Centre will compile its first NBS return in September 2010. The NBS report format delivers a detailed and comprehensive analysis of comparative performance for each facility. The following table highlights the key strengths, weaknesses and potential emerging "issues to watch" for each facility. More detailed analysis is included as Appendix 1.

Aston Leisure Centre	**Rotherham Leisure Complex**	**Wath Leisure Centre**
Strengths	**Strengths**	**Strengths**
Access indicators for females, 60+ years age groups, disabled groups and discount card holders Financial indicators for subsidy per visit, Subsidy per M^2 , Subsidy per resident and maintenance and repair costs Utilisation Indicators for % of casual visits. Satisfaction with Attributes for water quality, staff helpfulness and cleanliness of activity spaces.	Access Indicators: At least six groups which might be seen as important to social inclusion are at the 50% benchmark position or above Financial Indicators: Strong performance against indicators for cost recovery and subsidy per visit – largely driven by high volume of visits. . Utilisation Indicators: Strong performance against indicators for Visits per m^2 and % of casual visits Satisfaction with attributes: Good for Water Temperature, Equipment Quality, Quality of Flooring in Hall.	Access Indicators for 11-19 year olds, ethnic minorities, unemployed and discount / disadvantage card holders. Financial Indicators: Strong relative to the benchmarks with all subsidy and cost recovery indicators in the higher quartiles Utilisation: Top quartile performance against Visits per m^2 and relatively high % of visits which are casual Satisfaction with Attributes for staff, water quality in the pool, quality of equipment, cleanliness and ease of booking.
Weaknesses	**Weaknesses**	**Weaknesses**
Access indicators for 11 – 19 year olds, lower socio economic groups and	Energy Costs	Access Indicators for lower socio economic groups and disabled 60+

Aston Leisure Centre	Rotherham Leisure Complex	Wath Leisure Centre
ethnic minorities Satisfaction attributes for car parking and pool water temperature		years old. Energy Costs
Ones to Watch / Potential Issues	**Ones to Watch / Emerging Issues**	**Ones to Watch / Emerging Issues**
Food and drink and number of people in pool.	Pool attributes for water temperature and number of people in pool, value for money of food and drink and cleanliness of changing room.	Number of people and water temperature in the pool Value for money of food and drink

What is the outcome of this – is there an improvement action plan and how / where will it be monitored / reported?

7.2 Quest

As part of the output specification DCL are required to achieve Quest Accreditation at each facility within 12 months of the service commencement date and to maintain it thereafter. Quest is the national quality management scheme for sport and leisure facilities. It is managed and administered across the UK by PMP consultants under contract to the home country sports council (e.g. Sport England). The facilities at Aston LC, Rotherham LC and Wath-upon-Dearne LC underwent Quest assessment between September and November 2009. An assessment of Maltby LC is not due until early 2011.

.

Sport and leisure facilities undergoing Quest assessment are subject to an inspection and a mystery shopping exercise which together encompass a wide range of issues related to building management and maintenance, staffing and customer care, health and safety, programming and performance management. Assessments are scored and categorised as follows:

Score	Category
84% and above	Excellent
75% - 83%	Highly Commended
68% - 74%	Commended
Above 60%	Approved

The results for Rotherham's new facilities are summarised in the following table.

Facility	Inspection Date	Assessment Score	Assessment Category
Aston Leisure Centre	August 2009	80%	Highly Commended

Rotherham Leisure Complex	October 2009	76%	Highly Commended
Wath-Upon-Dearne Leisure Centre	November 2009	80%	Highly Commended

All three facilities were judged in the second highest category, *'Highly Commended'*. Quest status is retained for two years but in the intervening period registered facilities are monitored against a continuous improvement programme and through a further Mystery Shopping Visit and one day assessment.

Achievement of Quest Accreditation across all DCL managed sites is a key indicator of the success of the Leisure PFI for bringing a new generation of high standard sport and leisure facilities to Rotherham.

7.3 Community and Corporate Plan Themes

The output specification requires DCL to put in place plans and programmes to increase usage of sports facilities and to increase participation by specific priority and target groups. This aspect of the output specification is aligned with current Community and Corporate Plan Themes (although these are not specifically referred to in the output specification text). The following is a brief summary of key headline performance outputs and activity for 2009/10 under the relevant theme.

Alive

- Patronage: Initial trends in facility usage are positive. During their first complete financial year from April 2009 – March 2010 the new facilities attracted an estimated 957,800 visits compared with an estimated 786,400 visits during the final complete financial year of the old facilities between April 2007 and March 2008. Patronage is likely to increase further during 2010 and 2011 as the full impact of the Maltby facility, which did not open until February 2010, is realised.
- Sports & Physical Activity Development Plan: The output specification requires that DCL produce a Sports & Physical Activity Development Plan in partnership with the Council's Sports Development Unit. Progress against the Plan is reported to the Quarterly Liaison Group meeting. Key progress reported during 2009/10 included:

    - Amateur Swimming Association Funding secured for Level 1 and 2 courses
    - Future Jobs Fund post funded and employed full time by the Amateur Swimming Association to provide 2 apprentices at MSC and RLC, includes training package
    - Free Swimming Lessons now available for adults, including BME groups
    - Kangoo Jumps sessions for teenage girls introduced. Adult sessions are being considered as a pathway to encourage further participation
    - Rotherham Rockets are expanding to include RLC and MLC. They are already running at ALC

- DC promoting opportunities in the 2010 Mega Active Summer brochure
- All Facility Managers and Sports Development Officers are now meeting regularly for all 4 facilities and are working in partnership on the Sports Development Plan and reporting

- Marketing Plan. A marketing plan is in place with regular progress reports presented at the quarterly liaison meetings. Key marketing activity reported at recent meetings included promotion of health improvement projects in partnership with Rotherham NHS and the marketing materials targeted at areas and groups with low participation rates.

- Health Related Programmes: DCL is working in partnership with other organisations to promote the health benefits of participation in sport and active recreation. Carnegie Clubs, for example, are run in partnership with with NHS Rotherham and Carnegie Weight Management to deliver a family based weight management programme for overweight and obese children. The Carnegie Team attended the annual NHS Chairman's Awards on 26th March 2010 to receive an award for outstanding contribution to the Carnegie programme. Additional health related programmes held at DC facilities 09/10 included Condition Management, an NHS initiative designed to help people suffering ill health of with a disability to understand and manage their condition, and Drug Intervention.

Learning

DCL's contribution to Learning is through instructor led activities including swimming, gymnastics, fitness classes and children's holiday activities. Learning activities attracted an estimated 317,700 visits during 2009/10 which is between approximately 33% – 34% of all visits during the year.

Fairness

The National Benchmarking Survey includes a number of 'access' indicators which seek to measure the extent to which facility users are 'representative' of the local population. The summary in table 7.1 above highlights areas of strength and weakness against access indicators and reveals a mixed picture. Aston and Wath are each in the lower quartile for users from lower socio economic groups but are both relatively stronger on older users from the 60+ age groups. RLC, however, is performing relatively well regarding usages by young people, lower socio economic groups and BME groups.

The output specification requires that DCL target and address the needs of under represented groups. Initiatives reported by DCL during 2009/10 included the distribution of marketing materials in areas of high Rothercard ownership, gym programmes delivered at RLC in partnership with local schools and planned consultation with users and non users in the 50+ age groups.

7.4 Customer Comments and Complaints

DCL are required to report customer comments and complaints to the quarterly liaison meetings with the Council. The following table is a summary of the number of

comments and complaints received during 2009/10 across all DCL sites followed by a short commentary.

Complaint / Comment Type	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Annual Total
Operational	24	5	2	36	**67**
Programming	47	41	6	28	**122**
Design	17	11	1	6	**35**
Miscellaneous	2	2	2	3	**9**
Suggestion	21	16	8	62	**107**
Compliment	19	34	14	31	**98**
Staffing	1	0	4	3	**8**
Complaint	88	54	24	80	**246**
Quarter Total	**219**	**163**	**61**	**249**	**692**

- A declining trend in the number of comments and complaints was reversed in the final quarter. This was due primarily to teething problems at the newly opened Maltby facility. There were particular complaints about poor experiences with children's swimming lessons. This was due to difficulties arising out of an unprecedented level of demand when the facility opened but this has now settled down.
- The number of compliments also grew during the final quarter with particular emphasis on high standards of customer care. Aston in particular has attracted a significant number of compliments about specific staff members throughout the year.
- The issues raised by customers have been concerned with a wide and varied range of subjects. Key issues either attracting 10 or more comments in a single quarter or repeated over two or more quarters include:

    - Air Conditioning at Rotherham Leisure Centre during hot weather. This was due to technical problems which have since been resolved.
    - Requests for more Aquafit classes at Wath. A new additional session arranged after an instructor achieved the required qualification in aqua yoga.
    - Female lifeguards at women only swimming sessions.
    - Ongoing concerns about car parking at Aston. This matter is subject to ongoing negotiation with Aston school.
    - Concerns about faulty equipment including hairdryers at RLC and soap dispensers. EMCOR are in the process of changing the hairdryers for a more robust model. The faulty soap dispensers have been replaced.

7.5 Contract Monitoring Arrangements

The information summarised in this report is discussed regularly at the Leisure PFI Liaison Group meetings held during each quarter and comprising representatives of DCL and RMBC. Monitoring the results of the NBS, trends in usage and customer concerns enable both parties to measure and understand the success of the PFI project and for the Council as Client to

challenge the contractor's performance against the agreed output specification.

8. Finance

None

9. Risk and Uncertainties

None

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Link with Corporate and Community Plan objectives e.g. Alive, Fairness, Learning.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

National Benchmarking Survey Reports for Facilities at Aston, Rotherham and Wath
Leisure PFI Liaison Group Meeting Papers

Officer Contact:
John Finnen, Service Development Officer
Environment and Development Services
Performance & Quality Team
Ext. 54713
John.finnen@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1. Summary of Sport England National Benchmarking Service (NBS) Survey of DC Leisure Facilities (Rotherham) 2009.

1. NBS Performance Indicators

The National Benchmarking Survey provides each participating facility with an assessment of comparative performance against a set of 29 performance indicators. Indicators 1 – 7 below are the NBS key Access, Financial and Utilisation indicators which were proposed the final years of the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA).

Performance has been benchmarked against other participating facilities in the same 'family group'. The table includes quartile performance. Where a facility is on the border between quartiles this is indicated with a % score. For example, Wath's score against Indicator 3 is at the 75% point, the threshold between 3rd and Top Quartile (note NBS Quartiles are described in descending format so '3rd Quartile' is better then '2nd Quartile).

Key Access Areas	Definition and Guidelines for interpretation	Aston-cum-Aughton Leisure Centre	Rotherham Leisure Complex	Wath Upon Dearne Leisure Centre
1. % visits 11 – 19 years ÷ % catchment population 11 – 19 years.	1 = visits by 11 – 19 year olds representative of local population. <1 unrepresentative. 1> over-represented	**0.31 (Bottom Quartile)**	**0.82 (3rd Quartile)**	**1.08 (Top Quartile)**
2. % visits from social classes 6 & 7 ÷ % catchment population in social classes 6&7	1 = visits by 6 & 7 social groups is representative of local population. <1 unrepresentative. 1> over-represented	**0.30 (Bottom Quartile)**	**0.69 (3rd Quartile)**	**0.41 (Bottom Quartile)**
3. % Visits from Black, Asian and other ethnic groups ÷ % catchment population in same ethnic groups.	1 = visits by Black, Asian and other ethnic groups is representative of local population. <1 unrepresentative. 1> over-represented	**0.96 (Bottom Quartile)**	**1.19 (2nd Quartile)**	**2.45 (75%)**
4. % visits from 60+ years ÷ % catchment population 60+ years	1 = visits 60+ years is representative of local population. <1 unrepresentative. 1> over-represented	**0.92 (Top Quartile)**	**0.86 (3rd Quartile)**	**0.50 (50%)**
5. Visits from disabled under 60 years / % of catchment population disabled under 60 years	1 = visits from disabled under 60 years is representative of local population. <1 unrepresentative. 1> over-represented	**0.92 (75%)**	**0.30 (Bottom Quartile)**	**0.57 (2nd Quartile)**
Key Financial				
6. Subsidy Per Visit 1	Annual Total Operating Costs – Annual Total Income ÷ Annual Visits	**-0.04 (75%)**	**-0.07 (Top Quartile)**	**0.21 (3rd Quartile)**
Key Utilisation				
7. Annual visits per square metre of indoor facility spaces 1 (excluding offices)	Annual visits ÷ usable indoor floor space of the centre (i.e. total floor space minus offices and corridors). Higher number = better performance.	**109 (75%)**	**147 (Top Quartile**	**155 (Top Quartile)**

Other Performance Indicators	Definition and Guidelines for interpretation	Aston-cum-Aughton Leisure Centre	Rotherham Leisure Complex	Wath Upon Dearne Leisure Centre
8. % of visits of catchment population 20 – 59 years	1 = visits by 20-59 years group is representative of local population. <1 unrepresentative. >1 over-represented	1.17 (50%)	1.09 (Bottom Quartile)	1.19 (2nd Quartile)
9. % of Visits which were first visits	Higher % is better for effectiveness in access for new participants	7.11% (75%)	10.7% (75%)	5.37 (2nd Quartile)
10. % of visits with discount card	Higher % for effectiveness in use of discount card	56.48% (Highest Score)	46.98% (3rd Quartile)	59.00 (Top Quartile)
11. % of visits with discount cards for 'disadvantage'	Higher % for effectiveness in use of discount card for the disadvantaged	26.94% (Highest Score)	27.52% (Top Quartile)	30.96 (Top Quartile)
12. % of visits by females	Higher % is better	73% (Highest Score)	56% (2nd Quartile)	62% (3rd Quartile)
13. % of visits by disabled 60+ years ÷ % of catchment population disabled 60+ years	1 = visits by the disabled 60+ years group is representative of local population <1 under – represented >1 over-represented	0.56 (Highest Score)	0.36 (3rd Quartile)	0.18 (25%)
14. % of visits by the unemployed	Higher % is better	1.56 (50%)	3.78% (Top Quartile)	2.09 (50%)
Other Financial				
15. Cost recovery	Annual total income as a % of annual total operating expenditure <100% indicates a subsidy >100% Indicates an operating surplus Higher % score is better for financial performance	101 (75%)	103 (75%)	92 (3rd Quartile)
16. Subsidy per Visit 2	Annual Total Operating Costs (including actual central establishment charges, even if these are zero) – Annual Total Income ÷ Annual Visits Lower Score is better	-0.04 (75%)	-0.07 (75%)	0.21 (3rd Quartile)
17 Subsidy per square metre of indoor facility space	Annual total operating costs – annual total income ÷ Total indoor floor space of the centre. A positive score indicates a subsidy, a negative score indicates a surplus. Lower score is better for efficiency in use of space	-4 (75%)	-10 (75%)	31 (3rd Quartile)

Other Performance Indicators	Definition and Guidelines for interpretation	Aston-cum-Aughton Leisure Centre	Rotherham Leisure Complex	Wath Upon Dearne Leisure Centre
18. Subsidy per catchment resident	Annual total operating cost – annual total income ÷ relevant catchment population. A positive score indicates a subsidy; a negative score indicates a surplus. Lower score is better for efficiency for local taxpayers.	**-0.50 (75%)**	**-1.14 (3rd Quartile)**	**2.09 (3rd Quartile)**
19. Total operating cost per visit	Annual total operating costs ÷ annual visits Lower score is better for economy	**2.97 (3rd Quartile)**	**2.30 (Top Quartile)**	**2.71 (Top Quartile)**
20. Total operating cost per square metre of indoor facility space	Annual total operating costs ÷ total indoor floorspace of the centre Lower score is better for economy in the use of space	**302 (50%)**	**310 (2nd Quartile)**	**399 (2nd Quartile)**
21. Maintenance and repair costs per M^2	Annual maintenance and repair costs ÷ total indoor floor space of the centre Lower score is better for economy in use of space, but there may be adverse effects on quality	**2 (Top Quartile)**	**1 (Top Quartile)**	**0 (Top Quartile)**
22. Energy costs per square metre of indoor facility space	Annual energy costs ÷ total indoor floor space of the centre. Lower score is better for energy efficiency	**36 (50%)**	**46 (Bottom Quartile)**	**59 (Bottom Quartile)**
23. Total income per visit	Annual Total Income ÷ annual visits Higher score is better for financial effectiveness	**3.01 (2nd Quartile)**	**2.37 (Bottom Quartile)**	**2.50 (Bottom Quartile)**
24. Total income per square metre of indoor facility space	Annual total income ÷ total indoor floor space of the centre Higher score is better for financial effectiveness in the use of space.	**306 (3rd Quartile)**	**319 (3rd Quartile)**	**368 (3rd Quartile)**
25. Direct income per visit	Annual direct income ÷ annual visits Higher score is better for financial effectiveness in sales activities	**2.87 (2nd Quartile)**	**2.13 (25%)**	**2.96 (2nd Quartile)**
26. Secondary income per visit	Annual secondary income ÷ annual visits Higher score is better for financial effectiveness in sales of catering, vending, merchandise etc	**306 (25%)**	**0.25 (2nd Quartile)**	**0.13 (2nd Quartile)**

Other Performance Indicators	Definition and Guidelines for interpretation	Aston-cum-Aughton Leisure Centre	Rotherham Leisure Complex	Wath Upon Dearne Leisure Centre
Other utilisation				
27. Annual visits per square metre of indoor facility space 2 (including offices)	Annual visits ÷ total floor space of the centre (i.e. total floor space including offices and corridors) Higher score is better for effectiveness in use of space	**102 (3rd Quartile)**	**134 (Top Quartile)**	**147 (Top Quartile)**
28 % of visits casual, instead of organised	Casual visits are 'pay and play' customers who are not led in their activity by a member of staff. Organised visits have a coach instructor or other member of staff leading the activities. This indicator is a measure of programme effectiveness. Whether higher or lower % score is better dpends on policy objectives. NB care needed to interpret 'share ratio'	**86 (Top Quartile)**	**83% (Top Quartile)**	**76% (3rd Quartile)**
29. Weekly number of people visiting the facility as % of catchment population 11+ years.	The number of visits in the survey period is converted into people by applying the frequency of visit results. Higher % score is better for effectiveness in market penetration.	**10.32 (50%)**	**13.37 (3rd Quartile)**	**9.73 (50%)**

2. Satisfaction and Importance

The National Benchmarking Service (NBS) combines the results of survey questions measuring user views on what is important with responses to questions measuring levels of satisfaction to produce an overall gap analysis of strengths in service attributes as perceived by customers. Where specific attributes are regarded as important but have relatively low satisfaction scores this will indicate Weakness in service delivery. Attributes with high satisfaction and high importance will indicate Strength. Low importance and high satisfaction may in some instances indicate a need to consider a re-allocation of resource and focus.

The following is a summary of the *'Satisfaction / Importance'* gap analysis for each facility.

Aston Leisure Centre	**Relatively Weak Attributes**	**Evidence**
Primary weaknesses	Quality of car parking	Relatively the largest gap; absolutely low satisfaction; medium in importance
Secondary weaknesses	Water temperature in the pool	Relatively large gaps; relatively high in importance
Tertiary weaknesses	Quality of food & drink Value for money of food & drink Number of people in the pool	Relatively low satisfaction; low to medium in importance
	Relatively Strong Attributes	**Evidence**
Primary strengths	Water quality in the swimming pool Helpfulness of other staff Cleanliness of activity spaces	In top five satisfaction scores; relatively high in importance
Secondary strengths	Quality of flooring in the sports hall Quality of lighting in the sports hall	In top five satisfaction scores but not high in importance

Rotherham Leisure Complex	Relatively Weak Attributes	Evidence
Primary weaknesses	Cleanliness of changing areas Water temperature in the Pool	Relatively large gaps and relatively high in importance
Secondary weaknesses	Number of people in the pool Value for money of food and drink	Relatively large gaps; absolutely low satisfaction but relatively low in importance
	Relatively Strong Attributes	**Evidence**
Primary strengths	Standard of coaching / instruction Quality of equipment Helpfulness of other staff Water quaiity in the swmming pool	In top five satisfaction scores; relatively high in importance
Secondary strengths	Quality of flooring in the sports hall	In top five satisfaction scores but not high in importance

Wath Leisure Centre	Relatively Weak Attributes	Evidence
Primary weaknesses	Number of people in the pool Water temperature in the pool	Relatively large gap; relatively high in importance
Secondary weaknesses	Value for money of food and drink	Relatively the largest gap; absolutely low satisfaction; relatively low in importance
	Relatively Strong Attributes	**Evidence**
Primary strengths	Helpfulness of other staff Water quality in the swimming pool Quality of equipment Cleanliness of activity spaces	In top five satisfaction scores; relatively high in importance
Secondary strengths	Ease of booking	In top five satisfaction scores but not high in importance

3. NBS Survey 2009 - User Profile Data

The following table is a user profile for each facility based on the survey responses at each site. The representation of each group within the catchment demographic profile is also included where this data has been supplied. In some instances (e.g. Gender) catchment data is not supplied.

	Aston Leisure Centre		Rotherham Leisure Complex		Wath Leisure Centre	
Gender	**% Survey Participants**	**% Representation in Catchment Area**	**% Survey Participants**	**% Representation in Catchment Area**	**% Survey Participants**	**% Representation in Catchment Area**
Male	27.1%	Data not supplied for catchment area	44.4%	Data not supplied for catchment area	37.8%	Data not supplied for catchment area
Female	72.9%		55.6%		62.2%	
Ethnicity						
White	97.9%	97.83%	89.8%	91.46%	97.4%	98.96%
Mixed	0.5%	2.17% Non White	2.0%	8.54% Non White	1.3%	1.04% Non White
Asian or Asian British	1.0%		6.8%		0.4%	
Black or Black British	0.5%		1.0%		0.0%	
Chinese or Other Ethnic Group	0.0%		0.3%		0.9%	
Disabled / Long Term Illness						
Yes	15.6%	Data not supplied for catchment area	9.2%	Data not supplied for catchment area	9.7%	Data not supplied for catchment area
No	84.4%		90.8%		90.3%	
Age						
11- 19	4.1%	13.33%	12%	14.22%	14.4%	13.4%
20 – 59	74.6%	63.66%	68%	62.25%	72.9%	61.47%
60 plus	21.2%	23.01%	20%	23.53%	12.7%	25.13%
Socio-Economic Group *(NS SEC)*						
1 & 2	56.2%	Data not supplied for catchment area	49.4%	Data not supplied for catchment area	49.5%	Data not supplied for catchment area
3	23.7%		10.1%		22.8%	
4	5.9%		5.3%		4.9%	
5	6.5%		15.4%		11.4%	
6 & 7	7.7%	25.87%	19.8%	28.55%	11.4%	27.95%

Some Key observations from the Profile data

- Females have greater representation than males at all sites. This is consistent with the findings of other surveys of sports facilities usage in Rotherham.
- Female user representation is well above overall female representation in the general population of the borough (51?% according the latest mid year estimates)
- Younger people (11 – 19) age group have much lower representation at Aston than at other sites
- Socio- Economic groups 1 & 2 (i.e. professional, managerial) have much higher representation at all sites compared with socio economic groups 6 and 7 (i.e. manual workers, unskilled etc).

4. NBS Survey 2009 - Top 10 Postal Codes of Users Surveyed per Site

Aston Leisure Centre		Rotherham Leisure Complex		Wath Leisure Centre	
Post Code & Local Authority	**%**	**Post Code & Local Authority**	**%**	**Post Code & Local Authority**	**%**
S26 (RMBC)	40.1%	S65 (RMBC)	24.1%	S63 (RMBC)	51.0%
S60 (RMBC)	18.8%	S61 (RMBC)	21.4%	S64 (RMBC and Doncaster)	27.0%
S13 (Sheffield)	11.5%	S60 (RMBC)	14.2%	S62 (RMBC)	11.2%
S25 (RMBC)	9.4%	S66 (RMBC)	11.9%	S73 (Barnsley)	4.6%
S20 (Sheffield)	3.6%	S62 (RMBC)	10.5%	S61 (RMBC)	2.5%
S66 (RMBC)	3.6%	S64 (RMBC and Doncaster)	3.7%	CM7 (Chelmsford)	0.4%
S12 (Sheffield)	2.6%	S63 (RMBC & Barnsley)	2.0%	DN 11 (Doncaster)	0.4%
S65 (RMBC)	2.1%	S26 (RMBC)	1.7%	DN 12 (Doncaster)	0.4%
S21 (North East Derbyshire)	1.6%	S25 (RMBC)	1.0%	L25 (Liverpool)	0.4%
S64 (RMBC and Doncaster)	1%	S9 (Sheffield)	1.0%	S6 (Sheffield)	0.4%
Other	5.7%	Other	8.5%	Other	1.7%

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	**Meeting:**	**Cultural Services and Sport Delegated Powers Meeting**
2.	**Date:**	**29th June, 2010**
3.	**Title:**	**May Revenue Budget Monitoring Report**
4.	**Directorate:**	**Environment and Development Services**

5. Summary

To report on the performance against budget for the Environment and Development Services Directorate Revenue Accounts at **the end of May 2010** and to provide a forecast outturn for the whole of the 2010/11 financial year.

6. Recommendations

Members are asked to note the forecast outturn position of **an overspend of £720,000** for the Environment & Development Services Directorate based on expenditure and income as at May 2010.

That this report be referred to the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel for information.

7. Proposals and Details

Members are asked to receive and comment upon budget monitoring reports on a monthly basis from May onwards. This report reflects the position against budget for the period 1 April 2010 to 31 May 2010. The attached **appendices** give a summary of the projected 2010/11 revenue position for the Directorate:-

Appendix A – E&DS Summary Report.
Appendix A1 to A5 – Service Level Summary Report.

Following the May cycle of budget monitoring the Directorate has identified that it is likely to be overspent by **£720,000** (1.58%) against its total net revenue budget of £45,697,307. All possible actions to mitigate this are being taken.

The key pressures contributing to this position are :

- Office accommodation projections are to overspend by £300k (see Appendix A1)
- Reduced ability to contain vacancy management targets £420k (see Appendix A2, A3 and A5).

The Directorate are currently working to quantify other anticipated pressure resulting from the Governments recent announcements on cuts to public spending. The loss and reduction of Grants will impact significantly on Regeneration and Planning Services, including Highways work, which will adversely affect Streetpride budgets. (This is cross-referenced in Appendix A4).

The Service is still seeking to clarify the financial impact of the work undertaken at Clifton Park by UCS Civils, so that future reports can more accurately reflect the pressure and identify management actions which could be considered for mitigating these pressures.

8. Finance

Please refer to the attached appendices for detailed financial analysis.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The overall Directorate budget shows an overspend of £720,000 which have been identified and explained above and in the appendices. Further financial implications need to be quantified. There are anticipated cost pressures on the Winter Maintenance budget for 2010/11, expecting to overspend by £160k, as the current budget only provides for a mild Winter. There is a requirement for investment in the highways maintenance budget to improve the condition of the roads which has seen a marked deterioration following the severe Winter, this has been estimated at £0.5m.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Directorate budgets are aligned only to corporate priorities and spending within the agreed Directorate cash allocation is key to demonstrate the efficient Use of Resources.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

This is the first budget monitoring report for the Directorate for 2010/11 and reflects the position from April 2010 to May 2010. This report has been discussed with the Strategic Directors for Environment and Development Services and Finance.

Contact Name: Nichola Stretton – Finance Manager (EDS) – 01709 822079
E-mail: Nichola.stretton@rotherham.gov.uk

REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11 **Appendix A**

REASONS FOR VARIANCE FROM APPROVED BUDGET (Based on available information as at end May 2010)

Service	Under (-) / Over (+) Spending Projected to Year End £,000	Reasons/Implications	RAG Status	Actions Proposed	Impact of Actions	Revised RAG Status
Asset Management	300	This pressure has been identiifed within the Office Accommodation budget.	A	Costs are being reviewed within this budget heading.		G
Business Unit	140	This pressure relates to vacancy management targets.	A	These budgets will remain under review. All vacant posts will be considered by the Strategic Director.		G
Culture & Leisure	200	This pressure relates to vacancy management targets.	A	These budgets will remain under review. All vacant posts will be considered by the Strategic Director.		G
Planning & Regeneration Service	0	* Refer to note below.	A	The recent government cuts cannot currently be quantified, though it is expected there will be be a considerable financial pressure on some work within this Service. A projection on the impact of the cuts will be reported at Quarter 1.		G
Streetpride	80	This pressure relates to vacancy management targets. *(There are also costs associated with the road conditions are estimated at £0.5m but a report will be produced to determine what work is to be prioritised).*	A	A further report will be produced for Cabinet Members and SLT on the costs associated with the road conditions and further analysis of the expected pressure on the Winter Maintenance budget will need to be reviewed.		G
TOTAL	**720**					

REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11 **Appendix A - 1**

REASONS FOR VARIANCE FROM APPROVED BUDGET (Based on available information as at end May 2010)

Asset Management	Under (-) / Over (+) Spending Projected to Year End £,000	Reasons/Implications	RAG Status	Actions Proposed	Impact of Actions	Revised RAG Status
Management	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Building Cleaning	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Public Conveniences (All Saints)	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Caretakers	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Bailey Suite	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
School Crossing Patrol	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Education Premises	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Office Accommodation	300	Some pressures have been identified within the Office Accommodation budget.	A	Further work will be undertaken within this Service to attempt to limit the projected overspend.		
Community Buildings	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Facilities Management	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Swinton District Heating	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Emergency and Safety	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Environmental Management	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Strategic Support Team	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Miscellaneous Properties	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Transport	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Misc. Fee Accounts	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Fee Billing - Consultancy Management	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Valuation Group (Fee Billing)	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Commercial Properties	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
TOTAL	**300**					

REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11 **Appendix A - 2**

REASONS FOR VARIANCE FROM APPROVED BUDGET (Based on available information as at end May 2010)

Business Unit	Spending Projected to Year End £,000	Reasons/Implications	RAG Status	Actions Proposed	Impact of Actions	Revised RAG Status
Business Support and Central Admin	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Plan Printing	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Payments to RBT	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year.	G	No action required.		
Management	140	The vacancy management target set may prove difficult to manage due to budget savings already offered.	A	These costs wil remain under review throughout the year.		
Corporate Account	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		
Performance & Quality	0	Savings due to moratorium on spend	G	No action required.		
Training	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year.	G	No action required.		
TOTAL	**140**					

REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11 **Appendix A - 3**

REASONS FOR VARIANCE FROM APPROVED BUDGET (Based on available information as at end May 2010)

Culture & Leisure Services	Under (-) / Over (+) Spending Projected to Year End £,000	Reasons/Implications	RAG Status	Actions Proposed	Impact of Actions	Revised RAG Status
Culture & Heritage	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Library Service	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Recreation & Sport	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Tourism	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Service Management & Support	200	The vacancy management target set may prove difficult to manage due to budget savings already offered.	A	These costs wil remain under review throughout the year.		G
TOTAL	**200**					

REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11 **Appendix A - 4**

REASONS FOR VARIANCE FROM APPROVED BUDGET (Based on available information as at end May 2010)

Planning & Regeneration Service	Under (-) / Over (+) Spending Projected to Year End £,000	Reasons/Implications	RAG Status	Actions Proposed	Impact of Actions	Revised RAG Status
Business Development	0	There will be an effect on this budget resulting from the governments announcements, reducing grants.	A	Impact will need to be quantified and reported at Quarter 1 monitoring.		G
Development Promotion	0	There will be an effect on this budget resulting from the governments announcements, reducing grants.	A	Impact will need to be quantified and reported at Quarter 1 monitoring.		G
YES Project	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Strategy Development	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Work Implementation	0	There will be an effect on this budget resulting from the governments announcements, reducing grants.	A	Impact will need to be quantified and reported at Quarter 1 monitoring.		G
Managed Workspace (Business Centres)	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
RERF	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Town Centre Mgt	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Markets	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Forward Planning	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Management	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Land Charges	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Development Control	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Building Control (80% Trading/	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Transportation	0	There will be an effect on this budget resulting from the governments announcements, reducing grants.	A	Impact will need to be quantified and reported at Quarter 1 monitoring.		G
TOTAL	**0**					

REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11 **Appendix A - 5**

REASONS FOR VARIANCE FROM APPROVED BUDGET (Based on available information as at end May 2010)

Streetpride	Under (-) / Over (+) Spending Projected to Year End £,000	Reasons/Implications	RAG Status	Actions Proposed	Impact of Actions	Revised RAG Status
Community Delivery Teams	0	The current condition of the road network in Rotherham requires further investment, and cannot be contained within the mainstream revenue budget.	A	Work will be prioritised and the Service will look to reduce expenditure elsewhere to mitigate this pressure.		G
Network Management	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Schemes & Partnerships	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Waste disposal and collection	0	Nil variance at this stage in the financial year	G	No action required.		G
Corporate Accounts - Streetpride	80	The vacancy management target set may prove difficult to manage due to budget savings already offered.	G	No action required.		G
TOTAL	**80**					

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	**Meeting:**	**Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport**
2.	**Date:**	**29th June 2010**
3.	**Title:**	**Tennis Court Hire Charges**
4.	**Directorate:**	**Environment & Development Services**

5. Summary

In order to address an issue relating to tennis court hire a change was made to the fees and charges schedule, which introduced a charge per person rather than per court from April 2010. However it has become apparent that this new policy unfairly penalises customers playing doubles and a solution is recommended. The current policy also has had an effect on the take up of this facility by some customers and will detrimentally affect income.

6. Recommendations

That the fee for the hire of Culture & Leisure tennis courts be changed with immediate effect to bring the fee for doubles play into line with that for singles play by not charging for the 3rd and 4th player on any court.

7. Proposals and Details

The previous fee for court hire has been open to abuse as one customer could buy a season ticket, hire a court and then play with as many other people, for as long as they wanted. It was discovered that some tennis clubs were buying a minimal number of season tickets and then block booking courts for several hours at a time.

In order to stop this activity a change was made so that each player must hold their own ticket to play and the price per ticket was halved to keep the price of a court in line with previous charges and at a reasonable market level.

Following representations from tennis players the new policy has been found to unfairly penalise customers playing doubles and a solution is recommended. The current policy also has had a negative effect on the take up of this facility by some customers and will detrimentally affect income to RMBC.

To keep the whole court cost to a reasonable market level when more than two players play on any court it is proposed that the two least expensive tickets are not charged for when more than two people play ie in doubles games.

8. Finance

Income targets for 2010/11 are based on previous years income levels and may be affected negatively if a reduction for doubles play is not made.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The main risk is to do nothing as income will continue to fall. Increased income is predicted if the recommendation is followed but this cannot be guaranteed.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

These proposals meets the following priorities:

- **Rotherham Alive** by providing accessible tennis facilities for Rotherham residents.
- **Rotherham Sustainable** by providing facilities with an ongoing income to RMBC.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

2010/11 Fees and charges

Contact Name: *Andy Lee*
Operations Manager – Green Spaces
22457
andy.lee@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	**Meeting:**	**Cabinet Member for Cultural Services and Sport**
2.	**Date:**	**29th June 2010**
3.	**Title:**	**Proposed merger of Town Centre Events and Marketing Groups**
4.	**Directorate:**	**Environment & Development Services**

5. Summary

A review of town centre groups has been carried out by the Town Centre Strategy Team. The Team feel that it would be appropriate to merge the Town Centre Marketing Group and the Town Centre Events Group in order to avoid duplication of work, maximize resources available and ensure a consistent approach to the marketing of the town centre.

6. Recommendations

That Members approve the proposed merger of the Town Centre Events Group with the Town Centre Marketing Group.

7. Proposals and Details

The Town Centre Events Group was formed following a scrutiny review of Christmas Lights in November 2006. The Group replaced the former Christmas Carnival Group. The remit of the group was to co-ordinate all town centre events including the previous remit of the Christmas Carnival Group, aim to reduce Council spending on Christmas related events, develop a new Christmas and festival marketing package for the town centre and ensure the celebration of different religious festivals through the use of, for example, lighting. Membership of the group included the Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Development Services, the Mayor of Rotherham, town centre Ward Councillors and representatives from the Chamber of Commerce, Rotherham Minster and South Yorkshire Police. In addition officers from Events and Promotions Service, Housing and Neighbourhood Services, RIDO and Community Cohesion were also invited to attend.

The Group predominantly received reports on proposed town centre events and were able to put forward ideas. They also received evaluation reports on events that had happened.

In April 2009 the Town Centre Marketing Group was formed in order to establish an inclusive town centre wide approach to the marketing and image management of Rotherham town centre. Membership consists of representatives from the Local Strategic Partnership, Chamber of Commerce, Act for Rotherham, a Ward representative, and officers from RIDO, Events and Promotions Service, Neighbourhoods and Adult Services, Children and Young People's Services and Corporate Communications.

As events are considered as an important activity to increase footfall into the town centre, a specific objective of the Town Centre Marketing Plan is to "Promote and build on the annual town centre events programme". As such, all proposed town centre events are now considered and approved by the Town Centre Marketing Group for inclusion in the marketing plan.

It has become clear that there is an overlap between the remit of both groups in relation to events and it has been recommended by Town Centre Strategy Team that the two groups merge. See **Appendix A** for proposed terms of reference for the Town Centre Marketing and Events Group and suggested revised membership.

The Town Centre Events Group is currently serviced by Democratic Services and the Democratic Services Manager has indicated that it should be possible for them to service the newly merged group.

It is not proposed to include South Yorkshire Police or the Mayor of Rotherham on the merged group. The Police attend monthly meetings of the Public Events Advisory Team where they are updated on all forthcoming events in the borough, including the town centre. The Mayor can be consulted on the Civic Christmas Lights Switch On evening by way of a separate meeting, as is currently the case with planning for Rotherham Show.

8. Finance

There are no financial implications for the merger of the two groups.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There are no risks or uncertainties associated with this proposal.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Events contribute to the Council's themes as identified in the Community Strategy – in particular Alive and Proud.

Events also contribute to the cross cutting issue of Regeneration particularly with reference to non-physical activity which supports Town Centre businesses in the short term whilst the Renaissance programme is implemented.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Consultation carried out with RIDO and Democratic Services.
Appendix A – Proposed Terms of Reference for Town Centre Marketing and Events Group and proposed membership.

Contact Name: ***Marie Hayes, Events & Promotions Service Manager, ext 6883.***
E-mail: marie.hayes@rotherham.gov.uk

Town Centre Marketing & Events Group **Appendix A**
Draft Terms of Reference

1. Purpose
To establish a consistent approach to the marketing and image management of Rotherham Town Centre, in order to enhance its economic performance and public perception through the co-ordination of marketing, event and communication activity.

2. Remit
1. To plan and implement a co-ordinated, cohesive and effective annual Marketing & Events Strategy and Action Plan for Rotherham Town Centre (with clearly identified aims, objectives, detailed activity, costings and project lead).
2. To monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Town Centre Marketing & Events Strategy & Action Plan (through the identification of agreed performance indicators and through undertaking consultation and/ or market research).
3. To identify and establish partnerships that will enhance the delivery of the action plan and that will maximise resources
4. To identify and secure funding sources to support the implementation of marketing and events activity within the action plan

4. Accountability
The group will provide progress reports to the Town Centre Strategy Group.

5. Membership
The membership of the group shall consist of representatives from:
- Retail & Business Investment Team (RMBC)
- Barnsley & Rotherham Chamber of Commerce
- Events & Promotions Team (Culture & Leisure, RMBC)
- Corporate Communications & Marketing Team (RMBC)
- Rotherham Markets (RMBC)
- Rotherham Business Community
- Licence Watch/ Evening Economy Business Community
- South Yorkshire Police
- Rotherham Open Arts Renaissance
- Rotherham Partnership
- Cabinet Members whose portfolios include Rotherham town centre and culture and leisure
- Boston Castle Ward Members
- Neighbourhood & Investment/ Development Teams (RMBC- as appropriate)
- Yorkshire Forward (as appropriate)
- Any other suitable stakeholders as and when appropriate.

Membership is based on the ability of members to:
- Effectively represent the organisation, team or group on behalf of whom they attend
- Contribute to discussions by offering marketing and communication experience/ advice
- Actively deliver on specific activity identified within the plan

6. Frequency of Meetings
Meetings shall be held monthly

7. Chair
Sue Anderson- Director of Management Operations- UK Coal (following resignation of Brian Chapple, Chair of the Local Strategic Partnership)

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

Document is Restricted

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

Document is Restricted

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

Document is Restricted

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

Document is Restricted