

Recreation and Sport VFM Review

Executive Summary

Cherwell District Council

Timetable	Papers Finalised	Meeting Date
CMT	1 October 2010	6 October 2010
Use of Resources	4 November 2010	10 November 2010
Executive	24 November 2010	6 December 2010

Revision History		
Revision Date	Previous Revision Date	Summary of Changes
9 September 2010		First draft
15 September 2010	9 September 2010	PMW comments
17 September 2010	15 September 2010	'clean' version with agreed changes from PMW/NL meeting
29 September 2010	17 September 2010	Final amendments by PMW
07 October 2010	29 September 2010	CMT amendments
26 November 2010	7 October 2010	Incorporating feedback from Use of Resources Steering Group

Value for Money Review of Recreation and Sport - Executive Summary

1 Introduction

Purpose of this report

- 1.1. Given current financial circumstances, the nature of VFM reviews have changed significantly. Previously, savings identified would be through efficiencies found. This review, while focusing partly on efficiencies, seeks also to identify the full range of savings required of the service covered by the scope of this review.
- 1.2. This report sets out the findings of the Recreation and Sport VFM review with recommendations and options to achieve the savings target within its scope of £175,000. The total savings target for the Recreation and Health service is £894,235.

Introduction

- 1.3. The Recreation and Sport area of the service performs the following functions;
 - Managing the Parkwood leisure centres contract (Spiceball Leisure Centre, Bicester Leisure Centre, Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre) and fulfilling all client roles and responsibilities. Managing a separate short term contract with Parkwood for Woodgreen Leisure Centre.
 - Directly managing the Joint use facilities at North Oxfordshire Academy, Banbury and Cooper School, Bicester.
 - Providing opportunities and recreational activities through a range of initiatives and support
 - Undertaking strategic planning and co-ordination of Recreation and Health Service activities such as policy formulation and development, feasibility studies, and S106 requirements.
 - Administration of Village Halls, Recreation and Sports Facilities and Play and Youth Activity Areas Grant Schemes

VFM Conclusion

- 1.4. The overall conclusion of the review is that the service is **below average cost** for the operation of its leisure centres, according to national cost benchmarking. It has **good performance** in terms of its sports development assessment. It is **high quality** in terms of good and improving levels of customer satisfaction for leisure centre users

Staffing

- 1.5. The staffing structure is as follows;

Established Posts	At 30 June 2010	
	Posts	Vacancies
	FTE	FTE
Head of Recreation & Health	1.00	0.00
Rec & Health Improvement Manager	1.00	0.00
Senior Rec & Sport Dev Officer	0.6	0.00

Recreation & Sport Dev Officer	1.00	0.00
Senior Recreation Dev Officer (PYP)	1.00	0.00
Leisure Development /Recreation Officer	1.00	0.00
GO Active Co-ordinator	1.00	0.00
Youth Activator	1.00	0.19
Youth Activator	1.00	0.19
Recreation Facilities Manager	1.00	0.00
Snr Recreation Facilities Off	1.00	0.00
Recreation Facilities Officer	0.32	0.00.
Recreation Dev Off Older People	0.50	0.00
	11.42	0.00

1.6. Key points to highlight are

- Of this total, only 7.92 FTE relate directly to the provision of sports and recreation services (see below)
- A Recreation and Sport Development Officer post was removed in 2009/10 as part of achieving savings in the service
- The Recreation and Health Improvement Manager allocates 50% of his time to work in this area, with the remaining 50% divided between younger and older people's services.
- The two Youth activators and the Go Active Coordinator are externally funded and temporary until 31/3/2011, and although their costs/income are included here they provide services exclusively for young people.
- The Recreation Development Officer (Older People) is employed on a temporary contract until 30/3/2011 to provide future staffing flexibility.
- Staff hours reductions, as part of building block savings targets, for the Recreation Facilities Officer and the Senior Recreation Officer have already been implemented and are reflected in this table

Expenditure

- 1.7. The budget and expenditure of the cost centres within the scope of this review is set out in the table below. A more detailed examination of each of these is set out in Section 2

	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011
	Actual	Actual	Budget
Employee Costs	757,114	514,645	510,975
Premises Costs	203,475	133,255	187,285
Transport Costs	39,862	66,511	15,161
Supplies & Services	416,377	360,355	322,216
Third Party Payments	1,532,730	1,107,703	1,038,240
Support Services	173,303	167,406	170,715
Internal Support Services	165,258	92,938	120,782
Capital Charges	383,335	711,239	516,122
Total Expenditure	3,671,454	3,154,052	2,881,496

Other Grants Reimbursements	(537,560)	(651,554)	(653,224)
Sales Income	(9,314)	(957)	0
Fees And Charges	(182,357)	(98,591)	(98,113)
Chgs To Other Mgt Centres	(20,224)	(50,500)	0
Total Income	(749,455)	(801,602)	(751,337)
Net Expenditure	2,922,000	2,352,450	2,130,160

1.8. Sources of income for this area are listed below;

Grant Source	Purpose	Budget 2010/11
Banbury Town Council	Contribution to Woodgreen	£ 50,000
Oxfordshire County Council	Joint Use -Coopers School	£ 7,084
	Joint Use - BPSC	£ 215,590
	Joint Use - KGSC	£ 115,339
	Joint Use - SPSC	£ 169,365
Sports Development	School Club Links	£ 7,846
Sport England/Oxford Sports Partnership/Oxon PCT	Go Active	£ 32,000
Oxfordshire County Council	Play Ranger funding	£ 56,000
Total Grants		£ 653,224

Income	Source	Budget 2010/11
Sponsorship and Course Income	School Club links, Community Development & holidays schemes	£ 17,289
Income from Joint Use Centres	Cooper School	£ 37,487
	North Oxon Academy	£ 43,337
Total Income		£ 98,113

1.9. Play ranger funding is included in this breakdown for completeness, although its functions are limited to younger people activities and are therefore outside the scope of this review

Statutory functions

1.10. The Recreation and Health Service has statutory cost centres amounting to £292,350, which all relate to the Public Protection team. No cost centres within the scope of this review are considered statutory, and so there are no savings targets relating to these.

'Building Blocks' savings

1.11. Recreation & Health, as a Service, has building block savings totalling £434,000 for the realistic scenario, and a further £431,000 (making a combined total of £865,000) for the worst case scenario.

- 1.12. Below is a list of the building blocks covered within the scope of this review, together with their status and savings target;

Block No.	Description	Scenario/ Status	Total Saving
18	Reduced hours for some staff	Exec approved	£30,000
23	No sports development for clubs or projects	<i>On Hold</i>	£14,000
24	No leisure development projects officer	Exec approved	£26,000
25	No grants to village halls	Exec approved	£39,000
27	Withdraw from joint use agreement/enter trust status for Cooper School	Review required for Scrutiny	£40,000
28	Withdraw from joint use agreement & lease/enter trust status for North Oxon Academy	Review required for Scrutiny	£40,000
82	Reduce work in youth activities and sports development by 25%	<i>Exec declined</i>	£47,000
		Total approved	£175,000

2 Findings from the Review

- 2.1. The review has used a range of evidence including national benchmarking of leisure centres, analysis of the positive impact of sport and recreation on society, the most recent resident satisfaction and budget consultation data and a detailed examination of key cost centres.

Benchmarking of Leisure Centres

- 2.2. The RA 2010/11 comparative position of the service was examined as part of the initial project brief and found that;
- Cherwell is only the 9th highest spender out of 14 authorities
 - Cherwell spends 5.1% below the average of comparator authorities (an equivalent of £77,812 less expensive) and 18.4% above the lowest quartile cost (an equivalent of £226,742 more expensive)
- 2.3. However, this analysis is not considered reliable as the number and range of facilities provided by each authority can vary widely. A more reliable benchmarking framework is provided by the National Benchmarking Service for Sports and Leisure Centres, to which Cherwell subscribes.
- 2.4. All three leisure centres have been surveyed and compared with similar properties (a five-way categorisation system is used to ensure comparability) within the last 8 months. Their performance when measured against a basket of 15 indicators is set out in detail as Annex 1 and is summarised below;
- 2.5. Bicester Leisure Centre;
- achieves top quartile performance in 5 areas; level of participants aged 60 and above, value of subsidy per visit/per square metre/per resident and level of income per visit.
 - has 2nd quartile (above average) performance across 9 other indicators.
 - performs at 3rd quartile (below average) for the level of ethnic minority users it attracts
- 2.6. Spiceball Leisure Centre;

- achieves top quartile performance in 5 areas; level of visits from 11-19 year olds, value of subsidy per visit/per square metre, maintenance & repair costs per square metre and level of income per visit.
- has 2nd quartile (above average) performance across 6 other indicators.
- has 3rd quartile (below average) performance for the level of users aged 60+ and the operating costs per visit.
- has bottom quartile performance for the level of disabled users below 60 and energy costs per square metre.

2.7. Kidlington Leisure Centre;

- achieves top quartile performance in 7 areas; level of participants aged 60 and above, level of disabled users below 60, value of subsidy per visit/per square metre/per resident, operating cost per square metre and level of income per visit.
- has 2nd quartile (above average) performance across 5 other indicators.
- has 3rd quartile (below average) performance for the level of ethnic minority users and the level of visits per metre squared.
- has bottom quartile performance for the level of residents from the most deprived areas using the facility

2.8. For all three leisure centres the benchmarking identifies them as performing in the best quartile for public subsidy, the only exception being a second quartile performance for Spiceball in the level of subsidy per resident. This demonstrates excellent value for money for Cherwell residents from the new contract.

2.9. The outputs of this annual survey are integral to the monitoring of the council's contract with Parkwood, with prescribed performance required to be achieved in order to maintain levels of contract payment. This is an excellent use of benchmarking data, not seen in any other areas in the council, and is driving improvement and increased value for money.

Resident's Satisfaction and Budget Consultation 2011

- 2.10. Satisfaction with leisure facilities has increased from 68% to 71%, and the range of leisure facilities available is now ranked number one in the drivers of overall satisfaction with the Council. This can be seen as a direct result of recent investment in facilities around the District and, in particular, the opening of the new Spiceball Leisure Centre at the end of 2009 and highlights the influence this investment had in increasing levels of overall satisfaction with the Council. Activities for young people is also ranked highly (4th) and is likely to be linked to perceptions of anti-social behaviour, although it may well be a reflection of the timing of the survey, which coincides with the summer holidays.
- 2.11. Users of Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre are the most satisfied (82%). Agreement that local leisure facilities managed by the Council provide value for money has also increased significantly from 43% in 2009 to 50% this year. However, the fact that almost one in five (19%) still disagree with this statement supports the notion that there is still room for improvement in terms of making these facilities accessible and affordable for all.
- 2.12. The only aspect not to see an increase in satisfaction this year was the cost of using the facilities, which actually fell from 43% to 42%. We know from the Budget Consultation that the current economic climate has reduced disposable income for many homes across the District, so ensuring these facilities remain affordable is a key consideration.
- 2.13. Given the recent investment in facilities across the District, it may have been hoped that more residents would be using these facilities, so the fact that these figures (51%) remain comparable to last year is slightly surprising. Indeed, one key finding in this area from the

Budget Consultation was that residents would like the Council to make these facilities more accessible and encourage more people to take advantage of them.

- 2.14. In terms of areas where residents would be happy to see less money spent, sports and leisure facilities was selected by 20% of residents, which is likely to be a reflection of the fact that there has recently been investment in this area, removing the need for new facilities. It possibly also reflects the fact that people expect to pay to use these facilities.
- 2.15. When faced with deciding how to allocate a council budget reduced by 25% the public decided Recreation and Health's overall proportion could be reduced from its current 19% (of a 100% budget) to 12% (of a 75% budget); a 16% proportion of a re-allocated budget. In financial terms this equates to a total reduction of £252,000 for Recreation and Sports comprising;
- A 5% reduction in Sports facilities (a reduction of £157,000 from the 2010/11 budget)
 - A 4% reduction in Sports Development & Grants (a reduction of £95,000 from the 2010/11 budget)
- 2.16. This suggested £252,000 saving contrasts with the £175,000 savings target allocated by the council for Recreation and Sports.

Benefits of recreation and sport; research findings

- 2.17. The Culture and Sports Evidence Programme (CASE) is a £1.8m, three-year programme of research into strengthening understanding of how best to deliver high quality culture and sporting opportunities to the widest audience, generating positive outcomes for society. Its findings highlight the direct benefits of increased participation in recreation and sport activities;
- Young people's participation in organised sport improves their numeracy scores, on average, by 8% above that of non-participants
 - The participation of underachieving young people in extra-curricular learning activities linked to sport increases their numeracy skills, on average, by 29% above that of non-participants, and increases their transferrable skills by 12-16%
 - Sport generates substantial long-term economic value in terms of avoided health costs and improved health-related quality of life. For example, the total economic value generated by doing sport varies between £11,400 per person (for badminton) and £45,800 per person (general health and fitness)
 - Engagement in sport has a positive and quantifiable effect on a person's perceived wellbeing
- 2.18. Other research conducted by the Department of Health in 2004 highlighted that sport and recreation make a significant contribution towards overall physical activity levels in the population, with local authorities providing an important role in providing these opportunities. Sport was also seen as being attractive to many people and offering them social networks, with strong community bases and engagement being possible. An example of this within Cherwell was the identification of a participant in the council's apprenticeship scheme after she had been identified through sports development's work to support disadvantaged and disaffected young people.

Active People Survey performance and Quest Assessment of Sports Development

- 2.19. The only available comparator for performance in this area is NI 8 - *"The percentage of the adult (age 16 and over) population in a local area who participate in sport and active recreation, at moderate intensity, for at least 30 minutes on at least 12 days out of the last 4 weeks (equivalent to 30 minutes on 3 or more days a week)"*.

- 2.20. The last available analysis of this indicator as part of NI 8 reporting shows Cherwell's performance is close to bottom quartile of its comparator family, being 10th out of 14 authorities. However, a study by Sheffield University highlighted that the closure of a facility can have a detrimental effect on participation during the year. The Sport Centre modernisation programme and change of Leisure Providers would have had an effect on participation figures. Now they are completed and embedded participation figures are expected to increase.
- 2.21. The Council is only one of many organisations that are able to influence this measure and therefore it does not necessarily reflect the performance of CDC work. IDEA suggest a more appropriate measure for Local Authorities would be a Local Outcomes Framework.
- 2.22. Sports Development is quality assessed by a similar process to that implemented on the sports centres. In 2010 the Councils Quest assessment score 85% which is categorised as "Excellent" (previous score was 72%).

Sports and Leisure Centre contract specification

- 2.23. The 2010/11 net budget of £996,269 for the operation of leisure centres makes up 47% of the overall expenditure of this service, and so appears significant in identifying potential areas for efficiency savings.
- 2.24. Discussions have taken place with the operators, Parkwood, in order to identify means to reduce the ongoing contract payments, primarily through exploring a change in the council's specification for service provision. A key factor in the realisation of savings is the nature of the contract with regard to energy consumption and cost, with the operator meeting the costs/reductions in consumption changes and the council meeting the cost/reductions in energy rates. The contractual requirement is for the council to pay the difference in energy cost increases when consumption crosses a certain threshold, and this has occurred during 2010/11 leading to an additional £68,000 in payment required from the council.
- 2.25. Changes to specification which alter energy consumption (e.g. reducing swimming pool temperatures) are, contractually, of benefit to the operator rather than the council. Any other changes in specification that can be shown to impact on income cannot be forced on the operator, but rather achieved through negotiation. A series of meetings has been held to this effect during September 2010 but had not concluded at the time of writing, and will be reported verbally to CMT at its 6 October 2010 meeting.
- 2.26. The contract for operating Woodgreen with Parkwood is a separate one. A decision has been made to extend the existing contract for a further year when it expires in March 2011, with a full procurement exercise for a 10-15 year contract undertaken in January 2012. A variety of alternatives to operate the facility have been explored; a self-manage arrangement for the bowls club, returning the community-related operations to the community, an external operator managing the pool only or looking to an in-house operation. More information on progress here will become apparent between now and November/December.
- 2.27. However, any savings identified will be needed to offset utility benchmarking increases amounting to £59,000 and NNDR increases of around £30,000. This is likely to mean that there will be little, if any, net additional saving to be found here.
- 2.28. A further study is being undertaken by PWC on contract assurance, looking into the contract management arrangement for major contracts within the council. However, this was ongoing at the conclusion of the review and so its findings are not able to be reported here.

Joint Use Agreements for Sports Facilities in Schools

- 2.29. As part of the building blocks proposals, Executive proposed exploring Trust status for the two joint use centres that the council operates under formal agreements with Oxfordshire County

Council; North Oxfordshire Academy (NOA) and Cooper's School. The original savings target for this was £107,000, but this has since been reduced to £80,000 (£40k for each centre) based on feasibility work carried out to date.

- 2.30. The agreement for Coopers School has a five-year review period, whereas NOA has no review system in place. Reviews that do take place are currently limited to exploring costs and detailed operating arrangements rather than the fundamentals of the agreements themselves, as no automatic right to terminate exists; this would need to be undertaken through negotiation.
- 2.31. Trust status, as proposed, does not necessarily offer advantages that would translate into the savings required, so other options have been explored in parallel.
- 2.32. For Coopers School the options being explored are;
- Substantially reduce in-house operational costs by handing back the operation of the sports hall, and performance hall to Cooper School, but retain CDC operation of Astro turf pitch (this will require their agreement and a variation to the JUA), introducing club key holder arrangements for opening Astro turf facility, reduce staffing levels, reduce opening hours and increase income. (Saving of £38,714, no redundancies)
 - Try to terminate current agreement and negotiate a new agreement for Cooper School to take on operation of all facilities for club and community use. Would have to grant fund this option and protect current usage levels. (Saving of £12,714, would require redundancy for 8 casual staff)
- 2.33. For NOA the options being explored are;
- Substantially reduce in-house operational costs by introducing club key holder arrangements for opening facilities, reduce staffing levels, reduce opening hours, increase fees and charges and increase income. (Saving of £44,625)
 - Try to terminate current JUA's with Academy (United Learning Trust) and negotiate a new agreement for UTL to take on operation of facilities for club and community use. Would have to grant fund this option and protect current usage levels. (Saving of £11,625, would require redundancy for 6 casual staff)
 - Seek an external contractor to operate the facility on a 'cost plus' basis, similar to Woodgreen.
- 2.34. Negotiations are in progress around these options to secure the savings targets required, and the latest position will be reported verbally to CMT. Initial discussions with schools will take place in the late part of September.

Examination of other cost centres within Leisure and Sports Development

- 2.35. The cost centres within Leisure Development and Sports Development have a combined budgeted expenditure of £404,383 for 2010/11, with income of £57,130. A detailed examination of the purpose of and activity within each of these cost centres has been carried out as part of this review.
- 2.36. Leisure Development – budget £126,178
- The majority of this cost centre comprises staff, accommodation and support service recharge costs. It also has a miscellaneous costs budget of £32,000 which has been used to fund a variety of areas, such as technical assistance and small scale feasibility studies, policy development, S106 development work, software, staff training and running costs for Hanwell Fields pavilion. With Hanwell Fields likely to be transferred to Banbury Town Council, and other aspects of this budget better met through other controlled budgets this could be substantially reduced.

- 2.37. GO Active – budget £1,496 (includes £32,000 income)
- GO Active aims to help everyone lead a more active lifestyle by creating more social and fun activities to make getting fit more enjoyable. A co-ordinator is funded from income from Oxfordshire PCT provided through the Oxfordshire Sports Partnership.
- 2.38. Sports Projects – budget £8,807
- This cost centre comprises two elements; a contribution to the Oxfordshire Playing Fields Association (£4.1K) and GP referrals for sporting activity for cardiac patients (£4.7k). The payment to OPFA buys occasional advice and acts as a consultee to both this Council and to the Town/Parish Councils across the District. Applications to many funding bodies for grants towards improving play areas, playing pitches, etc. can sometimes require OPFA support.
 - The GP referrals are now dealt with through the Parkwood contract, leaving the remaining funding to ensure Parkwood can supply “adequately trained staff” to deal with the referrals, although this should be a transitional arrangement.
- 2.39. Grants to Public Halls – budget £61,815
- Comprises £39k for grants, £11k support charges, 2k accommodation costs and £6.5k salary costs.
 - Officers administer the grant scheme and provide a funding advice service to help local organisations seek funding from other sources.
 - This cost centre has been used in the past to match fund improvements in order to secure funding from other sources (e.g. lottery funding), land fill tax credits, etc), last year the grants awarded helped to generate a further £894,000 for improvements towards community facilities in the District. The grants element of this is an identified building block saving.
- 2.40. Sports Development – budget £169,086
- This is the main staffing budget for this area, with the large majority of the budget made up of employee costs (£90k) and support costs (£67k). The main delivery budgets for Sport Development are detailed in the next three headings.
- 2.41. School Club links – budget £10,311 (including income of £9,779)
- The focus of the budget is to introduce to and encourage young people to join sports clubs in order to sustain an interest in sport activity through the support a club can offer. The council selects sports to support that do not require any specialist kit or equipment to ensure sustainability, and do not support football as this is well represented across the district
 - There are mutual benefits through clubs gaining additional members, and the council gaining access to coaches at a greatly reduced cost. Grants and bursaries amounting to £7.5k are made available to sports clubs to buy equipment, and to fund the quality improvement of coaches used.
- 2.42. Community Development – budget £12,275
- This budget is focused on encouraging adults back into sport or recreational activities. Initiatives include touch rugby sessions and promoting the establishment of women’s netball teams (which have risen from 2 to 12 in the district as a result of these interventions).
- 2.43. Holidays – budget £14,415 (includes income of £13,413)

- This is used to fund Easter and summer holiday activity schemes, the focus of which is to provide activities in rural areas that do not have easy access to sports and leisure facilities.
- At a charge of just £6 per session there is a perception within the service that it is being used as a cheap childminding service for residents, particularly as charges made for private courses of a similar nature are much higher. There is some scope to increase fees to reduce the net costs of this activity

3 Options for Change

3.1. Three options are presented that provide for the following levels of savings;

- Option 1 – Savings to meet the agreed Building Block total of £175,817
- Option 2 – Additional areas for saving of £33,077 (bringing the total to £208,894) identified through the Review to bring the service closer to the level of savings that the public have stated they would wish to see.
- Option 3 – Areas of saving currently 'on hold' for further consideration amounting to £10,000

Option 1

3.2. These represent the approved building block savings to date

Option 1 Savings	Amount	Year	Comment
Reduce costs associated with Joint Use Agreement for Coopers School	£40,000	2011/12 & 2012/13	The options for achieving this are set out in the body of the report. Some redundancies possible
Reduce costs associated with Joint Use Agreement for North Oxfordshire Academy	£40,000	2011/12 & 2012/13	The options for achieving this are set out in the body of the report. Some redundancies possible
Withdraw any further grants to village halls	£39,000	2011/12	Parishes will be able to raise necessary funding for facilities through increased precepts
Deletion of Project Officer post from the establishment	£30,190	2011/12	The loss of this post will result in fewer projects, limited S106 activity and no support to parishes and other voluntary sector bodies. Currently vacant as post holder has resigned, so no redundancy costs (contract expires 31/3/2010). Already implemented as a saving.
Permanent reduction of hours for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts and Visitor Services Manager • Senior Sports Development Officer • Recreation Officer 	£26,627	2011/12	This relates to the permanent reduction of unused hours which have been used previously only for one-off savings. Most of these surplus hours have not been used in recent years or only for specific time limited projects/activities. Minimal impact. Already implemented as a saving.

Option 2

3.3. These savings have been identified as part of the Review process and are in addition to those in Option 1.

Option 2 Savings	Amount	Year	Comment
Discontinue membership of the Oxfordshire Playing Fields Association	£4,100	2011/12	Currently offers poor value for money for this Council but it does buy occasional advice and consultation input for the Town/Parish Council
Discontinue cardiac referral contribution to Parkwood	£4,700	2011/12	Contribution was intended as being transitional, as the main cover is now provided within the main Parkwood contract.
Reduce miscellaneous costs budget from Leisure Development cost centre	£15,000	2011/12	This is a non-specific budget that has been used to fund expenditure for areas covered by other cost centres (e.g. training) but also ad-hoc projects.
Increased income from Holidays scheme	£5,000	2011/12	Continue with a revised scheme and increase fees to reduce operating costs.

Option 2 Savings	Amount	Year	Comment
Cut Grants and Bursaries budget from School Links	£4,277	2011/12	Currently in the "on hold" group but Officers feel that this can be cut without having a significant impact on support to individuals and clubs

Option 3

3.4. These savings are currently classified as 'on hold'

Option 3 Savings	Amount	Year	Comment
Reduce Club coach support by 50%	£5,000	2011/12	This will reduce the support available by 50%
Reduce Holiday schemes by 50%	£5,000	2011/12	This will allow scheme to run in school summer holidays only and not at Easter

4 Recommendations

- 4.1. In order to achieve the building blocks savings target of £175,000 Option 1 should be pursued (saving a total of £175,817).
- 4.2. To realise the further savings possible of £33, 077, bringing the total savings to £208,894, Option 2 should be pursued in full.
- 4.3. It is not recommended that Option 3 is pursued as there are greater implications for the sustainability of service and a greater impact on the public and on the voluntary sector
- 4.4. The service pursue the most feasible savings identified through contract negotiations with Parkwood

Results from National Benchmarking Service for Sports and Leisure Centres (Cherwell)

Indicator	Actual scores			Sector quartile comparisons (specific to each Centre)									Quartile position			Polarity
	Bicester	Banbury	Kidlington	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	Quartile Bicester	Quartile Banbury	Quartile Kidlington	
				Average (Bicester)			Average (Banbury)			Average (Kidlington)						
% Visits 11-19 years	0.99	1.55	0.99	0.5525	0.795	1.1325	0.5525	0.795	1.1325	0.5125	0.7375	1.0625	2	1	2	H
NS-SEC 6&7	0.6	0.53	0.34	0.4275	0.52	0.7625	0.4275	0.52	0.7625	0.4025	0.4875	0.7325	2	2	4	H
Ethnic minorities	1.22	2.24	1.56	1.1725	1.86	3.08	1.1725	1.86	3.08	1.1875	1.7575	2.9475	3	2	3	H
60+years	0.67	0.4	0.88	0.385	0.508	0.67	0.385	0.5075	0.67	0.39	0.5125	0.7	1	3	1	H
Disabled <60 years	0.73	0.48	1.01	0.5325	0.69	0.9	0.5325	0.69	0.9	0.4875	0.6625	0.865	2	4	1	H
Visits per sq m	91	88	70	58	85.75	123.25	58	85.75	123.25	63	87.25	133.5	2	2	3	H
Subsidy per visit	-1.28	-0.59	-1.2	1.3275	0.553	-0.258	1.3275	0.5525	-0.258	1.21	0.46	-0.34	1	1	1	L
Subsidy per sq m	-101	-41	-72	92	27.75	-26.25	92	27.75	-26.25	77.5	26.25	-32	1	1	1	L
Subsidy per resident	-14.78	-5.62	-13.74	12.528	4.903	-5.773	12.528	4.9025	-5.773	11.013	4.6125	-6.558	1	2	1	L
operating cost per visit	3.16	4.15	3.15	4.7875	3.615	2.8325	4.7875	3.615	2.8325	4.65	3.675	2.87	2	3	2	L
operating cost per sq m	249	287	190	381.5	298.3	190.25	381.5	298.25	190.25	399.75	314.25	212.25	2	2	1	L
maint&repair per sq m	8	6	8	25.75	13.5	6.5	25.75	13.5	6.5	29.25	15.75	7.5	2	1	2	L
energy cost per sq m	26	54	29	42.25	29.5	19.25	42.25	29.5	19.25	43.75	31.25	20.25	2	4	2	L
income per visit	4.44	4.74	4.35	2.555	3.23	4.0825	2.555	3.23	4.0825	2.78	3.375	4.15	1	1	1	H
income per sq m	350	328	262	171	225.8	373	171	225.75	373	197.75	254.5	400	2	2	2	H