



# Cabinet

23 October 2013

<b>Report Title</b>	Removal of Council Subsidy for Central Baths		
<b>Classification</b>	Open		
<b>Cabinet Member with Lead Responsibility</b>	Elias Mattu Leisure and Communities		
<b>Accountable Strategic Director</b>	Keith Ireland		
<b>Originating service</b>	Delivery		
<b>Accountable officer(s)</b>	Mark Taylor	.	
	Tel	01902 556609	
	Email	Mark.Taylor@Wolverhampton.gov.uk	

## 1.0 Description of Savings Proposal

This needs to be read in conjunction with the proposal to commercialise all council run leisure facilities to ensure that the level of subsidy is reduced, this will require a complete culture change and new ways of working including a new business model, the proposal is very ambitious. A full review of all three centres including an option appraisal for the potential transfer, sale or closure of Central Baths needs to be undertaken. Closing, selling or transferring Central Baths would enable the remaining capacity to focus on two facilities which should improve the chances of a successful outcome. Central Baths opened in 1990, is at serious risk of failing to meet an increased income target set for 2013/14 and requires refurbishment.

This proposal forms part of the overall subsidy reduction target in the wider leisure services proposal and must not therefore be considered in isolation.

## 2.0 Table Setting out Financial Proposal

### 2.1 Total base budget savings

	Year 2014-2015 £000	Year 2015-2016 £000	Year 2016-2017 £000	Year 2017-2018 £000	Year 2018-2019 £000	5 year total £000's
Total base budget savings	316	0	0	0	0	316

## 2.2 Staffing Implication

	Year 2014-2015 £000	Year 2015-2016 £000	Year 2016-2017 £000	Year 2017-2018 £000	Year 2018-2019 £000	5 year total £000's
Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	18	0	0	0	0	18

## 3.0 Communications Strategy Implications

3.1 The Communications strategy Implications of this proposal represent considerable risk as detailed below. Chosen option need to be communicated to customers and local residents. Will need to be brought into whole reshaping of the desire to operate as a commercial entity.

## 4.0 Corporate Landlord Implication

4.1 The Corporate Landlord implications of this proposal represent some risk as detailed below. If the facility is transferred to another party then any corporate landlord liabilities need to also transfer, if the facility is closed then a decision on the future use of the building, or more likely the site, should be taken at an early opportunity so that the site does not become exposed to the risk of vandalism and/or anti-social behaviour. This can be mitigated through the Corporate Landlord strategic pathway

## 5.0 Customer Implications

5.1 The implications for customers of this proposal represent a considerable risk as detailed below. Impact on users of facility and local residents. The level of impact will depend on the option chosen.

## 6.0 Economic Implications

6.1 The Economic Implications of this proposal represent some risk. If the facility was to close then some regional events could be lost to other facilities in the West Midlands which could have an adverse impact on the local economy.

## 7.0 Environmental Implications

7.1 The Environmental Implications of this proposal represent some risk. The risk will depend on the outcome. If closure is the final option this can be dealt with through the asset management & planning processes, relating to either the demolition & redevelopment or change of use of the premises.

## 8.0 Equality Implications

8.1 An equalities analysis screening has been completed, some possible equality implications have been identified, a full equality analysis will be required.

## 9.0 Financial Implications

9.1 The Financial Implications in terms of savings and investments are as described in the proposal above.

### **10.0 Health Implications**

10.1 The Health Implications of this proposal represent some risk as detailed below. Level of risk will depend on final option and marketing of other leisure facilities in order to maximise usage / participation at other facilities.

### **11.0 Legal Implications**

11.1 The Legal Implications of this proposal represent some risk as detailed below. Some organisations have long term agreements to use the facility. These will have to be reviewed.

### **12.0 Policy Implications**

12.1 The Policy Implications on agreed Council policy are minimal. This supports the delivery of the corporate priority 'a Confident Capable Council'. Leisure services play an important role in the delivery of the corporate priority 'Empowering People and Communities' around encouraging healthy lifestyles.

### **13.0 Procurement Implications**

13.1 The Procurement Implications of this proposal are minimal

### **14.0 Staffing Implications**

14.1 The HR Implications of this proposal represent a considerable risk as detailed below. The proposal will result in a number of job losses. It is intended to avoid the need for Compulsory Redundancies as far as possible by maximising opportunities for Voluntary Redundancies, redevelopment and the deletion of vacant posts. Reductions in employee numbers which will require fair and due process to be followed regarding consultation, selection and implementation of any compulsory redundancies. Transferring provision to external providers will have potential TUPE implications.

### **15.0 Trade Union Implications**

15.1 **No Implications Recorded.**