| DECISION-MAKER:   |  | CABINET   |      |               |  |
|-------------------|--|---|------|---------------|--|
| SUBJECT:          |  | SOUTHAMPTON OUTDOOR SPORTS CENTRE                 |      |               |  |
| DATE OF DECISION: |  | 19 APRIL 2016                                     |      |               |  |
| REPORT OF:        |  | CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES, LEISURE & CULTURE |      |               |  |
| CONTACT DETAILS   |  |   |      |               |  |
| AUTHOR:           | Name:                                  | Mike Harris                                       | Tel: | 023 8083 2882 |  |
|                   | E-mail: mike.harris@southampton.gov.uk |   |      |               |  |
| Director          | Name:                                  | Mike Harris                                       | Tel: | 023 8083 2882 |  |
|                   | E-mail: Mike.Harris@southampton.gov.uk |   |      |               |  |

### STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

None.

#### **BRIEF SUMMARY**

Following a comprehensive consultation exercise, officers have developed some outline proposals in order to develop the Outdoor Sports centre into a facility capable of meeting the needs of the community into the future. Detailed plans can now be developed alongside funding applications

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

| (i)   | To note the outcomes of the consultation regarding the future of the Outdoor Sports Centre  |
|-------|---|
| (ii)  | To support the development of detailed plans on the basis of the outcome of the consultation and discussions with national governing bodies.                        |
| (iii) | To delegate authority to the Service Director Growth to allocate resources to feasibility and design works where necessary in order to submit funding applications. |

#### REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To facilitate the implementation of improvements following consultation with the public and potential funding agencies

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- To develop a plan that does not reflect the consultation feedback rejected on the probable waste of resources
- Not to implement any improvements rejected given the potential for the improvements to contribute towards key council objectives

# **DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)**

The outdoor sports centre was opened in 1938 and has served the people of Southampton well. Over the decades the facility has seen many improvements, including the development of the athletics facilities, all weather pitches and various play facilities. However, the last major investment was in 2000, when significant improvements to the athletics track and all weather

|    | pitches were implemented, prior to the Millennium Youth Games grand finals.   |
|----|---|
| 5  | Since 2010, the facility has been managed by Active Nation, along with other sports facilities in the city, on behalf of the City Council. Some significant, but more minor improvements have been made in that time; re-laying of the surface of the all-weather pitches, creation of a bike jumps course, new floodlights and lighting for the tennis / netball courts and some improvements to the athletics performance spaces.   |
| 6  | The facility has a great potential to provide a significant sport and recreation offer, and indeed is home to some of the largest and most successful sports clubs in the city and local area. However, to secure the sustainably of the clubs and to help them grow and attract more users and members to become physically active, it is recognised some investment is required to make the sports centre fit for the 21st century.   |
| 7  | <ul> <li>A comprehensive consultation process has been carried out, summarised below in paragraphs 8, 9, and 10 detailed in appendix 1. From the consultation there is a clear mandate for;</li> <li>A change to the sport centre to secure improvement</li> <li>The development of indoor facilities, especially changing accommodation, but including sports playing facilities</li> <li>The facility to serve users beyond the bounds of the city; a regional role as a minimum.</li> <li>This mandate for substantial change has been delivered by a broad demographic of regular and occasional users, and of sporting and recreational users.</li> </ul>  |
| 8  | Over 1200 stakeholders have engaged with the consultation process and have given their views on the future vision for Southampton Outdoor Sports Centre. There was a good range of engagement with the consultation both demographically and geographically. A total of 93% of respondents agree the existing Southampton Outdoor Sport Centre facilities would benefit from significant improvement. 89% of respondents agree with the suggested priority areas, which were listed as: Development of Hub(s), Sports facilities, Creation of physical activity opportunities, Infrastructure improvement. The overwhelming majority of consultation respondents that feel the facility should be at least a regional centre (85%). A large majority of respondents who currently use the Sports Centre once a month or less state that they would use the facility more if improvements were made. |
| 9  | Out of the three options for developing the pavilion shared within the consultation, Option 2 - providing changing for hard courts, beach volleyball and bowls, community space and indoor sports hall (to accommodate a wide variety of activities, including, for example 4 Badminton courts, 1 Netball, 1 indoor 5-a-side football, 1 Volleyball) was the most popular, with 48% of respondents selecting it as their preference.  |
| 10 | The top pre-defined options selected for improvement are broadly similar to the priorities shown in the free text question. This further underlines the importance of key proposals such as facilities, indoor sports and parking. It also affirms that the selected priorities are in line with stakeholders expectations. Overall, this consultation allows Southampton City Council's Cabinet to understand the views of residents and stakeholders on the future vision for the Southampton Outdoor Sports Centre.  |

- Given the challenge in the financial environment, a key challenge is to ensure that investment in facilities delivers on key objectives. In particular is it recommended that changes are required to:
  - Deliver increases in participation in sport and physical activity
  - · Be deliverable and fundable in the short to medium term
  - Reduce the net cost of managing the facilities
- Whilst the physical capacity of the sports centre would allow for a number of different buildings of facilities to be developed, there is a clear need for the future developments to have a multi-sport approach, as opposed to one which proposes a number of different sport specific developments, which would not be affordable, on either a capital or revenue basis, and which would potentially take up additional green space.
- Officers, alongside representatives of Sport England, have met with the Governing Bodies of Cycling, Football, Athletics, Netball, Hockey and Tennis to review the consultation feedback, balance it against their assessment of facility requirements and explore potential funding streams. Governing bodies of sport have detailed participant 'Insight data' that identifies potential areas for development, key features for clubs and facilities to be successful and an excellent understanding of what improvements would drive up participation. This data and understanding drives their investment decisions about what funding packages might be supported. It is critical that any proposals are developed with this knowledge in mind, in order that improvements do have the desired impact on participation, as well as placing the project in the best position to secure funding from these sources.

Feedback from the NGB's includes:

- This development project sits perfectly with the wider work we have been developing in relation to the parks in the City. I now see one large tennis project to develop the parks and Sports Centre in the next few years. (British Tennis)
- We are keen to support Southampton HC and their future at the outdoor sports centre. The club are very happy with the pitches and they want to remain on the site for the long term future, the opportunity to develop high quality ancillary facilities on site including an area for kitchen would be most beneficial to the club. Hockey is a family sport, where socialising and the community off the pitch is of equal importance to the performance on the pitch. (England Hockey)
- This local desire to contribute toward an improved facility is encouraging and we would support the club's desire to provide an improved base for them and the other track users. We are also pleased and excited to know of the City Council's drive to engage with the local community and National Governing Bodies to determine the local need and devise a plan which explores options to provide a realistic and affordable solution. (England Athletics)
- The lack of suitable multi-discipline cycling facilities throughout Britain is the single biggest barrier to a number of groups in society, including young people, women and girls, disabled people and new participants. It is a common model to see cycling facilities located on a multisport site, so purpose built cycling facilities at Southampton Outdoor Sports Centre, would appear to be a logical consideration in

|    | light of the results of the recent consultation.(British Cycling)  |
|----|--|
| 14 | <ul> <li>The result of these discussions identifies some key issues:</li> <li>The need for a central hub that provides for quality changing facilities, social area with catering, meeting rooms for clubs, facilities for coach education etc. These are common themes for continued sports club sustainability and growth, and to attract the current non participating parts of the community. All governing bodies were comfortable with a multi-sport approach</li> <li>The scale of the playing facilities was generally considered to be appropriate for the standard of the sport to be played there, with some (relatively) minor improvements recommended.</li> <li>Indoor playing facilities were only identified as preferable by the Governing Body for Tennis. This is based on models in similar locations where a mix of indoor and outdoor facilities have made substantial impacts on participation. – there is a need to assess the value of the additional investment in terms of revenue benefit and participation increases.</li> </ul>  |
| 15 | <ol> <li>As a result of the consultation, it is proposed that a detailed plan is developed that includes and considers the following elements and issues:         <ol> <li>Development of a single central hub, providing sufficient accommodation for the needs of the sports on site. The hub should include an option for the provision of a fitness offer in order to supplement outdoor activity and to contribute towards revenue costs.</li> <li>Continued provision of outdoor Tennis / Netball Courts – resurfacing required. Floodlighting has recently been upgraded and is of a good standard. The provision of 1 above would significantly enhance the Netball offer. The plan will need to establish what scale of benefit, if any, could be secured by adding indoor tennis facilities (both in terms of participation and income) when balanced against the additional investment required</li> <li>Continued provision of two sand dressed Artificial Turf Pitches (ATP's). This would allow Hockey to meet its playing needs, whilst the Hub, would provide more opportunities for the clubs to grow and attract new participants and events</li> <li>Provision of a minimum of one 3G ATP (suitable for football). This may allow mini and youth football matches to be played on an artificial surface, which is an increasing demand in the area, whereby a number of matches are regularly called off due to poor drainage and condition of grass pitches. The associated business plan will determine whether these facilities</li> <li>Potential provision of a Closed Road cycling circuit. The route needs to be carefully considered, taking into account some of the feedback from the consultation. This is potentially a significant facility; 1 km long, 6 m wide with run off either side, but has the potential to be used for a wide variety of activities, aside from competitive cycling.</li> <li>Informal recreational and non sporting opportunities; for example marked running routes and improved habita</li></ol></li></ol> |

|                               | <ol> <li>Provision of greater number of parking spaces (potentially some just<br/>for events to manage the impact on the local area). This can best be<br/>determined once the elements above have been considered</li> </ol> |  |  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| RESOU                         | IRCE IMPLICATIONS   |  |  |
| Capital                       | /Revenue  |  |  |
| 16                            | A detailed implementation plan is required, and so capital costs are not currently available. Some specialist work will be commissioned to progress this, given the lack of capacity to deliver this within the council.      |  |  |
| 17                            | Resources from the Section 106 Playing Fields fund will be used to support the next stage of project development  |  |  |
| Propert                       | ty/Other  |  |  |
| 18                            | none  |  |  |
| LEGAL                         | IMPLICATIONS  |  |  |
| Statuto                       | ry power to undertake proposals in the report:  |  |  |
| 19                            | Section 19 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 gives the power to a local authority to provide, inside or outside its area, such recreational facilities as it thinks fit.                            |  |  |
| Other Legal Implications:     |   |  |  |
| 20                            | None.   |  |  |
| POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS |   |  |  |
| 21                            | The work is in line with the Council's Policy Framework.  |  |  |
| <u>'</u>                      | ·   |  |  |

| KEY DECISION?             |   | No |  |    |  |
|---------------------------|---|----|--|----|--|
| WARD                      | WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED: Potentially all                                 |    |  |    |  |
|                           |   |    |  |    |  |
|                           | SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION  |    |  |    |  |
|                           |   |    |  |    |  |
| Appen                     | dices   |    |  |    |  |
| 1.                        | Consultation Results  |    |  |    |  |
| 2.                        | 2. Sports Centre schematic  |    |  |    |  |
| Docum                     | Documents In Members' Rooms   |    |  |    |  |
| 1.                        |   |    |  |    |  |
| 2.                        |   |    |  |    |  |
| Equalit                   | Equality and Safety Impact Assessment                                       |    |  |    |  |
| Do the                    | Do the implications/subject of the report require an Equality and Safety No |    |  |    |  |
| Impact                    | Impact Assessment (ESIA) to be carried out.                                 |    |  |    |  |
| Privacy Impact Assessment |   |    |  |    |  |
| Do the                    | Do the implications/subject of the report require a Privacy Impact No       |    |  | No |  |

| Assessr  | Assessment (PIA) to be carried out. |  |  |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Other Background Documents Other Background documents available for inspection at: |                                     |  |  |  |
| Title of Background Paper(s)   |                                     | Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable) |  |  |
| 1.   |                                     |  |  |  |
| 2.   |                                     |  |  |  |