

## WHITEOAK LEISURE CENTRE ASSET MAINTENANCE – CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS

### Cabinet – 10 January 2013

Report of the: Community & Planning Services Director and Corporate Resources Director

Status: For decision

Key Decision: Yes

---

#### **Executive Summary:**

Swanley White Oak Leisure Centre was built in the 1960s and it is expected that major costs for repairs to the existing centre will be necessary over the next ten years. The existing asset maintenance budget will not be sufficient to address these needs.

The Centre is an important local facility and it is necessary to consider options for its future.

This report summarises options for the leisure centre and outlines the impact of each option.

---

**This report supports the Key Aims of** Effective Management of Council Resources and the Community Plan vision for Safe & Caring Communities, a Green & Healthy Environment and a Dynamic & Sustainable Economy.

**Portfolio Holders** Cllr. Mrs Pat Bosley

Cllr. Brian Ramsay

**Head of Service** Lesley Bowles, Head of Community Development

---

**Recommendation to CABINET:** Members' instructions regarding future options are sought. This is to enable Officers to undertake further investigations into how the selected options can be delivered including detailed costings and delivery models.

---

**Reason for recommendation:** It is necessary to identify a future course of action with regard to the asset maintenance of Whiteoak Leisure Centre, taking into account the need for major expenditure over the next ten years.

---

## **Introduction**

- 1 White Oak Leisure Centre in Swanley was constructed in the mid 1960s by Dartford Rural District Council. The flumes were added in the 1980s and the main reception and café areas were refurbished in 2000 at a cost of £3m.
- 2 The centre now provides a 33 metre pool with diving pit, teaching pool, gym & exercise studio, 6 court sports hall, martial arts rooms, practice hall, 3 squash courts, soft play area, crèche, cafeteria and a 3-ride flume.
- 3 The centre is leased to Sencio Community Leisure for a period of 25 years from 2004 with the District Council remaining responsible for maintaining the structure and main plant. All other maintenance and improvement is the responsibility of Sencio.
- 4 A Leisure Asset Maintenance Options Report to Cabinet in November 2010 set out broad options for ameliorating the impact of reduced asset maintenance for Sencio. Cabinet agreed that officers should explore options for the future of White Oak Leisure Centre.
- 5 Four options have been explored for the White Oak Leisure Centre:
  - Option 1 - Do nothing. This option assumes that the current asset maintenance budget would not be adequate to deal with the maintenance needs and the Centre would gradually fall into disrepair.
  - Option 2 - Invest in the existing building. This option assumes that Council reserves would have to be used to undertake major work required over the next ten years.
  - Option 3 - Replace existing building either on the same site or a different site. This option assumes that a smaller, more economical centre would replace the White Oak leisure centre and that the Indoor Bowls Centre would remain on the site, unaffected.
  - Option 4 - Close the leisure centre. This option assumes that the leisure centre would be closed without any replacement and that the resulting value of the land on which it sits would be added to the Council's reserves. It assumes that the Indoor Bowls Centre would remain on the site, unaffected.

## **Sports Provision in Sevenoaks District**

- 6 A Sport England Profiling Report in 2011 on Sports Hall Provision in Sevenoaks District shows that there are two sports hall sites within Swanley, one of which is White Oak Leisure Centre. Unmet demand for sports halls in Sevenoaks District is 6% of total demand. This is almost entirely due to residents being outside the catchment area of a sports hall, who do not have access to a car, as opposed to a lack of capacity. The national figure for unmet demand is higher, at 9%.
- 7 A Sport England Profiling Report in 2011 on Swimming Pool Provision in Sevenoaks District shows that there is one pool site within Swanley, at White Oak Leisure Centre. Unmet demand is 5% of total demand. This is almost entirely due to

residents being outside the catchment area of a swimming pool, who do not have access to a car, as opposed to a lack of capacity. The national figure for unmet demand is higher, at 10%.

- 8 The Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities Needs Assessment Audit of 2009 sets out existing swimming pool provision in the Sevenoaks District. 13 swimming pool facilities are identified in the Sevenoaks District. Of these, 4 pools are for private use only and 6 are for school or club use only. The model sets out current (2009) projected pool demand and supply as follows:

Scenario	Demand	Supply	Oversupply/Shortfall
2009	1077 m <sup>2</sup>	1141 m <sup>2</sup>	Oversupply of 64 m <sup>2</sup>
2026 most likely	1106 m <sup>2</sup>	1141 m <sup>2</sup>	Oversupply of 35 m <sup>2</sup>
Closure of White Oak Leisure Centre	1077 m <sup>2</sup>	551 m <sup>2</sup>	Undersupply of 526 m <sup>2</sup>

- 9 Supply of 1141m<sup>2</sup> is based on three public leisure centres owned by this Council and run by Sencio Community Leisure. Closure of White Oak Leisure Centre would lead to a deficit of swimming water in the District.
- 10 The main pool and diving pool at White Oak is 590 m<sup>2</sup> in size, whilst for comparison, the main pool at Sevenoaks Leisure Centre is 325 m<sup>2</sup> (there isn't a diving pool at Sevenoaks).

#### Current Usage

- 11 Current usage of the leisure centre is set out below. From January to December 2011, there were a total of 336,953 attendances at White Oak Leisure Centre. For the 9 months from January to September 2012, there were a total of 270,425 attendances.
- 12 A total of 32 clubs use the leisure centre regularly for weekly dry and wet activities, 20 schools use the leisure centre regularly for swimming and other activities, and 23 organisations use the leisure centre for one-off annual events.
- 13 A scatter map showing users of White Oak Leisure Centre by place of residence is attached at Appendix B.

White Oak Leisure Centre Usage	12 months January to December 2011	Estimate 12 months January to September 2012
Wetside	169,974	171,061
Dryside	114,920	104,134
Fitness	52,059	55,323
Total	336,953	330,518

### Feasibility study into replacement facility

- 14 Alliance Leisure were appointed to undertake a study into the feasibility of redeveloping White Oak Leisure Centre to provide a more appropriate leisure facility and to reduce operating and future maintenance relating to the facility.
- 15 A copy of the full report is available from officers. The study established the demand for leisure in the area and set out a requirement for accommodation in a redeveloped leisure centre that would satisfy demand and provide sufficient income to cover costs:
- 6 lane x 25m swimming pool plus moveable boom and floor
  - 4 court sports hall, plus storage
  - 56 station fitness suite
  - Fitness studio (designated for spinning)
  - 2 x dance studios (flexible use areas)
  - Changing facilities, viewing, vending, administration and welfare facilities
  - 100 car parking spaces, including provision for blue badge and parent & toddler spaces
- 16 The study calculated, by analysis of current use, projected income and usage over the first five years of the facilities life income and expenditure predictions. These figures are given in Appendix C.
- 17 The study showed that the extent of the Council's landholding would enable the new leisure centre, the bowls centre and associated parking to be accommodated on the Whiteoak site, leaving 3.7 acres of land for other development. The scheme allowed for the existing leisure centre to be able to operate until the replacement is ready for use.

- 18 The estimated cost for construction of a new leisure centre to provide the facilities described above is £7.1 million.
- 19 Following the feasibility study, further work was undertaken by Sencio Community Leisure with the consultants to review the income potential for a new building. This further study critically examined :
- Current programmes both wet and dry
  - Club , schools and organisations usage both wet and dry and their relocation to the new facility
  - Fitness classes
  - Level of fitness memberships and the potential growth in line with the latent demand study ( 346 new members)
  - Casual visits for swimming and the impact of the removal of flumes and diving pool
  - Birthday parties and the impact of the removal of flumes
- 20 Proposed changes included the deletion of the proposal for a moveable floor and boom in the swimming pool and the addition of a teaching pool capable of generating additional income, requiring facilities as set out below:
- 6 lane x 25m swimming pool with spectator seating for 50-100 people (movable boom and floor proposed would not be cost effective )
  - Teaching pool
  - 4 court sports hall, plus storage
  - 56 station fitness suite –latent demand study shows capacity of 346 more members than current numbers
  - Fitness studio. The original feasibility proposed a designated spinning studio which would only operate 5 hours per week. The new proposal is for spinning bikes to be stored away after use to increase flexibility and usage of space.
  - Dance studios (flexible use areas) with sliding doors so that can be 2 separate spaces or 1.
  - Cafe pod/small kitchen area and vending.
- 21 This and other changes increased the estimated operating surplus and the 5 year estimates are set out in Appendix C2.

- 22 Estimated costs for the construction of the revised facility are an additional £250,000 taking the overall cost to £7.35m. It is anticipated that this would fit into the estimated footprint and would therefore not reduce the value of the residual land.
- 23 An analysis of income and expenditure at the current site, compared with figures for the original feasibility and updated feasibility study are set out in Appendix C.

#### Sites analysis

- 24 The Property Manager has undertaken an analysis of potential sites that might accommodate a rebuilt leisure centre. These are summarised at Appendix A. Taking into account ownership, suitability, affordability and planning implications, the site most likely for development is the existing Whiteoak site.

#### Procurement Options

##### Assumption

- 25 That the replacement leisure centre is constructed and operating before the existing centre is closed and demolished.

##### Option A

- 26 Leisure centre designed in house and constructed (subject to EU procurement procedures) prior to marketing the remainder of the site for housing (this is necessary as it is intended to keep the existing centre in operation until the replacement is completed).
- 27 A scheme such as this would require a team of professionals including architects, draughtsmen, services engineers, quantity surveyors, project managers and CDM/Health & safety professionals. Given the current size of the establishment of the Property Section, internal provision is not seen as a viable option.
- 28 Any capital receipt for the housing element would not be received until after the replacement leisure is built and by splitting the site into two contracts economies of scale savings and contract programming would prove problematical.

##### Option B

- 29 Tender the leisure centre as a design and build project by way of utilising a central purchasing group (this type of group was set up to work only with local authorities and charities and could accommodate EU procurement rules as the group will have already subjected the partner contractor to a tendering process).

- 30 This type of group will provide an “off the peg” solution thereby reducing costs (by possibly up to 25%) and construction time.
- 31 As in Option A above any capital receipt for the housing element would not be received until after the replacement leisure is built and by splitting the site into two contracts economies of scale savings and contract programming would prove problematical.

### Option C

- 32 As Option B above but with the leisure provider forming a joint venture with a residential developer which will enable the Council to include both elements of the proposed redevelopment into one transaction and thereby overcoming programming difficulties and passing some of the residential development risk to the developer. This option is recommended for further investigation.

### **Legal Background**

- 33 The Council owns the freehold K924375 of the premises known as White Oak Leisure Centre shown edged red on the plan attached hereto. This land is leased to the tenant – Sevenoaks Leisure Limited (Sencio) who is a leisure trust established as an Industrial and Provident Society. Sencio’s leasehold title is registered under K 871111.
- 34 The Council leased White Oak to Sencio on 22 April 2004 and granted a 25 year lease to them running from the 10 February 2004. The lease is a business tenancy that is controlled by the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 (the Act).
- 35 The lease in this instance has been ‘contracted out’ of the Act which means that the tenant will not be able to automatically renew their tenancy when it comes to the end of its term. There is effectively only a contractual tenancy and not a statutory tenancy.
- 36 The lease for White Oak contains two break clauses (clauses 7.1 and 7.2). Clause 7.1 deals with Landlord (the Council) wishing to demolish or reconstruct premises or a substantial part thereof. If exercising this provision the Council would need to give the tenant not less than 6 months prior written notice of such an event. The notice would have the effect of determining the lease (without prejudice to the accrued rights of either party). Sencio are required to deliver up the premises with full vacant possession.
- 37 Clause 7.2 gives the Council the right to serve a prior written notice of not less than 2 months duration on Sencio to surrender the lease of either the whole or part of the premises to the Council if the Council considers the premises are wholly unfit for use. Such matters that determine fitness will depend on insurability, latent or patent defects (in the building) or in the Council’s opinion it’s impracticable or uneconomic to rebuild, reinstate or effect major repairs.

38 Several points arise from such potential actions: -

- As the lease is contracted out and compensation excluded (clause 10) in theory compensation should not be payable. This should be the case provided all the administrative procedures for contracting out were correctly followed (this is a much litigated aspect of business leases). If compensation was found to be payable this would be calculated at once times the rateable value of the property if the occupation has been less than 14 years.
- If the Council wishes to terminate the lease prior to the end of the term they will need to show an explicit reason as to why this is required. Under clause 7.1 they would need to prove that there is a definitive financial plan to develop the premises and an intention to demolish and reconstruct. Such an intention would probably have to be shown at the date the break provision is exercised. Proof of intention is quite specific, including real intention, Cabinet or Committee authority, planning consent, building regulation approval, details of who would develop drawings etc. Similarly if the Council wish to exercise the break option under clause 7.2 they will need to show that it would be uneconomic to provide major capital investment to rebuild or reinstate.
- The Council would also have to give some consideration as to any outstanding contracts Sencio have entered into which can not be co-terminated to coincide with the break provision.
- If the Council wished to determine, unilaterally, the Lease (if it could not meet the requirements of clauses 7.1 and 7.2) or without the Tenant being in default then effectively this would put the Council in a breach of contract situation and a breach of its common law duty. If this were to happen several remedies are likely to be available to the Tenant, including
  - Damages for loss,
  - Specific Performance if the Council as Landlord fails to carry out its covenants under the Leases.
  - Injunction to prevent the Council determining the Leases.
  - Compensation.



## Key Implications

### Financial

39 The financial implications for the options detailed earlier in the report are as follows:

	Revenue (annual)		Capital (one-off)	
	Exp £000	Inc £000	Exp £000	Inc £000
Option 1	0	0	0	0
Option 2 Additional asset maintenance (average cost over 10 years)	130	0	0	0
Option 3 Sale of part of site (including demolition costs)				(3,000)
Construction cost of new leisure centre			7,350	
Contribution from Sencio due to increased income		(180)		
Funding required				(4,350)
Total	0	(180)	7,350	(7,350)
Option 4 Sale of whole site				(5,000)

Please note that the above figures are initial estimates; further work would be required to provide more accurate information.

- 40 If the decision were made to invest in the current building (option 2), £1.3m of asset maintenance costs would be required over the next ten years which are not currently included in the Council's 10-year budget.
- 41 Completing a scheme of this size and nature can have VAT implications, so external VAT advice has been obtained to ensure that the costing for each option above assume that the most VAT efficient treatment is used.
- 42 The Council charges Sencio a peppercorn rent, this means that any expenditure incurred by the Council is classed as a 'non business supply'. Sencio Leisure currently receives a management charge from the Council of £80,950 per annum. It is proposed that if option 3 is chosen, in future they would pay the Council a management fee due to the increased surplus they are expected to achieve from a new leisure centre. By doing this, the relationship with Sencio will continue to be classed as a 'non business supply' which will result in the Council being able to recover the VAT paid on constructing the new leisure centre. If the relationship with Sencio was deemed to be 'exempt business', this would not be the case and the cost of construction would increase by £1.47m. This could occur if Sencio

contributed in any way, e.g. by taking out a loan, to the cost of the new leisure centre.

- 43 There are a number of potential funding sources that could be used for Option 3, either individually or combined. These potential funding sources are explained below:
- a. Other parties - who would receive benefit from having a new leisure centre located in Swanley.
  - b. Sencio Leisure – the new leisure centre is expected to produce increased income and surplus compared to the current centre, which would enable Sencio to afford to pay the Council for the use of the centre. The existing surplus is set out at Appendices C1 and C2.
  - c. Borrowing – the Council is able to borrow funds from the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB). The current rate for a 20 year annuity loan is 3.01% which would result in annual repayments of £67,000 for every £1 million borrowed.
  - d. Alliance Leisure – within their feasibility study, Alliance Leisure included a funding scenario where they made a loan of £1.65m repayable at £180,000 per annum for 20 years which works out at a rate of 8%.
  - e. The Council's reserves – the vast majority of the Council's reserves are earmarked for specific purposes and to support the rolling 10-year budget. As part of the annual budget setting process, a review of reserves is carried out to ensure that funds are being used to support the Council's priorities.

### Community Impact and Outcomes

#### OPTION 1

- 44 If the 'do nothing' option were pursued, it is expected that costs for repairs to the existing centre will increase over time and may outstrip available budget. Deterioration of the existing building over time will make it necessary to close the centre, or parts of the centre, within 5 years.
- 45 Closure of the centre would cause some hardship in Swanley. Families on low income, older people and those with disabilities would be hardest hit, as these groups have lower car ownership and are less able to travel to alternative facilities. These impacts are set out under Option 4.

#### OPTION 2

- 46 Investing in the existing building would slow the deterioration of the building and prolong the life of the centre. However, in time, it is expected that parts or the whole of the building may become unusable or require rebuilding.

#### OPTION 3

- 47 Provided the replacement of the existing building did not necessitate a temporary closure of the leisure centre, there should be no adverse community impact and, following the provision of a new building, the community would enjoy a sustainable leisure facility in the future.

#### OPTION 4

- 48 Closure of the centre would cause some hardship in Swanley. Families on low income, older people and those with disabilities will be hardest hit, as these groups have lower car ownership and are less able to travel to alternative facilities.
- 49 Swanley residents would need to travel outside the Sevenoaks District to reach the nearest public leisure centres:

Leisure Centre	Distance from Swanley	Time taken on public transport	Return Cost (Adult/Child)
Dartford Fairfield Pool & Leisure Centre, DA1 1JB	4.8 miles (25 minutes by car)	27 mins by 477 bus (stops close to leisure centre)	£6.20/£3.10 Off peak cheapest fare
Orpington Walnuts Leisure Centre, BR6 0TJ	5.8 miles (30 minutes by car)	29 mins by 477 bus (stops close to leisure centre)	£6.20/£3.10 Off peak cheapest fare
Bromley Pavilion Leisure Centre, BR1 3EF	8.3 miles (38 minutes by car)	11 mins by train to Bromley South (then 0.5 mile to leisure centre on foot)	£4.20/£2.10 Off peak cheapest fare

- 50 Although current swimming pool provision in the Sevenoaks District outstrips demand, it is likely that the closure of White Oak Centre would lead to a shortfall in the supply of public swimming pool space.
- 51 Closure of the leisure centre would have an impact on the Sevenoaks District Community Action Plan 2010-13. The following priority outcomes are likely to be affected:
- 1.2 A low overall crime rate: Closure would remove diversionary activities for young people and may lead to increased levels of crime and anti-social behaviour.
  - 2.3 Healthier lifestyles for those over 50: Residents over 50 would no longer have access to leisure facilities. Those reliant on public transport may have difficulties reaching other facilities.
  - 3.3 Increased opportunities for children and young people to take part in physical activity: Children and younger people would no longer have access to local leisure facilities and may need to travel considerable distances to reach comparable facilities.

- 3.5 Health of primary school aged children improved: Many schools may no longer have access to swimming facilities.
- 4.2 Increased participation by younger people in positive activities: Many young people would no longer have access to leisure facilities. There may be a drop in participation figures for young people.
- 6.1 Increased carbon (CO2) savings: Closure of leisure facilities may lead to additional road journeys as residents travel to alternative facilities.
- 7.2 Improved weight management: A drop in leisure usage following closure may lead to increased levels of obesity amongst children and adults.
- 7.6 Increased adult participation in sport and active recreation: There may be a significant drop in adult sport recreation.
- 10.2 Reduced road congestion in the Sevenoaks District: Closure may lead to longer or additional road journeys as residents travel further afield to reach alternative facilities.

#### Key Statistics & Health Inequalities

- 52 Sevenoaks District Disadvantage Profile 2011 sets out key statistics for the Sevenoaks District by ward. Swanley St Mary's and Swanley White Oak wards have the highest percentage of households in poverty in the Sevenoaks District and a higher percentage compared to the national average. Swanley St Mary's ward is one of the 20% most deprived wards in Kent.
- 53 Sevenoaks District Health Inequalities Profile 2010 sets out major health inequalities in the Sevenoaks District, identifying the main health issues affecting the population by wards. For long term health outcomes in children, Swanley St Mary's and Swanley White Oak wards have the children with the poorest health outcomes in the District.
- 54 Smoking is strongly associated with deprivation, and has a higher prevalence in the more deprived wards of Swanley St Mary's and Swanley White Oak.

#### Legal, Human Rights etc.

- 55 **Option 1 - Do nothing:** The lease would run on unimpaired.
- 56 **Option 2 - Invest in the existing building:** There is a duty on Sencio to maintain the interior of the premises. SDC are under a duty to maintain the structure of the building and plant. SDC's obligations could be quite onerous in that it is a continuing liability were it not for the provision of clause 7.2 which allows determination of the lease where it becomes uneconomic. SDC would have a legal obligation to carry out repairs to the structure and plant that are economically viable and Sencio to repair the interior.
- 57 **Option 3 - Replace existing building:** SDC could rely on clause 7.1 in this regard.

- 58 **Option 4** – Close leisure centre: SDC would need to show an economic reason for this and rely on clause 7.2 of the lease.

Resource (non-financial)

- 59 Closure of White Oak Leisure Centre may have an impact on Sencio’s business and viability.
- 60 Staff Issues: If option 3 were agreed, then rebuilding of the leisure centre would be the largest building project undertaken by Sevenoaks District Council for many years. This may have an effect on staff workload.

Value For Money and Asset Management

- 61 Since the year 2000 the asset maintenance funding available for Council property assets has been set at approximately 40% of identified works based on the 10 year condition survey.
- 62 Under the terms of the lease of the premises to Sencio Community Leisure the District Council is responsible for maintaining the structure and main plant (including renewal of plant where necessary) and the current years asset maintenance for all Sencio property is £92,000 (this sum having being reduced incrementally over the last 2 years from an annual allocation of approximately £200,000. Of the annual allocation approximately 50% is invested in White Oak Leisure Centre i.e. approximately £46,000 p.a.
- 63 The asset maintenance funding is to ensure that the property remains a safe environment for the public users and to ensure that income generation can continue for the centre operators.
- 64 With maintenance running at only 40% of the identified need for the last 10 years, certain elements of the facility have deteriorated and, although all facilities in the centre have been kept available for public use, this has been achieved by diverting funding from other requirements, which do not have an immediate impact on service delivery.
- 65 A number of major maintenance issues for the future have been identified and it is estimated that in addition to the current asset maintenance funding allocation some £1.3m will need to be invested in the property over the next 10 years.

Equality Impacts

- 66 A full Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken, separately circulated to Cabinet, and is summarised below:

Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty:		
Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to disadvantage or discriminate	Yes	<u>Age:</u> Options 1 and 5 – older people may not have access to fitness activities and this may affect their health and wellbeing.

Consideration of impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty:		
Question	Answer	Explanation / Evidence
against different groups in the community?		Options 2, 3 and 4 – may improve and extend facilities for older people, although there may be some disruption during any building works.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have the potential to promote equality of opportunity?	Yes	<p><u>Disability:</u> Options 1 and 5 - Existing courses and activities that benefit people with disabilities may no longer be available, which may affect their health and wellbeing. Options 2, 3 and 4 - may improve and extend facilities for people with disabilities, although there may be some disruption during any building works. Access may be improved, eg removal of existing steps etc</p> <p><u>Residents on low income from deprived neighbourhoods:</u> Options 1 and 5 may affect these groups more severely as people on low incomes may not be able to afford to pay for or travel to alternative facilities. Options 2, 3 and 4 – these groups may benefit from improved facilities</p> <p>Evidence: Equality Impact Assessment</p>
c. What steps can be taken to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		Options may need to consider alternative arrangements from being put in place.

### Sustainability Checklist

67 A sustainability checklist for each Option has been separately circulated to Cabinet in advance.

### **Conclusions**

68 A summary of the implications of each of the 4 options is given at Appendix C. Members' instructions are sought regarding further work to be undertaken in pursuit of options.

## RISK ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

	Risk	Mitigation
Option 1	<p>Risk to the Council of not adequately maintaining a public building.</p> <p>Failure to provide leisure facilities in the area if leisure centre has to be closed.</p> <p>Failure to meet conditions of lease.</p>	<p>Continue to make short-term repairs. Unplanned expenditure may be necessary to maintain safety.</p> <p>Continue to investigate alternative proposals.</p>
Option 2	<p>Sufficient funding may not be available to maintain the building.</p>	<p>Build additional revenue expenditure of a minimum of £130,000 per year into future budget years.</p>
Option 3	<p>Not being able to find sufficient funding for the work.</p> <p>Sencio currently receive 80% mandatory and 20% discretionary relief for their premises, the council funds an element of the discretionary relief. The rules on the funding of reliefs are currently being amended as part of the new Business Rates Retention regulations. There is currently uncertainty about the effects of this in particular for new premises which may result in an additional cost to the council.</p>	<p>Identify funding including an appropriate contingency sum in advance.</p> <p>Continue to monitor new regulations</p>
Option 4	<p>Failure to provide appropriate leisure facilities for the area, failure to provide appropriate level of swimming space. Failure to address equalities issues.</p>	

**Appendices**

Appendix A - White Oak Leisure Centre – possible sites

Appendix B – White Oak Leisure Centre Customer Postcode Locations

Appendix C (Gold) – Financial Summaries

**Background Papers:**

Sport England Profiling Report in 2011 on Sports Hall Provision in Sevenoaks District

Sport England Profiling Report in 2011 on Swimming Pool Provision in Sevenoaks District

**Contact Officer(s):**

Lesley Bowles, ext 7335

Jim Latheron, ext 7209 (Property)

Graham Grove, ext 7401 (Legal)

Adrian Rowbotham, ext 7153 (Finance)

Simon Davies, ext 7374 (Leisure).

**Kristen Paterson**

**Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Community & Planning Services**

**Dr. Pav Ramewal**

**Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources**