

Overview & Scrutiny Task Group Meeting Notes



Lichfield
District Council

Review Topic	Date of Meeting
New Leisure Centre	08 May 2024

Attendance	Venue
<p>Members: Leona Leung (Chair) Paul Ray Dave Robertson Paul Taylor Keith Vernon Brian Yeates</p> <p>Officers: John Smith Simon Fletcher Will Stevenson</p> <p>Witnesses:</p> <p>Observers:</p> <p>Apologies:</p>	Virtual - Teams

Areas Discussed

The Chair and Chief Executive both thanked all attendees for being present at such short notice.

Declarations of Interests

No declarations of interest were reported.

Simon Fletcher (Chief Executive) explained that officers were looking for a steer from the task group given that the project was currently over budget. Members were encouraged to set out what recommendations they believed should be put to full council, whether that be construction of a Rainham style model or something different.

Officers highlighted that the Rainham model was gas powered and did not possess enough car parking spaces as would be required for the new leisure centre in Lichfield. Factors such as these will still need to be changed if members choose to follow the Rainham model.

Members noted that they had not had time to review the proposals in sufficient detail given the short timescale of the meeting being arranged.

Members asked if this would represent the final increase in costs or if there would be additional cost risks. It was confirmed any additional costs would be borne by the contractor not LDC.

Members asked about the possibility of looking at leasehold rather than capital investment in certain aspects of the leisure centre development.

Members expressed a reluctance to delay but noted the challenge in bringing this forward to council without clear funding arrangements represented a big hurdle to this moving forward. Officers assured members the report to council would include a breakdown of the funding figures involved. It would only be roughly £300,000 of the overall funding that would have any impact on the MTFS.

Members asked if the possibility of reconvening on Monday would be feasible to give members more time to review the documentation. It was also discussed whether a two-month delay until the next full council was more appropriate than a potential six-month constitutional delay if the proposals are voted down at full council.

Members noted that if they were willing to recommend the additional spend proposal to council, before reconvening to try and save on those costs, then this would mean that they would be agreeing to the overall spend whilst aiming to look at savings further down the line.

Members agreed to propose a recommendation to council separating the core building and external building costs, with delegated authority to the cabinet member to examine external building areas and where the proposed spend could be reduced in consultation with the task group.

Outcomes

The Task Group agreed to propose a recommendation to council with delegated authority to the cabinet member to examine external building areas and where the proposed spend could be reduced in consultation with the task group.

Further Work Required/Next Steps:

- The recommendations would be put to Full Council
- If approved, the Cabinet member would work in consultation with the task group.