



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Name and date of Committee	EXECUTIVE – 10 SEPTEMBER 2025
Subject	APPROVAL OF CAPITAL FUNDING FOR THE DELIVERY OF A PLANNED INVESTMENT PROGRAMME FOR LEISURE FACILITIES
Wards affected	All
Accountable member	Tim Sumner – Executive Member for Leisure and Carterton Area Strategy. Email: tim.sumner@westoxon.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Phil Martin, Director of Place Email: phil.martin@westoxon.gov.uk
Report author	Stuart Wilson, Leisure Contract Manager Email: stuart.wilson@westoxon.gov.uk
Summary/Purpose	<p>This report presents the forecast expenditure required to ensure the Council owned leisure facilities remain operationally effective and compliant with modern standards as well as improving the leisure services for residents into the future.</p> <p>A breakdown has been included to demonstrate the costs over a range of periods along with a summary of associated implications.</p> <p>The purpose of the report is to allow Members to decide on the preferred Planned Investment Programme.</p>
Annexes	Annex A – PIP Headline Report Annex B – PIP Headline data tables Annex C – PIP Overview Table Annex D – Site Specific Key Items List
Recommendation(s)	<p>That the Executive resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Allocate funds in the Capital Programme for the delivery of a 5-year planned investment programme, as determined by the latest condition surveys conducted at all Council owned Leisure Facilities.2. Delegate authority to the Director of Place, in consultation with Executive member for Leisure and/or the Section 151 Officer to approve the project specific procurement of works and services directly, or via the Leisure Operator, to deliver the programme of

	works over the agreed time period.
Corporate priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting Residents First • A Good Quality of Life for All
Key Decision	YES
Exempt	NO
Consultees/ Consultation	External consultation/surveying services were provided by CS2 – Chartered Surveyors to compile condition surveys.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1** This report highlights the forecast costs of repair and maintenance works which fall under the Councils duty as owners of the leisure facilities will ensure that the Council owned leisure facilities remain operationally effective and compliant with modern standards as well as improving the leisure services and experience for residents into the future.
- 1.2** These costs are presented as a Planned Investment Programme (PIP) which is over-arched by the adopted Asset Management Strategy 2024/29.
- 1.3** The programme will be scheduled to deliver both the compliance and operational elements that are detailed over the 5 Year recommended period to improve the services and standards that the community and customers of these Council owned facilities experience.

2. BACKGROUND

LEISURE FACILITIES

- 2.1** The Council owns a portfolio of Leisure Facilities across the District including three Leisure Centres, two outdoor heated pools, sports pitches (natural and artificial turf) including changing/pavilion facilities, a country park, and playing fields which provide accessible leisure services to residents.
- 2.2** The facility-based services are currently contracted for delivery by the charitable trust GLL Better, except for Chipping Norton Lido which is operated by Chipping Norton Lido Ltd (a company limited by guarantee) which operates the lido site on an underlease from the Councils current lease.
- 2.3** Under the existing leisure contract, which runs until July 2027, there is a shared obligation for the repair and maintenance of the facilities between the Council and the Operator. This risk share is weighted towards the Operator for most day-to-day repair and maintenance requirements. The balance of this obligation has been considered and duly reflected in the forecast 2-year option.
- 2.4** For modelling purposes, it has been assumed that a more neutral share position for repairing obligations would be established for the period from year 3 to year 10. This position is supported by market intelligence which is emerging as part of the Leisure Strategy.
- 2.5** The Council considered the option of replacing the Windrush Leisure Centre when it was looking at how best it could invest in safeguarding the provision of leisure facilities for residents into the future and does recognise at some point it may be necessary to do this. However, the opportunity for the Council to pursue this option further is curtailed by the timing of the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) which will result in the District Council being subsumed into a larger Unitary Council structure in 2028. Notwithstanding the LGR changes the Council faces it also does not have sufficient funding to be able to finance the building of a new Leisure Centre, which could cost upwards of £40 million. The current location of the Windrush Leisure centre is also a key consideration as it is easily accessible via current public transport and cycle routes, has parking available close by to supplement what's available on site and is within walking distance of the town centre.

ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

- 2.6** In 2024 the Council adopted an Asset Management Strategy (AMS) which provides strategic direction on how to manage buildings over the next five to ten years. This pulls together the Councils corporate objectives, latest financial situation, service needs, and regeneration and housing requirements to guide future property decision making.
- 2.7** Phase 1 of the AMS sets out a longer term (five to ten year) strategy for the estate. An implementation plan (Phase 2) will be developed to provide targeted Asset Plans for those properties being considered for change. Considering income and expenditure profiles, tenant events, and hold/disposal options for implementation.
- 2.8** Supporting the AMS is a 'Schedule of assets by priority', which falls under the implementation plan (Phase 2) this schedule details how asset plans will then be commissioned based on a priority ranking process.
- 2.9** Asset Plans will be supported by detailed Planned Preventative Maintenance programmes (PPM's) which will be collated to inform the next capital estates programme, allowing the Council to forecast spend over the next five years. Typical PPM information would include:-
- Condition Surveys
 - Running cost and energy performance data
 - Future maintenance, repair and replacement costs
 - Occupancy and space data
- 2.10** The 'Schedule of Assets by Priority' is being compiled to determine the appropriate rankings for all facilities, including the Leisure Centres, which will establish where they will fall under the forthcoming asset plan process.
- 2.11** The AMS also advises that the Council uses the latest leisure strategy (due in October 2025) and planned preventative maintenance data in understanding the long-term options for the Leisure Centres. This will include investment in planned repairs and maintenance. The first stage in progressing with the planned preventative maintenance data is therefore to obtain condition surveys as noted in 2.8. The information from these surveys can then be reviewed to provide a Planned Investment Programme (PIP) for a comparable purpose to the Capital estates programme which will be developed from the Asset Plans.

CONDITION SURVEYS and PIP

- 2.12** In April 2025, the Council commissioned CS2 (Chartered Surveyor Consultancy) to complete condition surveys at the leisure facilities to provide a detailed overview of the facilities.
- 2.13** The completed condition surveys have identified a backlog of required maintenance in the facilities and using industry knowledge and experience CS2 have forecast future maintenance requirements based on the conditions observed. This information has been reviewed to form the PIP.
- 2.14** The elements within a facility have a cyclical nature relating to the need for building refurbishments and replacements. Typically, 25 years is a common time period for a larger requirement of investment due to the lifecycle expectancy of building fabric and mechanical equipment. Currently Chipping Norton leisure centre and the original Phase one of

Carterton leisure centre have reached 25 years of age whilst Windrush leisure centre is 50 years old, this has led to higher level of cost requirements for these sites in the next two years in line with this lifecycle period. When comparing Carterton leisure centre with Chipping Norton leisure centre there are cost differences created as Phase two of Carterton leisure centre was completed in 2019 and is therefore only 6 years old.

- 2.15** High traffic areas and sanitary areas also reach an age where despite regular cleaning they become tired and do not meet customer expectations. Typically, this is a 10 to 12 year cycle and consequently aligns with the 25-year cycle noted in 2.13. This further increases required costs at these time periods.
- 2.16** The period that a PIP should be considered for will be impacted by factors including, but not limited to, the availability of funds and the emerging landscape associated with the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR)
- 2.17** The condition surveys have been broken down into three time periods; 2 years (this period aligns with the current duration of the Leisure Contract), 5 years, and 10 years. The surveys were provided split into discipline themes for Building Fabric and Mechanical & Electrical (M&E) and these themes have subsequently been assessed in relation to the contractual repairing obligations that are in place and that are likely to be in place in the future.
- 2.18** A further review of the condition surveys has been completed to determine elements which would be critical to the function of the facilities – Compliance items, and elements that will afford the expected standard of service provision or that may be considered as optional. In some cases, costs have been value engineered out, and in others supplementary costs have been factored in to cover expected outcomes.
- 2.19** It has also been assumed that should the leisure contract be extended with the current operator or marketed for new bids that a standard repairing obligations agreement would be entered into. The impact of this obligation has been reflected in the 5-year and 10-year options, with the impact being applied from 2027 when the existing contract with GLL expires.
- 2.20** Delivery of the PIP will support the Council leisure facilities by ensuring a continued provision of services, maintaining public use and support of the facilities, and providing the Council with a more attractive leisure estate for the purposes of negotiating extension/procurement options to the leisure contract post 2027.

3. PLANNED INVESTMENT PROGRAMME CAPITAL COST IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Table of costs.

Facility	2 Years £	5 Years £	10 Years £
Carterton Leisure Centre	525,500	787,400	1,693,150
Chipping Norton Leisure Centre	972,200	1,121,200	1,504,100
Carterton Pavilion	93,000	178,400	218,600
Witney ATP	121,300	134,200	275,200
Windrush Leisure Centre	708,000	880,250	2,539,250

Woodstock Outdoor Pool	211,600	400,100	528,600
Total	2,631,600	3,501,550	6,758,900

- 3.2** The table above includes items for Compliance and Operational elements and is adjusted to reflect a change to a standard repairing obligations contract from July 2027.
- 3.3** The table above excludes items which were considered desirable but that would not have had a significant detrimental impact on the service provision in the allotted timeframes.

4. ASSOCIATED OUTCOMES FOR THE PLANNED INVESTMENT PROGRAMME (PIP)

- 4.1** The standard and quality of the facilities that the Council owns is linked to the level of services which can be provided. This in turn has a proportional impact on the reputation of the Council and the Leisure Operator and will determine the level of income which can be generated by the sites. The balance of income and expenditure is reflected in the management fee position that the Council can secure with a Leisure contract operated model and it is therefore prudent to invest for higher returns where possible.
- 4.2** A further benefit to investing in the facilities is an increase in the income generated by the leisure contractor, whereby an element of their generated surplus is recycled as investment back into the Council owned facilities further improving their condition.
- 4.3** The Council recognises the importance of providing residents with high quality leisure facilities, whilst accepting the challenges the age of the current assets brings and to reflect this the PIP, will not only replace / upgrade key operational items within the centres but also focus on areas that will improve users of the facilities experiences, both in terms of the environmental conditions and service area standards.
- 4.4** If no funding is allocated there is a risk that as facilities degrade through age and use that they would become inoperable, which would ultimately lead to loss of income claims under any contracted service and unmanaged costs for emergency repairs etc.
- 4.5** When retendering or extending the current leisure contract the level of investment and improvements undertaken will impact the market value of the facilities. This value is affected two-fold, through the reduced costs associated with forced closures and unserviceable areas – and through the improved income generated through providing high quality facilities and the associated enhanced customer experience provided.

4.6 Table of advantages and disadvantages for a planned investment programme

Period	Advantages	Disadvantages
No investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No initial Council financial outlay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deterioration of facilities with short term required improvements not being delivered. Loss of service delivery through closures and poor standards Failure to meet remaining contract obligations with GLL until July 2027 Financial losses Significant Reputational Damage

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak portfolio for tendering post July 2027
2yrs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesser financial outlay Accords with responsibilities under existing contractual arrangement Short term improvements would be completed but these would not secure facilities in the medium to long term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower impact on services, costs and reputational damage which is delayed until July 2027 Post July 2027 impacts as noted above begin, and having extended the contract or reprocured with no planned improvements in place a weak return would be expected from the market. Providing an investment programme for 2 years (until April 2027) would cause an additional risk to services as the programme would end in alignment with the LGR timeframe adding to uncertainty in the facility management and operation
5yrs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a plan (and budget allocation) for Facilities which extends through the LGR process without over prescribing budgetary requirements into the new LGR framework. Medium term improvements would be completed securing the key areas of the facilities for years ahead. A contract extension or re-procurement with a plan in place will be stronger and may deliver future income to the Council through the management fee for re-investment in the facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delayed impact on services, costs, and reputational damage until 2030 Post 2030 reduced impacts recur due to medium term investments that have been completed. A contractual risk would be factored in by Operators for post 2030 as facility conditions would then be at risk of deterioration
10yrs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long term plan would be in place securing Facility condition. Longer term improvements would be made that would benefit the users and Council as facility owners with risks associated with income, costs, reputation etc. A stronger position would be held in current and future contract extension or procurement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High financial commitment Beyond 5 years the forecast of condition surveys becomes less accurate, so further costs may be identified as time progresses that haven't been budgeted for Increased risk from prescribing budgetary requirements into an as yet undetermined LGR landscape

5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 5.1 The Council could choose to allocate an alternative level of funding to the recommended 5 Year PIP which is detailed in this report. However, as demonstrated by the 2 Year or 10 Year options, alternative options which deviate from the 5-year recommendation will

increase potential risks to reputation or financial stability – as highlighted in 4.4 Table of Advantages and Disadvantages.

- 5.2 The Council could choose not to allocate funding to the PIP. This option would adversely affect the current leisure contract, and future leisure contract options, and would bring reputational and service risks.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The Head of Finance recommends that the Planned Investment Programme is included in the capital programme for 2026/27-2031/32 to be funded through a combination of capital receipts and earmarked reserves.
- 6.2 Allowance will be made in the Revenue Budget for any additional Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) that will be payable for qualifying capital works i.e. replacing plant and equipment like Air Handling Units. MRP is not payable on capital expenditure for maintenance or wear and tear.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no legal implications associated with this report.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 N/A
- 8.2 Note. The recommendation on this report is for the Council to allocate funding to the PIP and consequently there are no directly applicable risk assessment implications. However, further detailed assessments would be undertaken as part of the procurement and delivery of the ensuing works programme where applicable.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT

- 9.1 N/A
- 9.2 Note. The recommendation on this report is for the Council to allocate funding to the PIP and consequently there are no directly applicable equalities impact implications. However, further detailed assessments would be undertaken as part of the procurement and delivery of the ensuing works programme where applicable.

10. CLIMATE AND ECOLOGICAL EMERGENCIES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 As the recommendation on this report is for the Council to allocate funding to the PIP, there are no direct Climate and Ecological implications.
- 10.2 The Sustainability Impact Assessment Tool (SIAT) has been used to verify this and has confirmed that no actions are required.
- 10.3 Projects and works packages that will be delivered should the PIP be approved will be subject to further SIAT review based on their size and scope, and all repair and maintenance works will be undertaken with a low carbon refurbishment approach. Coupled with effective project procurement and management this will ensure that where applicable reduced carbon outcomes are delivered.

- 10.4** It is noted that by completing regular repair and maintenance works the facilities will improve in efficiency – particularly with the updating of Mechanical and Electrical (M&E) systems, enhancements to insulation, and improvements of air tightness in the building fabric.
- 10.5** The PIP will also, in some cases, extend the lifecycle of M&E components reducing the need to replace equipment. This accords with the waste hierarchy and its associated carbon impact.
- 10.6** The decision to extend the usable lifespan of the Windrush Leisure Centre holds climate benefits as the site location is suitable for access using public transport and cycle routes as well as being within walking distance of the town centre.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1** None

(END)