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Purpose of Report

The purpose of the report is to

1. report the outcome of the consultation exercise on the leisure estate to Cabinet
2. present Members with the Equality Impact Assessment information
3. agree that an Outline Business Case be reported back to a further Cabinet meeting in January 2012.

Executive Summary

The report summarises the consultation exercise and findings and the Equality Impact Assessment and seeks the Cabinet’s response to them.
Recommendations

Cabinet is recommended to:

1. Receive and indicate their response to the findings of the consultation exercise
2. Receive and indicate their response to the Equality Impact Assessment
3. Agree the requirement for a whole estate investment strategy and commit to exploring the possibility of a second phase of investment in the leisure estate in Oldham focusing on East Oldham
4. Confirm the aspiration, subject to affordability, for a new build replacement for Oldham Sports Centre
5. Confirm that a single, new build leisure facility will be re-provided within the leisure contract for the Royton, Shaw and Crompton District Partnership area
6. Request officers to present an Outline Business Case including any information on the facilities that will form part of the future operating contract as well as the proposed sites for a replacement Oldham Town Centre and Royton, Shaw and Crompton facility and the overall affordability position, to a further Cabinet meeting in January 2012
7. Request officers to report to a further Cabinet meeting the evaluation framework for assessing the leisure operating contract.
Leisure Estate – Report of the Consultation Exercise

1 Background

1.1 The current leisure contract (run through OCLL) is due to run out in March 2013. In order to meet the procurement timetable, the Council will embark on an open and competitive procurement exercise in February/March 2012 with the aim of driving efficiencies, service improvements and innovation.

1.2 The independent review of leisure services within Oldham undertaken during the Winter of 2010/11 considered the current provision across all sectors and provided a clear evidence base and supply and demand analysis. This supported the Council’s need to reconfigure the leisure facilities in Oldham in order to both reduce the revenue burden on the Council and improve the leisure offer to the public of Oldham.

1.3 The review supported the view that an overall leisure estate of fewer, high quality public sector facilities well distributed across the Borough, with a Town Centre facility at its heart, alongside private and voluntary sector provision, would be a realistic way forward for the Borough.

1.4 The review established the need to:

- clearly define the Oldham leisure estate to be included in procurement/management arrangements
- maximise use and availability to the community of sports facilities in BSF/Academy and PFI schools, including during the day
- exclude loss making facilities from the contract / offer by closure or transfer
- reduce the size of the estate
- increase cost efficiency, increasing income and bearing down on central and staff costs within the operating model
- remodel/reconfigure loss making facilities in Glodwick, Royton and Crompton and the Town Centre
- use revenue savings and capital receipts generated from closures and other potential transfers to fund the provision of two new high quality replacement facilities, in the Royton/Crompton area and the Town Centre
- procure any new facilities separately from the management/operation of the leisure estate.
The Council’s Cabinet considered reports on the Leisure review and next steps on August 22nd and October 3rd 2011. At the October meeting, Cabinet agreed the following recommendations to:

1. endorse the principles and outcome of the leisure review and option appraisal work undertaken as generating an outline position for the future leisure estate
2. approve officers to undertake consultation with stakeholders in relation to the proposals for a reconfigured leisure estate
3. instruct officers to report back to Cabinet in December the outcome of the consultation and to seek formal approval of the configuration of the leisure estate.

The following table summarises the consultation option that has been presented to stakeholders/residents during the consultation exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEISURE ESTATE</th>
<th>PROPOSALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddleworth Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>Refurbish or replace with more efficient facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodwick Leisure Pool</td>
<td>Close and transfer users to Oldham Sports Centre. Consider transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP)</td>
<td>Close or consider transfer to Oldham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>Close and replace with new centre to serve Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>Close and replace with new centre to serve Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton and Crompton AGP (at Royton and Crompton School)</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadderton Health and Wellbeing Centre</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radclyffe running track</td>
<td>Retain or consider transfer to Radclyffe school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failsworth Sports Centre</td>
<td>Retain. Consider transfer of sand-based AGP and tennis courts potentially transferred to Failsworth school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Road AGP</td>
<td>Transfer via open process of expressions of interest/submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL FACILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New pool and sports centre to serve Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
<td>New facility, managed by operator, location to be determined - Royton and Crompton School, Royton or Shaw Town Centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Current position

2.1 A consultation exercise was undertaken between September 23\textsuperscript{rd} and November 20\textsuperscript{th} 2011. The methodology and key findings from the consultation are summarised in section 4.2 of this report. The full Consultation report, including the detailed methodology and findings are featured at Appendix 1 to this report.

2.2 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been developed alongside the consultation exercise and report. The EIA is summarised at section 4.6 of this report and featured at Appendix 2 to this report.

2.3 Officers are now in a position to present the consultation report and EIA to Cabinet.

3 Options/Alternatives

3.1 Cabinet’s options are to:

1. Consider the consultation findings and EIA and agree that the options for the configuration of the leisure estate as set out above. This will enable the re procurement to commence in January 2012 but would not provide a firm basis of the new contract.

2. Consider and indicate their response to the consultation findings and EIA, give further direction to officers and request officers to undertake further work on facility mix/sites, affordability and present an Outline Business Case to a further Cabinet meeting in January 2012. This will enable the re procurement to commence in February/March 2012 and the new contract to be in place before the expiry of the current contract in March 2013 at the latest.

3. Consider the consultation findings and EIA and request further consultation work is done. This will delay the re procurement process and potentially require the Council to implement an interim leisure service and/or bring the service back in house prior to a re-procurement.

4 Preferred Option

4.1 Cabinet is requested to agree option 2.
4.2 Consultation

4.2.1 Communications methodology

A Communications and Engagement Plan was developed for the consultation on the leisure review proposals which ran between September 23\textsuperscript{rd} and November 20\textsuperscript{th} 2011. The following summarises key Council organised activities / consultation methods:


2. Oldham Council Question Time on 13.10.2011 featured discussion and questions on the leisure review

3. A Members’ briefing was issued on 3.09.11

4. An offer was made to speak to political groups and Ward Members – not taken up. Shadow Cabinet Member briefed on 10.10.2011

5. Proposals were presented to District Partnership (DP) meetings:
   - Royton, Shaw, Crompton 03/10 /11
   - Chadderton 15/11/11
   - East Oldham 21/11/11
   - Failsworth and Hollinwood 23/11/11
   - West Oldham 24/11/11
   - Saddleworth and Lees 01/12/11

The views of DPs taking place after the consultation deadline have been inputted into the consultation report.

6. The proposals were presented to a joint Special Royton and Shaw PACT meeting on October 26\textsuperscript{th} and to the Annual General meeting of OCLL on September 27\textsuperscript{th} 2011.

7. The Council’s website featured a ‘Leisure in Oldham - Have Your Say’ banner and the press release covering the proposals, an interactive map of current and proposed provision, a summary of the proposals, the full Leisure review produced by Sports Solutions GB and some Frequently Asked Questions.

8. The Council’s website also featured an email address futureleisure@oldham.gov.uk for email feedback and encouraged residents to express their views by email, letter or on leaflet response forms.
9. Leaflets with response forms and posters were displayed in Leisure Centres, libraries and other Council buildings. OCLL and Council staff gave leaflets out and encouraged casual users to respond.

10. Focus groups were held with organised User Groups in centres where major changes are proposed – one for Royton and Crompton, two for Oldham Sports Centre and one for Glodwick:

- Royton and Crompton Sports Centre users - 18th October at Royton and Crompton School 7.00pm - 8.30pm
- Oldham Sports Centre Users - 20th October at Oldham Sports Centre 1.00pm - 2.30pm and 7.15pm - 8.45pm
- Glodwick Pool users - 25th October at St Marks Parish Hall Glodwick 7.00pm - 8.30pm

11. A Drop-in session was held on November 8th 2011 at Glodwick pool with an interpreter, specifically to engage with BME women attending the facility.

12. A detailed Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) has been developed which assesses the impact of the proposals on people with low incomes and people with the eight protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010, namely age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief and sexual orientation. The consultation exercise has fed into the EIA and vice versa.

13. As well as the Council organised consultation activities highlighted above, the consultation exercise generated other responses including two petitions from the users of the Oldham Sports Centre bowling hall, a political party leaflet and response form and a letter campaign by the Girls Guides.

4.2.2 Consultation findings

The full findings and analysis are within the Consultation report at Appendix 1. A total of 1084 individual responses / feedback forms were received. A breakdown of the responses by leisure facility and number is given in the table below:
### Facility Consultation Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General feedback (not facility specific)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodwick Leisure Pool</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failsworth Sports Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Road Artificial Grass Pitch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radclyffe running track</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops Park pitch and putt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESPONSES</strong></td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response to the consultation was dominated by the issue of the proposed closure of Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre. The Council consulted on proposals to close both the existing leisure facilities in Royton and Shaw and replace them with a new build facility. The Council’s original consultation proposal was to locate the replacement facility for the Royton, Shaw and Crompton District Partnership area in either Royton Town Centre or at Royton and Crompton school. The Council reacted positively during the consultation period to requests from the Shaw PACT, Parish Council and individual respondents from Shaw/Crompton to include consideration of sites in Shaw for the replacement leisure facility.

Significant feedback was also forthcoming in relation to the proposals for Oldham Sports Centre and Glodwick Leisure Pool. Very few responses were received in relation to Royton Sports Centre. This is explained by the fact that Royton residents were content with the original consultation proposal that a new leisure centre be based in Royton either in the Town Centre or at Royton and Crompton school.

The table below indicates the most prevalent consultation responses relating to each category / facility:
The consultation responses from User groups, sports organisations, voluntary and statutory organisations and other stakeholders largely mirror the responses from individuals.

The issue of overall pool space in the Borough within the new leisure estate was raised during the consultation and requires ongoing discussions with Sports England and the Amateur Swimming Association. Further modelling work will be undertaken by Sport England during December 2011.

The involvement of centre user groups and in particular swimming clubs and representatives of disabled groups during the consultation provided valuable insights into issues and challenges around pool design and programming. The involvement of these groups will be maintained and bidders and the selected leisure operator will be challenged to demonstrate how they will involve such groups.
4.5 Leisure provision across the Borough

4.5.1 Whilst the consultation exercise and EIA have predominantly focused on specific proposals, Cabinet wishes to promote a whole estate investment strategy. The maintenance and upgrade of older facilities, in particular Failsworth Sports Centre, will be taken into account in full within the new leisure operating contract. Cabinet is also aware and the consultation exercise confirmed, that the East Oldham District Partnership area is the least well provided for area in terms of leisure facilities – by both public and private sectors.

4.5.2 Officers’ view is that at the current time it is not affordable to provide additional publicly funded facilities in the East Oldham area but that when a new operator is in place, the potential for a second phase of investment in the leisure estate in Oldham, focusing on East Oldham will be discussed.

4.6 The Equality Impact Assessment

4.6.1 A detailed Equality Impact Assessment has been developed alongside the conduct of the consultation exercise. Evidence has been gathered from OCL membership and monitoring data, from Ward profiles and Public Health reports. It has been concluded that the proposals for the leisure estate impact the following equality groups:

- Ethnic group
- Religious faith
- Disability
- Low income
- Gender
- Particular age groups - older and young people

The proposals do not impact other equality groups:

- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Sexual orientation

4.6.2 The impacts of the leisure review on the equality groups above have been identified in detail. The impacts are both positive and negative. Detailed mitigation measures for negative impacts have been put forward. A commitment has been made to improve monitoring of equality groups’ participation and usage of leisure centres within the new operating contract.

5 Consultation

5.1 See section 4.2 and Appendix 1
6 Financial Implications

6.1 The reconfiguration of public leisure facilities in Oldham is predicated on the generation of efficiencies and improved performance within the re-procured leisure operating contract, the reduction of the subsidy required by the Council to the operating contract and the re-investment of the savings on the subsidy and capital receipts generated by the reconfiguration of the leisure estate and the re-procured contract to fund borrowing by the Council to provide a new or refurbished facility in Oldham Town Centre and a new facility for the Royton, Shaw and Crompton area. Decisions about the configuration of the leisure estate are impacted by cost and affordability considerations. These will be fully explored in a report to a further Cabinet meeting in January 2012. (Sam Smith)

7 Legal Services comments

7.1 In reaching a decision in relation to the recommendations contained in this report the Cabinet must conscientiously take into account the response to the public consultation exercise as referred to in this report and the separate report in relation to the consultation response.

7.2 Where a local authority is taking a decision of this nature it must consider the consequences of its proposed decisions for service users and take account of the established public law principles relating to decision-making so that all relevant considerations are taken into account and no account must be taken of irrelevant considerations. The local authority must take into account and balance all relevant factors of which the amount of available resources is only one factor.

7.3 Regard must also be had to the Council's duties under the Equality Act 2010, including consideration of the Equality Impact Assessment attached to the report. The Cabinet must consider the potential impact of the proposed changes in terms of those duties and whether identifying financial savings and improving the offer of leisure facilities outweigh potential impacts.

Section 149 of the 2010 Act provides as follows:

"(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;"
(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

(2) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:
   (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
   (b) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

(3) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons’ disabilities.

(4) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:
   (a) tackle prejudice, and
   (b) promote understanding.

(5) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

(6) The relevant protected characteristics are:
   age;
   disability;
   gender reassignment;
   pregnancy and maternity;
   race;
   religion or belief;
   sex;
   sexual orientation.

7.4 It does not follow that a decision cannot be made because it will have adverse impacts on any persons with one or more of the protected characteristics. As part of the consideration of these issues decision makers are entitled to have regard to the mitigation measures
proposed in the report, which are intended to minimise the impact on any service user who would be adversely affected by the decision. Decision makers are also entitled to take into account countervailing factors such as the need to make savings and the importance of improving leisure facilities. However, Cabinet members must have the duties under the Equality Act at the forefront of their minds. (Bill Balmer)

8 Human Resources comments

8.1 None at this stage.

9 Risk Assessments

9.1 Project risk registers are considered and updated on a regular basis.

10 IT Implications

10.1 None at this stage.

11 Property implications

11.1 None for this report. A range of property matters are dealt with in a report to the next Cabinet. (Mark Elton)

12 Procurement implications

12.1 None for this report (Anthony Hilton)

13 Environmental and Health & Safety implications

13.1 None for this report

14 Equality, community cohesion and crime implications

14.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has assessed the impact of the proposals people with low incomes and people with the eight protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010, namely age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief and sexual orientation.

14.2 Current OCLL monitoring data does not record comprehensively BME usage patterns of the facilities. Monitoring information suggests that participation and membership rates for BME residents are far lower than their white counterparts. OCLL Trends in Performance data for 2009/10 and 2010/11 indicates that Chadderton Wellbeing Centre and Oldham Sports Centre have seen an increase in members from a BME background while other centres, including Glodwick, show a very low and static level of membership from the BME community.
14.3 Improved monitoring of membership and participation of equality groups will be incorporated into the new operating contract.

15 Equality Impact Assessment completed?

15.1 A detailed Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) has been developed which assesses the impact of the proposals on people with low incomes and people with the eight protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010, namely age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief and sexual orientation. The consultation exercise has fed into the EIA and vice versa. The EIA is attached at Appendix 2.

16 Key Decision

16.1 Yes

17 Forward Plan Reference

17.1 PCS-36-11

17.2 A presentation was made to the Performance and Value for Money Scrutiny Group on November 8th 2011 and agreement reached regarding a role for the Group in monitoring the new leisure contract, when in place.

18 Background Papers

18.1 The following is a list of background papers on which this report is based in accordance with the requirements of Section 100(1) of the Local Government Act 1972. It does not include documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information as defined by the Act:

File Ref: 01
Name of File: Sports Solutions GB, Oldham Council Leisure review – Final report and appendices
Records held in EPS Directorate, Room 310, Civic Centre, Oldham
Officer Name: Angela Stewart
Contact No: 0161 770 4294

File Ref: 02
Name of File: Cabinet report August 22nd 2011 Progression of the review of the leisure estate and the re-procurement of the contract to manage leisure provision in Oldham
Records held in EPS Directorate, Room 310, Civic Centre, Oldham
Officer Name: Angela Stewart
Contact No: 0161 770 4294
File Ref: 03
Name of File: Cabinet report October 3rd 2011 Review of the Leisure Estate
Records held in EPS Directorate, Room 310, Civic Centre, Oldham
Officer Name: Angela Stewart
Contact No: 0161 770 4294
APPENDIX 1
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1. Background

1.1 This report describes the formal consultation exercise which was undertaken on the future configuration of public leisure provision in Oldham between September and November 2011 and provides an analysis of the feedback received. The proposals that were consulted upon were drawn up following an independent review of the leisure estate undertaken during winter/spring 2010/11.

The review’s function was to advise on the reconfiguration of the public leisure estate in Oldham, within the context of leisure provision across sectors, in order to reduce the revenue burden on the Council and improve the offer to the public.

1.2 The review of the leisure estate comprised:

- review of leisure centre condition surveys and quantification of work required to maintain/improve centres
- review of centres’ usage, income generation performance and potential and ability to make operating efficiencies
- review of current leisure operator’s performance and costs
- supply and demand analysis and benchmarking in terms of swimming pool space, Artificial Grass Pitches (AGPs), sports halls and gym stations which revealed an oversupply across the Borough of AGPs and sports halls
- leisure trend analysis
- consideration of how to maximise new facilities in BSF/Academy schools coming on stream and closing school sites to be marketed to achieve required capital receipts
- consideration of how to maximise new facilities for young people at MAHDLO coming on stream and provision in other sectors.
The Council’s Cabinet agreed a consultation option for the leisure estate in August and October 2011. The agreed consultation option comprised the following proposals:

### LEISURE ESTATE PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddleworth Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>Refurbish or replace with more efficient facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodwick Leisure Pool</td>
<td>Close and transfer users to Oldham Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP)</td>
<td>Close or consider transfer to Oldham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>Close and replace with new centre to serve Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>Close and replace with new centre to serve Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton and Crompton AGP (at Royton and Crompton School)</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadderton Health and Wellbeing Centre</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radclyffe Athletics Centre</td>
<td>Retain or consider transfer to Radclyffe school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failsworth Sports Centre</td>
<td>Retain. Consider transfer of sand-based AGP and tennis courts to Failsworth school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Road AGP</td>
<td>Consider transfer via open process of expressions of interest/submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL FACILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New pool and sports centre to serve Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
<td>New facility, managed by operator, location to be determined - Royton and Crompton School, Royton or Shaw Town Centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 The consultation took place between September 23rd and November 20th 2011. It was designed to allow service users, the wider public, key stakeholders and other interested parties to input their views on the proposals and to provide a range of mechanisms to encourage participation in the consultation process and ensure access to it. The key consultation messages were that the proposals would:

- Develop an exciting yet efficient leisure offering that delivers revenue and savings and offers excellent value for money to Council Taxpayers
- Ensure access for communities and organised groups in facilities that are run in accordance with residents' interests and needs
- Maximise community use of the excellent sports amenities in the new Academy and Building Schools for the Future (BSF) facilities
- Encourage participation for all citizens in leisure and activities that improve health and wellbeing
- Contribute to the regeneration of Oldham and Royton town centres.

1.5 Following feedback during the consultation, a change was made to the consultation option for the replacement leisure facility for Royton and Shaw/Crompton. It was agreed to consider sites in Shaw for the facility as well sites in Royton Town Centre and Royton and Crompton school.

1.6 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was undertaken in conjunction with the consultation exercise. An Equality Impact Assessment has assessed the impact of the proposals people with low incomes and people with the eight protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010, namely age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief and sexual orientation. The consultation has targeted these groups so that their views have been captured as part of the feedback and has also captured key EIA mitigation measures as identified by the groups themselves.
2. Methodology

2.1 The consultation programme was developed in conjunction with the Council’s Communications and Marketing team. A Communications Plan was developed which comprised a variety of consultation methods tailored to a range of identified stakeholders.

2.2 The key stakeholder groups and the approach to their engagement is summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>A detailed briefing on the leisure review, the consultation option and the approach to consultation was issued via email to all Councillors on 23rd September 2011. An offer was made to present the consultation option and the approach to consultation to individual political Group meetings. A further offer was made to brief individual or groups of Councillors on proposals for their Wards/areas. A verbal briefing with supporting papers was provided to the opposition Cabinet Member for Leisure. Presentations were given at each of the Borough’s six District Partnerships and to PACT meetings in Royton and Crompton describing the borough wide offer and the proposals by district/area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents and service users</td>
<td>We split residents into two key groups; non-users or casual users of current sports and leisure facilities and known regular users. Residents had the opportunity to comment on the consultation option either online, via the feedback form on the consultation leaflet or by letter. The invitation to comment was advertised on the Council website’s front page and was signposted using press releases and regular social media updates. Posters and leaflets in current facilities were also used to signpost to the consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual or non-users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular users (including schools and clubs)</td>
<td>We used OCLL’s database of ‘block bookings’ ie organised groups to contact current users who may be affected by the proposed changes (including schools, local sports groups eg swimming clubs, disabled user groups. These user groups were invited to Focus group meetings at the facilities proposed for major change where they received a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
briefing around the proposals and the opportunity to feedback on those proposals. School swimming users were engaged with via the Council’s School Swimming Manager.

The Council’s request to OCLL to make available their full membership database in order for a membership consultation mailshot to be undertaken was not agreed by OCLL on data protection grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Partners</th>
<th>The District Partnership meetings referred to above are attended by key partner organisations such as the Health service and the Police. In addition a letter was sent to other partners eg. the PCT, Oldham 6th form College, Oldham College, Positive Steps, inviting views. A letter was sent to Parish Councils in Saddleworth and Shaw and Crompton inviting their views.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport England/the Amateur Swimming Association</td>
<td>Discussions are being held with Sport England and the Amateur Swimming Association to discuss the detailed proposals and to gain their views on the overall strategy and offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary/community sector groups</td>
<td>A letter was sent to key Voluntary/community sector groups inviting views eg. Fatima Women’s Association, Oldham carers, Groundwork Representatives of BME communities eg Pakistani Community Association and Fatima Women’s group assisted the Council by encouraging their members to attend focus groups and drop-in’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (OCLL)</td>
<td>Direct communication and consultation with staff was identified as the responsibility of the OCLL management team following agreement with the Council on key messages to be disseminated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **The Consultation methods**

A range of methods were used to engage with the key stakeholder groups identified above.

3.1 **Press coverage**

The consultation was launched via a press release on 23rd September 2011 informing the public of the consultation exercise, forward for consultation option.

A feature article in the Oldham Chronicle on the leisure consultation fronted by the Leader of Oldham Council appeared on 16 November 2011.

3.2 **Website**

A dedicated web page was established on the Council’s web site at [www.oldham.gov.uk/future_oldham_leisure](http://www.oldham.gov.uk/future_oldham_leisure). A link was provided from the Oldham Council home page and invited people to feedback comments and views. A series of background documents and Frequently Asked Questions were posted on the web page.

3.3 **Presentations to District Partnerships/PACT meetings**

Presentations were given at each District Partnership describing the borough wide offer and the current and future offer by district as follows:

- Royton, Shaw and Crompton – 3 October 2011
- Chadderton – 15 November 2011
- East Oldham – 21 November 2011
- Failsworth and Hollinwood – 23 November 2011
- West Oldham 24 November 2011
- Saddleworth and Lees – 1 December 2011

A Special Royton, Shaw and Crompton PACT meeting was held on 26th October which acted as a public meeting to discuss the proposals for that area. Discussion and public questions also took place at the Royton, Shaw and Crompton PACT meeting on 15 November 2011.
3.4 Leaflets

5,000 Leaflets were initially distributed to all OCLL facilities and Council buildings throughout Oldham. Due to demand, a further 3,000 leaflets were printed and made available. The leaflets outlined the main proposals of the leisure review and provided details of how to feedback views and comments either by completing a section on the back of the leaflet or by directing people to the email address or to write in with their feedback. The leaflet also explained where further information on the proposals could be found on the Council's website.

3.5 Posters

100 A3 posters were printed and put in all OCLL facilities and Council buildings across the borough. These directed people to the Future Leisure website to find out more information and to provide feedback.

3.6 Letters and meetings with key partners

Letters were sent to key partners eg. Primary Care Trust (PCT), Oldham College, Oldham 6th Form, Positive Steps seeking their views on the proposals. Oldham’s two Parish Councils were also requested to provide feedback.

Meetings were held with Sport England during the consultation period as part of the ongoing dialogue the Council has with them. Meetings held in September and November 2011 discussed the proposed facility closures and replacement schemes and their potential impact on local residents. Consultation with the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) has also been undertaken to support the review of swimming pool provision. The ASA is providing advice and views on both the proposed closures and replacement facilities.

A presentation regarding the proposals was given at the OCL Board annual general meeting on 27th September 2011 and progress was reported regularly at monthly keeping touch meetings between the OCL Chief Executive and the project sponsor, the Council's Assistant Executive Director for Strategic Commissioning.
3.7 Focus Groups/Drop-in’s

A number of Focus group sessions were organised for specific users of the sports centres proposed for major change. Individual letters of invitation were sent to specific user groups to invite them to participate. The invitees were identified through the OCLL database and included a mix of user groups eg. Swimming clubs, bowlers, martial arts, divers, over 50’s, women only groups, BME groups, disability groups etc. The Focus groups were facilitated by the project sponsor, the Council’s Assistant Executive Director for Strategic Commissioning and leisure project team members. Attendance at the Focus groups was by invitation only, in order to engage in detail regarding the groups’ views and requirements moving forward. Each Focus group started with a brief introduction to the overall proposals and the proposals put forward for specific centres. Attendees gave feedback and raised a range of issues that will inform the work of the project team in terms of design and programming of facilities and the requirements of user groups, including those with clients from equality groups.

3.7.1 Oldham Sports Centre Focus Group

Due to the large number of user groups at Oldham Sports Centre, two Focus groups were arranged at the Centre on 20th October. One was held during the day and the other in the evening. The user groups invited to the Focus groups represented a wide cross section of centre users. The groups present at the Oldham Sports Centre Focus group represented Age Concern, Scouts Group, ATS Swimming, Mend Project, Climbing Wall, Oldham Sub Aqua, Oldham Carers, Oldham Metro Swimming Association, Forum4Age, Oldham Indoor Bowling League, Oldham Vets Bowling, Boxercise/Karate and the Diving Club.

3.7.2 Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and Royton Sports Centre Focus Group

Due to the limited number of identified regular user groups at Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and Royton Sports Centres, it was decided to hold a joint Focus group at Royton and Crompton School, midway between the two facilities. The meeting was held on Tuesday 18th October 7.00pm – 8.30pm. Groups represented at the session included the local Scouts group, Crompton Classics Swimming Club, Shaw and District Disabled Association and Royton Water Polo / Swimming Club.
3.7.3 Glodwick Leisure pool Focus Group

The Glodwick Focus group was held at a venue nearby as the centre was too small to accommodate the meeting. Invites were sent to regular users of the centre and also to various BME community groups in the area as the centre is situated in a predominantly Asian area of Oldham. The meeting was held on Tuesday 25th October 7.00pm – 8.30pm. The session was attended by representatives from OSCA Swimming Group and from the NHS Disability sessions.

3.7.4 Glodwick leisure pool - Drop in session

Following the Glodwick Focus Group session further consultation took place via a drop-in at the centre with BME women as this group of people had been under-represented in the consultation undertaken to date. A Drop in session was held at Glodwick leisure pool on Tuesday 8th November 11.00am – 2.30pm in order to engage with users of the women only sessions in the pool and gym. Two translators was present at the Drop in session to assist with the gathering of feedback and responses.

3.7.5 A meeting was held with the primary user of Breeze Hill swimming pool on 26th September 2011 to discuss future options for the transfer of their uses.

3.8 Other initiatives

3.8.1 Petitions

Two petitions from user groups of the bowling hall at Oldham Sports Centre were received, acknowledged and analysed.

An initial petition of 254 signatures was received on 17th October. Analysis of signatories revealed that 60.4% were Oldham residents and 39.6% were residents of adjoining Boroughs.

A further 652 signature petition received on 18th November 2011. Due to the fact that it contained over 500 signatures this petition was due to be presented to Oldham Council's meeting on 14th December 2011. Analysis of respondents revealed that 5.4% of signatories had signed the earlier petition and 67.3% were Oldham residents while 32.7% were residents of adjoining Boroughs.
3.8.2 Political party involvement

The Liberal Democrat party in Oldham circulated material on the proposed closure of Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre which included the Council leaflet feedback form within it. These feedback forms were logged separately but analysed in the same way as feedback received on Council leaflets.

3.8.3 Girl Guide Letter campaign

The Shaw District Girl Guiding Association submitted individual letters from their members and these were analysed in the same way as the Council's feedback forms.
4. Administration and evaluation of consultation responses

The consultation was open to all residents regardless of which or whether they use public leisure facilities in the Borough and each response has been treated equally.

During the consultation the Council worked with OCL to maximise access to Council consultation materials and to avoid confusion among service users regarding the status of the consultation proposals and the origin of consultation materials.

Due to the volume of responses robust administrative arrangements were established to log and evaluate responses. All comments/feedback received were logged to include the nature of the feedback. All email respondents received an acknowledgment of their response but due to the volume of responses no detailed replies were made to individual responses. Respondents by letter did not receive an acknowledgment due to the volume of responses.

Notes were taken of all Focus groups and meetings held and are held in the Project Office. On request these were circulated to Focus group/meeting participants.

Feedback responses were logged daily and a weekly evaluation was undertaken of:

- Emails received to dedicated future leisure email address
- Letters received to dedicated postal address
- Completed leaflet feedback forms
- Newspaper coverage
- Petitions/other representations.

This information was summarised in a weekly report to the Project Manager and Cabinet Member.

All responses/feedback have been evaluated and summarised within this report. Feedback has been categorised according to consultation method and specific proposals. The quantitative analysis in the report relates to the individual responses. The Summary of key feedback and Conclusion within the report relate to all feedback.
5. Consultation findings

5.1 Summary by consultation method

5.1.1 Future leisure inbox

A total of 231 responses were received into the Future Leisure email address. The breakdown by facility shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General feedback</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodwick Leisure pool</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radclyffe running track</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Road pitch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 Council leaflet feedback forms

A total of 704 responses were received on the Council's leaflets feedback forms. They breakdown as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General feedback</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodwick Leisure pool</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failsworth Sports Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Road pitch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's Park pitch and putt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radclyffe running track</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.3 Letters to Oldham Council

A total of 27 letters were received relating to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radclyffe running track</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4 Letters to the Oldham Evening Chronicle

There were 29 letters to the editor in the Oldham Evening Chronicle regarding the Leisure consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre and Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre and Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton and Crompton School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.5 Political leaflet feedback

There were 91 forms received on “Save Crompton Pool” leaflets produced by Shaw and Crompton Liberal Democrats. All feedback related to Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre.

5.1.6 Girls Guide forms

There were 31 “Girl Guide” forms received. All feedback related to Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre.
5.1.7 Meetings held

Five Focus group / Drop-in sessions were held and seven District Partnership and PACT meetings were attended.

5.1.8 Councillor / Parish Council feedback

A number of Individual councillors provided feedback along with Shaw and Crompton Parish Council.

5.1.9 Responses from organisations

Statutory organisations - Responses were received from a number of schools, Oldham PCT and Oldham Council Additional & Complex Needs service

Sports Organisations - Responses were received from Sport England, Amateur Swimming Association and Oldham Community Leisure

Local Clubs - Responses were received from Crompton Classics Amateur Swimming Club, Royton Amateur Swimming Club and Water Polo Club and Saddleworth Swimming Club, Oldham Veterans Bowling, Oldham indoor bowls league, Oldham Ladies Hockey Club, Hollinwood Football Club, Saddleworth Su Aqua Club, Oldham and Royton Harriers and Athletics Club

Voluntary / community organisations - Responses were received from Shaw and District Disabled Association and Forum4Age.

5.2 Summary of individual responses

A total number of 8,000 Council leaflets with feedback forms were distributed. 704 were returned which equates to an 8.8% return. However, further individual feedback was received in the form of letters / emails / other feedback forms resulting in the total of 1084 individual responses / feedback forms. A breakdown of the responses by facility and number is given in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General feedback</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodwick Leisure Pool</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failsworth Sports Centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Road Artificial Grass Pitch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radclyffe running track</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops Park pitch and putt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESPONSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1084</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Detailed findings / key issues raised

This section summarises the detailed findings of the feedback from:

- Individuals
- Focus Groups
- District Partnership /PACT meetings
- Stakeholder organisations
- Councillors / Parish Council.
5.3.1 Individual feedback

5.3.1.1 General feedback

Analysis of feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep existing pools open / refurbish existing pools</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build new facilities in local areas / replace existing pools</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits associated with exercise</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not close existing pools until new ones are open</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues around transport / travel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money concerns</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement around new contract</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need hockey pitches in Oldham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71 individuals or 6.5% of the overall individual responses related to the proposals in general. The following analysis is of these 71 responses.

34 individuals or 47.89% of respondents felt that the existing pools should be kept open or refurbished.

9 individuals or 12.68% of the respondents felt that the existing local pools should be replaced by new facilities in the same local areas.

7 individuals or 9.86% of people also felt that existing facilities should not be closed until new facilities were up and running.

7 individuals or 9.86% had concerns relating to the costs of the proposals in the current economic climate.

The following table provides representative examples of the comments made by individual respondents.
General

“The closure of the facilities outlined in the proposals will of course be viewed as a loss to some local residents, but a prioritising and reassessment is long overdue. This is a sensible step forward”

“Whilst there is clearly budgetary challenge, this is also an opportunity to develop top class local sporting facilities, which if done well could be of great economic benefit to the borough”.

“In these times of rising obesity levels especially in young children, rising diabetes, heart disease and strokes especially in the local area, it is inconceivable that any council would be considering taking away one of the ONLY forms of year round exercise that is available to local people”

“I note the report suggests a low number of pools in comparison to neighbouring areas and m2 per population in Greater Manchester it does seem wrong to be having a net change of minus one, especially when swimming is identified as the top participation sport and that the pools are the most used at peak times in Greater Manchester!”

“I would support local provision in each town and suggest that with modern facilities people would be more likely to use these”

“The community use of school sports facilities is a good idea. The location of community facilities on school sites is not. There are several reasons for this. First this denies access to these facilities to the public during school times. Second the sites are not conveniently located at the centre of their communities for convenient access”

“This present, so called "leisure policy" is too myopic and is in direct opposition to the Cooperative Policy promoted by the present Council and in particular it's leader”
5.3.1.2 Oldham Sports Centre

Proposal: Refurbish or replace existing facility with a more efficient facility in Oldham Town Centre

Analysis of feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree with proposals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against replacing with new facility</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the bowling hall</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues around elderly using facility / social aspects</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits associated with exercise</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues around displacement if facility is refurbished / rebuilt. Don’t close centre until new one is open</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money concerns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep squash facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep line dancing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep diving facility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close both Royton &amp; Crompton centres and invest in Oldham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

106 individuals or 9.8% of the overall individual responses received related to Oldham Sports Centre. The following analysis is of these 106 responses.

35 individuals or 33.02% of respondents were in favour of the proposal, but 14 individuals or 13.21% were against replacing the current facility with a new facility.

The majority of feedback relating to Oldham Sports Centre referred to the Bowling Hall. 63 individuals or 59.43% of the feedback received asked for the Bowling Hall to be retained and 45 individuals or 42.45% of respondents mentioned the social / health benefits that the Sports Centre / the bowling hall had for the elderly.

A further 14 individuals or 13.21% of respondents highlighted the health benefits of exercising for all ages of people.

The following table provides representative examples of the comments made by individual respondents.
"Oldham has been opened for a long time and obviously needs a total refurbishment or new facility."

"I use the centre weekly and feel that a refurbishment is preferred to a replacement. I feel that a 'new build' would probably not be as spacious"

"Excellent facility ideally sited. Pool and changing areas need updating but large sports hall, gym, pool and all other facilities are an asset to all. Large numbers of over 55's remain fit and healthy as a result of being active here"

"Next to the main bus station. Only one bus required. Town Centre - Gym and shopping !"

"I hope somebody remembers that the bowling facility at Oldham is the only one available for about 12 miles radius around Oldham, and is very well used"

“The Government and Health Officials are forever encouraging the older person to 'keep exercising and keep healthy' and bowling is an excellent healthy exercise”.
5.3.1.3 Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre

Proposal: Close and replace with a new centre at Royton and Crompton school or in Royton Town Centre.

NB: Sites in Shaw added to above sites for consideration during consultation.

Analysis of feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For (F) proposal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against (A) proposal</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre open / refurbish existing pool</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues around travel / transport to facility outside Shaw including parking / cost</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern all users of both pools would not fit into single replacement pool</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need local pool in walking distance</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues around health and exercise and diversionary activities for young people</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build new facility in Shaw</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money concerns</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to facility at Royton and Crompton School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful public toilet facility</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep pool open until new one is open</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes to facility at Royton and Crompton School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for private company to lease pool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
778 individuals or 71.8% of the overall individual responses received related to Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre. The following analysis is of these 778 responses.

715 individuals or 91.9% of the total responses received relating to Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre, were against its closure and replacement by a facility in Royton.

387 individuals or 49.74% felt that the current pool should be kept open / refurbished and 78 individuals or 10.03% stated that a new facility should be built in Shaw.

129 individuals or 16.58% of the responses felt that Shaw needed a local community pool within walking distance.

25 individuals or 3.21% of respondents stated that they didn't want a facility at Royton and Crompton School citing reasons of transport access, car parking and safeguarding of children.

179 individuals or 23.01% of respondents commented on issues around travel and transport if a new shared facility was built outside Shaw. Concerns around cost of travel, time taken, parking etc. were the main issues.

138 individuals or 17.74% of respondents were concerned about a new shared facility being able to accommodate all the current users of the 2 pools eg. public, schools, swimming clubs.

There were a number of comments relating to the health benefits of exercise and how this would reduce if the facility was taken away from Shaw centre. 111 individuals or 14.27% of the respondents felt that the centre plays an integral part in people’s health reducing the need on other services eg. health services and that it also provided productive, diversionary activities for the town’s young people.

16 individuals or 2.06% of the responses viewed positively the fact that the centre provides the only public toilet facility in Shaw.

61 individuals or 7.84% of people had concerns associated with the costs involved in building a new facility and about how their council tax was being spent.

The following table provides representative examples of the comments made by individual respondents.
Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre

"Crompton pool has been here for over 100 years. Its part of the community and is well used. Shutting the pool down would be a sad loss for all of Shaw and have an impact on younger generations"

"Do not close Crompton pool. It means something to the people of Shaw, especially the people who don't drive and can't get anywhere else"

"If Crompton pool closed I will be devastated. I will have to travel to another pool in Oldham which would cost too much and take too much time. I don't think I would bother".

“The loss of a swimming pool in either Royton or Shaw would be highly regrettable. If this is the only option our concern is for people who are reliant on public transport to reach a pool. Public transport between Shaw and Royton is infrequent and the loss of a pool in either location is likely to result in many people who are dependent on buses no longer going swimming”

“Both pools in Shaw and Royton must remain open; Oldham Council does not have the money to spend on a new combined pool, leave things as they are until we are better placed, financially, to replace them both”

“The current facilities in both Shaw and Royton are in dire need of attention. It may be more financially sound in the long run to build a new facility, however, this needs to be done with adequate thought and consideration to both the communities and the swimming clubs who currently use the two pools involved.”
5.3.1.4 Royton Sports Centre

Proposal: Close and replace with a new centre at Royton and Crompton school or in Royton Town Centre

Analysis of feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For (F) proposal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against (A) proposal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to facility at Royton and Crompton School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern all users of both pools would not fit into single replacement pool</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues around travel / transport to facility outside Royton inc parking / cost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t close pool until new one is open</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish existing Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a site in Shaw is to be considered then arguments for Shaw will apply to Royton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 19 individuals or 1.7% of the overall individual responses received related to Royton Sports Centre. The following analysis is of these 19 responses.

There were concerns that following consultation, if a new proposal was to replace Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and Royton Sports Centre with a new shared facility in Shaw, the current objections and concerns by the Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre users would be made by the users of Royton Sports Centre.

13 individuals or 68.42% of the respondents were in favour of the proposal. Royton Town Centre was seen as the preferred location. 12 individuals or 63.16% did not want the replacement facility at Royton and Crompton School.

12 individuals or 63.16% of the respondents had concerns about a shared facility being able to accommodate all of the current users of both Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and Royton Sports Centre.

3 individuals or 15.79% expressed a preference that the current facility is kept open until the new facility was available.

The following table provides representative examples of the comments made by individual respondents.
"Better more modern facilities would be a definite advantage"

"A new facility covering Royton and Shaw would be the best. But it does need to be central as if it was placed near the school people will not use it as much. Also please, please, plenty of off street parking"

"Location in Royton town centre is essential as it must attract existing customers and enhance what can only be described as a dated town centre. It needs inward investment and a new sports facility would provide an essential boost! Locating this at Royton and Crompton School offers no such benefits for longer term development of Royton town"

"Any facilities must be easily accessible to both communities which should not include the use of cars by majority. Walking combined with swimming is very healthy"

"The swimming baths in Royton are badly in need of renovation but are still well used and we definitely need this facility to remain open until a new place is up and running"

"There is concern that if it goes to Royton and Crompton school then the time allowed for the general public to swim will be greatly reduced."
5.3.1.5 Glodwick Leisure pool

Proposal: Close or consider transfer to a community partner

Analysis of feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against the proposal</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beached access, shallow water, quieter atmosphere</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are valued and mean disabled/sick, elderly, young and learners able to use pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need local community pool in walking distance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool suitable for children / youth in Glodwick</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME women value women only sessions in pool and gym</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits associated with exercise</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to transfer to local community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish existing Glodwick Leisure pool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows integration of cultures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98 individuals or 9% of the overall individual responses received related to Glodwick Leisure pool. The following analysis is of these 98 responses.

74 individuals or 75.51% of respondents were against Glodwick Leisure Pool closing.

It was felt by 36 individuals or 36.73% of respondents felt that Glodwick Leisure Pool was the only facility in the borough suitable for disabled and elderly people due to the beached access to the pool and appropriate changing facilities. 25 individuals or 25.51% also felt that the pool benefited children/learner swimmers as the shallow water and pool entrance provided a safe environment and enabled their confidence to grow.

7 individuals or 7.14% of the respondents felt that the centre was the only facility in the Borough suitable for black and minority ethnic (BME) women as it provided them with discreet women only sessions. It was felt that if the was closed then there would be nowhere else in Oldham to go and this group of women would cease to take part in physical activity.
Respondents’ views on the pool’s place in the community varied. 28 individuals or 28.57% of the respondents stated that they needed a local community facility within walking distance of their homes. 2 individuals or 2% felt it was a place where residents from different backgrounds mixed successfully. 3 individuals or 3.06% didn’t want the facility to be transferred to the local community as they felt that it might become less mixed.

The following table provides representative examples of the comments made by individual respondents.

**Glodwick Leisure Pool**

“Being a female Muslim, I find the Glodwick centre discreet and more appropriate for females to access. No other centre offers what Glodwick pool does so it doesn’t make sense to take the centre away from the community as it stands. Many of the public centres in Glodwick are run and dominated by the male members of the community, the Glodwick pool is the only centre that women feel at ease to access, enjoy and exercise”

“Being in a predominantly Asian area of Oldham what better way of encouraging the mixing of cultures by joining in with our leisure time”

“It is the only pool with a sloped ramp access for wheelchair users”
5.4 Feedback from Focus groups /drop-in

5.4.1 Users of Oldham Sports Centre

The key issues raised during the Focus group session can be summarised as follows:

- Consider retention of the bowling hall in new/refurbished facility due to health and social benefits it brings to participants
- Guarantee space to existing users of OSC in new/refurbished facility
- Re-locate existing climbing wall to new/ refurbished facility
- Retain deep water pool for sub aqua/diving activity
- Have moveable floor if affordable
- Explore all external funding opportunities
- Consider transport and access issues, especially for elderly and disabled
- Ensure health improvement programme part of new operating contract
- Involve user groups eg swimming clubs in design and programming of new/ refurbished facility

5.4.2 Users of Royton Sports Centre and Crompton Pool and Fitness centre

The key issues raised during the Focus group session can be summarised as follows:

- Retain local facilities
- Consider locations in Shaw as well as Royton Town Centre and Royton and Crompton school for the replacement facility
- Time closures/bring new facility on stream to avoid loss of service
- Ensure needs of groups of disabled swimmers are met and latest innovation in pool access
- Ensure needs of swimming clubs are met
- Solution has to be shown to accommodate users from two pools into one pool
- Concerns re costs/ease of travelling individually or as groups if not two local facilities
- Involve user groups in design and programming of new facility
- Concerns regarding access, car parking, safety of children at Royton and Crompton school
**5.4.3 Users of Glodwick leisure pool**

The key issues raised during the Focus group session can be summarised as follows:

- Retain beached access, shallow water, less noisy/ more intimate atmosphere
- Retain women only sessions in pool and gym
- Retain exclusive use of pool by vulnerable client groups eg autistic, physically disabled people
- Provide changing rooms that support use by vulnerable client groups
- Consider transport and access issues, especially for BME women and vulnerable client groups
- Retain opportunity to integrate disabled users with non disabled users.
- Glodwick users do use Oldham Sports Centre and want to use it more
- Glodwick users travel to out of Borough leisure facilities

**5.5 Feedback from District Partnership/PACT meetings**

**5.5.1 Royton, Shaw, Crompton DP/Special PACT and Shaw and Crompton PACT**

Key issues raised during the meetings were as follows:

- Retain local facilities
- Consider locations in Shaw as well as Royton Town Centre and Royton and Crompton school for the replacement facility
- If single facility must be accessible for Shaw, Crompton and Royton
- Time closures/bring new facility on stream to avoid loss of service
- Concerns regarding access, car parking, safety of children at Royton and Crompton school and impact on adjacent residents
- Solution has to be shown to accommodate users from two pools into one pool, including schools, clubs and individuals
- Concerns re costs/ease of travelling individually or as groups if not two local facilities
5.5.2 East Oldham DP

Key issues raised during the meeting were as follows:

- East Oldham is among most deprived areas of Oldham, has few leisure facilities and will end up with less still
- Glodwick meets needs of local community and groups of users
- Concern re potential effect on competitive swimming with the reduction of the number of swimming pools overall
- Maximise number of existing facilities retained at Oldham Sports Centre
- Monitor future usage among equality groups

5.5.3 West Oldham DP

Key issues raised during the meeting were as follows:

- West Oldham does not have large number of leisure facilities but support leisure review as a whole
- Secure future and community access to former Grange school pitch
- Maximise number of existing facilities retained at Oldham Sports Centre, subject to affordability
- Ensure schools open their doors to the community and reduce competition between schools and with leisure operator

5.5.4 Chadderton DP

Key issues raised during the meeting were as follows:

- Find ways other than increased charges to increase income achieved at Chadderton
- Consider needs of running clubs who use Radclyffe running track
5.5.5 Failsworth DP

Key issues raised during the meeting were as follows:

- Facilities at Failsworth Sports Centre will become the oldest in the Borough if the proposals are implemented and a strategy for the centre’s modernisation during the contract’s lifetime will be essential
- The Council’s leisure offer needs to be set within context of overall provision in Oldham
- Each District Partnership areas can only expect to have one council provided leisure facility
- Need to link to health service and join provision up to deliver improved health and wellbeing outcomes

5.5.6 Saddleworth and Lees DP

Key issues raised during the meeting were as follows:

- Saddleworth does not have very many leisure facilities
- Capacity to increase income further may be limited as pool understood to be at capacity or thereabouts
- Ensure objectives around community access and health and well being as well as efficiency and value for money inform the procurement
- Ensure access for community use of sports facilities is negotiated with schools/Academies
- Consider heritage value of older leisure buildings.

5.6 Written feedback from stakeholder organisations

5.6.1 Statutory organisations

Key issues from statutory organisations can be summarised as follows:

**The Radclyffe School**
- Commitment to discuss further management arrangements for running track

**Failsworth School**
- Expressing interest in management of wider leisure facilities on site

**St Margaret’s Primary School**
- Requesting continued use of Chapel Rd facilities

**Glodwick Infant and Nursery school**
- Supporting continuation of Glodwick Leisure Pool as local facility for school children and families
Oldham PCT
- Supporting family oriented and culturally sensitive provision
- Promote healthy food in cafes/vending machines
- Work with partners to promote usage and deliver health outcomes

Oldham Council Additional and Complex Needs service
- Ensure needs of physically disabled swimmers fully met.
- Newbridge school pool is an example of excellent provision

5.6.2 Sports organisations

Key issues from sports organisations can be summarised as follows:

Sport England
- SE advocates Councils consider benefits of rationalising aging pool stock and re-investing in more efficient, fit for purpose centres
- Recommend further detailed planning work

Amateur Swimming Association
- Concerns re overall pool space in the Borough
- Offering dialogue on overall pool space in Borough, future configuration and management models

Oldham Community Leisure Ltd
- Advocates re-negotiating the OCL contract
- Contends that the best way to meet wider, engagement /health related objectives is via continued contract with OCL
- Expresses interest in tendering for facilities that may be transferred
- Negative comments on consultation and procurement processes

Crompton Classics Amateur Swimming Club
Royton Amateur Swimming and Water Polo Club
Saddleworth Amateur Swimming Club
- Provide new facility before closing existing ones
- Consider sites in Shaw for replacement facility for Shaw/Crompton and Royton
- Programming issues if two pools merged into one
- Transport/car parking issues
- Desire to input to detailed design of new pool
- Learn lessons from previous leisure projects eg Chadderton, Saddleworth
Oldham Veterans Bowling
Oldham Indoor Bowls League
- Seeking continuation of bowling hall in Oldham Sports Centre
- Point out health and social benefits activity brings to participants and wider benefits to Oldham of visitor spend

Oldham Ladies Hockey Club
Hollinwood Football Club
Saddleworth Sub Aqua Club
Oldham and Royton Harriers and Athletics Club
- Seeking continued use of leisure facilities and involvement in future discussions regarding their requirements

5.6.3 Voluntary/community organisations

Shaw and District Disabled Association
Forum4Age

Key issues from the voluntary/community organisations named above can be summarised as follows:

- Ensure needs of older people and disabled people met
- Keep facilities as local as possible
- Consider sites in Shaw for replacement facility for Shaw, Crompton and Royton

5.7 Councillors/Parish Council

The following councillors and Shaw and Crompton Parish Council submitted responses to the consultation:

Shaw and Crompton Parish Council
Cllr Chris Stevens - Shaw and Crompton Parish Council
Cllr Susan Eckersley - Shaw and Crompton Parish Council
Cllr David Murphy
Cllr John Hall
Cllr Howard Sykes
Cllr Ann Wingate
Cllr Philomena Dillon
Cllr John Dillon
Key issues submitted by the above can be summarised as follows:

- Opposed to closure of Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre
- Retain local facility that residents can access easily
- Consider sites in Shaw for replacement facility for Shaw/Crompton and Royton
- Provide new facility before closing existing ones
- Transport access/cost concerns if centre not in Shaw
- Programming issues if two pools merged into one
- Knock on effects of closure for Shaw Town centre
- Traffic /parking issues if replacement facility at Royton and Crompton school
6. Summary of key feedback

6.1 General

Respondents recognised that existing pools are tired and in need of replacement or refurbishment but do not wish to see their local provision or access to facilities taken away or reduced. The upgrade of leisure facilities is welcomed but some respondents felt that if new facilities are built they should be built locally to replace existing local pools and maintain local access. Facilities need to be evenly spread around the Borough. East Oldham was identified as the area with the fewest available public leisure facilities. The need to maintain investment and focus on existing facilities in Failsworth, Chadderton and Saddleworth was also stressed, with a strategy for the upgrade of Failsworth Sports Centre within the operating contract viewed as essential. Ensuring new facilities are open before closing the existing ones was a key concern for a number of respondents.

The issue of the impact of the proposals on the overall level of pool space within the Borough was raised by organisational and individual respondents. Oldham has a small deficit in water space and ongoing work is required to balance supply and demand.

Many respondents were concerned about their continued use of facilities if fewer pools and new management arrangements were in place. Several sports organisations and disability groups expressed a desire to be involved in the detailed design of new/refurbished pools and discussions around future requirements, usage and programming.

Community access to sports facilities at schools / Academies was seen as essential and competition between schools and the leisure operator should be reduced.

The feedback received on potential transfers from the future leisure operating contract stressed the need to protect the access to facilities of existing users eg sports clubs, primary schools under any new arrangements.

Feedback highlighted the health benefits exercise brings and how this might reduce if centres were closed and people had difficulty accessing a new facility. If people exercise less their health could potentially suffer and put extra pressure on health services.

A number of concerns were raised around the cost of new centres and value for money and whether the Council can afford new facilities in the current economic climate.
6.2 Oldham Sports Centre

Respondents supported a refurbished or new Town Centre hub leisure facility. The current centre is seen as spacious, ideally sited and accessible by public transport but in clear need of refurbishment and upgrade. The current location and wide ranging provision is also felt to be beneficial to the economy of the Town Centre. The current centre has a Borough wide catchment and existing users are keen to maintain their usage of the facility. Others wished to see its usage eg by BME population increased. A mixed view emerged of whether a refurbished or new facility was preferable with support expressed for both options but more support voiced for refurbishment.

The majority of feedback relating to Oldham Sports Centre was submitted by the bowling hall users. Bowling is highlighted as an important activity which benefits elderly, disabled and recovering sick people in terms of health and exercise and also in terms of social interaction. It was stressed that the bowling facility at Oldham Sports Centre is the only facility within a ten mile radius and therefore attracts users from a wide geographical area. Respondents requested that if a new facility is built it includes a bowling hall.

A smaller proportion of respondents highlighted the need to maintain other activities including the diving and squash facilities, the climbing wall and line dancing.

6.3 Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre

The majority of respondents in relation to Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre were against the proposal to close the centre and replace it with a new shared facility at Royton and Crompton School or in Royton Town Centre. A large number of respondents felt that the current facility is in poor shape and in need of renewal but that if this isn’t possible then sites in Shaw should be considered alongside sites in Royton for the replacement facility, which should be accessible to residents in Shaw, Royton and Crompton. A recurring theme was that Shaw is continuously having public provision removed and receives reduced value for money for their council tax.

Many respondents characterised Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre as “the heart of the local community” and a place where young and old exercise and mix socially. Respondents feel that the facility provides the youth of the area with an outlet to participate in healthy activities and keep them “off the streets”.

There were a number of concerns that if the facility was removed from Shaw Town Centre that children who currently walked to the facility unaccompanied wouldn’t be able to continue to attend a centre out of town due to the distance they would have to travel and the cost and time involved. This could result in the children stopping swimming and potentially result in an increase in anti social behaviour.

Key issues with a facility outside Shaw were transport and travel. Many thought it would be too costly to travel further and that they would have to stop exercising. Others thought that the bus service was too infrequent, too costly and difficult for many elderly people with mobility issues. It was also felt that the time taken to travel to a centre outside Shaw would mean that people with limited time would be squeezed out. Parking was also seen as an issue as it was felt Royton had limited parking. Environmental concerns were also raised with potentially more cars on the roads to travel to a facility out of Shaw.

Respondents questioned how the number of users who currently use both facilities including schools, swimming clubs, other groups and casual swimmers could all be accommodated in one pool and still have the same amount of pool time as they currently have.

6.4 Royton Sports Centre

The majority of respondents commenting on Royton Sports Centre were in favour of closing the existing facility which they regard as sub standard, building a new facility in Royton Town Centre and thereby contributing to the updating and vibrancy of the Town Centre. Respondents were keen that the current facility should not be closed until the new one was available. Some reservations were expressed about the location of the new facility at Royton and Crompton school. Concerns highlighted were segregation of leisure centre users and school pupils, safeguarding of pupils, community access to the facility during the school day and access and car parking. There were also concerns about whether the change in a school’s legal status could potentially lead to a change in the use/access to a facility.

Users also highlighted the same concerns as the Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre users around programming all the users of the current two facilities into a single pool and whether all users could be accommodated.

It was also highlighted that if the proposals changed and a proposal to build a shared facility in Shaw was envisaged then the same arguments currently being put forward by the Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre users would apply to Royton Sports Centre users.
6.5 Glodwick Leisure Pool

The majority of respondents were against Glodwick Leisure Pool closing. Individual feedback centred on the fact that the pool is considered the only pool in Oldham suitable for disabled users because of the sloped / beach entrance which makes wheelchair access possible. It was also felt that the noise levels were lower than other pools and more comfortable for users with certain disabilities/conditions. It is also the case that organised group users of Glodwick have a Borough wide catchment and groups and individuals use other pools in the Oldham Town Centre and outside the Borough.

Many users felt that the pool was the most suitable pool in Oldham for young children or other learner swimmers as the sloped entrance and shallow water help them gain confidence and provide a safe environment.

The women only sessions were seen as very important to the BME women users and the small pool provided the privacy they require.

A large proportion of the respondents felt that it was important to have a local facility within walking distance and that it was beneficial for the youth of the area.

Feedback also highlighted that the pool enabled the integration of cultures and of disabled people with able bodied people within a safe and friendly environment.
7. **Conclusion**

A wide ranging and multi-faceted consultation exercise was undertaken and reached all the stakeholders/audiences identified within the Communications and Engagement Plan which drove the consultation. The exercise enabled the Council to gather key feedback and a clear understanding of the impact of the proposals on equality groups and informed the Equality Impact Assessment.

A substantial response to the consultation was received from individuals and organisations.

The consultation responses were dominated by opposition to the closure of Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and calls for a local facility to be maintained or for Shaw to be considered as the venue for the replacement shared facility for Royton, Shaw and Crompton.

There is recognition that existing pools are tired and in need of replacement or refurbishment and the upgrade of leisure facilities is welcomed. Support was voiced for the proposals for the Oldham Sports Centre and for a new leisure facility in Royton Town Centre. Indoor bowlers’ groups created a significant lobby for the inclusion of an indoor bowling hall in the new or refurbished Oldham Sports Centre and other existing users pressed their case for continued specialist provision.

Users of Glodwick leisure pool opposed its closure and stressed the need to maintain its unique features which make it attractive to residents from BME background and to groups who work with people with disabilities and conditions such as autism.

The health benefits of exercise were stressed by many individual and organisational respondents.

Adequate provision of pool space for casual users, schools, and swimming clubs and to meet the needs of specific groups of swimmers such as BME women, disabled people and competitive swimming was a key theme of responses.

Access by public and private transport to replacement facilities was also a key concern for respondents.

Oldham Council wishes to thank all those individuals and organisations who responded to the consultation and will carefully consider all responses made in deciding how to proceed and will publicise widely its response to the consultation feedback. The Council values the input received from service users and will continue to engage with users on the shape and design of the Borough’s future leisure provision.
APPENDIX 2

**Stage 1: Initial screening**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. What is the project / policy / proposal?</td>
<td>The project is to review Oldham Council’s leisure estate. The current contract with Oldham Community Leisure is coming to an end and the Council will use the review /consultation findings to specify the contract to be re-procured in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. What are the main aims of the project / policy / proposal?</td>
<td>The aims of the project are to reconfigure the leisure estate in Oldham in order to improve the offer to the public and generate revenue savings for the Council. The revenue savings made via rationalisation of the estate and via efficiencies in the new operating contract will be reinvested to provide improved, more modern facilities. The proposals which have been extensively consulted on are summarised below:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEISURE ESTATE PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddleworth Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>Refurbish or replace with more efficient facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodwick Leisure Pool</td>
<td>Close and transfer users to Oldham Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP)</td>
<td>Close and consider transfer to Oldham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton Sports Centre</td>
<td>Close and replace with new centre to service Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>Close and replace with new centre to service Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royton and Crompton (AGP) at Royton and Crompton School</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadderton Health and Wellbeing Centre</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radclyffe Athletics Centre</td>
<td>Retain or consider transfer to Radclyffe School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failsworth Sports Centre</td>
<td>Retain, consider for transfer of sand-based AGP and tennis court to Failsworth School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Road AGP</td>
<td>Consider transfer via open process of expressions of interest/submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL FACILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New pool and sports centre to serve Royton, Crompton and Shaw</td>
<td>New facility, managed by operator, location to be determined – Royton and Crompton School, Royton or Shaw Town Centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At some provision/centres minimal change is proposed. There is little or no impact on equality groups and the proposals are not examined in detail in the EIA.
Centres not impacted are:
- Chadderton Health and Well Being Centre
- Saddleworth Pool and Sports Centre
- Failsworth Sports Centre
- Artificial grass pitches at Chapel Rd, former Grange school and Royton and Crompton school
- Radclyffe running track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1c. Do you need to complete an EIA? If not, please give your reasons why.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1d. Does the project / policy / proposal have the potential to have a disproportionate impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular ethnic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men or women (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of particular sexual orientation/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on low incomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in particular age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1e. Are there any other groups that you think may be affected negatively or positively by this project / policy / proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1f. What do you think that the overall NEGATIVE impact on groups and communities will be?</th>
<th>None / Minimal</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO TO 1G
GO TO STAGE 2
Stage 2: What do you know?

What do you know?

A review of the Borough's public sector leisure estate was undertaken during 2010/11. This comprised:

- review of leisure centre condition surveys and quantification of work required to maintain/improve centres
- review of centres' usage, income generation performance and potential and ability to make operating efficiencies
- review of current leisure operator's performance and costs
- supply and demand analysis and benchmarking in terms of swimming pool space, Artificial Grass Pitches (AGPs), sports halls and gym stations which revealed an oversupply across the Borough of AGPs and sports halls
- leisure trend analysis
- new facilities in BSF/Academy schools coming on stream and closing school sites to be marketed to achieve required capital receipts
- new facilities for young people at MAHDLO coming on stream and provision in other sectors

The review enabled the Council to develop a set of options for the reconfiguration of the leisure estate for the purposes of consultation, which was signed off by Cabinet in August and October 2011.

A substantial consultation exercise – Future Leisure - was undertaken between September and November 2011. The methodology and findings of the consultation are described in full in the report of the consultation which will be published on the Council's web site following its consideration by Cabinet on January 3rd 2012. During the consultation we engaged with specific groups who might potentially be disproportionately adversely affected including those within the groups protected under the Equality Act including disabled groups, people from an ethnic background and people of particular age groups. The engagement activity included face to face discussions at Focus groups and Drop-ins and by responses to the consultation on leaflet response forms, letters and petitions. Feedback came from disabled swimming groups using
Oldham Sports Centre, Glodwick pool and the Royton and Shaw centres, Muslim women only groups using Glodwick pool and gym and groups representing older users of Oldham Sports Centre. We have analysed the feedback from equality groups and have reflected it in the assessed impacts (negative and positive) and also considered mitigation measures in the EIA.

We understand the Equality context gathered via interrogation of Ward /Borough profiles and Public health /leisure participation reports. We have noted relevant information eg on demographics, unemployment, economic activity, health indicators, in the table in Appendix 1 which gives the equalities context and the above information for the Wards within which each of the centres affected by major change sit.

We have analysed OCL membership data postcode information. This has given us information about membership by ethnic group, gender and age but not disability or low income or other equality groups. We have noted centre specific relevant information on ethnic group, gender and age in Appendix 1. The key general findings are that:

- 10% of the overall OCL membership is from the an ethnic group
- 54% of the overall membership across Oldham is female
- Average overall age of members is 37 years; 37.5 for females and 36.5 years for males.
- 4% of the 55 and over age are members from an ethnic group (equates to 48 members), 35 of who are registered at Oldham Sports Centre
- Just over a quarter (26%) of all members are 25 and under
- Nearly one third (30%) of members from an ethnic group are 25 or under.

What don’t you know?

OCL membership and usage data has given us a limited evidence base of usage by equality groups. OCL membership criteria enable a user to join at any centre and use any centre. There is no strict correlation between origin of membership application, residency and centre usage. The membership postcode data does not highlight which users are disabled so no analysis of this has been possible.

Further data collection

The consultation exercise gave us a substantial insight into the impacts on equality groups of specific proposals and the views of groups on them. Below are some key points from the Focus groups/Drop-in’s and some representative quotations from participants.

Oldham Sports Centre

Disability and age

- Consider transport and access issues, especially for elderly and disabled
- Ensure health improvement programme part of new operating contract
- Consider retention of the bowling hall in new/refurbished facility due to health and social benefits it brings to participants (users mainly elderly)

Quotes:
"Large numbers of over 55’s remain fit and healthy as a result of being active here"

“What else is there for pensioners to do in Oldham that’s affordable and keeps them fit”

“Too many times senior citizens get sidelined for facilities for younger people. In my opinion there are plenty of facilities for the younger people in the community and not enough for the older element who have worked all their lives and put a lot of money into the community”
Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and Royton Sports Centre

**Disability**
- Ensure needs of groups of disabled swimmers are met and latest innovation in pool access

**Low income**
- Concerns re costs/ease of travelling individually or as groups if not two local facilities

**Age – Young**
- Concerns regarding access, car parking, safety of children at Royton and Crompton school

**Quotes:**
"If Crompton pool closed I will be devastated. I will have to travel to another pool in Oldham which would cost too much and take too much time. I don't think I would bother".

“It is used by all age groups from small children to those of advanced years. All of Shaw and Crompton schools use the pool, where would they go if it is closed, Royton couldn't cope with them as well as the Royton schools. Disabled groups use the pool, going to Royton and Oldham is not an option for them”

“What about the school children. Young and old all need this facility”

“I need this exercise as I have problems with my legs – so the swim keeps me mobile”

**Glodwick Leisure Pool**

**Ethnic group/religious faith**
- Glodwick meets needs of local community and groups of users
- Monitor future usage among equality groups

**Quotes:**
“Being in a predominantly Asian area of Oldham what better way of encouraging the mixing of cultures by joining in with our leisure time”

“It is the only pool with a sloped ramp access for wheelchair users”

“autistic clients tolerate the noise levels better than in more conventional pools”

“Being a female Muslim, I find the Glodwick centre discreet and more appropriate for females to access. No other centre offers what Glodwick pool does so it doesn't make sense to take the centre away from the community as it stands. Many of the public centres in Glodwick are run and dominated by the male members of the community, the Glodwick pool is the only centre that women feel at ease to access, enjoy and exercise”
### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the project / policy / proposal have the potential to have a disproportionate impact on any of the following groups? If so, is the impact positive or negative?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular ethnic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men or women</strong> (include impacts due to pregnancy / maternity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of particular sexual orientation/s</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on low incomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in particular age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups with particular faiths and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other groups that you think that this proposal may affect negatively or positively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stage 3: What will the impact be?

#### What do you know?

To reach a position of assessing the impact of the proposals on equality groups we have:

- Analysed all relevant information/evidence from the leisure review, OCL data, Ward profiles and Public health and leisure participation reports
- Undertaken an extensive consultation exercise which included targeted Focus groups/Drop-in, analysed feedback from equality groups. The full consultation report is currently available on request and will be placed on the Council’s internet site following Cabinet’s consideration of it.

At some provision/centres minimal change is proposed. There is little or no impact on equality groups and the proposals are not examined in detail here.
Centres not impacted are:

- Chadderton Health and Well Being Centre
- Saddleworth Pool and Sports Centre
- Failsworth Sports Centre
- Artificial grass pitches at Chapel Rd, former Grange school and Royton and Crompton school
- Radclyffe running track

We believe the 4 proposals that represent major changes will have an impact on different equality groups. These proposals are:

- Proposal to refurbish or replace Oldham Sports Centre (impact on groups from ethnic background, disabled groups, gender and particular age groups)
- Proposal to close Glodwick Leisure Pool and transfer users to Oldham Sports Centre or consider transfer (impact on groups from ethnic background and with religious belief, disabled groups, gender and particular age groups)
- Proposal to close Royton Sports Centre and replace with new facility shared with Shaw/Crompton (impact on groups from ethnic background and with religious belief, disabled groups, gender and particular age groups)
- Proposal to close Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and replace with new facility shared with Royton (impact on groups from ethnic background and with religious belief, disabled groups, gender and particular age groups)

In the attached table (Appendix 1) we have examined the negative and positive impacts on different equality groups of the above proposals.

There is no evidence to show that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups i.e. sexual orientation and transgender as their access to and use of current and future provision will remain the same and will not be impacted by issues specifically relating to their equality status.

**What don’t you know?**

We cannot say with any certainty what the impact of not having a local facility in Glodwick and Shaw/Royton will be on current users i.e. whether users will travel to replacement centres that are further away or where they might feel less comfortable. The impact of the changed provision of services on those without cars and dependent on public transport is most problematic. We will monitor users at Oldham Sports Centre after any changes occur.

**Further consultation**

The Council has given an undertaking to continue to involve service users in the implementation of the leisure review. The bidders and successful operator will also be challenged to involve service users, including from equality groups, in the design and programming of new and existing facilities.
Stage 4: Reducing / Mitigating the impact

What do you know?
In the attached table (Appendix 1) we have presented the mitigation measures for the 4 proposals that represent major changes, as per Stage 3
- Proposal to refurbish or replace Oldham Sports Centre
- Proposal to close Glodwick Leisure Pool and transfer users to Oldham Sports Centre or consider transfer
- Proposal to close Royton Sports Centre and replace with new facility shared with Shaw/Crompton
- Proposal to close Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and replace with new facility shared with Royton

The Council will work with OCL in early 2012 to undertake further sampling of service users, including casual users, to increase the understanding of usage patterns by equality groups. We will also build into the new operating contract the requirement to monitor current leisure centre membership by equality groups and current and future usage of centres by geography and by equality groups to establish trends, to understand barriers to participation and any requirement to take action, with partners, to market centres and to maximise usage. Access and participation targets by equality groups will be enshrined within the Performance Monitoring Framework within the contract which will be regularly reported and monitored.

Stage 5: Signature

Lead Officer: Maggie Kufeldt Date: 15 December 2011

Approver signature: Michael Jameson Date: 15 December 2011
Appendix 1

In the following table we have presented the mitigation measures for the 4 proposals that represent major changes, as per Stage 3
1. Proposal to refurbish or replace Oldham Sports Centre
2. Proposal to close Glodwick Leisure Pool and transfer users to Oldham Sports Centre or consider transfer
3. Proposal to close Royton Sports Centre and replace with new facility shared with Shaw/Crompton
4. Proposal to close Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and replace with new facility shared with Royton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Proposal to refurbish or replace Oldham Sports Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current and proposed provision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Oldham Sports Centre provides a 33 metre pool, learner pool, diving pool, fitness gym, sports halls, squash courts, combat room, climbing wall, bowling hall and café. Discussions will continue about what will be reprovided in a new or refurbished facility but minimum provision of a 25 metre 6/8 lane pool, learner pool, fitness gym, sports halls, exercise studios and café will be made. Other current provision is being considered for re-provision against criteria of space, affordability, need/demand, income potential/value for money and the consultation responses/ EIA assessment. The improved facilities and design of the new or refurbished centre will improve accessibility and better meet the needs of equality groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equalities context** (Sources: Oldham in Profile 2011, You and Your Community Survey, 2010)
- Proportion of Oldham’s population from BME groups is forecast to increase from about 18.3% in 2010 to around one-fifth (19.4%) in 2012, and to one quarter (24.6%) in 2022. This is predominantly associated with the growth of Oldham’s Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage communities and is due primarily to relatively youthful age structures of these populations
- Demographic changes over the next decade will result in an increase in the number of older people
- Obesity for primary school children in Reception Year has now fallen below the North West and national averages
- Oldham now has the 39th highest number of residents who are income deprived, nine positions worse than in Index of Deprivation 2004, when Oldham was reported to have the 48th highest number of income deprived residents
- The 2010 You and Your Community Survey found that there has been an increase in the proportion of people stating they have a limiting long term illness or disability (from 27% in 2007 to 34% in 2010)
- Oldham’s rate of adult participation in sport and active recreation is below the regional and national averages but the gap between Oldham and England has narrowed between 2008/09 and 2009/10
- Children and young people’s participation in high quality PE and sport is high in Oldham at 85%
OCL membership postcode analysis

- 15% of members at Oldham Sports Centre are from an ethnic group.
- 47% of members at Oldham Sports Centre are female
- 16% of Oldham Sports Centre members are 55 and over and of those 52% are male
- Oldham Sports Centre has slightly higher levels of 17 to 25 years olds with 19% of members compared to 16% across the Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Improved facilities for disabled users e.g. for wheelchair access to building &amp; pools, changing facilities, better lighting &amp; acoustics</td>
<td>New operator to consult with user groups &amp; programme pools according to needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to integrate disabled users better with peers</td>
<td>New operator to utilise pool divisions/booms, privacy screening to maximise comfortable, shared usage &amp; single occupation where necessary for client group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially more user groups competing for space &amp; less chance of single occupation of pool space</td>
<td>New operator/Oldham Council to work with PCT to maximise support services available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Groups transferring from Glodwick may find OSC larger, noisier and more intimidating</td>
<td>Mitigation on transport costs is limited but new operator to work with groups on transport plan &amp; support groups to pool resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Groups transferring from Glodwick may face increased transport costs</td>
<td>Increase access to Newbridge school pool for disabled children/young people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic groups

- Specific needs of people from an ethnic background need to be addressed or may not transfer from Glodwick to Oldham Sports Centre
- Improved facilities e.g. pools, sports halls, gym, changing
- Transfer of Glodwick users to Oldham Sports Centre will achieve better integration of
- New operator to consult with user groups, including those representing people from an ethnic background & programme pools according to needs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious faith</th>
<th>• Specific needs of people of Muslim faith need to be addressed or may not transfer from Glodwick to Oldham Sports Centre</th>
<th>• Improved facilities e.g. pools, sports halls, gym, changing</th>
<th>• New operator to consult with user groups, including those representing people of Muslim faith &amp; programme pools according to needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• Specific needs of women from an ethnic background/Muslim faith need to be addressed or may not transfer from Glodwick to Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td>• Improved facilities for families</td>
<td>• New operator to consult with user groups &amp; programme pools according to needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved changing facilities will better meet ethnic group women’s needs</td>
<td>• New operator to address specific issues to assist use by women from an ethnic group e.g. female pool attendants, screening of viewing areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Improved facilities eg pools, sports halls, gym, changing</td>
<td>• Public transport links to Oldham Town centre are good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups</td>
<td>• Older people potentially impacted if bowling halls not re-provided on affordability grounds. Bowling is form of exercise but social interaction also important</td>
<td>• Improved facilities eg pools, sports halls, gym, changing</td>
<td>• New operator to ensure range of activities aimed at specific age groups provided, including potential outreach provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Younger people potentially impacted if climbing wall not re-provided on affordability grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisations representing older people to be engaged regarding alternative social interaction opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New MADHLO centre will provide climbing wall &amp; other facilities for under 25’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| All above equality groups | • Has potential to increase participation rates among equality groups & contribute towards community cohesion | • New operator to market leisure facilities to equality groups in conjunction with partner organisations and community groups  
• New operating contract to monitor equality groups’ participation |
2. Proposal to close Glodwick and transfer users to Oldham Sports Centre or consider transfer

**Current and proposed provision**
Glodwick currently provides a freeform leisure pool and small gym. A new or refurbished Oldham Sports Centre will provide a minimum of a 25 metre 6/8 lane pool, learner pool, fitness gym, sports halls, exercise studios and café.

**Equalities context** (Sources: St Mary’s Ward Profile, March 2011, Active People Survey, Oldham Public Health Report 2010)
- St. Mary’s has the 2nd highest proportion (48.7%) of residents belonging to black and minority ethnic groups (non-white). This compares with 13.8% across Oldham and 9.1% nationally
- In St. Mary’s around one in three (35.1%) people are of Pakistani heritage, and 8.9% are of Bangladeshi heritage
- St Mary’s is the 2nd most deprived ward in Oldham and among the 5% most deprived wards in England
- In St. Mary’s half (50.3%) of people live in ‘income deprived’ households, the 2nd highest proportion in Oldham and more than twice the Oldham average (23.1%)
- One in five (21.7%) of all people and 11.9% of all working-age people have a limiting long-term illness or disability (LLTI) – compared with 20.3% and 10.1% of people, respectively, across Oldham
- Estimated obesity prevalence in St. Mary’s (21.8%) is lower than the Oldham prevalence (23.7%) and the England prevalence (23.9%)
- The Active People Survey (2005-6) identified that, nationally, BME groups were less likely to participate in sport and moderately active recreation at the recommended level of three times a week, thirty minutes a day, when compared to white population groups. In the NW, BME participation was even lower. In the survey of 2007-08 the disparity between groups was greater than in the 2005-06 survey, with 21.7% of white and 17.6% of non-white respondents reporting doing three or more sessions per week of active recreation and sport
- The Oldham Public Health report 2010 suggests ‘It appears that the provision of information on leisure and physical activity opportunities available is required by BME groups. Also, the promotion of inexpensive activities which are not leisure centre or gym based, which require little or no special equipment or clothing, for example walking or gardening, is to be recommended.’

**OCL membership postcode analysis**
- 9% of members registered at Glodwick Leisure Pool are from an ethnic group
- 65% of members at Glodwick Leisure Pool are female. The average age of female members is 15.
- Only 2% of Glodwick members are 55 and over
- Glodwick Pool has the higher proportion of members which are 16 and under
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to beached entrance to pool for wheelchairs reduced</td>
<td>• Improved facilities for disabled users at Oldham Sports Centre (see above)</td>
<td>• Consultation told us that many groups of disabled users of Glodwick have Borough wide catchments and will use other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to shallow water reduced</td>
<td>• Oldham Sports Centre is a more central location for groups with Borough wide catchment</td>
<td>• Re-create beached entrance to pool for wheelchairs &amp; shallow water at Oldham Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Particular groups of disabled users will be displaced. Most of groups are Borough wide &amp; do not have just local client catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• New operator to consult with Glodwick user groups /individual users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of quieter, more relaxed atmosphere, less echo/noise in Glodwick facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Groups of disabled users will be re-provided for at Oldham Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual disabled users &amp; parents/carers of disabled children/young people may face travel/transport issues &amp; increased costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Make small pool(s) at Oldham Sports Centre available to user groups/individual users &amp; use partitioning/screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mitigation on transport issues/costs is limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase access to Newbridge school pool for disabled children/young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic groups</strong></td>
<td>• Access to local facility in area with large ethnic group population reduced</td>
<td>• Consultation told us women from an ethnic group already travel to OSC and to centres out of the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May impact integration of communities in Glodwick as pool currently used by residents from all backgrounds</td>
<td>• New operator to consult with Glodwick user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New operator to market Oldham Sports Centre to ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved facilities available at Oldham Sports Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transfer of users to Oldham Sports Centre will achieve better integration of users from an ethnic group and users not from an ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious faith</td>
<td>Users/communities &amp; programme to meet needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Access to local facility in area with large ethnic group population reduced  
• May impact integration of communities in Glodwick as pool currently used by residents from all backgrounds | • Improved facilities available at Oldham Sports Centre  
• Transfer of users to Oldham Sports Centre will achieve better integration of users from an ethnic group and users not from an ethnic group  
• Consultation told us Muslim faith women already travel to OSC and to centres out of the Borough.  
• New operator to consult with Glodwick user groups  
• New operator to market Oldham Sports Centre to religious faith users/communities & programme to meet needs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Users/communities &amp; programme to meet needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Access by local women from an ethnic group to pool & gym in women only sessions reduced  
• Access to Oldham Sports Centre difficult because of travel & time considerations | • Improved facilities, including changing facilities, available at Oldham Sports Centre will better meet ethnic group women’s needs  
• Consultation told us Muslim faith women already travel to OSC and to centres out of the Borough  
• New operator to programme ethnic group women only sessions at Oldham Sports Centre |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Users/communities &amp; programme to meet needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Closure of local facility may have higher impact on those on low income as additional travel costs will be incurred by local users | • Improved facilities available at Oldham Sports Centre  
• Oldham Sports Centre is in walking distance from Glodwick for able bodied  
• Public transport links to Oldham Town centre are good  
• New operator to consider outreach facilities in local area |
| Age Groups                      | Access by local older people not significant but would be more difficult  
|                                | High use by young people (in swimming classes) will need re-programming |
|                                | Improved facilities available at Oldham Sports Centre                  |
|                                | New operator to ensure range of activities aimed at specific age groups provided at Oldham Sports Centre  
|                                | Oldham Council School swimming manager planning re-programming of school swimming on |
| All above equality groups      | May impact participation rates for equality groups                      |
|                                | New operator to market leisure facilities to equality groups in conjunction with partner organisations and community groups  
|                                | New operating contract to monitor equality groups' participation  
|                                | Partners to encourage non premises based leisure activities          |
### 3. Proposal to close Royton Sports Centre and replace with new facility shared with Shaw/Crompton

**Current and proposed provision**

The current Royton Sports Centre provides a small pool and small gym. A new, replacement facility would provide a larger pool, learner pool, fitness gym, exercise studio and café.

**Equalities context** (Sources: Royton North and South Ward Profiles, March 2011)

- Royton North’s claimant count unemployment rate (2.8%) is below the Oldham average (4.9%) and is ranked the 5th lowest in Oldham.
- The claimant count unemployment rate (3.5%) in Royton South is the 8th lowest in Oldham, below the Oldham average (4.9%).
- Nearly one in five (19.1%) of all people in Royton North and 9.1% of all working age people have a limiting long-term illness or disability (LLTI) - compared with 20.3% and 10.1%, respectively, across Oldham.
- Nearly one in five (19.5%) of all people in Royton South and 8.7% of all working age people have a limiting long-term illness or disability (LLTI) - compared with 20.3% and 10.1% of people, respectively, across Oldham.
- Estimated obesity prevalence in Royton North (24.9%) and in Royton South (24.5%) is higher than the Oldham prevalence (23.7%) and the England prevalence (23.9%)
- Around one in ten children in Royton North (10.2%) and Royton South (10.4%) are eligible for free school meals, less than half the Oldham-wide average (22.5%).
- Royton North has the 5th highest proportion and Royton South the 4th highest proportion of people aged 65 or over (18.4%). This is higher than both the Oldham-wide proportion (14.9%) and the national average (16.3%)

**OCL membership postcode analysis**

- 2% of members at Royton Sports Centre are from an ethnic group
- 66% of members at Royton Sports Centre are female
- 18% of Royton Sports Centre members are 55 and over and of those 63% are female
- Royton Sports Centre has above average levels of young members with 24% aged 16 and under
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td>• Access to local facility reduced, dependent on location of new facility</td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially more user groups competing for space</td>
<td>• New facility will have learner pool, unlike current facility which can be programmed for use by disabled groups, individual users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Groups may face increased transport costs</td>
<td>• New facility will provide improved facilities for disabled users eg changing, access to building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual disabled users &amp; parents/carers of disabled children/young people may face travel /transport issues &amp; increased costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic groups</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Improved facilities in new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious faith</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Improved facilities in new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• Access to local facility reduced because of travel &amp; time considerations, dependent on location of new facility</td>
<td>• Improved facilities in new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dependent on location of new facility, may be in walking distance from existing centre for able bodied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mitigation is limited &amp; linked to family budgeting/lifestyle choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public transport links between Royton &amp; Shaw are reasonable during the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New operator to consider outreach facilities in area furthest away from new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Age Groups</td>
<td>All above equality groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Closure of local facilities may have higher impact on those on low income as additional travel costs will be incurred by local users, dependent on location of new facility | • Access to local facility reduced, dependent on location of new facility
• Access by young people may reduce if cannot walk to facility, dependent on location of new facility | • May impact participation rates for equality groups in area furthest away from new centre |
| • Improved facilities in new centre | • Improved facilities in new centre |  |
| • Dependent on location of new facility, may be in walking distance from existing centre for able bodied
• Mitigation is limited & linked to family budgeting/lifestyle choice
• Public transport links between Royton & Shaw are reasonable during the day
• New operator to consider outreach facilities in area furthest away from new centre | • New operator to ensure range of activities aimed at specific age groups provided
• Dependent on location of new facility, may be in walking distance from existing centre for able bodied
• Mitigation is limited & linked to family budgeting/lifestyle choices
• Public transport links between Royton & Shaw are reasonable during the day | • New operator to market leisure facilities to equality groups in conjunction with partner organisations and community groups
• New operating contract to monitor equality groups' participation |
4. Proposal to close Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre and replace with new facility shared with Royton

Current and proposed provision
The current Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre provides a small pool, learner pool and small gym. A new, replacement facility would provide a larger pool, learner pool, fitness gym, exercise studio and café.

Equalities context (Sources: Crompton and Shaw Ward Profiles, March 2011)
- Crompton’s claimant count unemployment rate (2.4%) is lower than the Oldham average (4.9%) and is the 3rd lowest in Oldham
- Shaw’s claimant count unemployment rate (3.2%) is below the Oldham average (4.9%) and is the 6th lowest in Oldham
- Around one in ten people (10.6%) in Crompton and one in seven people (14.3%) in Shaw live in ‘income deprived’ households, compared with more than twice that proportion (23.1%) of people across Oldham
- Nearly one in five (19.4%) people in Crompton have a limiting long-term illness or disability (LLTI), similar to the Oldham average (20.3%). Around 9.5% of all working-age people in Crompton have a LLTI, compared to the Oldham average of 10.1%
- One in five (20.1%) of all people in Shaw have a limiting long term illness or disability (LLTI), as do nearly one in ten (9.7%) of all working-age people. These proportions are around the average for Oldham (20.3% for all people and 10.1% for working-age people) but are higher than the England averages (17.9% and 8.2% respectively)
- Estimated obesity prevalence in Crompton (25%) and Shaw (24.3%) is higher than the Oldham prevalence (23.7%) and the England prevalence (23.9%).
- Around one in six (16.0%) people in Shaw are aged over 65, higher than in Oldham overall (14.9%), but around the national average (16.3%)
- Crompton has the 2nd highest proportion of people aged 65 years and over (19.5%). This is considerably higher than the Oldham-wide proportion (14.9%) and higher than the national figure (16.3%)
- Crompton has the 4th lowest proportion (9.8%) of school children eligible for free school meals in Oldham (average 22.5%).
- About one in seven children in Shaw (13.8%) are eligible for free school meals, which is significantly less than the Oldham average (22.5%)

OCL membership postcode analysis
- 5% of members at Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre are from an ethnic group
- 59% of members at Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre are female
- 19% of Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre members are 55 and over and of those 57% are female
- Crompton Pool and Fitness Centre has above average levels of young members with 22% aged 16 and under, with more of the under 16’s male (59%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td>• Access to stone steps to pool for disabled users reduced</td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially more user groups competing for space</td>
<td>• New facility will have learner pool which can be programmed for use by disabled groups, individual users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Groups may face increased transport costs</td>
<td>• New facility will provide improved gym &amp; changing facilities for disabled users, access to building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual disabled users &amp; parents/carers of disabled children/young people may face travel/transport issues &amp; costs, dependent on location of new facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
<td>• New operator to consult with user groups/individual users &amp; programme larger pools according to needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will have learner pool which can be programmed for use by disabled groups, individual users</td>
<td>• New operator to work with groups on transport plan &amp; support groups to pool resources &amp; widen membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will provide improved gym &amp; changing facilities for disabled users, access to building</td>
<td>• Mitigation on transport issues/costs is limited &amp; linked to family budgeting/lifestyle choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
<td>• Increase access to Newbridge school pool for disabled children/young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic groups</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Improved facilities in new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious faith</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Improved facilities in new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>• Access to local facility reduced because of travel &amp; time considerations, dependent on location of new facility</td>
<td>Improved facilities in new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
<td>Dependent on location of new facility, may be in walking distance from existing centre for able bodied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
<td>• Mitigation is limited &amp; linked to family budgeting/lifestyle choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
<td>• Public transport links between Royton &amp; Shaw are reasonable during the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New facility will be fully DDA compliant, unlike current facility</td>
<td>• New operator to consider outreach facilities in area furthest away from new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>All above equality groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Closure of local facility may have higher impact on those on low income as additional travel costs will be incurred by local users, dependent on location of new facility</td>
<td>• Access to local facility reduced, dependent on location of new facility • Access by young people may reduce if cannot walk to facility, dependent on location of new facility</td>
<td>• May impact participation rates for equality groups in area furthest away from new centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved facilities in new centre</td>
<td>• Improved facilities in new centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dependent on location of new facility, may be in walking distance from existing centre for able bodied • Mitigation is limited &amp; linked to family budgeting/lifestyle choices • Public transport links between Royton &amp; Shaw are reasonable during the day • New operator to consider outreach facilities in area furthest away from new centre</td>
<td>• New operator to ensure range of activities aimed at specific age groups provided • Dependent on location of new facility, may be in walking distance from existing centre for able bodied • Mitigation is limited &amp; linked to family budgeting/lifestyle choices • Public transport links between Royton &amp; Shaw are reasonable during the day</td>
<td>• New operator to market leisure facilities to equality groups in conjunction with partner organisations and community groups • New operating contract to monitor equality groups' participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>