



**GREAT YARMOUTH**  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

**A G E N D A**

**for the**

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**17 September 2007**

**at 6.30 pm**

**LARGER PRINT COPY AVAILABLE  
PLEASE TELEPHONE: 01493 846325**

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

To be held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Great Yarmouth  
On Monday, 17 September 2007 at 6.30 pm

**A G E N D A**

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members must declare any personal interests in any items on the agenda and state whether they are also prejudicial interests. In the case of personal non prejudicial interests the Member may speak and vote on the matter. In the case of personal prejudicial interests the Member must leave the room while the matter is discussed.

**1. MINUTES**

... To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 9 August 2007 (pages 1-5).

**2. ARRANGEMENTS FOR LEISURE PROVISION IN THE BOROUGH**

... The Committee will be asked to consider the call-in of the Cabinet decision made on 22 August 2007. This decision was called-in by Councillor Easter, Councillor Field and Councillor Wainwright. Attached is the notice of call-in report (pages 6 - 7) and the Head of Regeneration and Environment's report to Cabinet on the 22 August 2007 is attached (pages 8 - 15).

**3. PUBLIC BROADCASTING INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

Members will be asked to consider the Head of Regeneration and Environment's report (copy to follow).

**4. FORWARD PLAN**

... The Forward Plan for the period 1 September 2007 to 31 December 2007 is attached (page 16).

**5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To note the date of the next Scrutiny meeting as Monday, 22 October 2007 at 6.30 pm.

**6. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC**

In the event of the Committee wishing to exclude the public from the meeting, the following resolution will be moved:-

"That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph(s).....Part 1 of the Schedule 12(A) of the said Act."

\* \* \* \* \*

**LARGER PRINT COPY AVAILABLE  
PLEASE TELEPHONE: 01493 846325**

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**9 August 2007 – 6.30 pm**

**PRESENT:**

Councillor Williamson (in the Chair); Councillors M Coleman, Collins, Cook, Easter, Field, Reynolds, C Walker and Weymouth.

Councillor Plant attended as an observer.

Mr S Duncan (Head of Financial Services), Mr D Glason (Planning Policy Service Manager), Mr P Hardy (Executive Director) (Environment and Economy), Mr R Hodds (Member Services Manager and Scrutiny Officer), Mr T Howard (Head of Regeneration and Environment), Ms H Speechley (Executive Officer) and Miss K Edmonds (Senior Member Services Officer).

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Wainwright.

**1. FORMER COUNCILLOR SUE ROBINSON**

The Chairman asked all Members of the Scrutiny Committee to observe one minute's silence in memory of former Councillor Sue Robinson.

**2. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2007 were confirmed subject to an amendment that Councillor Cook and Councillor Weymouth had given their apologies.

**(Councillor Collins and Councillor Reynolds declared a personal (non-prejudicial) interest in the following item as Members of the Greater Yarmouth Tourist Authority).**

**3. PUBLIC BROADCASTING SCREENS**

Members considered the Head of Regeneration and Environment's report on the Public Broadcasting Information Systems.

The Chairman informed Members that the report was an interim report and that a detailed report would be presented at the next Scrutiny meeting on Monday, 17 September 2007.

The Head of Regeneration and Environment detailed the eight areas that Members had requested further information on and stated that these could be broken down into three main areas; namely governance, procurement and contractual arrangements. Members' attention was drawn to section two detailing the work that would be carried out, which included looking at the relationship between the Council and ADI along with the malfunction of the screen in the Market Place. Members were informed that staff involved in the *inte*GREAT scheme would be spoken to along with Jim Dumolo, Herbert Tonkin and David Marsh.

Members were informed that the Council's insurers had repudiated the claim on the basis that the fault was integral to the screens and not as a result of an external incident such as a power surge.

The Head of Regeneration and Environment stated that there was a need to commission an investigation into the fault and, once the fault was identified, it would then be possible to make a decision on the appropriate action to take. A Business Plan was in the process of being produced for the Seafront screens which had been running effectively for the past three weeks. Members were informed that the Tourism Manager had been nominated as the responsible officer to oversee the running of the screens.

Members asked if the screens were under guarantee or if the guarantee could be extended. The Head of Regeneration and Environment stated that he would be looking into the guarantee and would also be looking at a maintenance programme. It was reported that the two screens on the seafront had been maintained by ADI and had been running well for the past few weeks and had been repaired at no extra cost to the Council.

A Member queried the action to be taken on the basis that the insurance company is not paying out for the repair of the Market Place screen. The Head of Regeneration and Environment stated that there was a need for the Council to undertake their own assessment of the screen to see what the fault was and to then ascertain the cost of repair. The Executive Director (Environment and Economy) informed Members that he would be able to update them on the insurance company's position at the September meeting.

Members agreed that they were happy that a business plan was being produced along with a comprehensive review of the screens. The Head of Regeneration and Environment stated that there was a need to explore the options of winter usage in order to receive revenue.

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the process and methodology for this review as set out in the Head of Regeneration and Environment's report be agreed and that a detailed report be produced at the 17 September 2007 meeting.
- (ii) That Jim Dumolo, Herbert Tonkin and David Marsh be invited to the September Committee meeting.

(Councillor Weymouth declared a personal (non prejudicial) interest in the following item in her position as the Parish Clerk for Hemsby).

#### 4. SECTION 106 REPORT

The Committee considered the Head of Financial Services' report which gave a financial summary relating to Section 106 Agreements.

It was reported that there was a need to look at each individual Section 106 agreement in order to see how much had been spent. Members were informed that a database would be created to record the details of the Section 106 agreements, along with information such as any land given in lieu would be included. It was reported that Colchester Borough Council would be visited as a best practice Council which was currently running such a database, to see if this would be suitable for this Council.

Members noted that Caister and Castle Green in Gorleston were missing from the figures produced.

#### RESOLVED:

- (i) That the Section 106 Receipts and Applications, as detailed in the Head of Financial Services' report be noted.
- (ii) That a report be brought back to Members following the compilation of a database detailing the current position on all outstanding Section 106 agreements.
- (iii) That an investigation into the database used by Colchester Borough Council be pursued.

#### 5. FORWARD PLAN

Members noted the Forward Plan for the period 1 July 2007 to 31 October 2007.

#### 6. OMBUDSMAN'S ANNUAL LETTER

The Member Services Manager and Scrutiny Officer gave Members an overview of the Ombudsman's Annual letter stating that 46 complaints had been received during the year, which was a significant increase on the 29 received in the previous year. The two main areas of complaint were about benefits and planning, although it was noted that nationally there had been a rise in planning complaints. It was reported that 19 of the 46 complaints received were premature, which is 40% of the total number of complaints received, and it was higher than the national average of 28%. The average time for responding to complaints was 27.8 days, being an improvement on 36 days in the previous year, and placing the Council in the top 50% of District Councils nationally. 19 of the complaints received were noted as premature and a discussion ensued around possible training for staff to prevent this from occurring.

#### RESOLVED:

That the Ombudsman's Annual Letter be noted.

## 7. SCRUTINY CONFERENCE

The Member Services Manager and Scrutiny Officer informed the Committee of the details of the Scrutiny Conference at the Norwich UEA Sport Park on Friday, 16 November 2007, along with the proposed agenda for the day. Members were informed that there were 12 places available for the Borough Council and that any unfilled places would be offered to non Scrutiny Committee Members.

**(Councillor Williamson declared a personal (non prejudicial) interest in the following item about the Integrated Service Centre as an employee of the PCT)**

## 8. FUTURE ITEMS FOR THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members were asked to consider the following items as possible issues to be addressed by the Scrutiny Committee:-

- Partnership Working between Local Strategic Partnerships and other such groups as appropriate.
- Look at improvements to the Town Hall in order to hold weddings and other such functions.
- Look at the Integrated Service Centre and the costs involved in staff moving and the savings that could be made.
- Look at how the Tourist Authority markets Great Yarmouth as a Heritage location.

It was also suggested that the Committee looked at how the Tourist Authority markets Great Yarmouth.

Another suggestion was that the Committee should look into the SHARP project as this was half way through its process and it was asked what the money was being spent on and whether this was being spent in the right areas, as it was felt that this scheme was being run at a distance from the Council. The Executive Director (Environment and Economy) informed Members that he would be looking into the project.

The issue of Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans being delayed was raised and the consequence of this on the Council.

Members discussed the need to look at the Town Hall and the improvements and repairs that were required. The Chairman stated that this item was placed as a possible issue due to the closure of Ferryside which would result in the possible relocation of the Registrar to the Town Hall.

### RESOLVED:

- (i) That a report be presented to the October meeting of the Scrutiny Committee for a review of the Sharp Project.
- (ii) That the Member Services Manager and Scrutiny Officer be requested to liaise with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman in order to produce a work programme of future items to be reviewed.

9. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on Monday, 17 September 2007 at 6.30 pm.

10. **CLOSURE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.35 pm.

# GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

AGENDA  
ITEM  
2

## NOTICE OF CALL-IN

Report Number: NT 8  
Subject: Arrangements for Legal Services Provision At The Marina Centre  
And Phoenix Door - Hair 208 onwards.  
Date of Consultation: 22/3/07

The following three Members of Council give notice that the above proposed decision(s) should be referred to the Committee for consideration:

Signed: (1) [Signature] Councillor TREVOR WAINWRIGHT  
(2) [Signature] Councillor MARIE FIELD  
(3) [Signature] Councillor TERRY EASTON

Dated: .....

The reason(s) for this Call-In is/are as follows:-

See Attached

### NOTES:

- (1) This notice must be signed by either the Chairman or any three Members of the Council (excluding Cabinet Members).
- (2) Members should be aware that, as part of the call-in procedure and to avoid any unnecessary call-ins, a valid reason(s) will need to be given at the Scrutiny Committee for that call-in and, therefore, it is advisable for Members to contact the relevant Officer to satisfy any minor queries or to discuss the proposed reason for the call-in prior to the formal submission of this form.
- (3) Members should note that in order to make this Call-In valid the reasons for the Call-In **MUST** be specified in writing above.

(NB Members should note that, in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 6.5.3 of the Constitution, if the Head of Member and Legal Services is of the opinion that the call-in process is being abused, he may refuse to deal further with the call-in).

### FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Dated Notice Received: .....

G:\HMLS\MemberServices\Robin Hodds\Call-in\Notice of Call-In.doc

## **Wainwright, Trevor**

---

**From:** Michael Castle [cmamc@great-yarmouth.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 23 August 2007 18:57  
**To:** Wainwright, Trevor  
**Cc:** Holmes, John  
**Subject:** Call-in - ARRANGEMENTS FOR LEISURE SERVICE PROVISION - MARINA CENTRE/PHOENIX POOL

We the undersigned request that the Cabinet decision Item 5, 22nd August 2007, be called-in to the Council's Scrutiny Committee - on the following grounds:

1. Why has the Cabinet decided to proceed with a tender process for management of both without regard to a fully-worked up strategy for replacing facilities currently available at the Marina Centre and a clear vision of what will be required by way of new provision across the Borough?
2. Why has the Cabinet not awaited the outcome of discussions on the future for the Marina Centre site and drawn up robust plans if necessary for providing replacement services for Yarmouth residents either by way of community use of the Gt Yarmouth High School/Beaconsfield campus and/or by way of new build as appropriate? Is not a change to management arrangements premature and ill-advised?
3. Could not the job security of staff employed by the Sport and Leisure Trust be better safeguarded without compromising the excellent service kafforded to users of the Phoenix Pool under Waveney DC management?
4. Can the Council first investigate the potential economies of scale that might be achieved by a closer working relationship with Waveney DC with regard to leisure facilities, either independent of or part of a possible Gt.Yarmouth/Waveney Unitary bid?
5. Should not the Cabinet extend existing arrangements for a further 18 months to allow for an informed decision to be taken once the Marina Centre and associated issues are finally resolved?

---

This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by Star. The service is powered by MessageLabs. For more information on a proactive anti-virus service working around the clock, around the globe, visit:  
<http://www.star.net.uk>

---

**Draft**

**Subject:** Arrangements for leisure service provision at the Marina Centre and Phoenix Pool – April 2008 onwards

**Report to:** Cabinet 22/6/07.

**Report by:** Tim Howard – Head of Regeneration and Environment

**Subject matter/recommendations****Subject matter**

To apprise Cabinet of the current contractual position in respect of service provision at the Marina centre and Phoenix pool and to establish a course of action designed to secure service delivery from April 2008.

**Recommendations**

- i) Note the present contractual position in respect of service provision at the Marina centre and the Phoenix pool
- ii) Identify their preferred option for securing service delivery beyond April 2008 as set out in paragraph 2.1
- iii) In the event of selecting options b), d) or e) agree to waive Council Contract Standing Orders
- iv) Instruct officers to explore which other related services and facilities might usefully be included in a tender specification and report back to Cabinet on this matter
- v) Note that work concerning potential future lease arrangements for the Marina centre and Phoenix pool will be undertaken in parallel with the development and subsequent placement of service contracts
- vi) Endorse the activity timetable set out at paragraph 5.4

## 1.0 Current situation

1.1 Members will be aware that the present provision of leisure services at the Marina and Phoenix venues is secured through 2 separate outsourcing arrangements, based on contracts struck with Great Yarmouth Sport and Leisure Trust and Waveney District Council respectively. Both of these contracts expire at the beginning of April 2008.

1.2 In both cases, there is no express provision made for extending the contract, but a period of 3 months notice of termination is required. In addition, the agreement with the Sport and Leisure Trust regarding the Marina Centre is augmented by a lease on the premises that will also expire in April 2008. In the case of the Phoenix pool, the premises are held by the Council on lease from the County Council and are not subject to any sub lease to Waveney District.

1.3 Therefore, in order to ensure that provision can be maintained at both of these sites beyond April 2008 and to provide sufficient time to prepare and execute the work required to achieve this, it is necessary for Cabinet to agree and initiate a course of action designed to secure an appropriate and affordable service delivery arrangement.

## 2.0 Main options and key considerations

2.1 There appear to be 5 main options. These are

- a) Revert to direct operation of the facilities by the Council
- b) Seek to renew existing arrangements with the Sport and Leisure Trust and Waveney DC
- c) Go to the market to secure a commercial operator
- d) Establish a single management arrangement with Waveney DC to operate both venues
- e) Establish a single management arrangement with the Great Yarmouth Sport and Leisure Trust to operate both venues

2.2 Clearly, each of these options carries with it a range of different implications. However, it is also evident that there are a number of fundamental considerations that need to be addressed from the outset. These include

- **Best value** – any arrangement must be affordable, subjected to market testing and minimise risk to the Council. Additionally, it will be essential to weigh the wider advantages that could be derived, including specific financial benefits that might flow from, for example, contracting with a Charitable Trust.

- **Service Quality** – any arrangement must seek to preserve and enhance the quality of provision, not only in terms of user experience, but also in relation to its 'fit' with the Councils service standards and strategic objectives.
- **Capacity** – the Council will need to have confidence that future arrangements can be adequately sustained over the life of the contract(s) and that contractors have the capacity and expertise to consistently meet requirements and targets
- **Flexibility** – it will be essential that contractors are able to respond flexibly and rapidly to changes in circumstances and requirements. This is of particular importance in the context of the Marina centre, as the ambitions of the Council for the re-development of the Golden Mile may well produce wholesale changes to that venue and its service spread
- **Synergy** – it is critical to the success of the Councils overall strategy for leisure sport and recreation that service providers are able to fully contribute to the wider task of improving the range of provision and access to it. This will need close strategic and operational collaboration with Council and other local organisations and will require a willingness to develop partnerships and alliances beyond the direct remit of any contract specification

### 3.0 An initial appraisal

3.1 The table below provides a basic analysis of the likelihood of each option to deliver against these key considerations

Key consideration/ Option	Best value	Service Quality	Capacity	Flexibility	Synergy
<b>Revert to direct operation of the facilities by the Council</b>	Unlikely to provide best financial value and may well be significantly more expensive. No 'added value' benefits	Unlikely to significantly boost service quality	Excellent	Excellent. As a direct operator, the Council is able to control its responses	Excellent. The Council is already at the heart of most of the relevant local partnerships and is the strategic driver

	from NNDR/VAT				
<b>Seek to renew existing arrangements with the Sport and Leisure Trust and Waveney DC</b>	May provide reasonable value for money, but unlikely to produce further economy of scale benefits	Would at least maintain existing service quality. Limited capacity for further improvements	Adequate	Adequate. Although contract driven, high levels of local awareness and shared ambition should be of help in terms of the Sport and Leisure Trust	Mixed. Good local networking and partnership building by the Sport and Leisure Trust in particular.
<b>Go to the market to secure a commercial operator</b>	Unlikely to produce major financial benefit for the Council and may not be viewed as an attractive commercial proposition. Will not bring VAT/NNDR benefit	Unknown	Unknown, but previous experiences suggest that there is some reason to question levels of long term commitment	Unknown but likely to be contract focused in approach, which may reduce flexibility of response	Unknown but likely to be contract focused in approach, which may reduce capacity to build alliances, forge partnerships and contribute to strategic planning and development
<b>Establish a single management arrangement with Waveney DC to operate both venues</b>	May produce some economies of scale, but would need significant 'gearing up' from	Current quality of service adequate. Better economies of scale may produce service improvements	Uncertain, but likely to be improved by generating a greater critical mass	Uncertain. Likely to be contract focused in approach, which may reduce flexibility of	Uncertain. Likely to be contract focused in approach, which may reduce emphasis on collaboration, but local

	present levels of activity. No NNDR/VAT benefit			response, but local awareness may be an asset	awareness and knowledge may be an asset
<b>Establish a single management arrangement with the Great Yarmouth Sport and Leisure Trust to operate both venues</b>	Would maintain present NNDR/VAT benefit (assuming a new lease). Possible extension of this to Phoenix pool	Current quality of service adequate and represent a significant measurable improvement on previous arrangements. Better economies of scale should produce further service improvements	Adequate and will be improved by generating a greater critical mass	Good. Although contract driven, high levels of local awareness and shared ambition should be of help	Good. Although contract driven, existing partner working, coupled with high levels of local awareness and shared ambition should help to develop valuable synergies

3.2 While the above analysis is by no means definitive, it does help to indicate that some options are unlikely to deliver the full range of expectations. In particular, there appears to be a strong case for seeking a single solution for both facilities, rather than continuing with separate arrangements. Although an 'in house' solution would achieve this, pursuing a return to direct delivery of the service by the Council has little else to commend it, especially in terms of likely cost benefit. Also, there is little reason to suppose that the contracting of a commercial operator to run both facilities will produce significant gains, either financial or operational.

3.3 Of the 2 remaining options, it is your officers' view that the most attractive proposition is to explore the development of a contract with the Great Yarmouth Sport and Leisure Trust to operate both venues. As well as preserving and building on the benefits that already flow from this arrangement in respect of the Marina centre, the extension of the specification to include the Phoenix pool ought to produce additional gains, both financial and operational. To an extent, this could also be argued in the context the operation of both facilities by Waveney, but the 'gearing up' that would be required to expand their operation to include the much larger Marina centre would represent a major challenge and an agreement with Waveney would not deliver the NNDR and VAT benefits currently enjoyed by the Sport and leisure Trust. In comparison, the level of management capacity within the Trust is considered to be good.

#### **4.0 Additional opportunities and issues**

4.1 So far, this report has focused on the specific issue of securing continued service delivery at the Marina and Phoenix facilities. However, there are a number of related matters that Cabinet may wish to consider as part of this. These include the future treatment of lease arrangements and the possible extension of the specification to include other leisure provision and venues.

4.2 The present lease arrangements are set out at paragraph 1.2. As stated, the present lease between the Great Yarmouth Sport and Leisure Trust and the Council regarding the Marina centre expires on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2008. Although the lease agreement is essentially separate from the contracting of service provision, there is clearly a relationship between the two. Further, by leasing the facility to a charitable trust, considerable benefit is obtained in respect of NNDR relief, for which the Trust, as leaseholder, qualifies. Therefore, there is obvious merit in ensuring that the renewal of the Marina centre lease with the Great Yarmouth Sport and Leisure Trust is pursued in parallel to the placing of the service contract.

4.3 Concerning the Phoenix pool, should Members decide to pursue the single contract option with the Sport and Leisure Trust, then it would be worthwhile exploring what potential exists for arranging a sub lease of the facility from the Council to the Trust. This would potentially extend NNDR relief and would provide an added level of security to the Trust, always assuming that they are able to accept the proffered terms and conditions.

4.4 In the medium term there will be the opportunity for Members to consider widening the package or packages of work to be outsourced progressively to include other leisure provision and venues. In particular, there may be value in considering increasing the range of specified services and venues to produce better economies of scale, a greater critical mass and a more consistent and coherent management of service delivery and development, together with exploring the financial gains that might flow from considering NNDR and VAT arrangements that are more favourable to the Council and to service providers.

#### **5.0 Further actions**

5.1 Members should note that, other than deciding to bring the provision back into the direct control of the Council, each of the remaining options will require a tender process to be undertaken. The precise nature of the tender process will depend upon the option chosen and an OJEU contract award notice will be required. It will not, however, be necessary to apply OJEU procurement regulations in respect of this tender. Nevertheless, should a decision be taken to pursue the option of a single bidder approach, it would be necessary for Cabinet to agree to waive Council Contract Standing Orders

5.2 In view of the timescales involved and the amount of work that will need to be undertaken, it is important that an early decision is reached as to the preferred option for the period beyond April 2008. This will enable work to begin on a number of key activities, including the drafting of the core specification, the commencement of market testing and, if deemed appropriate, an evaluation of other leisure services and venues that might be included.

5.3 In addition, work on leases needs to be undertaken in parallel to the service procurement process to ensure that arrangements are fully aligned by April 2008. This will centre on the Marina centre in particular, but could also include the Phoenix pool and other facilities, dependent on the Councils preferred option.

5.4 Assuming that a tender process will apply, the timetable below provides an initial activity analysis

<b>Month</b>	<b>Main Tasks</b>	<b>Additional tasks</b>
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine preferred option</li> <li>• Commence market testing</li> <li>• Commence drafting of specification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commence analysis of potential additional functions/facilities to be included</li> </ul>
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalise scope of specification</li> <li>• Continue market testing</li> <li>• Prepare Preliminary Invitation to Negotiate (if appropriate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalise functions and facilities to be included</li> <li>• Commence work on lease arrangements</li> </ul>
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish bidder short list (if appropriate)</li> <li>• Complete and issue full specification and Invitation to Negotiate</li> <li>• Complete market testing</li> </ul>	
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake clarifications work</li> </ul>	
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receive full bid submission(s)</li> <li>• Begin bid evaluation process</li> </ul>	
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete bid evaluation process</li> <li>• Identify preferred bidder</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue notices as required by present contracts</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commence financial close process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm proposed lease arrangements (if appropriate)</li> </ul>
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reach financial close</li> <li>• Agree handover arrangements (if appropriate)</li> <li>• Award contract</li> </ul>	
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement handover arrangements</li> </ul>	
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commence new contract</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement new lease arrangements (if appropriate)</li> </ul>

## 6.0 Recommendations

### 6.1 Cabinet is recommended to

- i) Note the present contractual position in respect of service provision at the Marina centre and the Phoenix pool
- ii) Identify their preferred option for securing service delivery beyond April 2008 as set out in paragraph 2.1
- iii) In the event of selecting options b), d) or e) agree to waive Council Contract Standing Orders
- iv) Instruct officers to explore which other related services and facilities might usefully be included in a tender specification and report back to Cabinet on this matter
- v) Note that work concerning potential future lease arrangements for the Marina centre and Phoenix pool will be undertaken in parallel with the development and subsequent placement of service contracts
- vi) Endorse the activity timetable set out at paragraph 5.4

GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

FORWARD PLAN LISTING KEY DECISIONS LIKELY TO BE MADE DURING THE PERIOD

Executive Members are:

Barry Coleman Barry Stone  
 Tony Smith Bob Peck  
 Jim Shrimplin Graham Plant

1 September 2007 to 31 December 2007

NB Key decisions are Executive decisions (i) likely to result in savings or expenditure of more than £100,000; or (ii) which are significant in terms of the effect on people living or working in two or more electoral wards.

Matter for key decision	Who will make decision	Date/Period when decision likely	Groups/organisations to be consulted	How consultations are to take place	How representations are to be made, and by when	List of documents to be submitted to decision taker
Adoption of Environmental and Sustainability Policy for the Borough	Cabinet	September 2007	Members Staff Stakeholders	Meetings, correspondence, presentations	To Environmental Strategy Manager	Draft policy and associated report by Environmental Strategy Manager

Notes:

(i) No key decisions were made in August and no key decisions have been added.

15

CFS/DJS – 1/9/1/3  
 6 September 2007

G:\HMLS\Legal\C F Skinner\Committee Admin\Forward Plan - 1 September to 31 December 2007.doc

AGENDA  
 ITEM  
 4