

**FINAL REPORT TO
THE LONDON BOROUGH OF LAMBETH**

**COMMUNITY MEETING ON THE FUTURE OF
BROCKWELL LIDO**

FEBRUARY 02

**CAG CONSULTANTS
GORDON HOUSE
6 LISSENDEN GARDENS
LONDON NW5 1LX**

**TEL/FAX: 020 7482 8882
E-MAIL: hq@cagconsult.co.uk
www.cagconsultants.co.uk**

CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Background	3
3 The process	4
4 <u>Part 1</u>: Options for the future of the Lido	8
5 Community concerns	8
6 <u>Part 2</u>: Finance and management options	11
7 Recommendations	12
8 Steering Group	17
9 Key suggestions to keep the Lido open	18
10 Conclusion	19

Appendix 1: Agenda for community meeting

Appendix 2: Key suggestions as to how the Lido should be kept open

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A community meeting was held on 31st January to explore options for the future of the Lido. The Lido is badly in need of funds, both for everyday operation and for capital investment, and its future is in question. The common goal of everyone at the meeting was to find a way of keeping the Lido open for the benefit of local people.

The meeting was attended by 54 representatives from the main interest groups involved in the Lido: the Brockwell Lido Users group, the Brockwell Park Management Advisory Committee, the Herne Hill Forum, Whippersnappers music and outreach group, Yoga group and current management of the Lido. It was supported by Ian Barclay of Torkildsen Barclay, an independent leisure consultant who has recently prepared a report for Lambeth Council on future options for the Lido. The meeting was facilitated by Mary Anderson and Alison Pilling of CAG Consultants. Councillors and officers from Lambeth Council were also present.

Views expressed

The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the future options put forward in the Torkildsen Barclay report. Options involving closure of the Lido were not felt to be acceptable to the community, and representatives of Lambeth Council respected this. Subsidy by the Council, possibly as part of the Sports and Leisure portfolio, was requested by many of the community representatives. Councillor McGlone explained that the financial pressure of other service commitments made such subsidy highly unlikely. Also, Lambeth's current Leisure contract would not allow addition of the Lido at this stage. A further option, involving a commercial development of part of the site to cross-subsidise the Lido, was also discussed. There were mixed feelings about this option: some community representatives felt there could be a 'clash of cultures' between a commercial 'health and fitness club' next to a community-based Lido. But others felt that some mix of commercial and community operation would be the most realistic way forward.

Main concerns

The main concerns emerging from the first part of the meeting were that:

- the Lido is highly valued by many sections of the local community
- closure of the Lido should be ruled out
- users and community representatives should be involved in shaping the way forward
- subsidy of the Lido, possibly within Lambeth's Sports and Leisure portfolio, should be considered by the Council
- a long-term view should be taken, to ensure viability
- short-term disruption to the current activities, including summer swimming, should be avoided
- a wider geographic area covering more of the park could be considered, to improve viability.

Recommendations for the future

In the second part of the meeting, participants put forward recommendations for three aspects of the Lido's future:

What it is used for:

- expand the range of uses of the Lido, building on its current strengths and developing year-round activities (eg. therapy centre, improved café, SCUBA in the pool)
- maintain its current community-centred atmosphere
- ensure uses are consistent with planning constraints

How it is managed:

- possibly form a development trust or community trust to monitor or steer commercial operations
- alternatively, when contractual arrangements permit, include the Lido within Lambeth's Sports and Leisure portfolio

Where money will come from:

- major funding is needed (current management estimate that the Lido needs £50-100,000 revenue funding per year, depending on the summer season; and £3-5 million investment needed within the next 10 years to keep the Lido open - but clarification is needed on these figures)
- expanded usage along current lines, and park events, could help meet revenue funding needs
- but additional funding sources will be needed to meet capital requirements
- a trust structure would qualify for more sources of funding , but
- commercial partners or sponsors are also likely to be needed

Steering Group

Lambeth Council asked participants to select a Steering Group of community representatives, which would work with the Council to take these ideas forward and help to shape the future of the Lido. The consensus was that the core members of the Steering Group should comprise 3 members of the Brockwell Lido Users Group, two representatives of MAC and Friends of Brockwell Park, and 1 representative from the Herne Hill Forum/Brixton Forum. Additional advisory members, without voting rights, would be called by the Steering Group as necessary. These would include council officers and members, current management of the Lido and current management of Lido activities (eg. Whippersnappers, Yoga).

The Council asked these groups to identify their Steering Group representatives within 1 week to 10 days, so that the Steering Group could hold its first meeting to decide its role and constitution as soon as possible. Advisory members would be invited to this first meeting.

At the end of the meeting, participants thanked the Council for showing a strong commitment to community involvement in this process.

1. INTRODUCTION

CAG Consultants were appointed by Lambeth Council to facilitate a community meeting on options for the future of Brockwell Lido. The meeting was held in the evening, from 6.30pm to 9.30pm on Thursday 31st January 2002.

The main objectives of the meeting were:

- To bring the main stakeholders together to develop an overall view of the conclusions of a report by Torkildsen Barclay (an independent report on the future options for the Lido);
- To establish a steering group, drawn from the main stakeholder groups, to guide the process after the event.

The common goal of all stakeholders at the meeting, including the Council's representatives, was:

Common goal:

To keep the Lido open for the benefit of local people.

2. BACKGROUND

Brockwell Lido is much valued as a resource by the local community. But, like many Lidos across the country, it is not viable without a subsidy for both revenue and capital costs. Lambeth took a decision some years ago that it could not continue to subsidise the Lido on an ongoing basis. The Lido was closed for four years from 1990 to 1994, but the council still met the costs of maintaining the buildings and repairing damage from vandalism.

Following that phase, Lambeth put out to tender a 7-year contract for re-opening and managing the Lido, with an initial subsidy over the first 4 years of £134,000, tapering to no subsidy after 7 years. This contract was won by Brockwell Lido Limited, the current managers of the Lido. When the contract was nearing completion, in February 2001, Lambeth reviewed the situation and found that significant investment was needed to enable the Lido to continue operating. A proportion of this investment, £120,000, was made up-front in 2001, to ensure that the centre met Health and Safety regulations. A further £135,000 may be spent on works to keep the Lido open.

Early in 2001, Lambeth started the process of reviewing the long-term future of the Lido. A report was commissioned from Torkildsen Barclay, Leisure Consultants, to review options for the future of the Lido. Ian Barclay consulted with the main stakeholder groups in preparing his report, which was released in October 2001.

The consultant's report presented four options:

- Option 1: continue with present arrangements, with some subsidy from the Council
- Option 2: close the Lido
- Option 3: close the Lido and redevelop as leisure facilities
- Option 4: partial redevelopment of site to subsidise Lido

The Torkildsen Barclay report suggested that Option 4 was the most realistic way forward, given the level of community support and the realities of council budgets. Option 1 would involve ongoing subsidy, which would be unacceptable to the council, and Options 2 and 3 would mean loss of the Lido, which would be unacceptable to the community.

The council's aims in consulting key stakeholders about this report were to:

- seek their views on the relative merits of the Options, particularly Option 4;
- if acceptable, to flesh out how Option 4 could work in practice.

3. THE PROCESS

3.1 Invitation of key stakeholders

The main stakeholder groups involved in the Lido were all sent an invitation asking for a total of 20 representatives from each group. These groups were:

- Brockwell Park Management Advisory Committee (MAC)
- Friends of Brockwell Park
- Herne Hill and Brixton Forum's
- Brockwell Lido Users
- Whippersnappers and Yoga users
- Current Lido Management
- Whippersnappers and Yoga Management

An article in the South London Press and an article on the Lambeth website also advertised the event.

All people interested (including the groups with their nominees) were asked to contact Iain Killingbeck, Lambeth Council's Consultation Officer, in order to secure a place and so that the numbers were known before the event. A total of 67 people had either been nominated or had independently contacted Lambeth Council before the event.

A total of 54 people turned up on the night (including Lambeth Officers) and 32 of these filled out an 'Evaluation and Feedback' form. As shown in Table 1, the Brockwell Lido Users group was particularly well represented. This group included users of Yoga and Whippersnappers services, as well as swimmers.

Table 1: Participants

Stakeholder/representative group	No. of people
Brockwell Lido Users (BLU) (which includes some Yoga and Whippersnapper users)	22
Brockwell Park Management Advisory Committee (MAC)/ Friends of Brockwell Park	6
Herne Hill Forum	1
Whippersnappers (management)	4
Yoga (management)	1
Current Lido Management	2
Independent/local residents (representation not stated - may include Herne Hill Forum and other organisations)	9
Lambeth Councillors	3
Lambeth Officers	6
Total	54

Source: Lido Meeting Analysis - Evaluation Forms; Iain Killingbeck; Lambeth Council

The analysis of evaluation forms reveals that half of the respondents (16) had heard about the meeting through the Brockwell Lido Users group. Two had heard of the meeting through the Yoga classes, 2 through Whippersnappers and two through the Herne Hill Forum. However, 8 people gave no response to this question.

3.2 Proceedings

The meeting style was highly participatory but also tightly structured. Presentations were kept to a minimum, and small group work was used with the aim of allowing everyone present to have their say.

As shown in the agenda, in Appendix 1, the meeting was divided into two parts. There was a brief presentation by Ian Barclay, author of the Torkildsen Barclay report, to set out the options for each part of the meeting.

Part one: What do you think about the four options?

Part two: Financial and management alternatives for Option 4

In part one, each of the small groups was asked to identify about 3-4 key questions or concerns they had about the options for the future of the Lido. These were written on A3-sized sheets that were then stuck to the wall (like oversized 'post-its') and grouped into common themes. These themes informed the large group discussion that followed. The facilitators directed questions to relevant 'resource people' such as Councillors, officers and current management, as the discussion demanded. One such resource person was a representative from Greenwich Leisure, which is a community-controlled organisation that manages a range of leisure facilities, including Charlton Lido. This part of the meeting did not reach any conclusion, and - in particular - did not show a clear consensus for Option 4. However, it allowed a range of important concerns to be aired. These are presented in Section 4 below.

At the start of the second part of the meeting, Ian Barclay outlined possible financial and management alternatives within Option 4 ranging from:

- Option 4A - The creation of a Development Trust - a locally established trust would develop the site and manage the Lido.
- Option 4B - Commercial Operator Development - a commercial operator would develop the site and manage the Lido with community input via a Management Advisory Board.
- Option 4C - Commercial Operator Development of site adjacent to Lido with rental from the development being used to subsidise a trust managed Lido.

At this stage, people were again asked to work in small groups. Because of the lack of consensus for Option 4, they were not asked to develop recommendations specifically for this option. Instead, they were asked to put forward their recommendations more generally under three headings:

- Usage and facilities that the Lido should offer;
- How to structure/manage the Lido;
- How to finance the Lido.

Again, each group wrote their suggestions on separate A3 sheets, like outsized 'post-its'. These were then stuck up on the wall by a spokesperson for each group, and grouped under the three headings. These issues were then discussed by the large group but, again, no specific conclusions were reached. The recommendations emerging from this session are presented in Section 7.

The final discussion focused on the way forward. Lambeth Council had invited the stakeholder groups to nominate representatives for a Steering Group, which would work with the Council to take forward the options for the Lido's future. Discussion focused on the composition and role of this group. The conclusions emerging from this discussion are presented in Section 8.

Before leaving, participants were asked to complete an evaluation form and - on this form - to give their key suggestion as to how the Lido could be kept open. About half of the community participants completed these forms. The key suggestions are presented in Appendix 2 and discussed in Section 9.

3.3 Feedback from participants

Analysis of completed evaluation forms suggested that 47% of participants felt that the workshop had been 'fairly productive' in achieving an acceptable way forward for the future of the Lido. 21% felt that the workshop had been 'very productive'. A quarter (25%) of people completing the evaluation form did not respond to this question, while the remaining 6% felt that the workshop had been 'not very productive'.

The relatively low number of participants describing the workshop as 'very productive' probably reflect the uncertainties that still surrounded the future of the Lido at the end of the meeting. The workshop aired community views but did not reach a clear consensus or agreement on the way forward.

Positive comments

The evaluation form asked which parts of the meeting people had found most interesting and helpful. The responses are presented below:

Format and Structure of the Meeting

- Small groups – facilitated main point being voiced.
- Working together to produce key points.
- Discussing what each group had come up with.
- Councillor input and discussions from the floor.
- Hearing other's opinions
- The obvious support for community activities, the true valuing of the Lido's unique resource of community positivity.
- Interaction of ideas between the syndicate groups.
- Open discussion.
- Open discussion and brainstorming.
- The Post-It notes ideas good for concentrating everyone thoughts and ideas.
- The discussion.

Torkildsen Barclay Report

- Interesting: the fact that Option 1 appeared not to be an option i.e subsidy, and that Options 2 and 3 were not officially ruled out.

Suggested improvements

The evaluation forms also asked for specific suggestions as to how the workshop could have been improved. These were as follows:

Format and Structure of the Meeting

- Parameters not so channelled and full plans/figures being released before.
- Well run but felt rather circular rather than forward moving.
- It seems odd to send ½ the agenda on the 4 options then the second ½ on how to manage Option 4. I think we could have spent more time on the second ½ issues.

Venue

- Smaller room. Better lighting.
- Use of a microphone.

Torkildsen Barclay Report

- Some of the options were not really options.
- The Report how much did it cost?

Response from Council

- Questions could have been answered more clearly and succinctly.
- Lack of clarity from the Council.
- Council officials and 'experts' joining us on the floor rather than on the edge – us and them.
- Were the conclusions decided before the meeting?

Supplying of Information

- Council to have supplied running costs (current) etc. Without figures felt a bit pie in the sky and a waste of 3 hours!
- Council figures. Specific planning information.
- More information on £'s earned and £'s needed would have been helped and enabled us to come up with more productive ideas.
- Probably more information about ideas already thought out by Paddy and Casey (current management) could have been brought in earlier.

Many of these concerns relate to the lack of detailed financial information available at the workshop. Some information was presented in the Torkildsen Barclay report, and some was fed into the workshop verbally by the current management. As facilitators, we hope that detailed discussion of these financial issues can be taken forward by the Steering Group.

4. PART 1: OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF THE LIDO

Ian Barclay started Part 1 of the meeting by outlining the process he had gone through in preparing his report on options for the future of the Brockwell Lido. His consultations had involved almost all of the stakeholder groups represented at the meeting. He explained the inherent viability problems faced by Lidos, owing to their short summer season and their dependence on high attendance during warm, sunny days over the school holiday period. And he stressed the need for ongoing operational subsidy, and periodic injections of major capital investment, which is a feature of the Brockwell Lido and all other Lidos he has studied. He briefly explained the four options set out in his report:

- Option 1: continue with present arrangements, with some subsidy from the Council
- Option 2: close the Lido
- Option 3: close the Lido and redevelop as leisure facilities
- Option 4: partial redevelopment of site to subsidise Lido

5. COMMUNITY CONCERNS

5.1 Notes from small group `post-its' session

The concerns identified by participants about the future of the Lido are listed below. They were written on large `post-it' sheets and roughly grouped into topics. There is some overlap between topics, which informed the plenary discussion that followed.

User involvement

- *Users/local representation in management, specification and tender assessment*
- *We want to ensure the working group is as effective as possible - how will it be organised, for how long will it be convened, what is it expected to deliver?*
- *Local input to tendering process*
- *If option 4, will current inclusive community use and service level be guaranteed?*
- *Community representation in future management*
- *Local involvement in management*

- *What kind of trust? - development or community governance?*

Wider geographic area

- *Park trust to include the Lido*
- *Is the car park on the agenda?*

Lambeth leisure portfolio

- *Can the Lido be part of Lambeth's leisure portfolio? If not, why not?*
- *Enquire re incorporating Lido into Lambeth Council's recreation Centres' contract (with community involvement)*
- *Why look at the Lido in isolation?*

Ruling out options

- *Can options 2 and 3 be ruled out?*
- *Can options 2 and 3 be completely ruled out? (not options in fact!)*
- *Has the council ruled out option 1 in terms of subsidy?*

Long lease

- *Concern about commercial involvement - we must ensure it stays as a Lido beyond the end of the contract (see 'Big Issue' this week)*
- *There must be a long-term lease with community control over any commercial development*
- *Therapy has attracted international teachers - need longer lease to exploit potential*
- *If a sponsor is found, will the council guarantee a set lease period to current management?*
- *Investment is dependent on a long enough lease*
- *Time-span to implement chosen option?*
- *How will commercial partner be tied in? - for full/long term?*
- *We have to look at next 30 years development and future users*
- *Tender dependent on long lease*

Finance

- *How much income is needed per annum - and capital?*
- *Option 4 - has it been market tested?*
- *Is it realistic to expect a commercial operator to subsidise the Lido?*
- *Would 'health club' proposal generate sufficient income?*
- *Council must keep option to subsidise: (1) short term; (2) long term; Lambeth's responsibility to maintain leisure/community asset/amenity*
- *For Options 1/2/3 - how much would it cost to change the site of the Lido into something else, and how much revenue would this new facility generate?*
- *Are there any alternative funding streams available?*

What happens in the interim?

- *Cannot afford to disrupt programmes that have been built up?*

- *How will the Lido be supported over the next 2 years? (prior to new management)*
- *What about the interim period? (protecting current activities and users...; council/other support possibilities...)*
- *Will the Lido remain open in the interim 2 years?*

What we value (and don't want to lose)

- *In keeping with park and local neighbourhood*
- *Retaining its current atmosphere*
- *Commercial development not to compromise current ambience/community access*
- *Families and children can share all activities*
- *Retain and expand existing community use*
- *Lido to cater for all of Lambeth's residents (eg. disadvantaged groups) as present*
- *Are we able to swim in the summer?*
- *Retain open air swimming*
- *The Lido is unique and a great asset as it is which is in no small part due to the current management*
- *Whippersnappers:*
 - *Lido is vital and unique location*
 - *Perfect access for wheelchairs and buggies etc*
 - *Parking!*
 - *7 day a week access*
 - *focus for local people, especially children (eg. estate nearby)*
- *Yoga and therapy centre:*
 - *No closure*
 - *Has built up members of all ages (young adults upwards)*
 - *Inseparable from park and pool, and its ambience*
 - *Perfect access for wheelchairs and buggies etc*
 - *Parking!*
 - *7 day a week access*
 - *focus for local people, especially children (eg. estate nearby)*

5.2 Summary of concerns

The main messages emerging from the 'post-it' session were that:

- the Lido is highly valued by many sections of the local community
- the community would like closure of the Lido to be ruled out
- users and community representatives should be involved in shaping the way forward
- subsidy of the Lido, possibly within Lambeth's Sports and Leisure portfolio, should be considered by the Council
- a long-term view should be taken, to ensure viability
- short-term disruption to the current activities, including summer swimming, should be avoided
- a wider geographic area covering more of the park could be considered, to improve viability.

5.3 Discussion in plenary session

The small group work was followed by a plenary discussion involving everyone. The facilitators focused the discussion initially on finance issues, directing the question about potential subsidy to Councillor McGlone.

Councillor McGlone stated that he was strongly in favour of keeping the Lido open as a community resource, and had worked to achieve this. But he warned that competing demands on Council Budgets made renewed subsidy highly unlikely.

Participants asked why the Lido was not included in the Sports and Leisure budget, along with other swimming pools. Other pools are subsidised, so why not the Lido? There was some discussion of this issue, by Councillor McGlone and by Grant Aitken, an officer from Sports and Recreation. The inclusion of the Lido in the Environment portfolio appeared to be a historic accident, rather than a logically chosen position. However, movement of the Lido to the Sports and Leisure portfolio would require a commitment from the Council, and from current contractors, to cross-subsidise (or partly subsidise) the Lido from elsewhere in the Sports and Leisure budget. Given that current contracts for Leisure facilities are ongoing, this would have its problems. No clear conclusion was reached on this topic.

Other points made in the plenary discussion were that:

- A Councillor for one of the local wards made a commitment to keep Lido open.
- One of the current managers stated that current management need a long term lease so they can get investment in the Lido.
- Participants felt that partial subsidy should not be excluded, to enable the Lido to continue as it is, with community involvement.

At the end of the first part of the meeting, the facilitators felt that there was a clear consensus against Options 2 and 3 (involving closure of the Lido). While the Council's preference for Option 4 was clear (involving cross-subsidy of the Lido by a commercial development such as a health and fitness club), there was no clear consensus for this Option amongst other stakeholder. Many stakeholders felt that Option 1 (some subsidy by the Council) should still be considered.

6. PART 2: FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

To launch the second part of the meeting, Ian Barclay made a second brief presentation on the financial and management options that could be used for Option 4. These were outlined as three sub-options within Option 4, involving different levels of community control and responsibility:

- Option 4A - The creation of a Development Trust - a locally established trust would develop the site and manage the Lido.
- Option 4B - Commercial Operator Development - a commercial operator would develop the site and manage the Lido with community input via a Management Advisory Board.
- Option 4C - Commercial Operator Development of site adjacent to Lido with rental from the development being used to subsidise a trust managed Lido.

Owing to the mix of views expressed in Part 1 of the meeting, the facilitators opened up the next session to consider financial and management of the Lido in general, not just under Option 4. Working in the same small groups, participants were asked to make recommendations for three aspects of the Lido's future:

1. Usage and facilities
2. Management structure
3. Finance.

Before commencing this session, participants asked for more information on the Lido's financial requirements. One of the current managers explained that the Lido will need:

- £50-100,000 per year operating subsidy, depending on the season and length of opening
- about £5 million capital investment over the next 10 years.

These figures need to be clarified and confirmed.

The recommendations put forward in 'post-it' form are listed below, grouped into the three categories listed above. These informed the final plenary discussion.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Usage and facilities

- *Reorganisation of space: build on existing brand - eg.*
 - *holistic therapy*
 - *osteopathy*
 - *mind, body, soul*
 - *expand yoga and meditation*
 - *beauty and hair*
 - *massage*
 - *acupuncture*
 - *reflexology*

- *retain open-air pool: current opening hours, usage and inclusivity - minimum; SCUBA*
- *open the pool all year round - open air but heated*
- *support current usage:*
 - *Whippersnappers*
 - *Yoga*
 - *Meditation/Tai Chi*
- *Facilities:*
 - *Big open air pool (current ambience; improve changing rooms)*
 - *Expanded community use of facilities (ie. youth club)*
 - *Yoga and mediation*
 - *Whippersnappers*
 - *Decent café/restaurant*
- *Continue with/expand catering facilities*
 - *More Healthy eating options*
 - *Evening social events*
- *Add to activities to involve even more people from wider community:*
 - *Cater for all ages including `youth' and older people*
 - *Improve toilets and changing facilities*
- *Facilities/usage:*
 - *Development of current `yoga etc'*
 - *Open air swimming*
 - *Heating of pool*
 - *Fitness/health (alternative also) centre*
 - *Other activities (SCUBA, ice skating, canoeing?)*
- *Open air no fewer hours/days - more if possible - all year usage possibilities*
- *Use existing space more efficiently:*
 - *Re-allocate changing rooms*
 - *Use 4 existing therapy rooms (unused) for massage etc*
 - *Develop existing activities*
 - *Bar open in evenings*
 - *Swimming club*
- *Encourage community use (ie. Yoga, Whippersnappers)*
- *Develop other health/education activities*
- *Small pool for babies*
- *SCUBA/canoeing - fine in cold water!*
- *Continue and develop current facilities and community use:*

- *Winter skating*
- *SCUBA school*
- *Education facility*
- *Extend season - solar heating/cover*
- *Audit of existing space in order to realise its maximum potential*
- *Existing cluster of facilities/activities which have evolved should be retained*
- *Avoid a clash of cultures: develop holistic/alternative health/therapy activities not exclusive yuppy-style club*

7.2 Structure/management

- *Keep commercial development separate from the Lido*
- *If it was part of the portfolio, the Lido could be marketed properly*
- *The Lido should no longer be in the Environment Portfolio - it should be under Sports and Leisure*
- *Current structure and management appears to be successful*
- *Prefer Option 4B: integrated community Lido/fitness development managed with input from trust and from Council and other sources*
- *Committee of local representatives, users, workers (eg. like Brix Trust management structure at St. Matthews)*
- *Development Trust like St. Martin's*
- *management structure to be run along current lines - community level, ideas, community commitment (ie. if commercial operator - to be monitored by community & current service level guaranteed (ie. if Option 4C)*
- *Option C - would the commercial operator be constrained to work within community -friendly guidelines?*
- *Management:*
 - *Council cannot give up responsibility*
 - *Local representation in management*
 - *Balance commercial and community interests*
- *Long lease for private company to be overseen by a trust*
- *Local management essential:*
 - *No large corporation or local authority*
 - *Community input to management*
- *How to structure management:*
 - *Community input (advisory committee; representation of all groups)*
 - *Profit, not primary concern*
 - *Existing management style*
- *Long lease = proper investment = increased potential (365 day usage = potential profit)??*

7.3 Finance

- *Finance:*
 - *Increase from existing users*
 - *Extend activities*
 - *Sponsorship from local businesses*
 - *Shortfall for 2001 = £58,000*
 - *Market at winter weekends*
- *Finance:*
 - *Revenue from existing sources*
 - *Commercial partner*
 - *Monies from park events*
 - *Trust - to attract funding*
- *Expansion of catering facilities: restaurant, bar, health food (regularly beyond daylight hours)*
- *Charity status*
- *Finance/funding:*
 - *Council commitment to long lease, if funding found for gym*
 - *Lottery funding*
 - *Business and trust*
 - *Long lease to attract sponsors*
 - *Patron*
- *Long term lease. Trust to develop site opposite pool, partially to fund the pool. What about planning? How will it work? Who will give permission for lease - would anyone really give planning (permission)*
- *Any development undertaken to cross-subsidise the pool*
- *Finance:*
 - *Keep options WIDE open*
 - *Where are the figures?*
 - *Will they be available?*
 - *'£50-100k operating cost; £5m capital expenditure' does not enable us to provide advice to experts here*
 - *steering group to be informed*

7.4 Summary of recommendations in `post-it' session

The main recommendations emerging from the `post-it' session were:

Usage/facilities

There was broad consensus on the type of facilities and usage that participants would like to see:

- Maintain open-air swimming, with current opening hours, usage and inclusivity as minimum
- Consider year-round uses for swimming pool (eg. SCUBA; canoeing, ice-skating; or heated pool)
- Make better use of existing space (eg. reallocate changing rooms; use 4 existing therapy rooms)
- Develop holistic/alternative health/therapy activities, building on existing `brand'
- Develop fitness/health centre
- Improve catering facilities (and possibly have evening bar or social events)
- Improve toilets and changing facilities
- Expand community use of facilities (more for young and older people; baby pool..)

Structure/management

There was a strong consensus that the community should be involved in management but views differed on how this should be achieved. For instance:

- Some felt the Council should not give up responsibility for the Lido, and should put it under Sports and Leisure where it could be marketed properly. But others wanted the Lido to be independent from the Council (eg. under a Development trust)
- Some participants did not want a `large corporation' - but there was a consensus that if the site was managed by a commercial operator (Option 4B/C), the operator should be monitored by/responsive to the community and should guarantee current service levels
- Views differed on whether a health and fitness club, with private investment, should be integrated with a community-orientated Lido (Option 4B), or whether commercial development should be kept separate from the Lido (Option 4C)

Several different management options received support:

- Current structure, management arrangements and management style (Option 1)
- Development trust (Option 4A)
- Private company, overseen by a trust (Option 4B)

There was consensus that a long lease would be required to allow proper investment and realise the Lido's potential

Two local examples of community involvement were given: a committee involving local representatives, users, workers (like Brix Trust, St Matthews) or a Development Trust (like St Martin's)

Finance

Ideas for generating funds were:

- Increase contribution from existing users
- Extend activities, including catering (eg. beyond daylight hours)
- Sponsorship from commercial partner(s) (eg. local businesses)
- Raise money from park events
- Trust or charity status, to allow access to more sources of funding
- Lottery funding
- Long lease to attract sponsors and/or develop site opposite pool
- Development to cross-subsidise pool

But there was concern that the financial information available at this workshop was inadequate, and that options should be kept open until they are available. The proposed steering group should be informed with the relevant figures.

7.5 Plenary discussion

The plenary discussion re-emphasised these points:

Usage/facilities

There was consensus that the pool should be kept open as it is but that existing space should be used more efficiently to allow expansion of current activities.

Structure/management

Many participants are happy with the current management arrangements and style. There is strong support for community input in the future of the Lido, for example through a community or development trust. Participants felt that a longer-term perspective would allow creativity for development.

Finance

Participants felt that there would be tensions between community uses and commercial development. But there was acceptance that expanded usage of existing facilities, park events and so on, would not meet capital investment requirements. Some other form of funding would be needed, possibly from a mix of sources including private investment.

One of the current managers pointed out that they want to develop the land next to the Lido into a community health club. When asked whether there was a business plan for this), he stated that turnover would be £800-900,000 per year (£3 charge per user).

Development trust

Some participants felt that the Council should hand over its 'landlord' role to a Development trust (Option 4A). The Trust could then contract a private operator to run the Lido and other facilities.

However, other options for community involvement were put forward in the 'post-it' recommendations. There was no clear consensus on the type of structure that should be developed, or how much responsibility it would be realistic for a trust to carry.

The final part of the meeting focused on proposals for a Steering Group, which would represent the community in taking all these issues forward.

8. STEERING GROUP

8.1 Composition

There was active discussion of Steering Group composition. The eventual consensus was that the core membership of the group should be entirely community-based, but that the core group would call in advisory members as necessary. It was felt that there would be potential conflicts of interest if current management, or managers of current services such as Whippersnappers, were voting members of the Steering Group. Also it was felt that councillors and officers should not be voting members. The proposed composition is therefore as follows:

Voting members to consist of 6 community representatives:

- Brockwell Lido Users - 3
- Brockwell Park Management Advisory Group/Friends - 2
- Herne Hill Forum - 1

Advisory members to include:

- Councillors - 3
- Officers (acting as secretariat and advisers, including Grants & Leisure)
- Current management
- Management of Whippersnappers and Yoga

The stakeholder groups were asked by the Council to nominate their representatives within the next week to 10 days. A first meeting will be held shortly, attended by the advisers as well as voting members, to agree the role of the group. Thereafter, advisers will attend by invitation of the core Steering Group.

8.2 Role

A number of important questions were raised about the role of the Steering Group:

- How much will it be listened to by the Council?
- How much time is it realistic to ask people to volunteer?
- What will its constitution be?

These issues should be discussed with advisory members at the first meeting. It will also be important to consider the timescale for which voting members are being appointed, and the mechanism for appointments to be reviewed over time.

At the end of the meeting, participants thanked the Council for showing a strong commitment to community involvement in this process.

9. KEY SUGGESTIONS TO KEEP THE LIDO OPEN

On leaving, participants were asked to complete an evaluation form. Feedback on the meeting in general is summarised in Section 3 of this report. The form also asked for people's key suggestions as to how the Lido could be kept open. Analysis of these responses gives some indication of the support enjoyed by different proposals.

The 32 responses to this question are summarised below. Some responses included more than one suggestion, and the points below are not all mutually exclusive. The

number in brackets indicates the number of times that each point was raised within the responses:

- Maintain but expand current 'alternative' activities (eg. create a comprehensive facility or 'Holistic health centre' with alternative therapies, classes, youth groups, good restaurant/bar, paddling pool, canoeing and SCUBA in winter) (11)
- Establish long-lease to encourage investment (8) *(of which 3 responses recommended extending the current management's lease)*
- Funding from Council (at least in part) (7)
- Move to Sports and Leisure portfolio (7) *(of which 3 are already included in 'funding from council' but 4 are additional to this)*
- Some balance of commercial and community involvement (6)
- Set up a trust, charity or similar status to attract Lottery or other funding (4) *(of which 2 responses wanted a development trust for the park as a whole)*
- Recognise the value that the Lido gives to the community, one of the most disadvantaged in the country, and that a price cannot be put on this (4)
- Listen to community and user groups and involve them in decision making (4)
- Health/Fitness Centre, with commercial investment (3)
- Find acceptable balance of commercial/community interests (2)
- Increase admission charges (means tested) (1)
- No granting of commercial leases (1)
- Aim for Listed Building status (1)

10. CONCLUSION

The workshop achieved a good airing of views from different stakeholder groups, but it did not reach consensus on the preferred way forward for the Lido. Some of the same points came up repeatedly throughout the workshop, in the 'concerns', 'recommendations' and 'key suggestions'. The points on which there was common agreement were that:

- The Lido is highly valued by many sections of the local community
- Closure of the Lido should be ruled out
- Users and the community should be involved in shaping the future of the Lido
- The Lido should retain its current community feel, as far as possible
- Open air swimming should be maintained, for current opening hours/times as a minimum
- Current alternative/holistic health and community activities should be expanded
- Some other source of funding needs to be identified to meet funding shortfalls, particularly capital investment requirements
- A long-term lease is needed to attract investment
- Short-term disruption of current activities should be avoided

There were mixed views about a number of important issues, including:

- The extent to which the Council should fund the Lido
- The need for a commercial development on the site to cross-subsidise the Lido
- Whether a community or development trust should be formed
- Whether the Lido should be moved to the Council's Sports and Leisure portfolio
- Whether the current management's lease should be extended
- Whether a wider geographic area should be considered (eg. the park as a whole)

The Steering Group has an important role in taking these issues forward, working in partnership with the Council. The Steering Group will be able to look at more detailed information on financial and management options, including the implications of forming a community or development trust.

This report documents the range of views held by different stakeholders, which should be borne in mind by both the Steering Group and the Council. It is important that mechanisms are found to respond to the suggestions made in this report, and to feed back future deliberations and decisions to the wider group of stakeholders.

APPENDIX 1: AGENDA FOR COMMUNITY MEETING

BROCKWELL LIDO - MEETING TO REVIEW OPTIONS

Thursday 31st January 2002

Meeting convened by Lambeth Borough Council and facilitated by CAG Consultants

Short presentations will be given by Leisure Consultants, Torkildsen Barclay

This meeting is an opportunity to explore the options for the Brockwell Lido, and to provide people with an opportunity to feed in their views before a decision is made.

The general principle behind the meeting is to keep the lido open.

6:30 arrive – coffee and tea will be available. We will start at 7:00.

Agenda:

Welcome and short briefing

Part one:

What do you think about the four options?

Work in small groups

Discussion of the key issues: everyone

Part two:

Briefing on the financial and management alternatives for Option 4

Discussion in small groups, followed by discussion of the key points:
everyone

Next steps

Finish at 9:30

APPENDIX 2 - KEY SUGGESTIONS AS TO HOW THE LIDO SHOULD BE KEPT OPEN

Representative Group	Response / Suggestion
BLU	Make more use of the unique qualities at Brockwell Lido, the space, access, environment, facilities. Create a comprehensive facility with alternative therapies, classes, youth groups, a good restaurant/bar, canoeing, scuba, in winter. Realising that this kind of facility gives to the community and a price not been put on its head.
BLU	Raise profile of value of Lido to one of most disadvantaged communities in the country.
BLU	LBC to commit to minimum management lease agreement, - i.e. Lido can be marketed properly, achieve sponsorship, retain current management etc.
BLU	LBC to aim for listed building status, Charity Trust community involvement and perhaps look at developing or expanding the current 'brand' i.e. holistic, mind, body and soul therapy – within current facilities etc (look at current use of changing rooms for this). Please not: It shouldn't just be about money as it seems to be. This seems to be a terribly short-sighted approach. Other things should be considered to have a true value.
BLU	Maintain 'brand' but expand e.g. holistic massage, acupuncture, osteopathy, health and beauty. Continue current activities and scuba diving, skating etc – extend season. There must be a long lease in order to attract any investment.
BLU	Charity status.
BLU	Increase catering facility – for 'out of hours' business.
BLU	Expand and build on current appeal and character of the Lido to maintain and extend current services swimming, yoga, meditation – Holistic Health Centre.
BLU	Move the Lido to the Sports and Leisure portfolio and find a minimum of 35% funding from Lambeth Council; remainder to come from activities and admission (rental from teachers/whippersnappers etc). Increase admission (means tested) prices.
BLU	That the Council should match the sum that Torkildsen Barclay has been paid (in total) exactly and use it specifically for the Lido.
BLU	Listen to the public and what they want.
BLU	Developing other uses – canoeing, scuba-diving etc so the lease can be extended.
BLU	Expand current 'alternative' based additional activities. Heat the pool, open all year round. Get it used by schools, swimming clubs, other activities/water sports. Look at Lottery funding. Expand catering, open it for functions.
BLU	Press the Council to re-allocate the Lido from 'Environment into Leisure – this is much more logical. Keep existing facilities but expand within the community need and requirements.
BLU	Develop a way to fund the core activity (swimming) through encouraging the development of all the ancillary activities (yoga etc) and developing the football changing rooms as a community health centre.

Representative Group	Response / Suggestion
	Possibly extend the area of the pool to include paddling pool.
BLU	A commercially run fitness centre in the adjoining changing room block may have a role in raising revenue to operate a Lido, but it must be run by the Lido operations if it is to be commercially viable. It is unrealistic to think a separate operator will be prepared to see this role of providing a subsidy for the Lido. Any commercial operators must not prejudice the present community orientated focus of the Lido activities.
BLU	Keep involving the user groups and listen to them.
BLU	User/community representation in decision and management. Council commitment. Acceptable balance of community and commercial.
BLU	I think that if the present management have the funding for a gym on the site of the changing rooms then the Council should guarantee a long lease so that this funding could be used. Without the promise of a long lease no one would fund any project. I think that the only way to keep the Lido as it is to have an expanded Health Fitness Centre.
BLU	Continue the Lido in the spirit that has been ran and expand on these principles. This however must be supported by a private investor – of any sort. Once this private sector is developed we must look at a long lease.
Whippersnappers	Collect all the facts financial/repairs/costings over next 30 years. Remain positive throughout, work imaginatively around private business and max opportunities for receiving funding. Keep as many people coming into the building and informed of the need to support the Lido even if it means paying a little more.
Whippersnappers	The principal that the Lido was closed, and it was re-opened and sustained without funding means it deserves some funding. Unlike projects which gets funding and caves in.
Whippersnappers	Involve in Lambeth portfolio 'Leisure/Sport'.
Yoga	Give current management a long-term lease in order to allow them to seek outside support and funding/sponsorship or set up a set a Park's Trust.
Yoga	Extend lease for further involvement Fund from different Council portfolios i.e. Leisure Fundraising events to create short-term revenue.
Friends of the Western Buddhist Order (Brixton)	Really look at and recognise both the current success and the potential for further growth of the uniquely positive community activities ongoing at the Lido: Whippersnappers, yoga, meditation: these are truly committed teams of individuals with genuine connection with the local community. Recognition of the preciousness of this oasis in the midst of the city must be inspiration since profits are not an obvious motivation. The spirit of the Lido must be embraced for it's real benefits to the health and well-being of the community: it is time for a deeper perspective: finances will be well invested the positive effects of this community resources cannot be measured in pounds alone.

Representative Group	Response / Suggestion
	OR Save money on hospitals, counselling social work, policing....
MAC/FOBP	Include the Lido in a wider Park (Dev.) Trust. Trust as landlord – including community stakeholders - ensuring commercial development did not subsume the 'core' uses – (Lido and community) – let the operational aspects to commercial enterprise.
MAC/FOBP	A mix of Council support, commercial enterprise, and identification of what must be many possible sources of further funding including the Office of the Mayor of London.
MAC/FOBP	Involving the community – as shown tonight. Long term commitment.
MAC/FOBP	Right legal status to get external funding. No granting of commercial leases.
Herne Hill Forum	Long lease. Trust status.
Current Management	Develop Health Centre
Current Management	To look at from a Leisure perspective rather than Environment thereafter releasing some additional knowledge and finance. Long, long, long lease.
Unknown	If it was part of the appropriate portfolio it could be marketed properly. Why is it under the Environment? I was shocked at Cllr McGlones refusal to answer a straightforward question i.e why is the Lido not included in Sports and Leisure' – and not only did he not answer it – he passed the buck – I think it would cost an awful lot of money to lose it's uniqueness.
Unknown	Taken into Leisure Dept. control.