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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>Prince of Wales Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFC</td>
<td>Cheltenham Rugby Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCHAC</td>
<td>Cheltenham and County Harriers Athletics Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Governing Body of Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Synthetic Turf Pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Whole Sports Plan (of Governing Body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX</td>
<td>Bicycle Moto Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G/4G</td>
<td>Third/Fourth generation artificial pitches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Introduction

1.1 Cheltenham Borough Council (The Council) has recently concluded the ‘planning’ stage of a commissioning review of Leisure and Culture which has defined target outcomes for leisure based on an understanding of community needs.

1.2 The Council has following a commissioning review established a preference for the creation of a new charitable trust and is undertaking a procurement exercise.

1.3 One of the facilities in the portfolio of Leisure and Culture in Cheltenham is the Prince of Wales Stadium (POW) and the Council appointed RPT Consulting in February 2013 to undertake a feasibility study to assess the best approach to use the facility to deliver the agreed leisure outcomes and in particular improve its financial performance.

1.4 In particular the Council consider that a successful conclusion would be the delivery of the following outcomes

- A sustainable future for the POW
- Savings in the financial operating costs
- Contribution towards the Council's corporate plan

1.5 We explore these outcomes later in the report. In particular the brief from the Council was very clear that the study should not consider either selling the freehold for the stadium or closure/part-closure of the stadium.

Background

1.6 The POW Stadium is operated by the Council and has a 500 seat stadium (with standing and grass banked seating to create a potential capacity of circa 2,000) and includes the following facilities

- 400 metre athletics track (8 lane straight/ 6 lane 300m)
- 2 pitches primarily used for athletics field events, Rugby Union and Rugby League
- 2 meeting rooms and a club house
- A personal gym operated by a tenant in the basement

1.7 The POW is home to a number of clubs, including Cheltenham Rugby Union Club (CRFC) and Cheltenham & County Harriers Athletics Club (CCHAC), as well as a number of other clubs, such as the University Rugby Club and All Golds Rugby League who play at the POW. CRFC currently have a lease agreement as opposed to the other clubs, who have hire agreements and book usage as required.

1.8 The lease agreement with CRFC commenced in 1981 and runs for 35 years until the 2016/17 season. It gives the club demise of the clubhouse all year and provides rights of access to pitches during the rugby season (1 September to 30 April) and 2 matches and 2 practices outside of the season.
1.9 In recent years there has been the development of housing behind the POW which has also resulted in an access road bisecting the site and separating out the main stadium pitch from the training pitch.

Our Approach

1.10 Our approach has been to undertake needs analysis and consultation to establish a needs led solution enabling us to develop a series of options for consideration. The options have been reviewed to identify the most appropriate management options, revenue projections and potential funding sources.

1.11 Our work has also reviewed previous work undertaken including the Leisure@ facility review undertaken in 2012 by FMG Consulting.

1.12 Our approach includes the following key areas

- Strategic overview – where we review the context in which POW sits including the wider regional and local agenda
- Needs Analysis – which reviews the catchment analysis including demographic and demand analysis together with a review of potential competitors
- Stakeholder Consultation – with key partners, including CRFC and CCHAC
- Facility Mix Options – which sets out possible facility mix options for the future development
- Management and Funding Options – how the facilities could be managed and funded, including timetable of uses and revenue projections.

1.13 We summarise the outputs from our work over the remainder of the report in the following sections

- Section 2 – Needs Analysis, setting out the results from our strategic overview, need analysis and stakeholder consultation
- Section 3 – Facility and Management Options, setting out the potential facility mixes and management options
- Section 4 – Conclusions and Way Forward, including key recommendations

1.14 We support our report with a number of key appendices.
SECTION 2 – NEED ANALYSIS

Introduction

2.1 Within this section we seek to identify the potential need for sports and leisure activities to enhance existing uses on the site. This includes the following key areas, which have been reviewed

- Strategic Context – an overview of the strategic framework within which POW sits
- Consultation – summarising the outputs of our consultation with stakeholders
- Demographic Analysis of the catchment area
- Demand assessment – review of the potential demand for facilities to identify the likely need for key facilities

2.2 We summarise the key findings from each of these areas over the following paragraphs with further detail in Appendices A & B, and we present an overall summary of the likely need for facilities at the end of the section.

2.3 In considering potential facilities that could be provided within the POW Stadium there are a number of opportunities which have been considered, including

- Future use of the main stadium and pitch – are Rugby and Athletics still going to be key users.
- What is the likely future for All Golds Rugby League team
- Opportunities for use of the training pitch and other space – for example the potential development of a BMX track which has been proposed
- Synthetic Turf Pitch – is there an opportunity to provide and develop
- Other sporting and commercial opportunities – to add value to the overall mix and also develop the financial performance, such as extreme sports, conferencing, etc

2.4 There are in considering the opportunities a number of key constraints which also impact on the future development of sporting and other activities, such as size of the site, current lease arrangements, car parking on the site. The existing provision at Leisure@ also provides some limitations on what can be provided at the POW stadium to avoid any duplication.

2.5 We take these into account in assessing the future needs.

Strategic Context

2.6 The POW stadium operates within a strategic framework which includes a number of strategies and plans at a national, regional and local level, which influence policy and the approach to provision, such as

- Sport England Youth and Community Strategy 2012 – 2017
- Sport England Strategy 2008 – 2013
- Start Active – Stay Active 2011
- Changing Behaviours, Changing Outcomes (Dept of Health)
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- Whole Sport Plans of National Governing Body’s (NGB) – for example Athletics, Rugby League, Rugby Union, Football and Cycling
- Joint Core Strategy between Cheltenham Borough Council, Tewkesbury Borough Council and Gloucester City Council
- Leisure and Culture Commissioning Review

2.7 All of these strategies and frameworks impact on physical activity, sport and improving health and provide the context within which POW sits. We present an overview of the various strategies and plans which impact on future provision in Appendix A and summarise over subsequent paragraphs the key themes which impact on POW.

2.8 There are a number of common themes and outcomes which the majority of the national plans focus upon including:

- Improving health and well being outcomes – through physical activity and sport
- Increased participation in sport and physical activity, particularly building on the legacy of 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games
- Safe communities – promoting and developing environments where people feel safe and secure
- Learning and development – providing opportunities for people to acquire new skills and develop themselves through differing environments

2.9 Within the Whole Sport Plans (WSP) of the NGB’s there are a number of key targets and outcomes which may be of relevance to the proposed developments at POW. We have reviewed a number of plans, with the most relevant being Football, Rugby (Union & League), Athletics and Cycling, which all offer opportunities for the POW, such as

- The development of flexible, small sided games such as Touch Rugby and 5 a side leagues for football, suggesting the opportunity to use some of the space available for these sports to be played at POW.
- Opportunities to develop colleges and university links to promote and develop the partnerships, for example the rugby football league (RFL) will support higher and further education institutes
- Facility improvements are also a feature of some of the WSPs such as for cycling and football, particularly for investment in 3G pitches, offering an opportunity for the POW to access some of this funding.
- Investment in clubs (such as Athletics) is also a feature with investment in specialist equipment
2.10 Cheltenham itself has a number of strategies and frameworks within which the POW operates and in particular this includes the joint core strategy, corporate strategy and leisure and culture commissioning review. Some of the key outcomes and priorities, which are relevant to POW, from the latter two in particular include:

- Strengthening Communities – in particular that people are able to lead healthy lifestyles
- Seeking to attract visitors and investors to the borough
- Using the arts and culture to strengthen the community, the economy and protecting the environment
- Ensuring the delivery of value for money services

2.11 The Leisure and Culture Commissioning Review sets out a framework for delivery of services and in particular the sports facilities and delivery of some key outcomes, which for sport, play and active living is that:

> “More people are inspired to be physically, socially and mentally active and are able to live life to the full”

2.12 Thus in evaluating the future opportunities for POW we will need to consider the key themes and outcomes and requirements from the various strategies to reflect whether the future proposals would deliver on these outcomes.

Stakeholder Consultation

2.13 There are a number of key stakeholders who currently use the POW or have plans to in the future, which include:

- Cheltenham Rugby Club
- Cheltenham County Harriers Athletic Club
- Cheltenham & County Cycling Club
- University of Gloucestershire All Golds Rugby League

2.14 In addition to this there are other organisations, such as Cheltenham Town FC who could be potential users of the site in the future. As part of the POW feasibility study we have undertaken consultation with these key groups and summarise over the subsequent paragraphs the key findings.

*Cheltenham Rugby Club*

- The Club has expanded significantly in recent years and now has over 300 members and operates teams from minis and juniors to seniors, including ladies teams.
- The Club currently have a base at Newlands where they have relocated their clubhouse facilities, however they still use the POW as a matchday venue
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- The Newlands site is not large enough for them to relocate completely and as such they believe there is a need for them to continue to use the POW in the foreseeable future.

- There needs for the use of the POW would predominantly be for use of the main pitch for matches and possibly some training. There appears to be a limited need for clubhouse facilities at the POW and the club would consider different arrangements to a lease (which they currently have)

- The current lease expires in 2017 and the Club are keen to continue using the POW but recognise that their use has changed since the lease was entered into and a different arrangement may be possible

Cheltenham County Harriers Athletic Club

- The Club currently use the stadium for training on a Tuesday and Thursday evening throughout the year and for events during the summer months.

- In addition the track has a number of regional events held there including usage for school events, county championships and regional events. It is considered the number one facility in Gloucestershire. The nearest comparable track (A grade according to UK athletics) are in Bristol or Bath and in Birmingham.

- The use with the rugby club works well and both clubs liaise regularly over the use to avoid clashes in fixtures and training, with any midweek rugby games being scheduled to avoid training

- The Club is growing in membership and has developed in recent years to circa 350 members

- The POW track is seen as a very important facility for the continued welfare of the club and is very much regarded as its ‘home’ base, bringing in events and usage of the site

- Ideally the club would like to see an expanded track to develop a 10 lane track, however recognise that there is likely to limited funding and strategic need for such a facility

Gloucester All Golds Rugby League

- The All Golds rugby league club play in Championship 1 division, which is two divisions below super league. They are funded and supported by the University of Gloucestershire and play home games at POW Stadium.

- They have ambitions to develop into a super league club within a few years and have identified a 3 year plan to seek promotion and be in a position to be challenging for the super league
• Currently they achieve circa 400 – 500 attendances for home games, although the recent match against Salford City Reds achieved circa 900. They anticipate that crowds of 7-8,000 would be achievable in super league.

• As part of their ambitions they are also seeking to develop a permanent home for the club and are exploring a number of options, including the development of a new stadium in Gloucester. They also however would consider POW stadium as their permanent home and see a lot of potential in the stadium. In the short term the POW meets their needs and would work in partnership with the Council.

• If however they achieve Super League status (or continue to be on track to deliver this) then it is likely that in order for them to commit their long term future to the POW stadium they would be seeking a number of key aspects in the long term, including
  - A 4G artificial pitch as the main playing area
  - Capital investment in the POW to refresh and create an updated offer
  - Loss of the athletics track

• They ideally would like a lease on the site but would consider a licence and partnership with Leisure@ over the operation. They are keen to promote and develop wider community use on the site and greater use by the University.

• However they may also consider a partnership with the council, as long as security of tenure can be secured for the Club.

• It should however be recognised that these aims set out above are their long term aim for the development of the club and in the short term (1-2 years) are happy with the arrangements at POW stadium, although would like to take greater control of certain aspects such as the clubhouse. There is thus the potential for a short term continuation of the current arrangements.

• In addition it may be that the All Golds cannot achieve their aim of having a 4G pitch as their main venue and would consider being located at the POW on a grass pitch in the long term.

Cheltenham & County Cycling Club (CCCC)

• The club are keen to develop a BMX track for Cheltenham and would like to develop this at the POW stadium. Their plans are to develop a regional BMX track on the patch of land next to the training pitch.

• The key features of the BMX track would be
  - Capital cost of circa £90,000 - £120,000
  - Funding has been secured of circa £80,000 including funding from Sport England
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- The club would expect to develop the track (although are flexible over this and if the Council were to build the track then there may be some VAT advantages)
- Ideally the Club would like the track to be operated by Leisure@ with some key usage times allocated to the Club, although again the Club are happy to discuss this

- The Club would seek to use the track not only for normal club use but also for events to create an overall increased use of the site.

- One of the issues is timescale where currently the Sport England funding is due to expire in May 2013, however the club believes that there is the potential for this to be extended if the Council were to support the project

2.15 We explore the issues arising out of this consultation in the next section when we review the potential options for POW.

Demographic Analysis

2.16 Cheltenham Borough Council has a total population of circa 115,700 (based on 2012 figures).

2.17 We compare a number of key features of Cheltenham’s population in Table 2.1 below, in particular where there are significant differences to the region and national profiles, with further detail in Appendix B.

Table 2.1 – Catchment Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicator</th>
<th>Cheltenham</th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>115,700</td>
<td>5,288,900</td>
<td>53,012,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and over</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minority</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Obesity</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Obesity</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.18 As can be seen from the table above there are a number of key implications for the population of Cheltenham, for example:

- Cheltenham has a significantly higher proportion of 20 – 34 year olds than both the region and nationally. On further analysis this translates to a higher proportion of 20 – 24 year olds.

- With a lower proportion of people with disabilities, unemployed and ethnic minorities this suggests that these groups, whilst lower proportions, may feel or be at a greater disadvantage.

- With lower proportions of unemployed and higher economically active people the population can be considered relatively affluent.

- Both adult and child obesity are lower than the regional and national average, suggesting a more physically active population.

2.19 The demographic profile suggests a younger more active population within Cheltenham, which is confirmed when reviewing the levels of participation in Sport and Active Recreation, which we summarise below.

- Active participation in sport (3 x 30 mins activity per week) is higher in Cheltenham (27.9%) than the South West (22.9%) and England (22.3%).

- In general the level of participation is increasing year on year, with participation increasing from 39.1% in 2005/06 up to 42.7% in 2011/12 (participation in sport at least once per week).

- Other indicators such as club membership, those who have received coaching and taking part in organised competition are all higher than the South West and England.

2.20 The analysis suggests that within Cheltenham the population is more active and this has impacted on obesity rates amongst adults and children.

2.21 We also compare participation rates in Cheltenham with its nearest neighbour authorities in terms of profile and population, as summarised below.

Table 2.2 – Participation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Participation in Sport and Active Recreation (3x30 minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.22 As can be seen from the table above Cheltenham has the highest rate of participation in 2010/12 whereas in 2005/06 it was third highest, showing a marked improvement in participation, whilst other authorities have declined in some cases.

2.23 Sport England has also developed a market segmentation profile which identifies a number of different types of people and their typical characteristics. From the local sport profile for Cheltenham (Appendix B) there are a number of segmentation types which provide higher proportions than South West and England. These include

- **Jamie – Sports Team Drinkers (7.5%)** – mainly aged 18-25, single, vocational student. Yong blokes enjoying football, pints and pool
- **Leanne – Supportive Singles (5.8%)** – mainly aged 18-25, likely to have children, works part time or student. She is the least active segment of her age group.
- **Helena – Career Focused Singles (6.0%)** – mainly aged 26-45, single, full time professional. Fairly active type and takes part in sport on a regular basis
- **Tim – Settling Down Males (10.1%)** – mainly aged 26-45, married or single, may have children and professional. He is an active type that takes part in sport regularly, including cycling, keep fit, football, swimming

2.24 Consideration of programmes for these groups should be taken into account in the future development of any facilities. In particular it can be seen that some of these groups would support and be active in the type of sports taking place at POW.

### Competitor Analysis

2.25 In considering the potential competitors there is the main stadium facilities but in addition we also consider the development of artificial pitches and also BMX tracks.

2.26 POW provides facilities which are not in general provided within Cheltenham in being a stadium and main athletics stadium.

2.27 The stadium itself can be considered a regional facility and provides facilities which can be delivered across the region. In addition Cheltenham sits as a conurbation within a rural area, meaning that to travel to other conurbations in general this requires travelling by car.

2.28 We summarise the key competing facilities from a main stadium or athletics venue with spectator seating focusing in those facilities in Cheltenham and Gloucester overleaf.
Table 2.3 – Local Stadia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stadia</th>
<th>Key User</th>
<th>Capacity (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Business Stadium (Whaddon Road)</td>
<td>Cheltenham Town Football Club</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Road, Gloucester</td>
<td>Gloucester Football Club</td>
<td>Currently out of use with plans for a new stadium submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsholm, Gloucester</td>
<td>Gloucester Rugby Football Club</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.29 As can be seen from the list above there is only one other stadium in Cheltenham, which is the Football Club stadium. Both Gloucester and Cheltenham have stadia for the rugby and football clubs, although competing at very different levels. Gloucester City FC currently play at Abbey Business Stadium in Cheltenham prior to the development of a new stadium following the floods which closed their ground.

2.30 None of the stadia have athletics as part of the venue and cater in general for one sport as opposed to the POW which is multi sport.

2.31 Another key area is looking at the potential for Artificial Turf Pitches (and in particular 3G) There are a number of facilities which provide such provision in Cheltenham as set out in the table below.

Table 2.4 – Artificial Pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Type of Surface</th>
<th>Floodlit</th>
<th>Community Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Saints Academy, Cheltenham</td>
<td>3G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcarras School, Charlton Kings</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournside School, Cheltenham</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ College, Cheltenham</td>
<td>Sand (2)</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham College, Cheltenham</td>
<td>Sand (2)</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Ladies College</td>
<td>Sand (2)</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Close School</td>
<td>Water Based (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pates Grammar School</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edwards School</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.32 Thus within Cheltenham there are a total of 12 artificial pitches, however of these only 4 have extensive community use with the other facilities having limited community use.

2.33 It should be noted that all of the artificial pitches are on school or college sites and thus although there may be extensive community use, access during the day is still unlikely. There is also only one 3G pitch within Cheltenham (although there are 2 within 10 miles of Cheltenham), which is also on a school site.

2.34 In considering use by hockey as opposed to football or rugby the preferred surface for hockey is water based or sand based, whilst 3G/4G pitches are preferred by
rugby and football. Due to the longer ‘grass’ on 3G/4G hockey is not able to be played to any competitive standard.

2.35 Current hockey demand for weekend fixtures is largely met through facilities on school sites being used at different times throughout the day, however evening access to pitch time for training purposes during the week is more difficult due to peak time demand from football and a lack of floodlighting on some school pitches.

2.36 As a result of this and the existing facilities it is likely that a 3G/4G facility is more appropriate than a STP more suited to hockey, when these are already provided.

2.37 The other key facility which has the potential to be considered in the future is the establishment of the BMX track at POW. We illustrate the locations of other BMX tracks within the midlands and south west region below.

**Figure 2.1 – BMX Tracks**

Note: the yellow flag is the location of the POW stadium, with the blue flags being locally based tracks and more regional tracks denoted by the red flags.

2.38 As can be seen from the map set out above there are limited BMX tracks within close proximity to POW and Cheltenham. The closest tracks are currently at Redditch (which has recently been developed and opened) and Filton, Bristol.

**Demand Analysis**

2.39 In considering the potential demand for future facilities we look at the potential demand for the key facilities identified, including stadia, artificial pitches and BMX tracks.

2.40 There are no formal demand models for stadia or BMX tracks however Sport England have developed the sports facility calculator which delivers a demand
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model for Artificial Pitches, which we have used to identify the demand for artificial pitches. We summarise the key demand for the three areas below

Stadia

2.41 Typically most towns of the size of Cheltenham would have some form of stadia which would be linked to the major sport clubs (Rugby, Football, etc) of the town. In the case of Cheltenham, the football club have a stadium which serves their need and the POW provides a multi use venue for Rugby and Athletics at present. There is also the potential for All Golds Rugby League to become permanent users of the POW, which we discuss later.

2.42 Based on the continued use by Rugby (of one form or the other) and Athletics there is the demand for the POW stadium and it also serves an important role in bringing events to Cheltenham, acting as a regional attraction for Cheltenham, bringing visitors and investors.

Artificial Pitches

2.43 The sports facility calculator provided by Sport England suggests that there is a need for 3.68 artificial turf pitches within Cheltenham, based on a population of 116,100.

2.44 Currently there are 4 pitches which have significant community use and a further 8 pitches, however of these only one is a 3G pitch.

2.45 This would suggest that there is a need for additional 3G or 4G pitches within Cheltenham which would have the potential to support and add value (plus increased participation) to the activities at POW.

BMX Track

2.46 A new track in Cheltenham would fit within the overall regional and national provision in England and currently there are no tracks within a reasonable distance from Cheltenham. Thus there is a strategic demand for a track within Cheltenham.

Summary

2.47 We have illustrated within this section the need for new facilities which could be developed at the POW stadium and in particular the outcomes which are established and set out within the strategic framework, focusing on the health and well being of the people of Cheltenham.

2.48 In considering the strategic framework we recommend that the following outcomes are used in determining any future facility development options for POW. Options should be developed for the POW which

- Maximise its potential as a sporting facility, contributing to improving the levels of physical activity and health within Cheltenham
• Recognise and support Cheltenham as a ‘destination’ – encouraging more visitors and investment into Cheltenham

• Improves the financial performance of the POW

2.49 We will use these key outcomes to evaluate any future facility development options in the following sections.

2.50 There appears to be continued interest in using the POW by the existing users with potential developments for Rugby League and continued use by Rugby Union (at least in the near future). Clearly there are issues in respect of the current leases on the site held by CRFC and constraints on any future developments.

2.51 Based on consultation with stakeholder and site users, there appears to be demand for a BMX track and also 3G or 4G synthetic turf pitches at POW which would add value and create critical mass at the venue.

2.52 We set out in the following section a number of options which can both deliver and meet existing users needs but also seek to maximise the opportunities for improving participation and usage meeting the outcomes set out above.
Introduction

3.1 We set out in this section the potential facility options and how any future development should be managed. The section is structured to identify

- The Facility Development Options – what are the options available for the development of the outdoor pitches and space
- Management Options – how should they be managed and programmed, including suggested programmes of use and sports development activities
- Financial Projections – what are the likely future revenue projections with sensitivities, together with indicative capital costs, in comparison with existing costs
- Funding Opportunities – how can any of the options be funded

3.2 We also then evaluate the various facility options against the outcomes the Council are seeking and summarise the various issues with each of the options, including examples of best practice elsewhere.

Facility Development Options

3.3 We have identified a number of opportunities and existing needs from users within the previous section and we explore the potential options there are for future facility developments within this section. There are a number of options which could be considered for the POW within the Stadium itself and within the Training Pitch Area, including

- Stadium
  - Meeting/Hospitality facilities
  - Artificial Pitch within the track
  - 8 lane track
  - Climbing facilities, such as clip n climb

- Training Pitch Area
  - BMX Track
  - 3G Synthetic Turf Pitch
  - 5 a side football facility
  - Extreme Sports Facility
  - Covered Sports Area

3.4 In addition to this the way in which the facility is managed and operated is also important to the future success of the facility, which we explore later in this section. For example a number of the facility development options are reliant on agreement with CRFC over the lease they have of the site.

3.5 We set out in table 3.1 overleaf an overview of the various facility development options and a brief description of them.
### Table 3.1 – Facility Development Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Meeting Rooms/ Hospitality** | Currently the clubhouse at the POW is operated under lease by CRFC and provides for a bar area which overlooks the main pitch in the stadium grandstand. There are also a number of other meeting rooms within the grandstand.  
  One of the options is to refurbish this area and other meeting rooms to create a flexible space that can be divided up into a number of different areas which can be used for  
  - Meeting rooms  
  - Functions (such as corporate training, social functions, events)  
  - Hospitality and bar for events at the stadium  
  Consultation with stakeholders and demand analysis suggests that there would be demand for such a facility and it could also provide meeting room space for use by both the University and Leisure@. |
| **Synthetic Turf Pitch (infield)** | One of the options to consider for the POW stadium is the potential to replace the grass pitch for the main stadium with an artificial pitch. Saracens RFC have recently become the first professional club to install an artificial pitch and play premiership games on artificial turf.  
  There are clearly a number of advantages in playing on artificial pitches including the ability to play in all weathers and having much greater intensity of use. Thus community use can take place to a much greater extent.  
  Our discussions with All Golds suggest that if they were to locate long term to the stadium then they would favour the introduction of a 4G artificial pitch.  
  One major disadvantage however is that the use of the pitch for throwing and field events for athletics is not possible without potentially harming the pitch. This may compromise the hosting of athletics events at the stadium. |
## SECTION 3 – FACILITY OPTIONS AND FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS

### Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8 lane athletics track     | Currently the athletics track at the stadium is 6 lanes with an 8 lane straight. The athletics club would ideally like an 8 lane track all the way round.  
                            | The key rationale for developing an 8 lane track would be to attract more events and create a venue which delivers the ability to host more events. |
| Climbing Wall/ Clip n Climb | There has been a growth in the delivery of extreme sports and in particular climbing walls and other activities in leisure facilities. There would appear to be the opportunity to develop and create a climbing wall or facilities to supplement and add value to the overall offer at POW.  
                            | In particular the rationale would be to deliver activities which can generate additional revenue and operate on a commercial footing to improve the financial performance. In addition the provision of climbing facilities attracts people who would not normally participate in traditional sports and promotes physical activity.  
                            | One of the potential opportunities could be to deliver ‘clip n climb’ facilities, which offer a highly visual and appropriate introduction to climbing (see case study below)  
                            | We believe that if the facility was to be developed then ideally this should be created through adding on to the existing grandstand so that it can be seen externally from the road. The best location would be to create a glazed extension to the south end of the grandstand to enable it to be high profile. |
### Training Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BMX Track** | The cycling club has an ambition to create a regional BMX track on the training pitch area. This would offer an opportunity to create an events and training venue which offers an added facility to bring in people who may not participate in traditional sports.  

The key rationale for the BMX track covers a number of areas  
- A venue for races and events  
- Training venue and introduction to BMX  
- Corporate and other events (such as race days)  
- Flexible operational design to cater for major event days, recreational usage and club night usage  
- A regional facility, satisfying the gap in provision (see map below)  

There appears to be a strategic need for the facility when considering other tracks, as illustrated in demand analysis.  

Overall the provision of a BMX track would offer additional usage and fit with the overall aim of generating additional usage. |
| **3G or 4G Synthetic Turf Pitch (STP)** | There is the potential to develop a 3G or 4G synthetic turf pitch on the training area. We have illustrated in the previous section the demand for such a facility and the provision of a STP would create added value for the POW, including  
- A training pitch which could be used for rugby and football with greater intensive use  
- Greater commercial input through additional revenue from the facility  
- Additional participation and creation of an operation which delivers non event day use |
### Issue 3 – Facility Options and Financial Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 a side football facility | There are a number of operators (such as Powerleague/Goals) who deliver small sided facilities which are used for 5 a side football and they provide leagues (see case study below)  
These type of facilities can deliver increased participation and also a facility which can deliver additional facilities for training.  
However they are facilities which offer a specific type of use (in football) and as such appeal to a specific market.  
There are however, we are aware, similar facilities which are being planned to deliver the similar concept but using touch rugby. |
| Extreme Sports         | With the growth of extreme sports in the market place, there has been the development of facilities which cater for extreme sports, such as skateboarding, climbing, high ropes, caving, etc. One such example is the XC centre in Hemel Hempstead, which is illustrated below.  
Whilst the scale of the facility is such that it is unlikely that a facility would both fit and be deliverable at the POW, some of the principles may be used to develop facilities at the stadium or potentially through use of the indoor cricket hall. |
**SECTION 3 – FACILITY OPTIONS AND FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covered Area</td>
<td>One option is to consider covering some or all of the training area to enable the pitches to be used at all times and avoid any cancellation of use due to inclement weather (see Case Study below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition having a covered area may well also enable certain activities to take place outside that could work as an extension to Leisure@, for example fitness or activity classes, basketball, tennis, netball, children’s activities and events, multi sport days, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst we understand that the current use of the pitches is interrupted due to weather on only limited occasions, the addition of a covered area may attract other users who would also welcome the opportunity to have the areas as covered spectator areas, for children’s and other activities during the evenings and weekends and during holidays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Another key benefit is the potential to use the space for alternative activities which traditionally would be played indoors but could use the space, such as volleyball, netball, basketball, handball. In addition alternative uses such as Dodgeball sessions could also work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However there appears to be limited times when training is cancelled due to poor weather and with a 3G pitch this would become even more unlikely. As a result, even though we have illustrated it as an example it may not be feasible or justified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 We explore later in the section how the future facilities should be managed and indeed the financial implications for each option. We present below some examples and case studies to illustrate the type of facilities, which could be utilised.
Clip n Climb, Exeter

Clip n Climb provides a climbing facility which creates a number of different challenges in a safe environment. The facilities can be developed in a number of different sizes and can form facilities to meet the needs of the space requirements.

Exeter is the first development in the UK with the next centre due to open in Carlisle in May 2013.

They offer facilities which can be used by children and adults alike, with opportunities for training, parties, corporate and team building events, etc.

5 a side Centres & Touch Rugby

5 a side football centres (such as Goals or Pwerleague) offer the opportunity for individuals or teams to play in a 5 a side league. Typically operated from Monday to Thursday nights as the peak times the facilities include a clubhouse and outdoor five a side pitches.

There are also a number of operations which are starting to consider a similar approach for touch rugby and the development of centres catering in a similar way to touch rugby. This would have a broader market appeal as there is the potential for mixed leagues and ladies leagues as well, whereas the five a side football tends to be male dominated.
### XC Centre, Hemel Hempstead
(www.thexc.co.uk)

The XC Centre was developed to incorporate a number of extreme sports including indoor skate park, climbing wall, caving, bouldering, high ropes, etc. At a cost of £5 million (funded through the new opportunities fund) it provides value for money and a much needed facility for the youth and other market groups in Hemel Hempstead and beyond. It attracts people from as far away as Cornwall.

### Bishan Active Park, Singapore

Bishan Active Park is a development which includes basketball and multi use courts, outdoor gym, jogging trails, football as well as relaxation and covered areas.

Of particular relevance is the inclusion of a number of covered areas, which allow sport and physical activity to take place whatever the weather, which is particularly relevant in Singapore, as despite being hot and humid does suffer from torrential rain.

3.7 As can be seen from the examples above there are a number of different activities and facilities which can create spaces, which are slightly different from traditional sports and attracts different markets.

3.8 With each of the facility development options the way in which the facilities are managed and operated can impact on the future use and sports development outcomes, which we consider below.

**Management Options**

3.9 There are a number of different management options for leisure facilities, including
• In House – direct management by the Local Authority
• Not for Profit Distributing Organisation (NPDO) or Trust operation – set up specifically for a Local Authority’s facilities
• Partnering with either an existing NPDO or Hybrid NPDO – through a management contract
• Private sector or commercial operation
• Locally operated by the community

3.10 The Council has following a commissioning review established a preference for the creation of a new charitable trust, including sports, arts, museums and other leisure and cultural facilities.

3.11 The way in which the facility is currently operated is based very much on a lease based approach, with CRFC holding a lease on the site till 2017 and taking responsibility for the operation of the club house and entitled to use the stadium pitch and the training area. In addition the fitness team also hold a lease on the fitness facility.

3.12 Whereas the other principle user, the athletics club book the facility for training and events. They liaise with the rugby club for their training end events to ensure no conflict.

3.13 Leisure@ whilst they do play an active role in marketing and promoting the POW they are limited by what can be achieved due to the rugby club lease and other user agreements. For example they do not have access to the clubhouse.

3.14 Whilst this approach has worked over time, particularly when the POW was CRFC main home and clubhouse, now that CRFC has relocated its clubhouse operation to Newlands it may be time to consider alternative management and operational arrangements.

3.15 We believe there are two principle options, with some sub options for the future management of the facilities, which are.

1. **Lease Based Operation** – where leases are continued with the principle users of the site, such as CRFC, which could also include the cycling club in the future for the BMX track. There are two approaches which could be considered within this overall approach

   a. **Lease to CRFC** – as existing and maintaining the existing relationship, however this may be dependent on CRFC approach to their ‘home’ base at Newlands

   b. **Lease to All Golds** – as part of a long term plan to establish the POW as All Golds home venue, through offering a lease for all or part of the stadium facilities

2. **Leisure@ Management** – where Leisure@ manage the POW as part of the management of Leisure@ and the facilities become part of a sporting hub
for Cheltenham. There would still be user agreements for the key users giving access and rights over usage.

a. **Leisure@ only management** – where Leisure@ manage the facility on their own working with existing users having hire agreements.

b. **Partnership Approach** – where Leisure@ work in partnership with another organisation (such as All Golds, CCHAC and/or CRFC) to manage the facility

3.16 Each of the options has advantages and disadvantages as summarised in table 3.2 below

**Table 3.2 – Management Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfers the risk and operation to a third party.</td>
<td>Potential lack of a presence on site at times other than matchdays causing issues with supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops ‘ownership’ and interest in the facility for the club to make it their own and invest and develop the business</td>
<td>Outside of matchdays and club activities there may only be a focus on revenue generating activities, which may sit outside the club’s core business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a revenue stream from the facility</td>
<td>Potential conflicts of use between community users and clubs which mean other community users don’t use the facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs more likely to invest into the facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Leisure@ Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A presence on site through the management and operation of Leisure@, enabling effective co-ordination with programmes and activities from Leisure@</td>
<td>• Possible concerns over security of tenure from clubs, leading them to look at alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More likely to be used for community use and overflow for activities from Leisure@</td>
<td>• Risk of the operation (both finance and quality) will sit with Leisure@ or the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to have flexibility in use and change the approach to suit changing needs and outcomes of the Council and users/non users</td>
<td>• Possible lack of ability to invest in the facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to manage conflicts and ensure that the programme can reflect the needs of users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leisure@ has an incentive to promote and market the venue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.17 With the development of the site we believe the Leisure@ operation has some significant advantages over the lease based operation, including

- Flexibility of use, which is particularly relevant if there are potentially many more individual users (outside of event days), who would need to pay
- Incentive for Leisure@ to promote and market the venue
- Flexibility in staffing, through use of staff at Leisure@ on the POW
- Potential to generate events and deliver additional use through programming of the venue
- The ability to have more flexible usage during the week of the meeting rooms, functions and bar areas to cater for different users

3.18 It should however be recognised that in order for the facility to be operated by Leisure@ then the current lease with CRFC would either have to be reviewed and a new agreement developed or the change in operation would need to wait till the expiry of the lease in 2017.

3.19 Consideration also needs to be given to the future users of the POW. Currently the CRFC have relocated their clubhouse to Newlands and tend to use the POW for matchdays and there does not appear to be significant incentive for the CRFC to develop the business. Conversely if All Golds were to make the POW their home...
venue and seek to develop the business there could be some significant benefits from such a partnership, including

- Additional usage from other University sports teams and potential use of meeting rooms for lectures, etc
- A commitment to developing community use and promoting and developing use
- With the University there is a the same ethos as the Council to develop public services and deliver improved access and community use
- Sustainability of use if the projected plans of the All Golds are delivered, with regular events and matches hosting upwards of 5,000 people per event

3.20 We discuss later the implications of a partnership with All Golds but if this was a preferred options consideration may need to be given to how best to maximise the benefit and we suggest this would be through a partnership approach, giving All Golds security of tenure (possibly through a licence) but enabling the benefits of joint working with Leisure@ to be realised, as opposed to a lease approach.

3.21 Because of the anticipated additional use through some of the new facilities identified earlier, we recommend that the future management of the site should be with the Leisure@ management as opposed to a lease operation, however depending on the future of All Golds this could be a partnership approach or some form of licence.

Financial Projections

3.22 We consider here the capital and revenue implications for each of the facility development options identified earlier and compare these with the existing revenue costs to operate the POW.

3.23 Appendix C presents revenue projections and indicative capital costs for each of the facility development options presented above and we summarise in the table overleaf the future revenue projections.

3.24 It should be noted that the revenue projections and capital costs are indicative costs only and further work will need to be undertaken to develop detailed business cases, once the preferred option (or options) have been chosen, prior to any future investment decisions.
### Table 3.3 – Revenue Summary

#### Stadium Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£'000's</th>
<th>Meeting/ Hospitality</th>
<th>4G Artificial Pitch (Infield)</th>
<th>8 lane Athletics Track</th>
<th>Clip n Climb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Contribution/ (Deficit)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative Capital Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Training Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£'000's</th>
<th>BMX Track</th>
<th>3G Artificial Turf Pitch</th>
<th>5 a side facility</th>
<th>Extreme Sports</th>
<th>Covered Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Contribution/ (Deficit)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative Capital Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.25 All of the facilities provide a net contribution on operation to the overall financial performance, although we discuss the potential preferred option later in the report and the financial projections. These projections are based on a number of assumptions as set out below:

- The contribution represents how the facility would contribute to the existing costs of operation which are established and presented in Appendix C, summarised in Table 3.4 below.
- The projections have been developed based on market positions for the operation of the facilities, whilst taking into account local conditions, including pricing and usage of existing facilities.
- All the projections exclude any existing operational costs (such as rates, reception, IT costs) which Leisure@ have for the operation of the stadium and present additional costs associated with the new facilities. It is also assumed that Leisure@ has a staff structure which will have the capacity to manage the site from Leisure@ if required, including the marketing and promotion of the facility.
- The capital costs are based on either existing facilities elsewhere or build/refurbishment costs per sqm. We have also used Sport England guidance in developing the capital costs.
The projections from the BMX track are the figures presented by the cycling Club and based on minimal operational costs, with events and activities at least providing a break even position on net contribution.

We have not factored any increase in the rental from lease holders into the financial projections, however if All Golds were to become the primary tenant/user then it is likely that rental will increase.

3.26 The existing operational costs for the POW are summarised below.

Table 3.4 – Existing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>£’000’s</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Predominantly Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent (Fitness &amp; Rugby)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rugby Club Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Charges</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Expenditure      |        |                              |
| Staff            | 22     | Cleaner and rec asst only    |
| NNDR             | 43     |                              |
| Utilities        | 30     | Total cost                   |
| Premises         | 14     |                              |
| Supplies & Services | 16   |                              |
| Total            | 125    |                              |

| Net Cost         | 80     |                              |

3.27 The net cost presented above reflects the additional costs of operating the facility from Leisure@ and are already included within the Council’s budgets. It should however be recognised that because POW is operated as a separate identity these figures are only estimated and as a result may not be totally accurate. For example staff and supplies costs are estimated and the costs linked to property maintenance are not shown.

3.28 We consider later in this section the financial implications of the recommended options, however in order to assess this we initially consider each of the facility development options to assess:

- Whether there is the potential to attract additional funding towards the development
- How well each of the options delivers against the outcomes identified earlier

3.29 These issues are summarised over the following paragraphs.

**Funding Opportunities**

3.30 There are three principal sources of funding, which include:

- Grant funding – from organisations such as Sport England;
• Developer contributions (or CIL), where funding is achieved from the sale of land for residential or commercial development; and

• Public sector funding – either from the organisations own capital programme or through prudential borrowing.

3.31 These are discussed in the paragraphs below and highlight the likelihood of achieving the funding for the various options.

Grant Funding

3.32 Sport England has been the main grant funder of Sports Facilities historically, through the Sports Lottery Fund. Currently there are two principal sources of funding which relate to facilities, which are

• Iconic Facilities Fund – which seeks to fund regionally significant facilities which deliver the needs of at least two National Governing Bodies
• Inspired Facilities Fund – which offers between £10-£50,000 for investment in sports equipment and other activities which will promote and deliver increased participation

3.33 Other funding has been channeled through National Governing Bodies (NGB), particularly their whole sports plans and also other opportunities such as Sportsmatch. There may be the opportunity for some small scale funding towards equipment.

3.34 There may be some potential for funding from NGB’s where facilities are targeted for specific sports, such as football or rugby league. This would appear to present a real opportunity to fund the 3G artificial pitch or any developments associated with All Golds, through either the Football Association or Rugby Football League providing some funding.

3.35 The other opportunity is for funding towards the BMX track through British Cycling and we understand that the Cycling club have held discussions which could lead to funding if the Council were minded to support the development of the BMX track.

3.36 There may be opportunities to attract other smaller sources of funding through charitable trusts, regional funding sources and other grant giving bodies. However, there are no real opportunities to attract a significant grant which would fund a major part of the redevelopment.

Commercial Development (Developer Contributions)

3.37 Within the leisure market commercial development has been a source of funding, either where land has been sold or leased or through development agreements funding has been allocated for community developments (through Section 106 agreements).
3.38 In addition, the recent introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) has meant that there are opportunities to identify funding for strategic leisure facilities as a result of developments. The identification of the overarching strategy for sports provision in Cheltenham will assist in identifying priorities which the CIL could potentially fund.

3.39 We are not aware of any immediate funding available for POW but there could be the opportunity as the Joint Core Strategy is produced and new housing is developed for some developer funding.

Public sector funding

3.40 The potential for capital funding within the public sector is limited to two principal areas

- Funding from Cheltenham’s capital programme – which would require the Council to approve any scheme and add to its capital programme.
- Prudential borrowing funding – since 2004, local authorities have been able to borrow monies through the prudential borrowing scheme. This has resulted in a number of DBOM (Design, Build, Operate and Maintain) or spend to save schemes, where investment has resulted in improved revenue positions and the revenue saved has been used to fund the prudential borrowing;

3.41 A number of the facility development options may have the potential to be delivered through spend to save schemes, such as clip n climb or 3G STP.

3.42 We summarise the potential for additional funding against each of the facility developments overleaf
### Table 3.5 – Potential Funding

#### Stadium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potential for Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Rooms/ Hospitality</td>
<td>• Potential for spend to save scheme due to revenue generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Turf Pitch (infield)</td>
<td>• Rugby Football League funding if All Golds relocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 lane athletics track</td>
<td>• Funding unlikely and unlikely to deliver a spend to save scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing Wall/ Clip n Climb</td>
<td>• Spend to save scheme or commercial development through revenue generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Training Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potential for Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMX Track</td>
<td>• Sport England funding secured although may be withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible British Cycling funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G or 4G Synthetic Turf Pitch (STP)</td>
<td>• Potential FA funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible spend to save scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 a side football facility</td>
<td>• Commercially funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Sports</td>
<td>• Commercially funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Areas</td>
<td>• Possible spend to save scheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.43 As can be seen there are opportunities to fund many of the facility development options through a range of sources.

**Delivery against the Outcomes**

3.44 In addition to the potential funding we also consider how each of the facility development options will deliver the outcomes identified earlier. We summarise the position of each facility in the Table overleaf.
Table 3.6 – Delivery against outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Meeting/ Hospitality</th>
<th>4G Artificial Pitch (Infield)</th>
<th>8 lane Athletics Track</th>
<th>Clip n Climb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximise Sporting Potential</td>
<td>Ancillary support</td>
<td>Yes through intensification of use</td>
<td>Limited – no real additional use</td>
<td>Broadens sports to be played</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham as a destination</td>
<td>Yes through events</td>
<td>Yes – new and innovative</td>
<td>Limited as not unique</td>
<td>Yes – would be third one in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Financial Performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>BMX Track</th>
<th>3G Artificial Turf Pitch</th>
<th>5 a side facility</th>
<th>Extreme Sports</th>
<th>Covered Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximise Sporting Potential</td>
<td>Broadens sports to be played</td>
<td>Yes through intensive use</td>
<td>No – narrow scope</td>
<td>Broadens sports to be played</td>
<td>Yes – greater use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham as a destination</td>
<td>Yes – brings events</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – would be third one in England</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Financial Performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- X – no delivery of the outcome or even opposite impact on the outcome
- ✓ – some delivery of positive outcomes
- ✓✓ – very good delivery of positive outcomes

3.45 Although it can be seen from the table above that the majority of facility developments deliver against the outcomes, the athletics track and five a side development both are considered not to deliver the outcomes, as they are very narrow focused and the only outcome the five a side delivers is financial improvement.

3.46 There are other issues with Extreme Sports and Covered Areas which whilst delivering on the outcomes we would question the value of including these going forward as both would be significant buildings and as such are unlikely to fit with the ethos of the POW and achieve planning.

3.47 The extreme sports centre could however be a possibility for the cricket hall in Leisure@ if no other use can be found.
SECTION 3 – FACILITY OPTIONS AND FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS

Summary

3.48 We have in this section presented facility development options which in principal address the outcomes which Cheltenham have for the overall development. The mix of facility options which we believe would deliver against the outcomes as a whole are

- Refurbishment of the clubhouse/stand to provide meeting, function and hospitality space
- Development of a new BMX track on the training area
- Development of a 3G artificial pitch
- Development of a Clip n Climb

3.49 We illustrate in the diagram below the proposed location of these facilities, with a summary of the capital costs below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£'000's</th>
<th>Meeting/ Hospitality</th>
<th>4G Artificial Pitch (Infield)</th>
<th>3G Synthetic Turf Pitch</th>
<th>Clip n Climb</th>
<th>BMX Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.50 The other key issue is whether there should be an Artificial Turf Pitch in the infield which we explore in the next section, which is dependent on who the principle users will be going forward.

3.51 It should also be recognised that with the intensification of use of the site there will be a need to consider the car parking in particular for events and there may be a need to explore the potential for expansion of the car park or facilities into the current public open space alongside Tommy Taylors Lane to the north of the car park.
3.52 This could also be considered alongside any park and ride strategy for the town, or temporary shuttle scheme arrangements for major event days linked to the Racecourse.
SECTION 4 – CONCLUSIONS AND WAY FORWARD

Delivery of Outcomes

4.1 In considering the facility development options outlined in the previous section, it is important that these are evaluated not just against the financial sustainability but also against the other outcomes, as has been identified in the earlier section.

4.2 There are a number of core facilities which should feature in any redeveloped POW, which deliver against the outcomes as summarised below, together with the capital cost and revenue enhancement:

Table 4.1 – Core Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Meeting/Hospitality</th>
<th>Clip n Climb</th>
<th>BMX Track</th>
<th>3G Artificial Turf Pitch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximise Sporting Potential</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham as a destination</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Financial Performance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative Capital</th>
<th>145</th>
<th>656</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>840</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Savings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- ✔ – some delivery of positive outcomes
- ✔ ✔ – very good delivery of positive outcomes

4.3 These facilities have the potential to deliver a facility which is
- well utilised (not just on event days but throughout the week)
- attracts events which bring in visitors to use the town
- financially sustainable and improves the current costs
- complementary to Leisure@

4.4 The other key issue in respect of the POW is the future use of the stadium by All Golds and there are two long term (5 years plus) options for developing and taking forward the POW development as follows

1. With All Golds as a partner – which would deliver greater use of the facility and create a regional facility which raises the profile of Cheltenham bringing visitors, but also means that this may only happen if an artificial pitch was developed in the infield and athletics was relocated elsewhere. Although there may still be the potential for further discussion to be held to review the All Golds position.

2. Without All Golds as a partner – which is likely to mean that the facility can still be developed sustainably and delivers the outcomes set out above, but could be without a significant anchor tenant moving forward, particularly if CRFC did move from the POW to Newlands totally
In the short term (3-5 years) there is the potential to maintain All Golds use of the POW Stadium in conjunction with athletics, although recognising the difficulties with All Golds playing in the summer season at the same time as athletics.

4.5 If the Council decided that the benefit of All Golds being located at POW was important then further discussions would need to be held and it may be that an approach which is a long term plan can be developed. Issues which would need to be addressed in this would include the future provision of athletics as the artificial pitch and also the fact that both use the summer season would mean a conflict.

4.6 There are also risks with the partnering of All Golds which mean that the Council would need to build in protection if the All Golds did not deliver on their ambitions.

4.7 It should however be recognised that the provision of athletics is considered important at the POW and as such the Council should continue to work in partnership with the All Golds and recognise the benefits of having them as key users of the facility but retain the grass pitch for the main stadium.

4.8 This may mean that in the long term All Golds seek alternative accommodation as their home venue.

**Way Forward**

4.9 We recommend that the core facilities identified above are considered for the long term investment in POW and consideration is given to further discussions with All Golds, for the longer term, whilst maintaining use by the All Golds in the short term.

4.10 If the Council accept the recommendations above then the next steps should include

- Detailed discussions with CRFC over the future use and lease arrangements – recognising the changing approach and use of the site.

- Further discussions with All Golds to explore whether there is the potential for the Council and All Golds to work in partnership to deliver a long term future for POW (retaining a grass pitch) and potentially Super League status

- Working with the Cycling club to secure funding for the new track and support planning

- Development of detailed business cases to enable formal investment decisions to be made.

4.11 Consideration should also be given to the future management and operation and we recommend that Leisure@ should be involved in any future operation, in particular for the operation of the bar, meeting rooms and functions

4.12 The current lease arrangements should be given priority to resolve as currently the lease arrangements do not give the Council the opportunity to maximise the usage
and income generating potential of the site. In addition to this the future operating model for Leisure@ will also impact on the future use.

4.13 Once these two issues are resolved the Council can consider how they should take the project forward, together with the investment needs, and how the project could be phased to deliver the most appropriate priorities.

4.14 We also recommend that consideration is given as part of the wider approach to Leisure in Cheltenham as to how POW fits within the overall provision of leisure, sport and recreation in and around Pittville Park, which currently acts as the major destination for Leisure within Cheltenham. Any future plans to develop POW should fit within the overall plans for the development for Pittville Park (and Leisure@) to act as the sporting/leisure hub for Cheltenham.