

## **Written questions - Council 26 February 2009**

### **1. From Councillor Newbold to the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation**

1) a) On what date did i) she, and ii) the Leader, first become aware that the Council had not been paid the promised £618,000 for 2008 Folk Festival internet ticket sales, and what action did she and the Leader then take to enable the swift recovery of this money ?

b) Can she also make a wider statement on the circumstances that now threatens the total loss of this Council money and whether any of the money is expected to be recovered?

### **Answer from Councillor Smith, the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation**

*a) The Head of Arts and Entertainment wrote an email to the Leader, copied in to the Executive Cllr, on 20 October 2008.*

*b) We worked closely with senior officers to oversee legal action to recover the Council's money. On the basis of legal advice, proceedings for the compulsory winding-up of the company had already been commenced, in order to exert the maximum pressure to secure payment. The company made a number of representations regarding proposals for payment, based on a number of deadlines, including an anticipated refinancing of the company but the promises came to nothing. We therefore carried on with the court action (scheduled for 21 January 2009), which was pre-empted when the company placed itself in voluntary liquidation.*

*b) Can she also make a wider statement on the circumstances that now threatens the total loss of this Council money and whether any of the money is expected to be recovered ?*

*The company is now in liquidation. The liquidator anticipates that there will be insufficient assets to pay any unsecured creditors, including the Council. We do not believe, therefore, that there is any realistic prospect of recovering any of the money from SecureTicket. If there is a reasonable prospect, in the light of the liquidator's investigation into the conduct of the company, to recover sums owed from those involved in the company or from third parties, we will, of course, pursue this. However, the prudent course, which is reflected in the budget proposals, is to proceed on the basis that it will not be possible to recover the sums owed.*

## **2. From Councillor Herbert to the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation**

1) Please list both a) the significant health and safety incidents and b) the service interruption incidents and maintenance problems, that have occurred in the last two years at Parkside Pool including

- i) the dates they occurred/began
- ii) when they and responses were first reported by SLM to the Council, and
- iii) what resulting action did a) SLM and b) the Council take on each, and as a consequence, also advise the detail on the latest flume problem and the need for works to improve both Parkside pool control systems and overall maintenance.

## **Answer from Councillor Smith, the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation**

**\*\*\*See separate response attached\*\*\***

## **3. From Councillor Herbert to the Leader**

When will the Council account for the up to £9m investment potentially lost in Landbanki and its subsidiary, and what impact will this have on the Council's finances?

## **Answer from Councillor Nimmo-Smith, the Leader**

*The approach being adopted to accounting for the Icelandic investments is as detailed in the Budget-Setting Report to Council. The relevant parts are :*

*14.11 However, as part of the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement the Minister stated :*

*“Mr Speaker, turning to Icelandic Banks. Authorities are very uncertain about how much they will recover as they prepare their budgets so soon after the failure of these banks.*

*I therefore propose – exceptionally – to make a regulation which will mean they need not make provision in their 2009/10 budgets for any possible loss on these investments. This will give them time to adjust their medium term financial plans and be clearer about recovering their money before making decisions which affect their budgets or council tax.*

*We are writing to all authorities today and will issue a draft regulation for consultation very shortly.”*

*14.12 A draft regulation was subsequently issued on 10 December 2008 with a consultation period ending on 23 January 2009. The Minister intends to bring the regulation into force on 31 March 2009.*

14.13 *The broad effect of the regulation is to allow authorities to postpone the impact on their budget calculations of accounting for impairment (assessed or actual losses in value) of these investments, as required by accounting practice, from the financial year 2008/09 to the year 2010/11. In practice, this means that authorities will not have to seek capitalisation directions in 2008/09 to enable effective management of the current budget process.*

14.14 *On the basis of the draft regulation the budget proposals do not include any reflection of potential losses related to the principal element of the frozen investments. However, the draft regulation does not permit authorities to postpone accounting for any loss of interest on these investments and proper accounting practice requires the Council to take potential losses into account in setting its budget. Based on the information and guidance available, a prudent approach has been adopted and the proposed Council budget provides for 100% of the potential loss of interest involved.*

*In terms of the impact on the Council's finances :*

*The impact on the Council's finances will obviously depend on the eventual level of any recovery of the sums invested, and the interest on those sums. It is unclear at this time what the likely level of eventual recovery will be and, indeed, this is the basis for the exceptional regulation allowing provision for any potential losses to be deferred.*

*However, the Council, as indicated above, has included in the 2009/10 Budget a reduction in external interest based on the assumption that the £9m will not earn any interest either during the term of the loans to Icelandic Banks or subsequently. As a result, any recovery of interest and any recovery of the original sum invested will lead to an increase in the budgeted level of external interest earned.*

*In terms of the £9m invested, the Council is currently reviewing options for the treatment of any sums which cannot be recovered. This includes technical advice to support a review of the Council's balance sheet.*

#### **4. From Councillor Howell to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources**

What City Council owned rooms or property are available for Councillors to hire for Councillor surgeries, and what charge would be made to the Councillor, if any, for each of these rooms if hired for this purpose?

#### **Answer from Councillor Cantrill, the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources**

*The Council has a number of community centres and other facilities that hire out rooms and councillors are able to book these at normal hire rates. I will ask the Democratic Services Manager to provide a full list to all Councillors. There are also public spaces within some community buildings where*

*councillors could meet constituents informally without hiring a room and I will also ensure these are included on the list.*

*In addition when the Guildhall is open, Councillors can use Committee Room 1 and 2 free of charge for meetings which are not party political, subject to availability and the Members Room is also available for members use for informal meetings.*

*The Council is obliged by statute to allow candidates to use Council premises for election meetings, between the publication of the Notice of Election and the day before the election, on payment only of the expenses of preparing, heating, lighting and cleaning. Any requests (outside this statutory right) to use Council premises in connection with an election campaign would only be granted on the normal commercial terms applying to the premises in question.*

## **5. From Councillor Blencowe to the Executive Councillor for Housing**

In the context of the present economic situation, what initiatives are the Council pursuing to bring forward the delivery of affordable housing on sites marked for development, and with what results?

### **Answer from Councillor Smart, the Executive Councillor for Housing**

*Over the last five years the Council has worked with developers and housing associations to provide approximately 225 new Affordable Homes a year, mainly through section 106 agreements. This level of provision is anticipated to be maintained during 2008/09 and 2009/10.*

*Significant additional Affordable Housing is planned on the three growth sites Southern Fringe; North-West Cambridge and Northstowe, over and above the 'traditional' programme. Planning approval has been granted on the first site to come forward in the Southern Fringe at Trumpington Meadows and section 106 negotiations are expected to be concluded in the next few months.. This site will provide at least 230 new Affordable Homes. Intensive negotiations with our preferred housing association partner, Cambridgeshire Partnerships Limited, and the former Housing Corporation, secured significant contribution from these partner agencies prior to the creation of the Homes and Communities Agency in December 2008. This up-front commitment has been significant in ensuring that the section 106 negotiations with the developer have been less substantively affected by the present economic situation. The Clay Farm and Glebe Farm sites have been the subject of detailed discussions with the developer in respect of their overall viability in the present economic situation. These two sites in the Southern Fringe alone will provide over 1000 new Affordable Homes. As all of the growth sites are to be phased over several years, discussions have focusing on how development can continue in anticipation of the up-turn in the housing market. Officers have been working with colleagues from Cambridgeshire Horizons and the new Homes and Communities Agency to look at additional up-front public investment to keep the development process moving with repayment of that investment as the housing market improves. For example, the use of Housing*

*Growth Fund monies is being explored through Cambridgeshire Horizons to focus on opening up parts of the site including the Council owned land and the Community Hub subject to consideration by JSGIC and final approval by the Cambridgeshire Horizons Board in due course.*

*The Council has approved a three-year rolling programme to investigate the development potential of any housing sites in the Council's ownership. This programme will generate a further approximately 50 new homes a year in due course. Finally, the Communities and Local Government has produced a consultation paper to relax revenue and capital rules that at the moment are significant barriers to the Council considering the provision of new Council housing. There is a Key Action in the Housing General Fund Service Plan 2009/10 to "test the viability of the Council building new Affordable Housing subject to government policy".*

## **6. From Councillor Walker to the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth**

Where and how may trees have been felled in the city during the last year, and where are more planned to be felled?

### **Answer from Councillor Reid, the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth**

#### ***Private***

*The City Council, as the Local Planning Authority, is responsible for determining works to trees that are protected by virtue of being in a conservation area or a Tree Preservation Order.*

*There are 10 conservation areas covering 710 hectares and 11,000 addresses and 500 Tree Preservation Orders. An Order can encompass a single tree or a street of 250.*

*Last year there were 371 Tree Works Applications to carry out works to protected trees.*

*Of the 252 Section 211 Notifications in conservation areas 129 were to fell 307 trees. The Council has no powers to grant consent subject to conditions, but where a tree is felled, and it is appropriate to plant a replacement, the Council recommend the planting of another tree.*

*There were 27 applications to fell 41 trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The Local Planning Authority required 20 replacements to be planted and waived the requirement to replace 21 trees.*

#### ***Public***

*The City Council manages and maintains 15,000 trees in the Highway for the County Council and communal Housing land on a cyclical programme. Last year 161 trees were felled on this land. 273 new trees were planted on the highway.*

*Of the 30,000 trees on Active Communities open spaces, 56 trees were felled including 35 saplings and young trees from Hobson's Conduit as part of a management and habitat restoration programme.*

*In addition nearly 100 trees were removed from Byron's Pool as part of a woodland restoration programme; they have been replaced by oak, field maple, alder trees inter planted with guelder rose and hazel to create an understorey.*

*55 trees were planted by Amenities and Recreation as part of a programme to replace trees felled after the comprehensive survey of 2007-2008. The Tree Team secured the planting of 85 trees on the open spaces through Environmental Improvement funding.*

### **Development Control**

*Policy 4/4 of the Local Plan sets out clearly that 'development will not be permitted which would involve the felling, significant surgery or potential root damage to trees of amenity or other value unless there are demonstrable public benefits accruing from the proposal which outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees.'*

*Last year there were 1351 Planning Applications of which the Principal Arboricultural Officer provided comments for 201 on the retention and protection of trees in accordance with British standard 5837:2005 'Trees in relation to construction - recommendations'. In the largest planning application last year on the Station Area, whilst 117 trees are shown for removal, the landscape strategy shows 375 new standards and 130 new pleached trees to be planted.*

*The Principal Arboricultural Officer is involved in the forward planning of the growth areas and has consistently argued for the planting of trees both in the highway and on public open spaces.*

## **7. From Councillor Bick to the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services**

What would be the impact on the City's overall performance in street cleansing if £60,000 per annum was switched from the City Centre to other areas of the City?

### **Answer from Councillor Rosenstiel, the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services**

*The Environmental Protection Act 1990 requires Cambridge City Council to meet minimum service standards and response timescales to reflect that the City Centre is the busiest area of the City. Since 2000 this minimum standard has been exceeded in line with the authorities medium term objectives.*

*The performance of Street Cleaning is measured by the National Indicator 195a, for litter and is one of nearly 200 government measures of local authority performance. This indicator shows that we are achieving required standards across the city.*

*The impact of reducing £60,000 worth of resources from the City Centre street cleaning function to other areas would be:*

- 1) Compromising our statutory duty to meet EPA standards, particularly in respect of achieving a daily early morning clean up and in our ability to maintain required standards in the busier City Centre areas throughout the year.*
- 2) The NI 195 outturn is expected to reveal that 95% of streets will achieve an acceptable or higher standard of cleaning. However if we reallocate our resources to other areas this figure is likely to drop to 89% as we would be unable to meet our statutory duty and the demands placed upon us in the City centre.*
- 3) That our city centre visitors would experience a less pleasant environment, with more litter, that could potentially lead to them going elsewhere and damage the reputation of the City.*
- 4) The reallocated resources could be used to strengthen the approach to litter removal in outer areas. However, the need for this reallocation has not yet been assessed and the need for this change should be assessed following agreed changes to refuse collection rounds in Autumn 2009. The changes will see a reduction in wind blown litter, particularly from recycling boxes, in residential areas.*

*We are continuing to work in the City to reduce the impact of litter and detritus from residential streets. This involves proactive identification of cleaning requirements through to active involvement of local residents in local clean up events helping us to meet our medium term objectives.*

## **8. From Councillor Wright to the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth**

How is the value of a listed building assessed if request for demolition is made, when, in the course of that building's history, it has been demolished and rebuilt?

How does the right to demolish operate when buildings lie outside of conservation areas?

### **Answer from Councillor Reid, the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth**

*In response to the first question:*

*In the case of a building which has been demolished and rebuilt, its intrinsic architectural and historic interest as a historic structure will be lost either largely (depending on the extent to which original features have been reincorporated) or completely, but its contribution to the local scene and the character of the area will remain to the extent that the reconstruction reproduced the outward form, character and features of the original building and its setting. The assessment of value of the rebuilt building depends on the balance of these factors.*

*The assessment is made in accordance with Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/10 and Government guidance in PPG15 paras 3.3, 3.5, and 3.16-3.9. (details of both appended)*

*In particular, PPG 15 para 3.5 " i) the importance of the building, its intrinsic architectural and historic interest and rarity, in both national and local terms"... ii. the particular physical features of the building (which may include its design, plan, materials or location) which justify its inclusion in the list"...iii. the building's setting and its contribution to the local scene, which may be very important, eg. where it forms an element in a group, park, garden or other townscape or landscape, or where it shares particular architectural forms or details with other buildings nearby; iv. the extent to which the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community, in particular by contributing to the economic regeneration of the area or the enhancement of its environment..", and*

*para 3.19 "Where proposed works would result in the total or substantial demolition of the listed building, or any significant part of it, the Secretaries of State would expect the authority, in addition to the general considerations set out in paragraph 3.5 above, to address the following considerations:*

*i. the condition of the building, the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance and to the value derived from its continued use."...ii. the adequacy of efforts made to retain the building in use. The Secretaries of State would not expect listed building consent to be granted for demolition unless the authority (or where appropriate the Secretary of State himself) is satisfied that real efforts have been made without success to continue the present use or to find compatible alternative uses for the building."...iii. the merits of alternative proposals for the site. Whilst these are a material consideration, the Secretaries of State take the view that subjective claims for the architectural merits of proposed replacement buildings should not in themselves be held to justify the demolition of any listed building. There may very exceptionally be cases where the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community which have to be weighed against the arguments in favour of preservation. Even here, it will often be feasible to incorporate listed buildings within new development, and this option should be carefully considered: the challenge presented by retaining listed buildings can be a stimulus to imaginative new design to accommodate them."*

*[Note: It is assumed that this question relates to Brunswick House, 61 Newmarket Road. This is a modern rebuild significantly different in character to the original listed building (c18, remodelled in the c19, with c19 sashes, a yellow brick front and red brick side walls). The rebuild is all yellow brick with modern windows, and is attached to (and dominated by) a large modern block].*

*In response to the second question:*

*Listed building consent is required to demolish a listed building anywhere (within or outside a conservation area).*

*There are provisions relating to demolition of residential property anywhere, noted in the Planning Portal (<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/england/genpub/en/1115315297671.html>): "*

*Where demolition of any kind of residential property is proposed, the council may wish to agree the details of how you intend to carry out the demolition and how you propose to restore the site afterwards. You will need to apply for a formal decision on whether the council wishes to approve these details before you start demolition. This is what is called a "prior approval application" and your council will be able to explain what it involves."*

*Background info to the answer:*

### *Cambridge Local Plan*

#### *4/10 Listed Buildings*

*Development affecting Listed Buildings and their settings, including changes of use, will not be permitted unless:*

*a - it is demonstrated that there is a clear understanding of the building's importance in the national and Cambridge context including an assessment of which external and internal features and aspects of its setting are important to the building's special interest; and*

*b - the proposed works will not harm any aspects of the building's special interest or the impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable level for example by being easily reversible; or*

*c - where there will be an impact on the building's special interest, this is the least damaging of the potential options and there are clear benefits for the structure, interest or use of the building or a wider public benefit; and*

*d - features being altered will be reused and/or properly recorded prior to alteration.*

*Works for the demolition of Listed Buildings will not be permitted unless:*

*a - the building is structurally unsound for reasons other than deliberate damage or neglect; or*

*b - it cannot continue in its current use and there are no viable alternative uses; and*

*c - wider public benefits will accrue from redevelopment*

### *PPG15*

*3.3 The importance which the Government attaches to the protection of the historic environment was explained in paragraphs 1.1-1.7 above. Once lost, listed buildings cannot be replaced; and they can be robbed of their special interest as surely by unsuitable alteration as by outright demolition. They represent a finite resource and an irreplaceable asset. There should be a general presumption in favour of the preservation of listed buildings, except where a convincing case can be made out, against the criteria set out in this section, for alteration or demolition. While the listing of a building should not be seen as a bar to all future change, the starting point for the exercise of listed building control is the statutory requirement on local planning authorities to 'have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses' (section 16). This reflects the great importance to society of protecting listed buildings from unnecessary demolition and from unsuitable and insensitive alteration and should be the prime consideration for authorities in determining an application for consent.*

*3.5 The issues that are generally relevant to the consideration of all listed building consent applications are:*

- i. the importance of the building, its intrinsic architectural and historic interest and rarity, in both national and local terms ('historic interest' is further explained in paragraph 6.11);*
- ii. the particular physical features of the building (which may include its design, plan, materials or location) which justify its inclusion in the list: list descriptions may draw attention to features of particular interest or value, but they are not exhaustive and other features of importance (eg interiors) may come to light after the building's inclusion in the list;*
- iii. the building's setting and its contribution to the local scene, which may be very important, eg. where it forms an element in a group, park, garden or other townscape or landscape, or where it shares particular architectural forms or details with other buildings nearby;*
- iv. the extent to which the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community, in particular by contributing to the economic regeneration of the area or the enhancement of its environment (including other listed buildings).*

### *Demolitions*

*3.16 While it is an objective of Government policy to secure the preservation of historic buildings, there will very occasionally be cases where demolition is unavoidable. Listed building controls ensure that proposals for demolition are fully scrutinised before any decision is reached. These controls have been successful in recent years in keeping the number of total demolitions very low. The destruction of historic buildings is in fact very seldom necessary for reasons of good planning: more often it is the result of neglect, or of failure to make imaginative efforts to find new uses for them or to incorporate them into new development.*

*3.17 There are many outstanding buildings for which it is in practice almost inconceivable that consent for demolition would ever be granted. The demolition of any Grade I or Grade II\* building should be wholly exceptional and should require the strongest justification. Indeed, the Secretaries of State would not expect consent to be given for the total or substantial demolition of any listed building without clear and convincing evidence that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain existing uses or find viable new uses, and these efforts have failed; that preservation in some form of charitable or community ownership is not possible or suitable (see paragraph 3.11); or that redevelopment would produce substantial benefits for the community which would decisively outweigh the loss resulting from demolition. The Secretaries of State would not expect consent to demolition to be given simply because redevelopment is economically more attractive to the developer than repair and re-use of a historic building, or because the developer acquired the building at a price that reflected the potential for redevelopment rather than the condition and constraints of the existing historic building.*

*3.18 Where proposed works would not result in the total or substantial demolition of the listed building or any significant part of it, the Secretaries of State would expect the local planning authority to address the same*

considerations as it would in relation to an application in respect of alterations or extensions (see paragraphs 3.12 to 3.15 above).

3.19 Where proposed works would result in the total or substantial demolition of the listed building, or any significant part of it, the Secretaries of State would expect the authority, in addition to the general considerations set out in paragraph 3.5 above, to address the following considerations:

- i. the condition of the building, the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance and to the value derived from its continued use. Any such assessment should be based on consistent and long-term assumptions. Less favourable levels of rents and yields cannot automatically be assumed for historic buildings. Also, they may offer proven technical performance, physical attractiveness and functional spaces that, in an age of rapid change, may outlast the short-lived and inflexible technical specifications that have sometimes shaped new developments. Any assessment should also take account of the possibility of tax allowances and exemptions and of grants from public or charitable sources. In the rare cases where it is clear that a building has been deliberately neglected in the hope of obtaining consent for demolition, less weight should be given to the costs of repair;
- ii. the adequacy of efforts made to retain the building in use. The Secretaries of State would not expect listed building consent to be granted for demolition unless the authority (or where appropriate the Secretary of State himself) is satisfied that real efforts have been made without success to continue the present use or to find compatible alternative uses for the building. This should include the offer of the unrestricted freehold of the building on the open market at a realistic price reflecting the building's condition (the offer of a lease only, or the imposition of restrictive covenants, would normally reduce the chances of finding a new use for the building);
- iii. the merits of alternative proposals for the site. Whilst these are a material consideration, the Secretaries of State take the view that subjective claims for the architectural merits of proposed replacement buildings should not in themselves be held to justify the demolition of any listed building. There may very exceptionally be cases where the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community which have to be weighed against the arguments in favour of preservation. Even here, it will often be feasible to incorporate listed buildings within new development, and this option should be carefully considered: the challenge presented by retaining listed buildings can be a stimulus to imaginative new design to accommodate them.

## **9. From Councillor Wright to the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation**

What powers has Cambridge City Council to prevent \*certain uses of Commons and public open spaces when weather conditions have temporarily rendered these spaces vulnerable to damage?

\*These uses to include access by vehicles, intensive use by persons e.g. for training and the siting of marquees etc. for events.

**Answer from Councillor Smith, the Executive Councillor for Arts and Recreation**

*The public has the right of access to Common/open space land for the purpose of open air recreation subject to certain restrictions. Where the Council is the owner of Common/open space land it has the power to prevent activity that goes beyond these public rights of access and/or the rights of Common. For example, in appropriate cases, the Council could take proceedings in the County Court for trespass.*

*There are no rights of vehicular access to Common or open space land except where there are specific easements.*

*In order to minimise damage, we do not use maintenance vehicles on grass during winter, we use temporary roads when vehicle movement is necessary, and we ensure all gates are locked to stop unauthorised vehicles. Our Sports Pitches are tined and slitted to ensure they remain playable, however, in heavy frost or heavy down pours, games can be postponed. In addition the Council can refuse consent for activities that may cause damage to the ground. We have a programme of maintenance to ensure watercourses are kept clear to ensure adequate drainage.*

## Response to Written Question 2

### Significant Health & Safety incidents

The following incidents required a report to the Health and Safety Executive under the RIDDOR regulations of Reporting Injuries Deaths and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations.

It can be reported that over the last couple of years only 2 instances have fallen into this category.

The first occurred in February 2006 when a 78 year old man died of a heart attack on poolside.

The second incident was in January 2008 when a young girl reportedly got her foot caught in the moveable pool floor in the diving pit whilst the level was being adjusted.

### Service interruptions are listed on the chart below;

Brief summary is 9 closures as listed in the table below

Whole pool on 4 occasions but none more than 1.5 days

SLM have reported to Council within the contractually required timeframe.

Detail of responses in table

**The flume problem** is related to a failure of the metal clasps that hold the tensioning wires to the flumes to stop undue movement whilst in use. The main structure supports the flumes and this was not affected. The pool was closed temporarily for 2.5 hours to enable installation of netting. Repairs are currently being undertaken.

**The Building management system** is on order and works are expected to start within the month. This will enhance the air flows throughout the building and give much greater and precise control of the air and pool water temperatures.

As requested at the Community Services Scrutiny Committee, a performance management framework is being drawn and comes back to committee in March for approval. As part of the proposed extension works a conditional survey of pool plant and assets has already been undertaken and a series of works identified to be completed.

### Recent maintenance problems

**Building Management System (BMS)** – ongoing problems, which cause problems with maintaining accurate pool and air temperatures. Due for replacement March 2009

**Boilers** – One of the pumps in the booster set failed in the autumn

Combined heat and power unit (CHP) – intermittent faults, under service contract with ENRG. Effects pool water and shower temperatures. Contractually scheduled for replacement in 2010

**Domestic mains water feed** - Cold water booster set has intermittent faults, pumps and control panel have been replaced, currently under repair for replacement seals and glands. This effects cold water supply to the shower.

**Ozone unit** – provides additional pool disinfection. Under a service contract but currently not working. Awaiting repair dependent on delivery of an imported part. Standard chlorination facilities able to provide standalone disinfection to required standards.

**Air handling** – Motor failure of pool intake, remedial repairs scheduled March/April 2009.

Date	Service Area	Problem	Reported	Length Closure	SLM response	CCC response
17/02/09	Flumes	Flume tensioning wire fittings failed	17/02/09	Pool 2.5 hrs on 17/02/09 Flumes approx 11 days	Reported to CCC Arranged for onsite meetings	Ordered up Netting, onsite meetings, arranged for repairs – being carried out 24-28/02/09
09/12/08	Pool	Small electrical fire in contactor panel	09/12	1½ days closure enforced as no pool circulation	Reported to CCC Arranged for contractor repairs	Site visit
08/12/08	Flumes	Closed for repainting of steps	Dec 08	3 days	Maintenance – repainting of steps	None required
27/10/08	Pool	Incoming mains Power failure – Power surge caused damage to Control panel	27/10/08	½ day pm	Arranged for external contractor to repair control panel	Site visit
19/09/08	Pool – 2 lanes closed	Re-hanging of poolside high level lights and fascia boards	Sept 08	2 lanes for 1 day	Planned Maintenance item Lane closure	CCC organised these works
16/09/08	Spectator area	Re-hanging of poolside high level lights and fascia boards	Sept 08	Spectator area access closed during works	Planned Maintenance item Area closed	CCC organised these works
01/09/08	Pool	Arson – fire started in a bin	02/09/08	1 hour	Full site evacuation – tidied up after	None required
July 08	Flumes	Maintenance repairs and re-lamination of a couple of flume sections	July 08	10 days	Planned Maintenance item Area closed	Site visit
12 Jan 08	None	Interruption to Gas supply	14/01/08	None		