

Deputation to Councillors June 10th 2021

I am Barbara Crellin, a Rutland resident of 40 years, retired Primary Headteacher, always passionate about sport, physical activity, wellbeing and mental health and Chairman of the Active Rutland LSA and involved with its predecessors.

I have studied the Report of the Strategic Director for Places re Catmose Sports Contract Update which you are studying and taking a recommendation from Councillor Walters this evening.

This response is in the context that I have not seen the full Consultant report nor the 'exempt' papers. I ask has RCC a strategic vision for this important area in Rutland? I was part of another expensive consultation which I believe it cost in the region of £200k and nothing appeared to come of it.

I had great hopes of the latest consultation even though the Consultant made no response to anything I said or suggested during the interview, namely among many other things a local consortium, managed via Service Level Agreement by RCC. It was by Zoom, but I had the impression he was writing things down. Now I wonder as nothing appears relevant to any of what I suggested???

Prior to this I sent an email to Lucy Stephenson and Oliver Hemsley which Lucy used almost verbatim in her report to RCC in I believe January. In the email I stressed how needs, activities etc had changed due to Covid and plans needed to take account of that, change and provide for future needs.

The suggestion that RCC has only two options as suggested in this report horrifies me and I find neither option acceptable; the first, of mothballing above the second. I realise this would cause public uproar, no less however than would occur when the public discover that with financial constraints as they are RCC is continuing to support a near bankrupt business for the questionable benefit of the 2% and reducing of the population who actually access the facility!

The 3 month break clause of Option 2 is the only flicker of hope.

It could be presented to the public that RCC are taking either option but actively investigating what I believe to be a viable, innovative option.

This might even also meet Sport England's criteria?

Has anyone, including the consultant investigated my suggestion with the Council, Providers or the Public, and if not why not? Why is it not a viable option?

I understand that Mary Hardwick made similar suggestions to mine to the Consultant and has further outlined them in the recent document she has sent you.

I gave my response to the points in the document that Councillor Walters forwarded to you so will not repeat them all.

In a nutshell I would ask you to consider the final points in my email

- 1) What is the long term vision (3-5yrs) of RCC?
- 2) Has anyone explicitly created any mid-long term visions (the consultant)?
- 3) If RCC don't have one, how will you respond if the current arrangement becomes unviable for any reason in the short-mid term?
- 4) Has the Consultant or have the Council considered exploring a flexible Community delivery model/Consortium as detailed in Mary Hardwick's document?
- 5) If not, why not (ref opportunities and threats in the same document)?
- 6) If yes and it's considered non-tenable, what research/actions have you done with the community to reach this conclusion?

- 7) If yes and it's worth exploring, what are the next steps you plan to take to validate it?
- 8) If the current successful community offerings in sport and leisure work so well, why wouldn't RCC want to be seen to be part of the big picture in a CIC?

In which context are the longer term decisions going to be taken over the Summer if only 2 options have been identified?

I fully support Mary Hardwick's presented idea as it aligns with mine and I firmly believe that here is another viable option, seemingly ignored by the recent Consultant, which deserves serious consideration.

The population of Rutland deserves the best that RCC can give them, not by patching what we have.

I would urge you to take this option forward with both of our support.

Barbara Crellin