

To: Christopher Heath, Project Director, Cleveland Pools Trust.

*Dear Christopher,*

24 July 2017

CLEVELAND POOLS – COLD WATER OPERATION.

1. Thank you for JURA's analysis of the implications from a business point of view of operating the pools without water heating, with more limited opening hours, and a target of much lower visitor numbers, and a more volunteer based workforce. I found the analysis encouraging. Planned visitor numbers are reduced by 2/3 to a much more acceptable level. The financial summary shows a surplus for the first 3 (supported) years of operation, and a cumulative surplus for 2 years after that. Looking at the longer-term deficit, the report itself includes a comment that the unheated pool is not a viable or sustainable proposition. What the same figures tell me is that it gives us a 3-year period to find ways of balancing the books by using, for example, more volunteer roles.

2. Some detailed questions arise from the figures:

(a) – Some of the cost lines (on e.g. Table 1.7) show “Activity Plan Cost”, rather than figures, in the first 2 years. Does this imply that they are separately funded by the HLF, in addition to the contributions on staff and maintenance from the HLF for the first 3 years shown on (e.g.) Table 1.9?

(b)- It seems to me that there is scope for considering more volunteers substituting for paid staff roles than JURA envisage, but to address that we need rather more detail on the roles, and their assumed hours of working. Can we have this please? Does JURA have any clear criteria for recommending that particular roles are not suitable for volunteers?

(c) – The General Maintenance etc line (e.g. on Table 1.7) has a number of significant peaks. What specifically do they represent?

(d) – Is there any current BathNES expenditure on the maintenance of the Pools as they are now that we should take into account?

(e) – Not a financial question, but can CPT give us more details on the operating routine and sound footprint of the water purification system?

3. More broadly, this new analysis offers a serious prospect of redirecting this project on a more joint basis that would enable the Pools to be restored into use in a way that is acceptable to the local community, which I hope is the aim of all. Assuming the CPT is willing to go down this route, what steps do we need to achieve this given your current 31 August HLF deadline?

4. The practical challenges of the major building programme currently envisaged would be little reduced by the elimination of water heating. Are there other aspects of the project that should be revisited granted a much-reduced scale of operations? This would require a more fundamental review, but might lead to a more deliverable project.

5. I hope the questions at para 2 at least can be answered fairly rapidly by email to help the discussion at the joint meeting on 11 August be as constructive as possible. I am copying this to Ann Dunlop, Fiona Darey, Richard Samuel, and BERA Members. I will also be updating the HLF.

Yours ever,

*Charles Draper*

Chairman BERA.