

**Committee:** Scrutiny 1  
**Date:** 12 November 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 4  
**Title:** Grants Allocation – Policy  
**Author:** Alex Stewart/Sue Hayden/Ian Orton (01799) 510555/510563

## Summary

- 1 This report provides Scrutiny Committee with details of the existing policy that forms the basis for considering the allocation of Grants principally by the Community & Leisure Committee. This includes applications for funding under the new three year Contributions Fund Scheme and requests from other organisations. It also includes other issues regarding funding to organisations within other Schemes. Members requested this information as part of the work programme of Scrutiny I Committee.

## Background

- 2 Over the past 12 months decisions have been taken to redefine the various Grant schemes that are allocated by the Community & Leisure Committee. This decision process included the consideration and agreement of actions resulting from the Best Value Review of Leisure & Cultural Services. These decisions instructed officers that:
  - Organisations should be required to be consistent about their presentation of information such as financial details
  - The Criteria for Schemes should be consistent and simplified allowing applicants to choose between a range of clearly defined grant schemes covering a number of disciplines. They would also provide applicants with clarity as to what the Council is wishing to achieve through its grant schemes i.e. grants to support leisure & cultural projects, community orientated projects and Health & Social Care services.
  - Schemes should be merged where possible e.g. organisations providing health and social care services should be able to apply to one grant scheme, funded by partners such as Essex County Council, Social Services (ECC,SS) and the Uttlesford Primary Care Trust (UPCT).
  - Town and Parish Councils should be encouraged to fund local schemes from their precepts
  - Schemes should be flexible and allow grants to be carried over in certain circumstances.

- 3 All of the above have been incorporated into the new grant structure, resulting in redefined Schemes with funds being redistributed. In conjunction with the Uttlesford Primary Care Trust (UPCT), Essex County Council's Social Services Department (ECC,SS) and the Council for Voluntary Services, Uttlesford (CVSU) the Community Partnership Grant Scheme has been established with funding from each statutory organisation. On the assumption that Partners contribute the same amount, this fund will be in excess of £65,000. The Schemes and their grant allocations provided by Committee are summarised in the table below -

<b>GRANT SCHEME</b>	<b>TOTAL BUDGET 2004/05</b>	<b>MAXIMUM GRANT</b>	<b>TIMESCALE</b>
Leisure & Cultural Grant Scheme	£8,500	£400	Monthly determination of Grants
Contributions Fund Scheme (Support)	£140,320 (including £30k ring-fenced for UCT)	No maximum	3 Year Grant
Contributions Fund Scheme (Subscriptions)	£7,000	Variable	Annual allocation
Community Partnership Grant Scheme	£27,100	Up to a maximum of £9,000 p.a.	3 Year Grants

- 4 The above outlines the existing Policy Guidelines. Scrutiny. The Terms of Reference for Scrutiny Committees are:
- To carry out the advisory, monitoring and scrutiny role in relation to the functions of the committees within their scope.
  - To report to the relevant committee(s) on any matter within the scopes affecting the district or its habitants, including the policies and/or functions of other agencies and organisations.
  - To be responsible for service reviews, including Best Value Reviews.
- 5 The Work Programme for Scrutiny Committee(s) has been prepared on the that in the first instance Members will wish to consider the existing policies of the Council.

RECOMMENDED that the comments of Members are sought on the policies in place to recommend the allocation of Grants.

Background Papers: Grants Files: Scrutiny One Background Files – Ian Orton  
Policy & Performance Library

**Committee:** Scrutiny 1  
**Date:** 12 November 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 5  
**Title:** Work Programme – Community Plan  
**Author:** Ian Orton (01799 510402)

### **Summary**

- 1 This report provides Scrutiny Committee with details of the existing policy associated with the production of the Community Plan.

### **Background**

- 2 The Community Plan was launched in June 2003 and is called Uttlesford Futures. The Community Plan grew out of a recommendation from central government that all authorities develop a Local Strategic Partnership where local issues would be managed, wherever possible, at local level using a combination of private, voluntary, charitable and public sector resources. The Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) works together to identify a number of high level strategic goals and then set up sub groups within the LSP to deliver these goals. These goals will be published in a Community Plan that will be reviewed on a regular basis.
- 3 The Uttlesford Community Plan grew out of a consultation framework to improve the quality of life for the people of the district. The vision that developed was:

*Uttlesford, a safe and pleasant environment in which to live, grow and prosper*

To deliver this vision the Community Plan is divided into five sections:

- Safety of the Community
- Conserving our Environment for Future Generations
- Improving Health
- Transport – Getting Around
- Economic Well Being – Education and Economy

4 Each of the five sections within the Community Plan has concerns that flowed from the consultation process. These concerns are issues such as:

- How do we reduce violent crime and burglary?
- How do we ensure that the roads are safer?
- How do we hope to reduce waste and recycling?
- How we hope to improve sports facilities?
- How we aim to encourage the use of public transport and cycling?
- How do we aim to help local companies grow in Uttlesford?

All the concerns have targets to measure success during the next one, three and five years.

5 The Community Plan was launched in June and a Conference of partners and anyone interested in the work in the partnership will be held on the 14 November to examine the initial achievements of the LSP. Issues that may well be considered include:

*Partnership Working in practice*

*Resource Allocation*

*Measuring Success*

*Relationship between the Community Plan and the draft Corporate Plan of the Council*

*Who leads on which projects?*

After only a few months in action it is probably too early to judge the success of the Community Plan and the Local Strategic Partnership and Scrutiny Committee may wish to re-consider the work of the LSP during 2004/05

RECOMMENDED that the comments of Members are sought on the policies and practices of the Community Plan.

Background Papers: Community Plan ( LSP ) Files: Scrutiny One background Files – Ian Orton Policy & Performance Library

**Committee:** Scrutiny 1  
**Date:** 12 November 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 6  
**Title:** Work Programme – CPA Process  
**Author:** Ian Orton ( 01799 ) 510402

### **Summary**

- 1 This report provides Scrutiny Committee with details of the existing policy to deliver the requirements of the CPA process.

### **Background**

- 2 Members are now fully aware of the requirements to prepare for a Comprehensive Performance Assessment of the authority. But to briefly recap the Council will need to carry out following seven stages in the CPA process by early January 2004.
  - Council Self Assessment
  - Accredited Peer Challenge
  - Corporate Self Assessment informed by the Peer Review and our Self Assessment
  - Diagnostic assessment of the council's approach to Management of Public Open Space and progress in delivering a Balanced Housing Market
  - Benefit fraud Self Assessment
  - Auditor Assessment of Performance
  - Audited Performance Indicators, Inspection Reports and BV Plan Assessment
- 3 The Council will be subject to a Peer Challenge Review during the 24 to 26 November 2003 and the on site CPA Review will be carried out the week 23 February 2004. The work to complete this process started in May 2003 and a copy of the timescale is attached at Appendix A.
- 4 Appendix A outlines the delivery dates for the various stages of the CPA process. The Council has prepared draft Corporate Self Assessment documentation to meet the Peer Challenge and any recommendations from the Peer Challenge will be considered prior to submitting the final documents in early January 2004.

- 5 The existing policy is linked to sharing the process with Members, staff and partners via staff meetings, Member workshops and the production of a monthly newsletter Uttlesford News.

RECOMMENDED that the comments of Members are sought on the policies in place to implement the CPA process within the Council.

Background Papers: CPA Files – Ian Orton Policy & Performance Library

## Appendix A

### Uttlesford District Council

### Comprehensive Performance Assessment

**The CPA is about helping councils to deliver better services to local people**

Uttlesford District Council will be subject to a CPA site visit the week beginning 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2004 and an IDeA Peer Challenge during the 24<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> of November 2003. What do we need to do to prepare for these challenges? We need to plan to meet the key elements of the District CPA process, which are:

#### Project Plan to Deliver the Above

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Why</b>
Create CPA Member Group	12 June 2003 – First meeting	Political ownership established
Establish Officer led process to co-ordinate the CPA objectives	23 June 2003 – First Meeting	Work Plan drafted by 23 June 2003
Member Workshop	23 June 2003	CPA process shared with Members
Officer process to prepare draft documentation re the Corporate Self Assessment and the two diagnostic reviews	Officer Team established to meet on a regular basis to deliver the objectives	Essential that the draft documentation is gathered early so that gaps can be identified

Workshop Staff	Thursday 4 September 2003	The first of the staff workshops. All staff will attend at least one workshop
Meeting of Uttlesford Futures	Monday 15 September 2003	Opportunity for Partners to share in the process
Member Group to meet on a regular basis	Wednesday 17 September 2003	Members need to be fully involved in the Self Assessment scoring process
Workshop Staff	Thursday 25 September 2003	The second of the staff workshops. All staff will attend at least one workshop
Workshop Members	Tuesday 30 September 2003	An opportunity for all Members to comment and score the CPA documents
Draft documentation completed	3 October 2003	It will take most of October to go through the paperwork and prepare for the Peer Review
Member Group Meeting	8 October 2003	Agree the IDeA Timetable
Workshop Staff	Thursday 9 <sup>th</sup> October 2003	The third of the staff workshops. All staff will attend at least one workshop
LSP CPA Workshop	20 October 2003	Draft Scoring of the Corporate Self Assessment
Workshop Staff	Thursday 23 October 2003	The fourth of the staff workshops. All staff will attend at least one workshop
Draft Self Assessment completed	31 October 2003	Changes will be required as we consult with partners and the community re the Peer/CPA processes
Member Group Meeting	4 November 2003	Score the IDeA Corporate Self Assessment
Workshop Staff	Thursday 6 November 2003	The fifth of the staff workshops. All staff will attend at least one workshop
Member Group Meeting	19 November 2003	Go through the IDeA Peer Challenge arrangements

Complete Version Two of the two Diagnostic Review Workshop Staff	20 November 2003	Part of the process
Workshop Staff	20 November 2003	The sixth of the staff workshops. All staff will attend at least one workshop
IDeA Challenge Review	November 26 to 28 2003	Essential part of the CPA process
CMT	28 November 2003	Consider the Peer Challenge Report
Member Group Meeting	3 December 2003	Agree Peer Challenge Improvement Plan
Return Benefits Self Assessment Forms	8 December 2003	Part of the process
Council Meeting	16 December 2003	Agree process to submit final CPA documentation
Member Group Meeting	17 December 2003	Consider CPA Final Documentation
CPA documentation – continue development process	Up until week of 2 January 2004	The CPA documentation will require fine tuning prior to delivery to the Audit Commission
Member Group Meeting	7 January 2004	Assess CPA position
Deliver Self Assessment documents to Audit Commission	9 January 2004	These documents are required a minimum of six weeks prior to the on site inspection
Member Group Meeting	28 January 2004	Update on implementing the Peer Challenge Recommendations
Member Group Meeting	11 February 2004	Confirm who sees who
Member Group Meeting	18 February 2004	Final document review prior to inspection
CPA Corporate Assessment	23 February 2004	A key element of the CPA process
Draft report to authority	25 April 2004	Opportunity for the authority to comment on the report and the CPA process
Authority to comment on report	9 May 2004	Chance to correct any mistakes and influence the final document
Final report to the authority	13 June 2004	To prepare for the final report
Report published	27 June 2004	Manage the media
Version Five	31 October 2003	Ian Orton

**Committee:** Scrutiny 1  
**Date:** 12 November 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 7  
**Title:** Work Programme – Port Health Services  
**Author:** Richard Secker (01799) 510550/Ian Orton (01799) 510402

### **Summary**

- 1 This report advises members of the Port Health Services currently undertaken by Environmental Services staff.

### **Background**

- 2 Currently at Stansted Airport this local authority is responsible for two separate activities dealing with passenger health controls within the main terminal and imported food control in the cargo areas. Until recently there was a grey area of smuggled food imports via arriving passengers. However, since the attention given to this problem following the foot and mouth disease outbreak H M Customs has been designated as the responsible agency and extra funding has been allocated.

### **Port Health Unit**

- 3 A suite of accommodation including a reception area and consulting rooms is provided within the main passenger terminal and located airside immediately before passport control. The purpose of the unit is to deal with infectious passengers on behalf of the Department of Health and to assist the Immigration Service by undertaking medical examinations of refugees, asylum seekers and long stay visitors.
- 4 The staffing is provided by three Health Control Officers employed by Uttlesford and a consortium of four Medical Officers contracted by the Uttlesford Primary Care Trust. All the costs incurred by Uttlesford are fully recovered annually from the Department of Health.

### **Border Inspection Post**

- 5 Across the European Union there are a number of designated air and seaports (BIP's) where animals and products of animal origin from outside the EU must receive entry clearance. Stansted Airport is a designated BIP and premises have been developed on the north side of the airport for this purpose. The premises are owned and operated by a consortium of private importers.

- 6 Staff employed by DEFRA are responsible for all live animals and by this local authority for all products of animal origin. Inspections are carried out by Environmental Health Officers on a rota basis and a contract Veterinary Surgeon attends as required. The costs incurred by Uttlesford are recovered by a scale of charges relating to consignment weights and time of inspection. EU Veterinary Inspectors audit the systems and procedures in place.

### **Other Foods**

- 7 In addition to the products of animal origin are fruit and vegetable imports from outside the EU and these are known as products of the soil. Inspections of these are carried out in the cargo sheds which are owned or leased by Import Agents and Ground Handling Companies.
- 8 These inspections are undertaken by Environmental Health Officers on a rota basis and the cost is recovered by a scale of charges relating to consignment weights and times of inspection. This arrangements has now been in operation since the formation of Uttlesford and stems from a voluntary agreement between the Import Agents and local authority to provide an inspection and advisory service.
- 9 Further responsibilities should soon be placed on this local authority to deal with imported organic products through Stansted Airport to certify origin and quality of the products. Again a scale of charges has been agreed nationally to recover costs.
- 10 The range of products, specific controls and physical checks required and the variability of import times means that it is essential to maintain a trained, knowledgeable and available team of Environmental Health Officers to undertake this work. This authority has been fortunate in having such a team available and agreeable to respond to a callout at what can be very unsocial hours.
- 11 Airport security has been greatly increased since 9/11 and ad hoc visits are more difficult to arrange. However some daytime escorted visits could be programmed to both the Port Health Unit and the BIP.

RECOMMENDATION that the comments of Members are sought on the policy and practice of managing Port Health Services at Stansted Airport.

Background Papers: Port Health Files: Dick Secker  
Scrutiny One Background Files – Ian Orton Policy & Performance Library

**Committee:** SCRUTINY 1 – COMMUNITY & HOUSING

**Date:** 12 November 2002

**Agenda Item No:** 8

**Title:** BEST VALUE REVIEW DAY CENTRES – FINAL REPORT

**Author:** Sarah McLagan/Alex Stewart

**MEMBER REFERENCE GROUP MEMBERS –**  
**Councillors - David Gregory (Chairman), Eggy Abrahams, Mrs Cecile Down &**  
**Mrs Helen Baker**  
**Critical Friend - Mrs Daphne Cornell**

### **Summary**

- 1 This report provides Members with full details of the Best Value Review that has been carried out of the Council's Day Centre services. It provides Members with the final Improvement Plan agreed by the Member Reference Group (MRG) and proposes that Scrutiny 1 recommends to the Community and Leisure Committee that the Improvement Plan is adopted.

### **Scope of the Review**

- 2 The Scope of the Review set out to consider the following:
  - Whether the Day Centres should continue to operate and, if so, in what format?
  - Whether the Day Centres meet customer expectations?
  - Could the Day Centres be more effectively or efficiently managed?
  - What impact the introduction of charges has for all hirers?
  - What possibility there is for increased and varied usage to reflect the community needs?

### **Brief Description of the Services**

- 3 The five Day Centres in Saffron Walden, Great Dunmow, Stansted, Thaxted and Takeley each were originally provided by the Council to:-

“Promote the welfare of people over 60 years of age and/or registered disabled by providing and maintaining a Day Centre for recreation and leisure purposes in the interests of social welfare and improving quality of life.”

“Provide meals and light refreshments for eligible persons attending the Day Centre”.

In terms of the Council's new Quality of Life Themes, the Day Centres help to “Improve the community safety and health of the population”.

4 A voluntary Management Committee manages each Day Centre. The Council has a Management Agreement with each Management Committee. This sets out the management and financial arrangements between the two parties. Essentially, the Council relies on the Management Committees to provide the Day Centre services. The Council's responsibilities are:-

- Liaison with Management Committees
- Training of staff/volunteers in evacuation procedures, first aid, health & safety, etc.
- Carrying out of Risk Assessments
- Attending at Management Committee meetings and Annual General Meetings
- Organising and chairing Day Centre Forums meetings
- Repairing and maintaining the buildings
- Appointing a District Council Representative on Day Centre Management Committee
- Paying Electricity, gas, water, non-domestic rates and sewerage bills
- Cleaning of the Centres
- Buildings Insurance.
- Public Liability Insurance.

5 The Council receives 50% of the income achieved by the Management Committees hiring the Day Centres to groups and organisations for various uses. The Management Committee organise fresh cooked lunches and light entertainment to be provided to local residents who are over 60 or disabled on a "drop-in" basis. The Council meets the cost of providing cooks at Thaxted and Takeley Day Centres. Takeley Day Centre is hired by Essex County Council Social Services to provide day care services.

6 The following table sets out the estimated costs and income for 2003/04 for the Day Centre service.

	Saffron Walden	Stansted	Takeley	Thaxted	Dunmow	Totals
<b>Expenditure</b>						
Direct Costs*	10,960	8,030	7,190	8,500	14,710	49,390
Internal Charges +						66,320
<b>Income</b>						
Fees & Charges	680 -	920 -	870 -	390 -	1,230 -	4,090 -
Meals on Wheels						18,000 -
<b>Net Total</b>						<b>93,620</b>

\* Includes Employees, Premises, Supplies & Utilities

+ Includes Management, Other Support and Capital Charges

## **What we are Currently Achieving**

- 6 The Day Centres are run by volunteers on behalf of the Council. Officers meet with the Day Centre Management Committees on a regular basis to provide support and for each to share good practice, issues and concerns.
- 7 The main activities provided by the Management Committees include Lunches, Coffee Mornings/ Strawberry Teas, Games/Quizzes, Music, Flower Arranging, Christmas Lunch and other celebrations, Keep Fit. They make the facilities available for hire to sectors of the local community including voluntary groups and for private functions. The Day Centre Management Committees collect performance information on a quarterly basis.

## **What we have done in this Review**

- 8 The Review has followed the standard Best Value process, using the 4 'Cs' – Compare, Consult, Challenge, and Compete. The MRG met on a monthly basis through the process. It also met with and consulted representatives appointed by the Day Centre Management Committees who collectively made up a wider Day Centre Best Value Review Team.

### **(a) Compare**

- 9 The MRG tried to compare the services the Council provides with its benchmarking group (the Daventry Group) and neighbouring authorities. Unfortunately, no authorities provide a comparable service and, despite writing an open letter to a national magazine, it has proved impossible to make any direct comparisons.

### **(b) Consult**

- 10 Four separate questionnaires were agreed and sought opinions about the Day Centre services from hirers, daily users and statutory agencies/town & parish councils/UDC Members. Officers and Members also carried out a non-user survey in each of the five towns/villages with Day Centres and with relevant clubs and organisations in the district. The surveys included questions about transport and access to the Day Centres, knowledge about the services that are available, and improvements that could be made to the services. 850 surveys were circulated and 439 replies were received - a response rate of 52%. The results enabled a structured approach to the Challenge Event.
- 11 The results of the surveys indicated
  - a. The Day Centres are regarded as well used facilities by local people
  - b. There could be greater use made of them by other people/groups in the community.
  - c. Some of the non-users surveyed were unaware of the existence of the Day Centres or considered they were too "young" to utilise such a facility.
  - d. Others were unable to access the Day Centres due to lack of suitable transport.

### **(c) Challenge**

- 12 With regard to the Challenge aspect of the review, the results of the surveys were used to inform two Challenge Events which were held at Dunmow Day Centre, one in the afternoon and one in the evening in mid July. Over 100 people were invited representing hirers, users, statutory agencies, town/parish council etc and over 75 attended in total. The Events sought to address the fundamental and specific questions posed in the Terms of Reference and make suggestions as to how the service could be improved. The MRG circulated amongst the discussion groups and gathered feedback and impressions about the Day Centre services.
- 13 The MRG considered that there were 5 themes that needed to be both considered and challenged by participants:
- Publicity – what is being undertaken at present, what is working, who should be responsible for what?
  - Who should run the Day Centres – another body, e.g., Town or Parish Council, should we enter into partnership arrangements or seek sponsorship, should staff be employed to manage or should the Day Centres be sold off?
  - Who currently use the Day Centres – how should they be made better use of and how should people from outlying villages be encouraged to use them?
  - What are the Day Centres used for – who should have priority use and what types of activities should be run form Day Centres?
  - What improvements could be made to Day Centres – in terms of the way in which they are managed and/or physically?

A number of suggestions for improvement emerged from the Challenge Event exercise. These were condensed into an Improvement Plan format under the following four themes:-

- a. The image of all Day Centres
  - b. The publicity of all Day Centres
  - c. To be inclusive and prevent social exclusion from all Day Centres
  - d. To revise all Constitutions and Management Agreements to ensure some consistency between Day Centres
- 15 In addition, the Challenge Event confirmed the overwhelming support for the Day Centre services to continue to be provided by volunteer Management Committees on behalf of the Council and that the Council should recognise volunteers as being an asset, both in terms of time and value for money.

**(d) Compete**

- 16 To address the requirement to consider whether “there is a better alternative way to deliver the services e.g. in-house, outsourcing, partnership, sponsorship?” the Head of Community & Leisure Services sent a letter to the five Town/Parish Councils, the WRVS, the Salvation Army and Essex County Council (Social Services). She sought expressions of interest to deliver the Day Centre services. To date, only Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow Town Council has expressed an interest in partnership opportunities and it is proposed that, through the improvement planning process, this principle is explored further with these bodies.

**Answers to the Fundamental Questions**

- 17 The Terms of Reference required the Best Value Review process to answer several Fundamental Questions. Having gone through the Best Value process, the MRG can answer the questions as follows:-

No.	Question	Response
1	What is the Council wanting to achieve in future in relation to provision of Day Centre services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continued high level of service provision for the elderly and disabled users.</li><li>• Use of the Day Centres by a wide variety of both statutory and non-statutory services for users.</li><li>• Extended use of the Day Centres.</li></ul>
2	Does the Council have a statutory obligation to provide the services?  Are there any other specific obligations, e.g. contracts?	No. The Day Centres are a unique, discretionary service.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Council has Management Agreements with each Day Centre Management Committee for the provision of the service from the facility.</li><li>• The Council employs contract cleaners to carry out cleaning of the Day Centres</li></ul>
3	If not should the Council cease to provide the services and, if so, what is its impact?	No. Consultation with users, hirers, town & parish councils etc. confirmed that the Council should continue to provide the services as they facilitate an important social welfare and quality of life function, which compliment other statutory provision e.g. Primary Care Trust (HIMP)) Without the services, the local elderly and disabled populations could be denied access to hot meals and social interaction.

4	If the services are to be continued are there better alternative ways to deliver the services – in-house, outsourcing, partnership, sponsorship?	The Day Centres should continue to be provided through the voluntary Day Centre Management Committees as this method provides the Council with excellent value for money. However, there are opportunities of partnership working at some of the Day Centres e.g. with the local Town Council, and this should be pursued further through the Improvement Plan.
---	--	---

### Answers to the Specific Questions

- 18 The Terms of Reference required the Best Value Review process to answer several Specific Questions. Having gone through the Best Value process, the MRG can answer the questions as follows:-

No.s	Questions	Responses
1	Are we working to the greatest effect, with others, to bring real benefits to the Uttlesford community in terms of its access to Day Centres?	No. More needs to be done to provide information to people, particularly in outlying villages, to encourage their attendance at the Day Centres. This can be done through work with UPCT, Social Services, Uttlesford Community Transport and local village car scheme organisers. Information about bus routes and timetables can be circulated to local villages in cooperation with Essex County Council.
2	What is the prime focus of the Day Centre services e.g. social care, health improvement	The prime focus of the Day Centres is the social welfare of the elderly and disabled population that they serve. They seek to improve the quality of life of the users leading, in turn, to healthier living.
3	Are we providing an important complementary role to other service providers, e.g. the voluntary sector, ECC (social services)?	Yes. The Day Centres provide a unique social welfare services that are not available to the population through the voluntary sector or Social Services. The important issue to address is how to remove the stereotypical image of Day Centres being aligned with “Social Services” & therefore, just for old people.

4	Should we increase our focus on those requiring greatest support, e.g. disadvantaged young persons, those 'isolated' within the villages?	Yes. It is clear from usage information that those living closest to the Day Centres utilise the facilities. It is essential that the Centres become more accessible to people from outlying villages and that people are positively encouraged to attend. The Day Centre Management Committees (DCMC) should positively engage with groups making services available for disadvantaged young people to encourage use of the Day Centres e.g. respite care.
5	How can the Day Centres be developed with limited resources? Is there a better, more effective, way to run the Day Centres, e.g. external support - charitable trust?	The Council relies on the volunteers to provide the Day Centre Services. It would not be cost effective to move away from this position. Each of the DCMCs has charitable status. As they are loss-making facilities, little interest has been shown by external bodies to consider partnership arrangements, although the potential for this does need further exploration.
6	Are the Council's/Day Centre's charging policies appropriate?	The Charging policies are established and managed by the Day Centre Management Committees. The level of charge reflects the "market rate" appropriate to the facility. Improvements can be made in the processes for hiring the facilities.

- 19 As a result of the Review Process, the MRG is now in a position to propose an Improvement Plan, which sets out a number of actions to be taken to help improve the Day Centre services over the next couple of years and is appended to this report. This was consulted on and approved by the Day Centre Best Value Review Team.

RECOMMENDED that the Committee approve the Day Centre Best Value Review Improvement Plan and recommend it to the Community and Leisure Committee for adoption.

Background Papers: Day Centre Best Value Review files.