

Report of the Strategic Director of Children's Services to the meeting of Governance and Audit Committee to be held on 20th February 2015.

AH

Subject:

Youth Service Buildings Review

Summary statement:

This report informs the Governance and Audit Committee of the findings of the Youth Service Buildings Review. It seeks the Committees comments and recommendations in relation to proposed retention and opportunities to identify alternative estate arrangements in partnership with local community and voluntary sector organisations.

Michael Jameson
Strategic Director – Children's
Services

**Portfolio: Children and Young People's
Services**

Report Contact: Heather Wilson
Phone: (01274) 431781
E-mail: heather.wilson@bradford.gov.uk

Overview & Scrutiny Area: Children's



1. SUMMARY

This report informs the Governance and Audit Committee of the findings of the Youth Service Buildings Review. It seeks the Committees comments and recommendations in relation to proposed retention and opportunities to identify alternative estate arrangements in partnership with local community and voluntary sector organisations.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Council at its budget setting meeting on 20th February 2014 set the budget for The Youth Service for the periods 2014-15 and 2015-16. The agreed budget required the Service to be restructured, which included a necessary review of the buildings used for the delivery of youth work.
- 2.2 The Youth Service reports to the Area Committees in July 2014 outlined that the existing usage of Council and non Council buildings for the delivery of Youth Work would be the subject of a formal buildings review. Area Committees and Area Coordinators are stakeholders in the outcome of this review in order to determine a preferred approach within each Constituency.
- 2.3 The Review has focussed on the Council owned or leased properties used for the delivery of Youth Work across the District. This report is concerned with the buildings currently used to deliver youth service provision in each constituency, rather than with the provision of the service itself.
- 2.4 Elements of the preparatory work for the review commenced in August in terms of understanding the number of young people who use provision delivered from the Youth Service premises, alongside assessments around the condition of the buildings.
- 2.5 The consultation element of the review has been undertaken between September and December 2014.
- 2.6 The responsibility for the collation of the views and opinions of the five constituency areas and ensuring this is reflected within the decision making processes has been undertaken by the Commissioner (Youth Provisions).
- 2.7 Meetings have been held on a Ward basis to determine the views of Elected Members in individual Wards. These meetings have been facilitated by the Ward Officers and recognise there is a wealth of local knowledge that can make a positive contribution and ensure a direct input in to the design of solutions of what is a 'devolved' service.
- 2.8 We have circulated to Parish and Town Councils a questionnaire to enable their views to contribute towards the review.
- 2.9 Local community and voluntary sector groups have been consulted through a questionnaire and the results have been used to inform this report



- 2.10 The Youth Service has created opportunities for young people to voice their views and make recommendations through open access sessions. Staff from the Youth Service undertook consultations with young people using the provisions accommodated by the existing buildings. This has enabled the young people using provision to think and contribute ideas. Young people's feedback is reported in the appendix relating to each building.
- 2.11 Information gathered from the various stakeholders has been collated together and presented back to members in each Constituency area to enable further discussion and ascertain preferred options and recommendations to be incorporated in this report.
- 2.12 The review has explored potential and interest for Community Asset Transfers, and sought the local knowledge of community groups who may be interested in sharing or contributing to Youth Service run spaces.

3. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 The Youth Service Buildings Review has been undertaken within the context of maintaining youth work provision within areas, but freeing up the locations identified as delivery sites.
- 3.2 There have been 18 organisations in the district who have expressed interest in Community Asset Transfer of premises. Some have specified particular premises of interest to them; others have expressed interest in seeing the range of premises available. Any organisations who have expressed interest will be contacted following the Council Executive decisions and advised of the due process to be followed should they wish to pursue their initial expression of interest. It is hoped that the Community Asset Transfer of premises to organisations committed to maintaining community access will secure sites for future delivery of services to young people.

4. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL

- 4.1 The Buildings Review needs to contribute towards the sustainability of the Youth Service within its agreed budget. The current running cost for the buildings used by the Youth Service is £253,000 (plus an estimated £355,000 within Estates Management). The budget will be reduced to £182,600 from April 2015 hence a saving of £70,400 is required through this buildings review process. Any savings generated by Estates Management will be allocated against their budget. The proposed recommendations in this report will ensure that the £70,400 saving is achieved.
- 4.2 The Youth Service Buildings Review is being carried out from within the existing resources of Children's Services, Neighbourhood and Customer Services and Estates Management.
- 4.3 Estates Management will be required to have increased input following the decisions of the Executive particularly in relation to supporting Community Asset



Transfers and if required different management arrangements for premises. Initial discussions have taken place with Estates Management so that any transfers / alternative arrangements are incorporated into the overall Council Estates Strategy.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES

- 5.1 Alternative estate management arrangements will contribute towards the sustainability of the Youth Service and the offer to young people.
- 5.2 There are some risks in that no suitable organisations may come forward for alternative estate management arrangements including Community Asset Transfer. This could mean removal of premises in an area for delivery of youth work, however, Youth Work practitioners would be required to identify alternative delivery sites and to work to develop transition plans to ensure young peoples continued access to youth workers and services they provide.
- 5.3 Recommendations for alternative estate management arrangements, including Community Asset Transfer and Assets of Community Interest would need to comply with Council protocols and procedures.

6. LEGAL APPRAISAL

- 6.1 Under the Education Act 1996 local authorities must, so far as reasonably practicable, secure for young people in the area sufficient educational leisure time activities which are for the improvement of their well-being and sufficient facilities for such activities; and sufficient recreational leisure-time activities which are for the improvement of their well-being, and sufficient facilities for such activities. A local authority may provide such facilities or activities itself, assist others in the provision of such facilities or activities, make arrangements for facilitating access for young persons to such facilities or activities, or take any other action which the authority thinks appropriate.
- 6.2 This report is concerned with the buildings currently used to deliver youth service provision across the district, rather than with the provision of the service itself. There is no legal requirement for the Council to provide buildings from which to operate Youth Service provisions.
- 6.3 Before exercising its functions referred to above the local authority must take steps to ascertain the views of young people in the area and take such views into account.
- 6.4 The Council must have regard to the public sector equality duty under the Equality Act 2010 which requires the Council when exercising its functions to have due regard to the need to :
 - eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010
 - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
 - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected



characteristic and persons who do not share it.

6.5 Community Asset Transfers

The legal background to proposed community asset transfers is as follows:

The Local Government Act 1972 section 123(2) states:

Except with the consent of the Secretary of State, a council shall not dispose of land under this section, otherwise than by way of a short tenancy, for a consideration less than the best that can reasonably be obtained.

A General Consent for local authorities to dispose of land to community organisations at below market value was given under section 123(2) in 2003. The consent specifies the following conditions:

The specified circumstances are:

- a) *the local authority considers that the purpose for which the land is to be disposed is likely to contribute to the achievement of any one or more of the following objects in respect of the whole or any part of its area, or of all or any persons resident or present in its area:*
 - i) *the promotion or improvement of economic well-being;*
 - ii) *the promotion or improvement of social well-being;*
 - iii) *the promotion or improvement of environmental well-being; and*
- b) *the difference between the unrestricted value of the land to be disposed of and the consideration for the disposal does not exceed £2 million.*

The General Consent further states as follows:

In determining whether or not to dispose of land for less than the best consideration reasonably obtainable, and whether or not any specific proposal to take such action falls within the terms of the Consent, the authority should ensure that it complies with normal and prudent commercial practices, including obtaining the view of a professionally qualified valuer as to the likely amount of the undervalue.

6.6 Enforceability of conditions attached to Community Asset Transfers

Enforceable conditions relating to the future use of property subject of a community asset transfer are more effectively facilitated if the property is disposed of by the grant of a long term or short term lease rather than by the sale of the freehold 6.5

7.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY

- 7.1.1 In considering the options the Council must have regard to its public sector equality duty. An equality impact assessment is attached as appendix 1. Members will also wish to consider carefully the feedback given in the consultation process. The following issues are in particular drawn to the attention of members.

Shipley Constituency



City of Bradford
Metropolitan District Council



- 7.1.2 The Bingley Youth Provision is currently used as a delivery site for the 'Inclusion' provision which specifically meets the needs of disabled young people who are less able to cope within mainstream settings. This provision is delivered by the Youth Service and has previously been accommodated within the Shipley Youth Café.
- 7.1.3 The Highcroft Youth Centre also accommodates a district wide provision that is run by a voluntary organisation to specifically support young people with Asperger's. .
- 7.1.4 Shipley Youth Café provides support to a significant number of vulnerable young people, some of whom access provision anonymously and is reported to deal with many more complex issues in its provision of Information, advice and guidance alongside open access youth work provision.
- 7.1.5 The Duke of Edinburgh's Award Centre currently accommodates provision on 2 evenings per week for young people from new migrant communities, particularly those from Central and Eastern Europe. These young people have a high number of needs, particularly around isolation and many do not access other services. Should a decision be taken to dispose of these premises, the preferred method would be through Community Asset Transfer to a community group that could continue to accommodate the delivery of youth provision for this new migrant group.

Bradford West Constituency

- 7.1.6 Toller Youth Café accommodates provision for young people from new migrant, Central and Eastern European Communities. This building is recommended for retention but should a decision be made to dispose of these premises careful plans would need to be made to ensure that the identified alternative delivery sites would be considered by young people to be a safe space that met their needs

7.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

The Buildings Review should contribute towards the sustainability of the Youth Service.

7.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS

Greenhouse gas emissions and wider environmental impacts will be a consideration in making recommendations.

7.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

In making the recommendations contained in this report, possible impacts on young people and the community have been taken into account

7.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

There are no direct Human Rights implications arising from the recommendations below.



7.6 TRADE UNION

There are no implications for Trade Unions.

7.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS

The Youth Service Buildings Review aims to ensure that young people in all Wards continue to have opportunity to access youth provision.

7.8 AREA COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN IMPLICATIONS

The Youth Service Buildings Review will help ensure that the priorities within the Area Committee Action Plans 2014-17 are supported.

8. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS

None.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- 9.1 Members make comments and recommendations in relation to proposals for retention and exploration of alternative estate management arrangements for Youth Service run buildings.
- 9.2 That members make comments and recommendations to the Executive of the desire to work closely with community and voluntary sector groups in locality areas to explore alternative estate management arrangements, including Community Asset Transfers where due process can identify strong partnership arrangements.

10. APPENDICES

Appendix 1
Equalities Impact Assessment

Appendix 2

Summary Documents from consultation feedback for the following Buildings:

- Bingley Youth Project
- Denholme Youth Café
- Highcroft Youth Centre
- Shipley Youth Café
- TFD Centre
- Scholemoor Centre
- Buttershaw Youth Centre
- Wibsey Pod
- Parkwood Centre for Young People
- Silsden Youth Centre
- Addingham Youth Centre
- Ilkley Youth Centre



- Haworth Youth Centre
- Laisterdyke Youth Centre
- Canterbury Youth Centre
- Ravenscliffe Youth Centre
- Immanuel Eco Pod
- The Duke of Edinburgh's Award Centre
- Toller Youth Café

Appendix 3

Summary of rented spaces currently used in each Constituency area

Appendix 4

Financial and attendance overview for each Constituency area

Appendix 5

Summary of criteria used and proposed recommendations for retention and exploration of alternative estate management arrangements.

12. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- Amended Budget Recommendations to Council on 18th February 2014
- Youth Service Report to Shipley Area Committee on 2nd July 2014 (*Document I*)
- Youth Service Report to West Area Committee on 23rd July 2014 (*Document D*)
- Youth Service Report to East Area Committee on 26th June 2014 (*Document A*)
- Youth Service Report to South Area Committee on 26th June 2014 (*Document F*)
- Youth Service Report to Keighley Area Committee on 3rd July 2014 (*Document D*)
- Transfer of Youth Service to Neighbourhood and Customer Services Report to the Meeting of Children and Young People's Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 22nd July 2014 (*Document G*)
- New Delivery Model for Bradford's Children's Centres Report to the meeting of the Council Executive on 4th November 2014 (*Document AA*)
- New Delivery Model for Bradford's Children's Centres – Response to call in to the meeting of the Council Executive on 2nd December 2014 (*Document AK*)
- Shipley Area Committee Meeting on 14th January 2015 (*Document AO*)
- Report to the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27th January 2015 (*Document AR*)



Equality Impact Assessment Form

Department	Children's Services	Version no	1
Assessed by	Heather Wilson, Commissioner (Youth Provision)	Date created	11.01.15
Approved by	Cindy Peek, Deputy Director	Date approved	
Updated by		Date updated	
Final approval		Date signed off	

Section 1: What is being assessed?

1.1 Name of proposal to be assessed:

Youth Service Buildings Review

1.2 Describe the proposal under assessment and what change it would result in if implemented:

A Review has been undertaken of Youth Service run premises in the District with a view to reducing the number of these to enable the budget to be realised.

If the recommendations to the Executive are accepted there would be a reduction in the number of buildings run directly by the Youth Service. Services currently located within the buildings identified for disposal would be relocated to alternative delivery sites within the area.

Section 2: What the impact of the proposal is likely to be

The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to have due regard to the need to-

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- advance equality of opportunity between different groups; and
- foster good relations between different groups

2.1 Will this proposal advance equality of opportunity for people who share a protected characteristic and/or foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those that do not? If yes, please explain further.

By reducing the number of Youth Service owned premises, the budget reduction will be realised and service delivery will be enhanced by local partnership working and increased

sharing of resources. There will be a more direct link to locally run services, increasing awareness of issues impacting on young people.

The Youth Service will remain focussed on ensuring open access provision for 13-19 year olds across the district using a prevention and early intervention approach.

A continued commitment to supporting vulnerable and young people not in education, employment or training will remain with youth work practitioners providing one to one support from a range of local venues that are appropriate to meet young people. The Youth Service would continue to ensure volunteering and leadership opportunities for young people which will lead to accreditations.

2.2 Will this proposal have a positive impact and help to eliminate discrimination and harassment against, or the victimisation of people who share a protected characteristic? If yes, please explain further.

Yes

2.3 Will this proposal potentially have a negative or disproportionate impact on people who share a protected characteristic? If yes, please explain further.

The proposal to reduce the youth service owned sites for youth work delivery may have a direct impact on young people due to their age including those who are vulnerable, from new communities, or who are NEET. It is likely to impact on young people who have a disability and those who lack confidence or struggle with new or changing environments, those with different sexual orientations or who are pregnant.

It is not intended that this proposal should reduce the number of youth work practitioners supporting these groups.

Specifically the Buildings Review has identified:

The Bingley Youth Provision is currently used as a delivery site for the 'Inclusion' provision which specifically meets the needs of disabled young people and those who are less able to cope within mainstream settings. This provision is delivered by the Youth Service and has previously been accommodated within the Shipley Youth Café.

The Highcroft Youth Centre also accommodates a district wide provision that is run by a voluntary organisation to specifically support young people with Asperger's.

Shipley Youth Café provides support to a significant number of vulnerable young people, some of whom access provision anonymously and is reported to deal with many more complex issues in its provision of Information, advice and guidance alongside open access youth work provision.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award Centre currently accommodates provision on 2 evenings per week for young people from new migrant communities, particularly those from Central and Eastern Europe. These young people have a high level of need, particularly around feelings of isolation and many do not access other services. Should the recommendation for disposal of these premises be accepted, the preferred method for disposal would be through Community Asset Transfer to a community group that could continue to accommodate the delivery of youth provision for this new migrant group.

Toller Youth Café accommodates provision for young people from new migrant, Central and Eastern European Communities. This building is recommended for retention but should Executive make a decision to dispose of these premises careful plans would need to be made to ensure that the identified alternative delivery sites would be considered by young people to be a safe space that met their needs

2.4 Please indicate the level of negative impact on each of the protected characteristics?

(Please indicate high (H), medium (M), low (L), no effect (N) for each)

Protected Characteristics:	Impact (H, M, L, N)
Age	H Young People 13-19yrs
Disability	H
Gender reassignment	M
Race	H
Religion/Belief	L
Pregnancy and maternity	L
Sexual Orientation	H
Sex	N
Marriage and civil partnership	N
Additional Consideration:	
Low income/low wage	H

2.5 How could the disproportionate negative impacts be mitigated or eliminated?

The aim of the proposal is to reduce the number of Youth Service owned sites and not the delivery / offer of youth work to young people. Where buildings are identified for alternative estate management arrangements or for disposal consideration would be given to potential for Community Asset Transfers with the retention of space for the provision of Youth Work as a prerequisite.

Where buildings are not suitable for Community Asset Transfer either because of the condition or no interested or viable groups wishing to take transfer of buildings the use of locally identified voluntary and community sector owned premises would be sought to enable and maintain provisions.

There is funding within the budget allocated for rental of spaces within voluntary and community sector premises which should help to mitigate any negative impacts. Youth Workers are already developing and creating locality based partnership working with use of partner premises being offered as part of local delivery plans. Local knowledge gleaned from the neighbourhood structures will enable more joined up and true partnership working and less silo working. There is strength in developing and increasing local partnership

working as this may improve access and broaden the offer to young people in communities.

The externally commissioned and independent review of youth provisions in the district has given the Council a wealth of information about the current offer to young people. It has identified the location of services provided by the voluntary, community, uniformed and faith sectors. This information will be shared with Neighbourhoods and will be used to inform planning at a local level; enabling more joined up working and shared responses across the sector, particularly in response to emerging issues.

Section 3: What evidence you have used?

3.1 What evidence do you hold to back up this assessment?

Information that is acquired from Youth Workers and Neighbourhood Area Coordinators from their locality and neighbourhood knowledge.

An understanding of our client base of young people, alongside consultation with elected members, town and parish councillors, voluntary and community sector partners and young people who are currently using the premises.

Statistical information evidencing the numbers of individual young people using each provision currently delivered from Youth Service run premises.

3.2 Do you need further evidence?

No

Section 4: Consultation Feedback

4.1 Results from any previous consultations

From consultation undertaken as part of the budget savings in February 2014 and the subsequent remodelling of the Youth Service it was suggested that:

There would be a disproportionate impact on vulnerable and hard to engage young people Young people from low income families as they have less income available making costs associated with travel beyond reach of many young people. This is also of concern to young people from rural communities who could be impacted as often the rural areas of the district are not as well served by public transport and are vulnerable to increased isolation due to their rural location and associated costs for travel.

There were concerns of the loss of anonymous youth spaces creating a disproportionate impact for LGBT young people with potential for this to increase their feelings of isolation There were concerns about young people who are not in education, employment or training and the links to the broader austerity measures reducing the opportunities for this group.

4.2 Feedback from current consultation

Elected members, town and parish councillors, young people, voluntary and community sector partners have all been consulted during the Review of the Youth Service Buildings. Their thoughts and considerations have been collated in relation to each owned building and alongside the condition survey, back log maintenance and attendance figures, which

has been presented back to local members for their consideration prior to the recommendations for disposal.

There is recognition that buildings are costing considerably more than the budget available from 1st April 2015. There are few of the existing stock of buildings that are being used to their full potential, and there is potential for other services and providers to make use of premises at times when these are not being used for delivery of youth work, and for this increased use to contribute towards running costs for premises.

Some buildings are in a poor state of repair and there are locally identified buildings in some areas that offer appropriate and in some instances enhanced environments for youth work delivery.

Young people's feedback identified potential barriers to their participation in relocated provision had similar responses across the district with many young people identifying distance required to travel to any alternative delivery sites and provision being offered in a different part of the area, which raised territorial issues for many and feelings of safety outside their own immediate communities. A common concern for young people was if provisions were relocated the distance should enable them to still walk to provision, with travel costs and feelings of safety whilst using public transport considered to present a significant barrier to participation.

Young people clearly valued the youth work experiences they were in receipt of and expressed concerns of "nothing to do", "increased anti social behaviours" and "isolation" should the offer be reduced by the closure of premises

4.3 Your departmental response to this feedback – include any changes made to the proposal as a result of the feedback

The Youth service offer to young people presents only a part of a much larger and broader offer to young people in the District. It is not intended that the Offer to young people be reduced in response to the Buildings Review, indeed there are opportunities for services to become more joined up which could increase offer to young people. Where premises are recommended for retention there is opportunity for young people to play a more significant role in income generation to support the running costs of the premises, many young people during the consultation had lots of very viable ideas for fundraising.

Recommended alternative estate management arrangements for some premises will free up ties to existing delivery locations – enabling services to be delivered in response to need rather than being tied to the existing locations of owned buildings. Disposal of premises in the current financial climate will contribute towards the sustainability of youth work provision and offer to young people.

There are opportunities for Community Asset Transfer of premises and increased opportunities for empowerment of local organisations and communities to become more active in the running premises identified for retention. These contribute towards the Council priority of becoming more of an enabler to local communities.

The Youth Offer Review has given us rich data of the location of many other providers of services to young people. This will be used to inform potential delivery sites for the continuation of youth work provision. Alongside careful transition arrangements with youth work practitioners working alongside young people it is considered that young people would continue to receive high quality youth provisions in their areas.

Stakeholder responses:

- Bingley Youth Café is well placed in the town centre and could pick up support to young people currently using the Youth Project if we had to close the provision
- The building hosts the only Indoor skate park in the district and this would have an impact on skaters in the winter months when it is most used because they cannot skate outside so much - Young people do attend this from all over the District.
- Inclusion provision would not be difficult to move / relocate to other premises – Shipley youth café or Bingley youth café could easily accommodate.
- If we can make the building sustainable we should try to keep it

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people report that they feel safe, happy and find the building to be very welcoming.
- Young people did not feel the building was in a poor state of repair but they would like to decorate the centre and change the white wall covering
- They feel the building should be rented to other people to use at times when they are not using it – like in the daytime when they are at school, but they were also keen that anyone who did use it remembered it was a youth provision and did not want lots of changes to it. Some young people were concerned that it could get too busy and crowded if too many people used it as the building is not that big. Parent responders were happy to consider shared use of the building but not at the same time as their children as they felt this would restrict the freedom their children currently had.
- Fundraising to help with the costs was also something young people were happy to consider
- Disabled young people who responded told us they did not want to go to other centres, parents and workers confirmed any changes for some disabled young people would need to be carefully planned and managed to ensure transitions if they became necessary
- Disabled young people also felt they could become isolated if they had no where to go and that the size of the building and layout offered quiet small spaces and bigger activity spaces so young people had choices and could get away from things that were too much for them
- Most of the disabled young people who use this provision are transported by family / carers from more than 2 miles, 2 YP catch the bus but felt their parents would not let them independently travel as far as Bradford. 1 parent felt it was important to her as it was their “local” provision and that helped her sons understanding of community and place
- Skaters also reported that they travel an average of 2 miles or more to attend the skate sheds, they used a combination of cycling, walking public and private transport to get to the building.
- Young people do not currently “pay in” to the provision, some parents had advised they would be willing to consider this
- Parents of disabled young people reported they find the building to be very accessible for wheelchair users particularly, most use the provision at least once, often twice per week.
- Parents felt the building was ideally located and not difficult to get to, they did not feel other buildings in the area could cater for the disabled young people's needs in the same way, and that removal of the provision would have a detrimental impact on them as parents as they appreciated the short break/ respite the provision gave them
- Some young people also attend other provisions in the district (Laisterdyke Fab club – where they pay £1), others reported that they find access to “mainstream” provisions difficult and specialist provisions like Bingley were in short supply so they have no option but to travel
- Young people who skated at the provision were keen to point out that this is the only indoor skate shed in the district and they felt this did keep them off

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

the streets. They would like the building to be open more than it currently is.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- I think that it is becoming more important to work in partnership to help to ensure any gaps in provision are filled. There are some geographical areas which have voluntary sector run buildings which may be able to house or share Youth Provision from the Youth Service, this currently works very well in Bingley and we would welcome more partnership work.
- Where premises are managed by Voluntary organisations extra funding may be gained to commission out work to “specialists” for example, D of E, drugs and alcohol specialists or voice and influence specialists, maybe the youth service could “sell” programmes to the Voluntary sector In addition to this Youth Service could support delivery in Voluntary Organisation run centres therefore increasing opportunities available to young people.
- We currently offer 5 days of Youth Provision a week over 24 hours in the Bingley area. We offer a range of services such as sexual health, diet and nutrition awareness, smoking, drugs and alcohol awareness and various short courses to improve young people’s skills and enable chance to gain an accreditation. We have a good staff team with a broad number of skills, we feel well placed to deliver youth work in this area, however we are always open to inviting other to work with us. In this challenging climate we may not be in such a fortunate position in the future which will make partnership work even more important.
- We are not interested in CAT.

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition survey undertaken in 2013 Backlog maintenance is £85,028 for windows, lighting and the roof. Ease of disposal indicator is Amber (considered to present some challenges)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 4,515
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 9,712
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0
Individual attendees	191
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	2
Other Centre users	

Stakeholder responses:

- Only other building in the area is the Mechanics and this is not considered to be suitable – this used to be used before the café was created.
- There are strong possibilities that the management committee and town council could share the running responsibility for the café if it is earmarked for disposal
- It does not cost a huge amount to run and there is potential to fundraise to cover the costs
- The area really does need to keep youth provision running – the young people are very isolated and transport links are both expensive and poor services to / from the area on an evening.
- This building feels like it has a genuine opportunity to become community led with the existing support the building has.

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people feel the building could do with a small makeover – a paint job !
- The size of the building limits activities, but it has a good layout and we feel safe
- Young people report using the provision twice a week
- Young people would be prepared to fundraise to help pay for the running costs with ideas of a swear jar and tuck shop. They feel others could use the building when they are not using it, local business's could be asked to get involved and support the club. The young people felt the building could be given to the management committee to run
- Young people do feel they have ownership in the building and would like to attend more if there were more staff available. They felt the building could be more accessible to others if they had more staff to support them.
- They have concerns of losing the premises and the impact this would have on them (increased isolation, getting into trouble in the community etc) they were also concerned about other young people in the area who may be less able to travel than they were
- Young people report that they walk to provision, and the area is very isolated with costs for transport being high and the service infrequent
- Young people do not currently pay to use provision, but they could – the steering group are looking at this option

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Important to maintain the support from the Youth Service staff and for this to be supplemented with volunteers to secure and expand the provision at the Café. Some consistent support, more than just the short term would be welcomed to give security to the young people. Needs more involvement of young people through a Youth Steering group
- Not possible to share premises with others due to remote location. Have a number of existing partnerships (HALE, Early years and Play team) – would welcome other collaborative projects. Management Committee keen to find ways to increase service already available to young people.
- Management Committee is a small team and can help with fundraising and guiding the café. They could ensure good use of the premises through advertising and publicity in the village. In the future if they became a charity, given sufficient funds they might be able to employ

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

staff directly.

Management Committee would be interested in exploring potential for CAT, subject to costs being acceptable and possibly Denholme Community Association would consider a CAT

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	No condition survey undertaken No backlog maintenance recorded Ease of disposal indicator is Red (considered to present significant challenges)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 1,098
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 872
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0
Individual attendees	104
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	2
Other Centre users	

Stakeholder responses:

- The Sports hall is considered to be an asset, but the local school also have sports halls that could be used
- For many young people the provision is Inaccessible due to the big hill – young people don't want to walk up the hill so it is mainly accommodating young people from Wrose
- Young people also attend Greenwood Centre, or potentially opportunity to build relationship Windhill Community Centre and Bolton Woods Community Centre.
- The early years provision - Happytots have moved out as have Superstars after school club – there is potential for the space to be used by others providing these services. It would be worth exploring with Early years about child care providers in the area who may be willing to pay to use the building – potentially one child care provider has EOI in purchasing building.
- There is a real need for a space for 2 year old offer in the area. The group who did provide the nursery could no longer afford to rent the space after the council increased the rental amounts. There is interest from the school Low Ash Primary and from the provider Children's Place Nurseries to possibly look to run something in the premises. The space in Highcroft is purpose built, and is fit for use immediately.
- Early years could support interested groups in getting started through a start up grant, but the cost of renting the space would need to be reasonable if it were to work.
- There are some drainage issues in the building which may need to be considered as this creates an ongoing maintenance cost as they are prone to blockage.
- There is potential to share the building with others – this should be explored
- Wrose does not have a community centre any more as the old one was demolished – there may be opportunity for Highcroft to absorb some of that function if there is interest in the area from the community in developing this
- There is nothing else in the immediate area – there is youth provision in Swain House which some young people use.

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people felt the building offered a safe and welcoming environment,
- It is spacious and offers a wide range of opportunities to deliver activities/project work.
- The feel it is a bit run down and could do with decorating, and the majority of young people felt the layout of the building was not good.
- Most young people reported that they attended the club 2 nights per week. Some young people also attended Greenwood youth club in Swain House.
- Young people were keen to identify opportunities that could help generate income to keep the provision open.
- A majority of the group suggested renting space in the building to other groups / schools/ businesses fund raise or identify a community group willing to take it over running the building.
- Young people also said that having their own local young provision offered opportunities to meet friends and other people, be able to put young people friendly publicity/literature on the walls etc. Young people were very strong on their opinions if the provision was to close, they felt they would have nowhere to go in the evenings, would be bored, hang around the local streets and end up getting in trouble with the

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

authorities.

- A majority of the users live less than a mile from the club. When ask young people were only willing to travel less than a mile to a local youth provision. A majority of young people said they would not feel safe attending provision outside of the Ward, due to other areas being territorial, being too far from home and the cost of getting to the alternative venue.
- Currently young people do not pay to use the facilities.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Youth Provision in the area could be best delivered if you consider utilising private club's assets as a potential win-win. There are lots of under-used facilities in the area I suspect.
- The win-win is a greater use of private facilities with the savings to the local authority and the potential cash benefits of asset sales.
- For small clubs the upside has to be rental income.
- Our organisation could support the delivery of youth work in the future as we have a field, changing rooms and a clubhouse; lots of potential here - We are not interested in CAT of your premises

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition survey undertaken in 2013 Backlog maintenance is £222,291 for floors, rewiring, boiler and drains It has sports hall facilities and early years specific space within extension to property Ease of disposal indicator is Amber (considered to present some challenges)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 8,517
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 14,214
Income Generation (2013-14)	£4,453
Individual attendees	198
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	2
Other Centre users	

Stakeholder responses:

- Should look to keep this – offers central location and offers some support to some very vulnerable young people. There are a number who attend as anonymous young people to gain support
- IAG services are essential in the town centre, NEET provision, accreditation / skills for young people.
- Would like to keep this if at all possible
- There may be potential to write to landlord to ask for rent reduction
- There did used to be a Management Committee but it is now disbanded – could be rebuilt as part of a sustainability strategy and fundraising / charity status in the future.
- Potential to run this as a proper café/training space.
- Leaving care also located in town centre – potential to share premises
- Impact of closure of this would be significant to Information, Advice and Guidance
- Town Centre location makes this very accessible and offers young people an anonymity when accessing some services (health particularly)
- It costs too much at this moment in time and we need to explore opportunities to reduce this – particularly the rental figure
- It would be worth exploring the opportunities for the development of a management committee, possibly exploring charitable status as they may be able to generate other income to support the running costs of the premises
- We would like to retain this building if we can reduce the costs and work towards it being more sustainable

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people report feeling safe in the café premises, the layout is good.
- It could do with a bit of financial investment and a bit of a makeover – young people would like to redecorate the building and make it look friendlier. It could be with the windows and carpet cleaning, and the computers need updating / making work.
- Of the group consulted most reported using the provision more than twice per week, and they did not use other provisions.
- Young people considered fundraising and sharing the space with others as options to offset running costs. They felt the building could have local building improvement challenge projects with other local groups and business's. It was important that it remained a YP space.
- YP feel they have ownership of the building, and would like it to be open more nights. They feel the building is accessible to young people who might need more support.
- YP felt a town centre location was essential and were concerned about impact on closure of this (no where to go, loosing YW support, boredom and increased isolation)
- All young people consulted reported that they travel less than 1 mile to attend the provision and that they were happy to walk in the area. 10 of the group consulted said they would be happy to use public transport to access other provisions, many said they would not be prepared to travel, and were concerned about costs for this.
- Currently YP do not pay, but plans were in place for this to commence in November, with the money generated being used to offset costs

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

for resources for the café.

- Young people felt the café was essential, and that all young people needed access to provision like the Shipley Youth Cafe

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- None received

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	This is a leasehold property that has dilapidations clauses at end of lease Lease is currently “holding over” this means either party is required to give 3 months notice for termination of lease
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 27,476
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 4,401
Income Generation (2013-14)	£ 400.
Individual attendees	147
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	4 evenings and 4 daytime openings
Other Centre users	Hale – One off use

Stakeholder responses:

- The TFD Centre is not currently considered to be a community hub.
- There are lots of other buildings in the area that could be used, some felt there are too many buildings in the area and there is opportunity to joined things up. Suggestion of premises in Bierley and Step 2 in Tong Street as alternative venues.
- The building is not considered to be suitable for CAT due to its size – most groups in the area simply could not sustain it, and it would require real commitment - not sure the desire is there.
- The local upper school - Tong, whilst is a great resource in the area due to its location it would not serve the needs of Holmewood very well.
- If the TFD Centre were to be disposed of it would need very careful planning - it would quickly become a blight in the community. We have seen this with other empty buildings in this area
- There is some recognition that the building could be better used. The Library is an integral part of the building and is needed in the area – this should be retained if at all possible
- The building is a huge undertaking – a monster to manage. It does have other providers of services – James use the track at the side – but don't pay, Ride Safe pay a peppercorn rent (approx £300 per quarter)
- The gym is a valuable resource in the area and we may need to consider if this can be used in a stand alone way – possibly this could be developed as a social enterprise
- There has been in the past approaches by other providers to use the TFD Centre – including a national charity called shared futures who run Alternative Education provisions
- The Positive Futures Project is contracted to deliver until March 2016 – This is funded by the Police and Crime Commissioner to tune of £60K and whilst this budget is currently fully committed and they do not pay for rent this may need to be looked at so their budget can be realigned and contribute towards costs for the space they use in the daytime.
- There could be a future in exploring a cooperative arrangement the side wing / activity centre could be used, the library could stay, an alternative education provider could use and this could mean it was more able to self sustain.
- There is some local interest from a local business entrepreneur who may be interested in enterprise skill training
- The Youth Service could reduce the space they use so they only use the café space
- The centre boasts a specialist music and sensory provision which has been incorporated into the fabric of the building through a short breaks capital investment to the tune of £50K – loss of this would have a significant and detrimental impact on disabled young people who use the provision – last year this was used by 5 special schools.
- It was generally felt that there were opportunities with the TFD Centre, but it would need a change of mindset. There is belief that it could generate income to offset costs and over a period of time it could stand on its own 2 feet.
- All agreed the area has high needs and they need to be accommodated within the estate. But the youth provision could manage with a smaller space within the centre.
- There may also be potential for other council services - Wardens, PCSO's etc to also relocate to better use space.

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people report that they feel safe at TFD centre. They felt the centre provided a space and opportunity to meet friends
- The building they consider to be well maintained and they report it is open at the right times to meet their needs.
- There is provision that is designed just for girls and this was important to the girls to have a girls only space.
- Most young people advised that they attended twice or more per week
- Young People would be willing to fundraise or share the building with other people from the community to generate funding to support the running costs of the building.
- Young people did not feel the building should be given away for others to run, but felt approaches should be made to the private sector and other local providers who should be negotiated with to increase services in centre.
- They wanted the centre to be kept as it is.
- Young people did have concerns that if it were to close they would have no where to go and may get bored / get into trouble in the community.
- They were equally concerned that if building goes they would lose the support of their local youth workers, and did not think they would access other provision.
- All the young people who responded stated they live only a short walk away from the centre, and are happy to walk in their local area. Generally they felt they would access provisions providing they could walk to get there as would not be prepared / could not afford to travel other than on foot to access services
- Currently young people report that they do not pay into provision

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- There is a heavy presence of charity sector work, mostly carried out by Christian organisations, though the work is rarely faith based, and there are no signs of this ceasing to be the case in the future.
- Youth work organisations that are already operating are involved with schools in the local area and work in partnership with them, this too looks to be growing in strength rather than declining.
- Organisations advise that they are looking at working more closely with the families of the young people to really try to make a positive impact on the young people's lives, reporting they were unaware of other organisations that are currently doing this as a standard practice but were hopeful this will change.
- The respondents felt there were opportunities for a partnership approach to increase the level of provision for young people, increase breadth of provision and offer a more varied programme. However, there is recognition this does also come with some 'threats'; such as, a potential lack of focus, different styles in approach to different sessions, differences in desired outcomes etc. Organisations reflected on what made a good partnership
- As a youth work provider that is not statutory funded, we will continue to grow and deliver youth work in Holmewood. It is our intention to meet the needs of as many young people on the estate as we can; whether in school, at clubs, on the streets or at home.

St Christopher's Youth Project has expressed interest in exploring the potential of Community Asset Transfers of premises in Holmewood.

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition survey undertaken in 2014 Backlog maintenance is £314,196 for windows, flooring, external work and boiler. Provision also accommodates Library facility and is part of a multi use complex. It has large sports hall facilities Ease of disposal indicator is Red (considered to present significant challenges)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 25,809
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 13,600
Running Costs - Library Services	£ 22,361 (£7,227 repairs, £4,463 utilities, £6,353 rates, £458 insurances, £3181 cleaning, £679 refuse collection)
Income Generation (2013-14)	£3,468.
Individual attendees	441
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	5
Other Centre users	Library provision James Positive Futures Ride Safe

Stakeholder responses:

- The Scholemoor Centre does offer wider community activities from the centre including older people's provision and cohesion work.
- Many felt the Scholemoor centre did not come across as a council building, but felt it looked like a Beacon building which the council uses to deliver its services.
- There is £100k capital money held in respect of Scholemoor which is earmarked for building work ** see note at bottom of page*
- Scholemoor is well placed and does serve local community needs.
- Provision in Great Horton is vital, this meets differing community needs. Young people from Great Horton area would not attend Scholemoor and vice versa.
- Hollingwood Lane needs more youth provision as it is felt these young people do not tend to travel to existing provisions.
- Young people from Beacon Road may go down to Buttershaw Youth Centre.
- Scholemoor/Beacon may be interested in CAT, they have a reputation for bringing money into the area and developing work.
- There is already some local business sponsorship by Provident who part fund a development worker for the Beacon.
- It is felt that schools are underused assets – Buttershaw, Grange and Kings Schools are all local and should be explored as potential venues
- Scholemoor is in an area that has Big local funding. This may be able to further support Scholemoor. The Board for this project has just been established and they will make the decisions about how the money is spent. There is £1m available over ten years.
- It is felt that Scholemoor would make a good building to be used as a PRU provision
- There is some insurance money, around £20K, held in the council finances – this is used to pay for cleaning costs. *** see note at bottom of page*
- There is a brand new football pitch with lighting at the back which is well used and popular with young people
- The Youth workers also undertake outreach work in the area as a way of contacting young people
- There are other premises in the area that could be used for youth provision – there is a village hall in Great Horton, but there is some concern that young people would not move to this. There is also a church hall linked to St Winifred's Church, it has not worked for youth work delivery previously, but may be worth trying again.
- The Beacon project are thought to have around £25K in their accounts which is earmarked to support the development of Scholemoor
- The building needs a strong management committee to develop it

****Re £100K balance of capital money***

In October 2007 money from the sale of the land (Capital Receipt) and the section 106 agreement for the new housing deposited £ 315,000 Since then the play area, Muga, lighting works and the construction of the new grass football pitch have taken place. These works have a total value of £ 307,491.42 leaving a grand total of £ 7,508.58 in the Capital Pot (106 money was used first as it was time dependant) It should be noted that the works included VAT payments as the land is not Council land.

Confirmed by Mick Priestley – Technical Manager sports and Leisure Services

***** Re £20K Money held in council***

Confirmation that £27K is held in reserve as a one off pot of money which is the balance on the insurance money payout following a fire. This has not been used in last 4 years or so. There is suggestion that this money could be used to support a voluntary organisation if they were to

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

take on the building via CAT. There is some concern that as this money has not been touched recently it needs to be drawn down fairly soon as it is vulnerable to be absorbed / considered as part of council corporate savings. Suggestion that this money was been used to pay for cleaning costs etc is not true as these costs have been able to be picked up by the main youth service budget. *Confirmed by Amarjit Gill – Finance Team*

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people felt the building was in a good condition
- The space they felt was small but is utilised well
- Most young people who responded advised that they attend provision twice per week, and they do not attend other youth clubs
- Young people had lots of ideas and a willingness to look at fundraising to help to keep the centre open – this included bag packs at supermarkets, sponsored bike rides and walks, sponsored silence and a 24 hour football tournament
- Young people do not currently pay to use the centre, but felt they could pay in
- Some young people think that Scholemoor Beacon are similar to the youth service in terms that both the workers at Scholemoor Beacon and the Youth Service workers deliver a lot of work in partnership.
- The Youth Service tends to run the youth sessions and the Beacon worker occasionally delivers sports sessions.
- Young people report that in school holidays they attend more sessions and activities that are done in partnership
- All you people felt that the centre provided them with a safe environment that they described as being a great place to meet friends and chill out.
- Some Young people have been attending sessions for many years and feel at times the youth centre is a second home to them
- Young people felt it was good to have somewhere they could go where they could get to speak to youth workers who gave them time and supported them through issues they have been through
- Young people reported that sessions are opened at good times and days for them and they felt the centre is accessible for all young people to use.
- When discussing the “what if scenarios”, when asked about the impact of any potential closure of the building some had reported that they felt it would be ok because the beacon provision would still be there. Others had stronger views about how they felt the government valued or cared for the younger generation, reporting that they felt some councillors/MPs do more bad things than good things. They felt it was unfair that things could be taken away from them that helped and supported them.
- Many young people reported that they would not travel to other areas, they lived in the estate and that the enjoyed attending Scholemoor. Some reported that whilst Clayton is nearest to them their experiences in going into that area had not been good and they have issues with local kids up there
- Most young people reported that they walked to the centre and whilst some did suggest they may walk to another centre others felt they should not have to travel too far and they liked having a centre that was on their doorstep. Some young people told us that parents would be concerned / not let them travel outside of their estate so they would be less likely to access provision.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- None received

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey has not been recently undertaken as this was listed with FM as a non operational premises. Backlog maintenance is considered to be minimal – arrangements for detailed survey are in the pipeline Ease of disposal indicator is Amber (considered to present some challenges) Adjacent land is already leased to Beacon
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 4,732
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 139 ***note does not include Utilities costs***
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0.
Individual attendees	248
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	2
Other Centre users	

After Meeting information from FM to be added into the figures:

Utility costs £3,374

Stakeholder responses:

- Buttershaw Youth Club is considered to be a community hub. It has other services for young people also operating from the building including James, Eden, Save The Children and the Princes Trust.
- Buttershaw School delivers services from their building.
- There is possible interest in setting up a community trust in the area, this trust may be interested in CAT.
- There are other community spaces in the area including Healthy Living Centre which belongs to Royds Community Centre, but we are not sure if they would be open to young people's provisions.
- Other council owned buildings in the area include the Horsfall Park playing fields and Bradford Park Avenue – these may be open to wider community work if they were approached
- The youth centre works really well for area – there were times when numbers were low, but these are starting to increase more recently
- It is considered that the centre offers a valuable community space for a wider offer to young people including the Princes Trust who use the centre 5 days per week working with 14 young people from different schools. The youth service support this project by providing a youth worker.
- James have small garage and go karting track which is popular with young people, but there are also those who complain about it - both when it is open or because it is not open.
- Other properties in the area include The Sandale Centre, currently the centre has a broken boiler. Not all young people will go to Sandale at the moment, and work would need to be done to support them to make transitions.
- If we keep the Buttershaw Youth Provision it would be in direct competition with the Sandale Centre – if the Youth Service delivery for Buttershaw could move to Sandale centre and this would reduce the costs of running the service.
- One of the things the Buttershaw youth centre does have that Sandale does not is a sports facility so if there were others interested in CAT this may mean that it could still be used on an occasional basis for sports activities for the young people in the area. If the building were sold this provision could be lost, and potential for further costs to be incurred in “hiring” other facilities in the area.
- There are not considered to be other appropriate provisions in the area – there was detailed the Eden project which is a church based provision – and is considered by many young people to be a faith based learning and not all young people feel comfortable with this.

Young People’s perspectives:

- It is very welcoming, safe and well maintained.
- The building has a good layout, but they felt it was run down and unwelcoming. Young people identified a number of things they felt needed fixing in the building including the roof because it leaked, painting and the music room they felt needed fixing.
- They would like a bigger sports hall.
- Young people reported that they use the building at least once per week, most used it twice – most reported walking to the provision.
- Young people accepted the costs of running the building needed to be met – they suggested that they could pay in but were concerned about those who may not be able to afford to do this and what would happen to them. They considered sharing the space with others but felt they may want different things from the building and they were not sure how this could work out. They did see mileage in hiring the space for local birthday parties etc to help with the running costs.

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

- Some concern that If the youth club closed and they had to go somewhere else they may not be able to go because of days and my parents don't like me going to new places they came to this youth club
- The sports hall allowed for activities they did not feel they could get elsewhere like freerunning.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Youth Provision in the area is considered by some to be best delivered through an asset transfer of existing premises to a community board which could be drawn from local community groups and for this to have some initial revenue support from the Council.
- There is potential and extremely good opportunities for partnership working, including building sharing.
- In the future we think the provision needs to be tied to a Bradford Youth Strategy, so we have a consistent offer across the district.
- We feel that innovative approaches to provision will be needed to maximise the youth provision budget; breaking down VCS/ council silos, and supporting provision where external resources cannot be found. For example this could be covering core costs, or open provision, as additional external funding can often be found to cover targeted programmes.
- The youth services review which is being undertaken by independent parties should be the basis for a youth strategy and our offer across the district.
- The unit price for youth provision should be considered, so should targeting areas of the greatest need, plus asset transfer of those resources which can be supported and delivered through VCS provision. Links to maximising other pooled budgets such as public health need to also support these.
- We think there is huge potential for partnership and collaboration in the provision of youth services. Many organisations already work together ranging from joint delivery to joint use of buildings and there are new structures such as the Young Lives Bradford Consortium.
- Any commissioning should support partnership and joint delivery where and when this is the most efficient and effective use of resources. Current partnership use of buildings offers young people a range of delivery styles, approaches and specialism's, supporting wider achievement of outcomes.
- We have been delivering youth services in the district for over 30 years, and supporting young people to overcome disadvantage is at the heart of our mission statement. Our vision is to be recognised as a valued provider of services for young people and families, across all communities of Bradford District, therefore we are constantly developing our offer and striving to improve the quality and breadth of our services. This includes sourcing additional external funding to deliver a range of targeted and some open services to young people. We support delivery on the ground in partnership with other statutory and VCS organisations and strategically to design and coordinate provision to maximise outcomes for young people in Bradford. We can support a youth offer in a whole range of ways, for example through; community asset transfer and delivery of local services.
- We have been in discussion with other providers in Buttershaw about best meeting the needs of local young people and we are interested in the possibility of asset transfer and working with other local groups and organisations to best support the delivery of youth provision.
- If we were able to secure this building for asset transfer we would be able to pursue external funding to support the development and investment in the building, where at the moment short term leases give us no capacity to build and invest in these services, which would be to the benefit of all.

There have been a couple of expressions of interest in considering CAT of this premises suggesting a partnership between Buttershaw Christian

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

Family Centre, EDEN Youth Project, BBEC High School, JAMES project and the Prince's Trust.

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey undertaken in 2013 Backlog maintenance is £257,965 (Floors, windows, rewiring and fencing work required) Building is considered to be in poor repair Ease of disposal indicator is Green (considered to be relatively straightforward to do)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 7,237
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 17,004
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0.
Individual attendees	49
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	3
Other Centre users	James Project Eden Project Save The Children The Princes Trust

Stakeholder responses:

- The Wibsey POD caters for young people in the Smith Avenue Estate,
- It is not considered to cater for young people in the Bankfoot area or St Matthews area.
- The Joshua Project does some work in the Wibsey area.
- It is considered to be cheap to run *(See additional notes in costs below)*
- There may be potential for new POD buildings to accommodate community activities, but may cater better for young people on Wyke side.
- Sandale Centre was recently refurbished and makes a good venue for youth in the community work.
- Other properties in the area are the BMDC Plant nursery in Wibsey Park or the park keepers house
- There is also an Incommunities property on the roundabout next to the park – not sure if this is suitable to meet needs of young people
- It is felt that schools must be explored further – they are a massive resource that is currently under used beyond the school day
- St Winifred's Hall is in good location, this may be worth exploring. Some youth provision used to run from the hall, but it was not well attended
- The pod is really only meeting the needs of the young people from the smith avenue area, but it does provide a base and space for young people to meet up with youth workers.
- Other premises in the area are rented, including the rugby group – this is larger for open access youth provision, but it does have bar so its not ideal.
- Suggestion of using the Cube (Church) and the Salvation Army premises has been previously tried with young people and this did not work out / young people did not like this.
- Sedgeberg club is not considered to be an option and the Bradford Bulls site is not an option – previous issues.
- Richard Dunns on a Friday night is a new provision – on this basis we could possibly lose the pod – but this may depend on swimming pool review and any new pool in the area as to whether this was a sustainable option
- It was considered that the pod would be worth keeping, but if it had to go it wouldn't be the end of the world.

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people report that the building is in a bad state of repair inside and out.
- It does not have a good layout, and the small size of the building limits activities.
- They feel it needs a make over
- Young people report that they attend the provision more than once per week, and also attend other provision in the area (Salvation Army, Buttershaw YC)
- Young people would help with fundraising and they see alternative use of the premises (possibly in the day time) as a way of covering running costs
- They do feel they have ownership of the building and it is open at the right times to meet their needs – they also feel it is accessible to all

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

young people.

- Young people report that If pod was to go they would be concerned they would have no where to go / they would lose the support of their youth worker and access to local facilities.
- Some Young people identified they may find another youth club to attend, but concerns were expressed by some who may be less confident than they were and they may not feel they could access other provisions.
- Young People state they are happy to walk to provision in their area, and should the provision close they would be prepared to walk less than one mile to access other provision
- YP do not currently pay into provision, but this could be explored

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- None received

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey has not been undertaken as building is a portacabin / container style Backlog maintenance is £0 Ease of disposal indicator is Red (considered to present significant challenges)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 577.00
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 0 Please Note: This does not include electricity bills as they have not been paid for the last 10 years – only recently this has come to light – meter reading taken 21.11.14 and we await the bill for this
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0
Individual attendees	105
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	2
Other Centre users	

Stakeholder responses:

- Parkwood Centre is identified by some respondents as been a key location / hub offering space for cross constituency working that it is well placed to meet local needs.
- Others felt this was not the case and whilst there was recognition that the building met the very local needs of the surrounding area they were less convinced it offered a constituency wide provision and that other areas were adequately serviced by the building.
- Some felt there was a need to explore a more central location for a hub building possibly in the town centre. References to Alice Street building located in the Town Centre which was a Youth Service owned premises and is now run by the voluntary sector that previously acted as a hub for the service.
- Suggestion that there should be a plan for responding to young people's needs and developing Town Centre based provision which could include local businesses.
- There is recognition that the space could be better used during the daytime by different age groups, some seeing this as a real developmental opportunity that should be explored. Some felt work needed to be done to expand the status of the centre to other community groups currently under using the facility from neighbouring areas.
- There was recognition of the potential for more partnership work (in communities etc) from the building and developing wider community groups
- Suggestion that mini-hubs could be created from Parkwood into other parts of the Constituency
- The offer to young people has significantly grown from the Centre and there has been over recent years investment from YOF Plus funding which has funded a new roof and windows.
- Running costs were offset by income generated from Prospects and YOT use of the rented Connexions Centre prior to the move into the town hall – this presents a significant gap in the budget for funding the continuation of Parkwood Centre
- Is located within a Big Local area and there could be potential for working with this to help in the future in sustaining youth work provision.
- There is recognition that youth work is needed in area, and that Parkwood offers a good base for this.
- If Parkwood were to close Hainsworth Community Centre is only a short distance away on foot and may be able to offer space for youth work provision.
- Young People should generate funding / contribute to costs.
- Schools could use Parkwood more, but recognise they are hard to engage with.
- Suggestion that schools could offer an alternative delivery site for youth work beyond the school day.
- The Leisure Centre in the Town Centre is also identified as a potential delivery site *(after meeting note - this is already used)*
- Local mill owner has previously expressed interest in supporting community based activities and it may be worthwhile to approach and see if they would be willing to support.
- Other local business were considered as been a potential source of support possibly for one off events but further discussion was needed with them
- Keen to keep youth workers rather than buildings if it has to be one or the other
- Some felt the building was not well used. Others felt the opposite and that the building was well used, with any potential relocation to a more central / town centre position possibly increasing reach / access.
- Some felt there would not be interest from other groups in a CAT of the premises; others felt this needed exploring as an option and this should not be closed off for consideration.
- Some felt running costs were high and the centre did not offer value for money.
- The building is on main bus route and was felt to offer a non territorial space.
- The layout of the building is good and this can accommodate different needs within one session meaning more individual needs can be met (reference to quiet space, IT space, group work space and chilling spaces) Concerns expressed about another buildings ability to accommodate these needs / some

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

not convinced there is suitable alternative premises in the area.

Young People’s perspectives:

- Young People report overall they felt it is a very good building with good facilities. They feel the building is accessible to all young people, and offers a neutral space.
- They identify the building is close to the train station, and they feel they can walk there from the town centre / train station and say on the whole they feel safe in doing so.
- Young People identified the building is well resourced and that it has a range of sensory equipment which is good for disabled young people
- Young people report using the provision at least once or twice per week.
- They would be happy to do fundraising and whilst they do pay subs now they felt they may be able to pay more subs to come into use the building. They also felt negotiation with other local providers to use the space could also help pay towards running costs when they were not in.
- Young People report they come from different areas of Keighley and they all get on there and feel safe.
- Some said this is the only place they attend and where they get support from. Others identified they do use other provisions in area (Wed Leisure, Highfield and D of E mentioned)
- All Young People asked said they lived less than 2 miles away from the centre and that they walk in small groups to attend. Some reported sometimes parents drop off / pick up.
- Most of the inclusion group felt they could use public transport / cycle, said they had particular concerns over travel to other centres, and reported travelling less than one mile was best for them
- YP reported concerns over gangs in the areas and if they had to go elsewhere, and concerns they had about others who were less confident than them if they had to go elsewhere to access a youth clubs.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Youth provision should have a Partnership approach – Youth service, schools and private sector all working together. There are lots of opportunities here.
- Schools, in particular, are an under-used resource and all schools should recognise that they are community facilities which can provide a focus for a wide range of activities for children and adults
- We are currently seeking a new venue for our holiday play schemes, which could provide rental income to help support youth work and we would be interested in using Youth Service premises (Parkwood would be ideal) for holiday play scheme provision.
- We would be unlikely to be able to raise funds to consider a CAT.

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey undertaken in 2013 Backlog maintenance is £31,506 for pointing, decoration and fencing Building is considered to be in good location / close to centre of Keighley Ease of disposal indicator is Green (considered relatively straightforward to do)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£13,843
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£22,756
Income Generation (2013-14)	£81
Individual attendees	501
Number of nights provision	6

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

run by Youth Service	
Other Centre users	Keighley District Scouts Dance United have previously run sessions Some daytime use by school groups Early Years Play Team run weekly session with attendance of approx 40 children This building also acts as a office space for youth work practitioners

Stakeholder responses:

- The Youth Centre is considered to be a hub for young people.
- Outreach work is undertaken from the youth centre is also undertaken and there is some use by local Police.
- The Parish Council contribute towards the running costs, and they also give the school £1,000 per year to support the MUGA for wider community use.
- The MUGA enhances the offer to young people from the site, and there is a children's centre attached which offers wider community access to the building. The MUGA is well used by local community; youth centre users and local primary schools.
- The MUGA and Youth Centres toilet facilities have been refurbished with lottery money acquired through Bradford Education.
- Lights for MUGA are housed within Youth Centre and this makes the MUGA usable on darker nights which offers additional activity for young people in the area.
- The Youth Centre is considered to be well used by youth service in the evening sessions running 2 nights provision per week, but there is potential for increased daytime use which needs to be explored as this could contribute towards running costs.
- Others felt the children's centre could make more use of the centre in the daytime for things like parenting classes
- The building is considered to be in right place to meet local needs and suggestion is that other buildings in the area are not well placed for young people.
- Some identified the local Town Hall as been a potential delivery site as this has recently been refurbished, and they felt this was currently underused so could be utilised, but there was also acceptance that this did not offer the same space and facilities as those currently offered within the existing youth centre premises.
- Respondents did not think other community groups had premises that could be shared, and they were not aware of groups who may be actively seeking a CAT, but did identify that there may be may be other groups in the area who may be prepared to share running costs / premises (for example the Choral group and children's centre)
- There was felt to be potential for further discussion with business's who may offer support, but this would need to have further discussion with local business's to explore this further.
- We need to be mindful of rural location of Silsden and that relocation out of the area could have significant impact as travel costs could be too high to enable young people to travel to access provision outside of the Silsden area
- Schools were not considered to offer a suitable alternative premises for Silsden young people as they are only primary schools in the area and the larger schools are all located outside of the area
- Other council premises in the area were not considered suitable for delivery of youth work.
- Parish Council had been interested in another building in the area (Wesley House) which is not available and it could be worth exploring with them if they may be interested in CAT of the Youth Centre, but this would need a discussion with them.
- The building has a children's centre attached to the youth centre and this would need to be considered as this is also under review

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

Young People’s perspectives:

- Young people felt the building offered a safe and welcoming environment. They report the building to be spacious with a good layout that means they can do lots of different activities and project work in the space they have.
- The majority of young people who responded reported that they attended the club both the nights the centre was open (2 nights per week).
- Young people were keen to identify opportunities that could help generate income to keep the provision open.
- A large number of those consulted suggested renting space in the building to other groups / schools/ businesses and doing fund raising to keep the building open and running.
- Young people would be happy if other people were to run the centre / like a community group who might be willing to take it over
- Young people said that having their own local young provision offered opportunities to meet friends and other people and that they were able to put youth friendly publicity/literature on the walls made them feel ownership in the building.
- They felt the centre was accessible to all young people in the area and because it was a youth centre it encouraged young people to go to the provision
- Young people liked the MUGA attachment and see this as their own outside safe play area.
- Young people were very strong on their opinions if the provision was to close of the impact this would have reporting they would have nowhere to go in the evenings, would be bored, hang around the local streets and end up getting in trouble with the authorities and become isolated from other young people.
- All young people said the live within walking distance from the club and reported Silsden is in a rural position and the nearest provision is some 5 miles away. Young people said they want to attend a provision which is in walking distance as they could not afford the cost of transport.
- Young people do pay to use the provision and felt that the income generated should be used to fund resources and education activities.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- None received

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey undertaken in 2013 Backlog maintenance is £54,364 Ease of disposal is Amber rated as there is potential claw back on the funding for the adjoining children’s centre which would potentially disallows the sale of the premises
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 3,148
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 3,247
Income Generation (2013-14)	£ 1,530
Individual attendees	200
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	2
Other Centre users	Early Years Play Team support Youth Service delivery on one session per week

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

	LEGO Majorettes
--	--------------------

Stakeholder responses:

- Some consulted felt that the youth centre provided a vital provision for young people living in this rural area.
- Others felt the centre is well used and that there is potential to increase usage by other groups which could generate income to offset running costs
- Addingham is felt to be in the right place to serve the needs of the local community as there is very little nearby for young people
- The only other community building in the area is possibly the scout building
- Do not think other groups would be interested in CAT of building
- Local business may help with one off support – but this needs further discussion with local business's
- Concern if no provision in Addingham, costs for travel would prohibit young peoples attendance at other centres
- Schools in the area do not offer an alternative option – only for younger age range in Addingham and bus journey to local secondary schools
- No other council premises in the area that could offer alternative delivery site
- Potential for this to be CAT and transferred to the Trustees, but would like to keep access to building for 2 nights per week.
- Building has good sports facilities.
- Trustees manage bookings at the Centre.
- Youth Service could rent other space in area – eg Memorial Hall, but facilities are not as good as those that are purpose built in the existing Youth Centre.

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people feel it is a good place to meet because of the facilities offered in terms of the Sports Hall and Kitchen area which is accessible.
- A number of young people come, particularly to partake in activities around sports and DofE.
- Young people have also made comments around the availability of the 'playing fields' outside and these are extensively used during the Spring and Autumn months.
- Young people have also said that they would like to be involved in making the space more 'young people' friendly as there is a feeling that a lot of the equipment and how it is laid out currently and recently meets the needs of the younger age range.
- Young people come to this space to engage with youth workers and to meet other young people in a safe and comfortable environment.
- The space is known to the majority of young people in Addingham because it is adjacent to the Primary School.
- Some young people also commented that it was a good space to do 'environmental/gardening projects'

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Building is leased for 80 years from 01.08.88 to the Addingham Youth Council Trust who act as Trustees for the premises
- Trustees have an agreement with Council that Youth Services would meet running costs of the premises.
- Trustees have invested in the premises replacing electrical heating system a couple of years ago.
- It is felt that the building is in ideal location to meet local needs

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

- There are not other community buildings in the area that could meet the needs of young people or offer the range of facilities they can currently offer from the Youth Centre.

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	<p>Condition Survey undertaken in 2013</p> <p>Backlog maintenance is £71,355 (windows and redecoration)</p> <p>Building is part of the school</p> <p>Ease of disposal indicator is Red (considered to not be straightforward to do)</p> <p>Building is currently leased to The Trustees on a full repairing lease until 31.07.2068. This is on a peppercorn rent that is currently not billed. Trustees are responsible for all outgoings.</p> <p>Youth Service have an Service Level Agreement with the Trustees to deliver Youth Services and have been paying some of the bills</p> <p>Income from Funky Monkeys and other centre users is paid to Trustees.</p>
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 1,909
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 10,814
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0.
Individual attendees	27 showing on IYSS – but advised by advanced practitioner that numbers have grown to 42 over recent weeks
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	2
Other Centre users	<p>AWARE (autism support group) use premises for one session per week and holiday schemes of up to 3 days per week. They have 150 families accessing their provisions.</p> <p>Fast Bats Table Tennis Coaching</p> <p>Badminton Club</p> <p>Football Coaching</p> <p>Funky Monkeys after school club Mon – Fri term time only</p> <p>Addingham sports academy use sports hall at weekends when weather disallows outdoor sessions</p>

Stakeholder responses:

- There is a good Management Committee in place and they have experience of fundraising
- The Management Committee run the project paying peppercorn rent to the Council
- They have invested in the building and have plans for developing sports provision linked to the Youth Centre
- It is linked to the Childrens Centre, which is currently run by Early Years and as these are also being reviewed there may be opportunity to see if there could be interest in a private nursery getting involved.
- There are a number of other community groups use the youth centre including a martial arts group
- There are no other community facilities in Ilkley
- It is considered to be in a good location to serve the local needs
- Some did not feel that there would be interest from business / private companies to support this work
- Many felt there was potential for others to come on board to deliver services or work with existing management committee to further develop provision / services and contribute towards running costs. Health may be interested in coming on board and paying to use space
- The building was considered to be in ok conditions and could generate additional income from charging / renting space and possibly even a small charge to young people
- The School in the area (Ilkley) is not considered to be suitable as an alternative venue – the Youth Service already deliver provision from the school in the school day and report space is limited
- Other council premises in the area include the Swimming pool and the Town Hall but these are not considered suitable space for youth provision
- It is reported that the Parish Council work closely with the Management Committee and they may be interested in working together to take on CAT of the building. Others felt whilst it did offer an opportunity to be CAT the Youth Service would need to have a supporting role in the development of the partnerships to generate the funding to help cover the costs.

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people report they really like the building and that they feel safe there.
- Young people do contribute towards the youth provision with money they generate currently been used to offset activity costs.
- They report they would be happy to contribute something towards running costs for the building and say they could be more active in raising funds.
- Most attendees report they are from local area and travel to the centre on foot.
- Young people feel they have ownership in the building and that it offers a space giving them positive things to do that stops them getting into trouble in the area

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- No responses received from local voluntary sector / community groups

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	<p>Condition Survey undertaken in 2014 Backlog Maintenance is £63,937 (Windows, decoration and plumbing) Property is also used as community hall and this may need re-provision. Ease of disposal is Amber rated as there is potential claw back on the funding for the adjoining children's centre which would potentially disallows the sale of the premises Youth Centre Building is currently on 20 year lease to the Youth and Community Association who act as the Management Committee for the building.</p>
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£2,071
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£10,057
Income Generation (2013-14)	£100.
Individual attendees	227
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	3
Other Centre users	<p>Martial Arts group use the centre each week (private business) Childrens Centre Health group use the centre for parent classes</p>

Stakeholder responses:

- Not all stakeholders are clear of who owns the premises as the building is run by a voluntary management group.
- The building is considered to be a hub, but one floor is out of action and not able to be used.
- It is expensive to the Youth Service when it is only open 2 nights per week.
- The building is well located and is felt to serve local needs well and to be in the right place to serve the local community needs.
- Its more than a youth centre as it is also well used by other groups and boasts a bar / function space, but we need to find out why the income is not going to the Youth Service to help offset the high running costs.
- Other premises are on outskirts / some distance away and are not well placed to meet needs. Concerns that young people could be isolated if provision is lost from the immediate area.
- Other groups using the premises do pay for their use – directly to the management committee – not known how much this generates – this could potentially pick up some of the costs for the running of the premises.
- Whilst some considered schools in area could offer alternative delivery space others felt these were not considered to be fit for purpose as these are primary schools and secondary schools were not within walking distance.
- There are no other council premises in area that would be suitable or that could be utilised for youth work delivery.
- Some felt it would be worth talking to the Management Committee to see if they would be interested in CAT of premises, but recognised that it would need a real commitment if it were to work and the building itself would be a challenge due to its poor state.
- Local business's may offer one off support – this needs further discussion with local business's
- Concern as young people live in a rural area if building were to close young people would not have transport costs to access other provisions
- Concerned about sustained under spending on the premises over many years and the building now appears run down.
- It has own parking facility and it is used as a storage space for community groups including the 1940's festival and the scouts.
- The Youth Club is valuable provision and we know this reduces ASB in the area we are keen to ensure provision is not lost from the area.
- Previously the area has had money identified for undertaking development work, but this has never materialised in a new building – this included a feasibility study undertaken by the Airedale partnership which recommended disposal of the premises and the caretakers cottage and then rebuilding a new community centre building on the same site, with plans for this to be linked to development of a children's centre. But this never came to fruition as the timeline for children's centre could not be met and they had to withdraw the funding from the planned development so they could establish provision at Treetops within their required timelines.
- The Council has funded flooring work in the premises.
- There is other premises in the area that could be soon available (Fire Station) and this could be worth exploring. It would need additional work doing if it were to meet the needs of those using the existing Community Centre, but it would be worth looking into this further. If this could be developed there could be opportunity for the existing users to transfer to that provision, but we would also need to be mindful that we maintained some space whilst an alternative site was explored and developed.

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

Young People’s perspectives:

- Young people feel the centre is welcoming, spacious and they report feeling that this is a safe space
- It is in need of repair or a big make over.
- Young people like the location and say they don’t feel confident about walking to other locations (outside of Haworth)
- Young people want to keep something in Haworth area reporting that they would be prepared to travel up to 1 mile to access provision.
- Young people, whilst they know others do use the existing provision when they are not using it are keen to ensure they had space that was for their age group and where they felt safe.
- Young People would like to share their building with others, including schools and have everyone contributing towards the running costs so they could keep the provision in their area.
- Whilst some young people reported concerns that if the building were to close they would lose contact with youth workers, others felt the impact would be minimal
- Young people reported they do not pay to use provision

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Management Committee responses Included in Stakeholders responses section

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey undertaken in 2013 Backlog maintenance is £509,118 for windows, boiler, plumbing and wiring Building is considered to be in poor state and beyond reasonable repair – first floor of property is unsafe / unusable Ease of disposal indicator is Amber
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 2,369
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£16.979 (this includes underpayment in previous financial year for electricity – awaiting confirmation of exact amount – but is estimated to be around £1,268)
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0.
Individual attendees	57 showing on IYSS – but advised by advanced practitioner that numbers have grown to 65 over recent weeks
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	2
Other Centre users	Scouts use premises for 2 nights per week There are a number of other centre users (mums and tots etc) that would need to be considered in any closure / relocation plans

Stakeholder responses:

- Laisterdyke should be retained, it is a valuable provision that is well located in the area to meet local needs
- Bradford Moor has the highest number of young people who are unemployed, and it's a growing youth population –
- Young people need a safe space and education and the centre is considered to provide both and particularly towards those who are hardest to reach.
- Recognise that the building could have a wider community use, particularly in the daytime
- It would make a CAT, but this needs to be properly explored to ensure the local needs are not lost in the process and it needs to engage different organisations
- It is felt that the building is in good condition and is located in the right place
- There are other community settings in the area and small voluntary organisations but their premises are too small compared to Laisterdyke centre
- There could be potential for sharing premises and match funding if the space can become more accessible to other groups
- We would prefer the council to keep the property, but we recognise the need to support and bring the different parts of the community together.
- There are big organisations in the area – but they have their own focus and goals and we need to be sure smaller and very effective local groups do not miss out
- There are lots of small businesses in the area, but they would not have premises that could be used for youth provision – they don't have the space
- The Library facility at the centre is good – but it needs to pay its fair share of the running costs – not sure this currently happens or if the YS picks up all the costs
- It would be good if schools in the area would pick up more – they are under utilised resources and whilst we recognise they have to focus on education of young people, it would be good if they could provide space to provide more things for young people to do – to keep them off the streets
- The only other council owned premises in the area is Mortimer House, but this is not considered to be a viable alternative
- Early Years are interested in developing provision in the centre as part of the 2 year old offer as they have a need to increase spaces in the area
- Laisterdyke has lots more community buildings within a short distance around it (Thornton Community Centre, D of E centre, Karmand centre) this means we could possibly lose this building and use another organisations building in the area if needed

Young People's perspectives:

- Young People report they feel safe in the provision
- They feel it is run down and suggest it could do with a makeover / financial investment to make it look more youth friendly and as it looks dull.
- They report kitchen facilities that are not working and they felt sure there were mice in the building.

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

- They like the layout and feel this offers opportunities for a wide range of activities.
- Young people feel the building is accessible to all young people in the area
- Half those asked reported that they use the provision at least once, sometimes twice per week, and that they generally do not attend other provisions in the area
- They consider fundraising as an option to offset running costs or they could increase subs / paying in
- Young people would be happy to share the building with others, but had concerns about others might not looking after the centre.
- They felt a CAT was a consideration, as was support from other voluntary groups or local business's providing there was still space for young people.
- Some of the young people expressed concerns that if the building were to go then this would mean they had no where to go, and whilst they recognised the library was an option they felt it did not meet their needs in terms of being able to the same wide range of activities.
- Most Young People attending report they walk to the provision and live less than a mile away. They did not feel they could travel elsewhere as they would not feel safe and some reported that parents would not let them travel outside of the local area (Girls group). There were also concerns over cost of travel, and about those who were not confident to go to other locations.
- Young People report they have just started to pay to use provision and the money generated would be used to pay for resources and trips.
- They saw benefits of using the centre as this space allowed them to meet other young people who were from different communities and they felt this reduced conflict in the community as they knew each other.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Responders to the consultation felt that youth provision should be provided through a range of options including partnership working with locally trusted organisations, schools and colleges and with active involvement of local communities through volunteering.
- There was an identified need to share and pool resources especially financial resources, knowledge and networks
- There was felt to be opportunities in Inward investment/ grants/ commissions/ corporate sponsorships and by involving the private sector in the funding of youth provisions
- They would like to see organisations working to district wide targets together but delivering at a local level
- Some responders felt there were real strengths in the voluntary sector and there were opportunities for organisations to work together to deliver youth service / shared targets from a number of different buildings including those in the Laisterdyke area, the e:merge centre, Sutton community centre, the Vine Church building
- There are opportunities for the voluntary sector to pick up commissioned pieces of youth work and potentially work in partnership with council youth workers

Inspired Neighbourhoods CIC has already submitted interest and business case under Right to manage community assets. INCIC will agree to maintain a level of youth work in the area. And to support the continued delivery of youth work by working in partnership, engaging private sector and bring in further funding.

Karmand Centre have expressed interested in CAT

Attock Park group are interested in delivering more activities for the community from Laisterdyke Centre including elderly daytime provision,

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

homework club and crèche facilities

E:merge have expressed interest in possible CAT of Youth Service buildings and for use of buildings for delivery of provision.

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey undertaken in 2014 Backlog maintenance is £157,483 (Floors, windows, mechanical and electrical works) Building also has library on site Ease of disposal indicator is Amber (considered to present some challenges)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£19,935
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£19,062
Running Costs Library Service	£2,371 (£2,200 of this is for cleaning the library, £81 for window cleaning and £91 for fire insurances)
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0.
Individual attendees	432
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	3
Other Centre users	Library services share the site

Stakeholder responses:

- Currently it is felt that the centre is not acting as a 'hub' for the local community, but is for young people.
- It is felt to be currently under used and that it could become a community hub if more community members/groups could access it.
- The building is considered to be vital to the area and to close it would have an impact and result in a further increase in antisocial behaviour, drug misuse, Child exploitation, increase in crime etc.
- It is the only provision where young people go or where they want to go; most young people from this area would not travel to other areas.
- The centre is well used by Youth Service and partners 1 in a Million (partners). Early Year, In communities, Trident, Café (private concern).
- Some partners have said they would be interested in partnership work and possibly have funds that could be available.
- The centre is considered to be in the right position to attract potential partners etc.
- 1 in Million maybe interested in a possible CAT (but further discussion would be needed).
- It is considered that the opportunity to generate funds is endless; but feelings were that it needs a focused worker to attract opportunities
- Funding for partnership working with Early Years is in its early stages and needs to be revisited.
- Also Section 106 funds have been made available in the area and further clarification of these funds needs to be identified to see if these can help.
- Canterbury is an area of really high needs and this must be considered as part of the review – there are not other buildings in the area that could be used – there have been intermittent plans for developing the area, but these have not been joined up or sustained to make real improvements in the area.
- There is a children's Centre on the other side of the estate – but this is not considered appropriate for youth work delivery
- Joseph Nutter House used to be owned and run by the college – this could have been an option previously, but it is now privately owned
- Recognise the building is not in good shape, but it is well used by the wider community for one off events and it does act as a focal point for the community as there are no other community facilities within the estate.
- The local primary school has had an extension recently – but this would not be ideal for youth provision either really as it is still very much a school site for younger children
- There is no community association within the estate that is there and ready to work with us in developing the centre, but there is will from the community – they would need a lot of support to get off the ground and become an effective and functioning group. They really need a full time community development worker – they have not had long term sustained staffing into the centre as other parts of the constituency have
- 1 in a million run a PRU from the centre and they run an after school provision 3 x per week – currently they do not pay for this.
- No suitable provision in Canterbury that could accommodate young people apart from the youth centre building
- Canterbury carnival wanted to use the building to create things for the carnival but have struggled to get into building as wanted the same nights as other things were already taking place so were not able to be accommodated
- Little Horton had a masterplan some time ago – this could do with relooking at for the area - this was looking to free up land to enable development of a new community centre, landscaping the area differently etc. In this the arc was considered to be high value for housing purposes.
- Canterbury is a high need area and has real poverty and this should be considered as being a building to keep as the need is greater in this area than in some of the other areas – it does not have the benefits of the new housing for example that Ravenscliffe has which has changed

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

- the community make up and has brought private owned/ rented housing into the estate.
- If Canterbury youth centre goes there is nothing else in the area that the community could use.
- People do come to the centre – they get good attendance at community type events – but the area really needs a proper community centre

Young People’s perspectives:

- Young people report that the building offered a safe and welcoming environment for them
- They report it is spacious and offers a wide range of opportunities to deliver activities/project work it also has a MUGA.
- Young people say it feels a bit run down and could do with redecorating, and the layout is not good
- Most of the young people said that they usually attend the club 2 nights per week. Some young people also report that they also attend the Mayfield Centre.
- Young people were keen to identify opportunities that could help generate income to keep the provision open.
- The group suggested renting space in the building to other groups or identify a community group willing to take it over via a CAT(1 in a Million was suggested).
- Young people said having their own local young provision offered opportunities to meet friends and other people. The whole group who were consulted felt this was really important.
- Young people were very strong on their opinions of what would happen if the provision was to close, they felt they would have nowhere to go in the evenings; they would be bored, hang around the local streets and end up getting in trouble with the authorities.
- The majority of the users reported that they live less than a mile from the club, and that they were only willing to travel less than a mile to a local youth provision.
- Young people expressed concerns about losing the building and not having anywhere local to go saying they would not feel safe attending provision outside of the Ward, due to other areas being territorial, being too far from home and the cost of getting to the alternative venue would mean they could not attend.
- Young people do pay in (30p) but they felt this has stopped some young people going.
- The overwhelming statement from young people was “Please don’t close our club”

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- None received specifically related to this premises but users of this premises have responded in relation to District wide YS premises

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey undertaken in 2013 Building is in poor state with significant backlog maintenance Backlog maintenance is £308,176 Ease of disposal indicator is Green (considered to be relatively straightforward to do)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£ 8,590
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£ 13.446
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0.
Individual attendees	40
Number of nights provision	2

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

run by Youth Service	
Other Centre users	JAMES project , One in a Million

Stakeholder responses:

- The building is considered to be a hub in terms of youth work and it works as a satellite to other areas including schools work.
- Membership is considered to be good
- It is considered to be well used provision by other community groups – but this could be explored further for bringing in additional resources, for example the residents group may be interested in using the building.
- The Ravenscliffe Centre is considered to be central to the area, with other buildings in the area been too small / not big enough to meet the needs.
- There is a local sports facility in the area, but this is a members only arrangement and therefore it excludes young people.
- Some responders were unsure if other groups in the area would have capacity to consider CAT, but felt there would be benefit in exploring local business / local supermarket to see if they could meet shortfall in the budget for running expenses
- Young people do pay in but this is used to contribute towards activities.
- On the whole young people tend to not travel outside of the estate to access provision – they are quite territorial and it is considered that they would not travel to Laisterdyke.
- There is no school in the immediate area, most use the bus to travel in the daytime, but unsure they could afford to do this on an evening.
- It would be worth exploring if costs could be reduced if parks / sports etc were to contribute to costs.
- It would be worth seeing if Newlands would be interested in CAT
- Other buildings in the area include the Gateway Centre – they have a centre manager (Maureen Holmes) – she is doing a good job in the area having been in post around 1 year. Gateway Centre has a management committee (chair is Anne Henderson). Not sure what capacity the board would have to take on another building. They are trying to get new people to join the board to build this up.
- The Gateway centre would not lend itself to youth provision – its run in 2 parts – there is a children’s centre part run by the children’s society and its a lot smaller on the inside that it appears to be from the outside, and its layout is an odd shape – not at all compatible to the Ravenscliffe Youth Centre, which was purpose built for young people
- There are new business units in the area linked to Newlands, but they would not be ideal either
- The Council owns the Victoria Rangers Social Club – but this is inappropriate for youth provision in the area
- The Inspired business park at edge of Ravenscliffe is open to wider community use, and could be an option to explore, but they would probably charge for use and it is within the business park so may not be ideal

Young People’s perspectives:

- Young people report that they feel safe and welcome at the centre. They like the different parts and layout of the building (like the football room) as this allows for a wide range of activities to be offered.
- They feel the building is mainly in a good condition, but a makeover and financial investment would make it better
- The young people thought they could fundraise to offset the running costs and had ideas of things they could do.
- They also felt they could share the building with other groups and this could generate income
- YP would like a gym in the centre and felt this could generate money.

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

- Young people feel building is accessible and really would like it open more. They feel the building is accessible to all and that they have ownership of the building.
- They report that they recognise and value the facility being in their area and have fear / concern over going somewhere else outside of the area and how they would struggle / could not afford bus fares. They also reported concerns of feeling unsafe when using public transport especially at night
- Young People pay into the club with the money generated being used to purchase resources and offset activity / trip costs
- When discussing the area young people said this is a big housing area and even more houses are being built, we need more provision not less.
- Most of the young people report that they attend the provision twice or more times each week
- Young People raised real concerns over the impact closing the building would have. They suggest young people would become bored and that the loss of local facilities would impact on behaviour in the area, and increased trouble with the police. (fighting and rioting were mentioned).
- There was some concern over increased isolation for some young people as not all would be comfortable in travelling to other areas.
- All the young people using the provision say they live less than one mile away from the provision.
- Some Young People reported they would be prepared to use other provision, providing it was in a reasonable place and less than 10 minutes walk away, others said they would not go to another club as they had previously visited other clubs and had not liked them.
- Almost half of the YP consulted stated they would not be prepared to travel, but were happy to walk in their own area.

5 individual letters of support have been received from young people highlighting the benefits they each have had from attending youth provision at the centre, they outline their concerns and the impact they think there would be on the community if the centre were to close. They ask the council to think about what it is doing.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Youth Provision is best delivered from existing community Centres in the area. Partnership working and sharing of premises offers potentially a good way forward. We can support the delivery of youth work through partnership working.
- We need to be working together with a range of partners, ensuring effective communication and dialogue is managed.
- We need to map provision and share data and work together to ensure children are catered for within the transition period from primary – secondary
- There are many positive examples of partnership approach in our area, and across the District. It is not always about one specific building or service it is more about catering for needs. The needs can be catered for out in the community utilising a local community hub to best benefit.
- There is a concern that 12/13 year olds will not be picked up by any service and arguably it is important that they are supported.
- We would need the support of qualified Youth Workers to help with this as many of the needs of young people in our area are beyond our expertise to work with, but we would be willing to share resources to enable this to materialise.

There have been expressions of interest in exploring CAT and discussing this further from 2 organisations Ravenscliffe Community Association and Eccleshill Adventure Playground

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

2 Letters of support have been received from HOTS team (Health on the Streets) highlighting the value of youth work and the work they undertake on the health agenda and how this contributes to the wellbeing of young people in the area

A letter of support has been received from Immanuel School highlighting the value they place on the youth worker linking with the school and continuing to work with young people beyond the school day and in targeted provisions

A letter of support has been received from Ravenscliffe Community Association highlighting the value of the youth centre and negative impact ceasing this work would have on families living in the area

A Petition has been received with 202 names requesting the Youth Centre building remains and is continued to be funded by the council. (Petition received from Nicki Lannen – youth worker who has forwarded this from young people and community members who the young people have spoken to in the area)

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey undertaken in 2014 Backlog maintenance is £121,417 Centre does require some improvements Ease of disposal indicator is Green (relatively straightforward to do)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£11,392
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£17,154
Income Generation (2013-14)	£ 2,422 To date in 14-15 this is £838.
Individual attendees	287
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	3 plus 1 afternoon session and occasional weekend use and 4 days per week holiday provisions
Other Centre users	Older People's Group Come Alive Church Group Barnardos work with YP at risk of CSE Use of sports hall by local football teams Councillors surgeries Election polling station Partner meetings – ie ASB One off events – ie jobs fair Community bookings – parties etc

Stakeholder responses:

- The spread of centres for the Constituency is just about right and covers most of the communities, although there is a gap in Thackley area since the YMCA building was knocked down.
- Greenwood centre for example also provides provision for young people from the neighbouring ward
- The Eco pod is needed in the area, but the provision needs developing there
- Some young people do attend provision at the church, but its size restricts numbers to 20 or so and the rest hang around outside, which does cause problems in the area when they are fighting each other and messing about. The Eco pod is also limited to smaller numbers due to its size.
- There are plans for more houses to be built in the area and this will bring in more families and young people which will need to be considered for provision of services.
- The BD10 Partnership that used to run in the area was a valuable joining up of resources, this has not operated most recently, but plans are in place to try to bring this back. This would be a partnership for those providing services in BD10 and BD2 areas to explore how together we can best provide. There is a real will to develop provision from others and this has potential to stand alone as an organisation rather than be council led.
- There are local businesses that could be supportive and would be worth exploring.
- The Schools in the area are difficult to engage with. The Youth Service could explore use of the Ellar Carr PRU premises as this is considered to be a better option in the area and has a gym / toilets etc
- Springfield Centre is a busy centre for young people and works with disabled young people in the daytime, but needs to be more attractive to young people from the Thackley area - this needs leadership to make this happen.
- The needs in Ravenscliffe are high and this needs to be considered
- There is a lot of potential to develop work in the Idle and Thackley areas, a soon to be redundant library would make a really good youth café / drop in space and could meet the needs of the young people who hang around in the village. There is also a willingness from local business's to take in young people for work experiences and this could be linked to entrepreneurial activities from a shop front in the village.
- The Council owns Buck Mill Cottage and this would be an ideal base for a forest school type programmes – Inspired Neighbourhoods have put in bid to develop this linked to Shipley College and woodland management this could be a real opportunity for young people to get involved
- There are also plans in the area for developing an indoor court with Thackley Football Club and there is potential there for additional provision for young people.

Young People's perspectives:

- Building is not currently used for delivery of youth work provision – but stores items used for delivery of the forest schools programme

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

- None received

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey has not been undertaken as building is a portacabin / container style Backlog maintenance is £0 Building is part sited within the school grounds Ease of disposal indicator is Red (considered to not be straightforward to do)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£466.
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£0
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0.
Individual attendees	0
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	0
Other Centre users	none

Stakeholder responses:

- The premises and facilities are seen as a fantastic and very important /valuable resource to the area
- The building is felt to be well located to meet local needs, with nothing else suitable nearby – whilst some outlined they did not feel there were other community buildings that could be utilised, others felt there were buildings but they would not be as good in meeting the local needs
- Suggestion by some that if building were to close young people may use Karmand Centre
- The building hosts the D of E store of outdoor equipment for the youth service and wider D of E use, and is the only D of E centre in the District, and whilst some felt this meant the building was a key building, others felt this could be relocated to the Baildon Recreation Centre where the Council Adventure Development Team store their outdoor equipment.
- There was felt to be opportunity to increase and extend the use of the building to include other groups and ages ranges.
- There was felt to be potential to hire out for meetings and generation of income.
- Locally it was considered that the building was in the right place to serve local needs and that it is well used.
- Other community groups could be interested in using / CAT building (Beech Grove Residents Association for example) are a local group that are looking for a premises / base nearby and they may be able to make good use of the premises.
- There are not local businesses that are nearby who may be able to support

Young People's perspectives:

- Young people report they feel safe and welcome in the building
- They like the layout and feel the spaces allow them to do different activities. They like the outdoor space which is small but does allow them to practice putting up tents and using stoves. They would like more outdoor space as the space at the front is on a hill and less useful to them for outdoor activities
- Most of the young people consulted reported that they use the provision twice per week and do also attend other provisions (Joshua project, Toller Youth Café and Emerge listed)
- Young people felt they could help with the running costs by undertaking fundraising activities.
- Young people say they feel they have ownership of the building and they consider it to be an accessible provision
- They report concerns and worry about having to travel to other areas to use youth provision as most report they walk to provision now. They feel safe getting her and could not afford travel costs to access provision that was out of the area,
- Young people do pay in to provision with the money generated helping to offset costs for activities and trips. They had ideas of how they could run one off events (Mendhi, dance events, fitness classes etc).
- Young people say they would be happy to share the building with other groups and they felt that there should be negotiations with other providers to increase the use of the building in the daytime as not all the space is used all the time.
- The majority of responders said they travel less than one mile to attend the club the reminder travelled between 1-2 miles
- All reported they felt happy to walk in their local area, with only a very small number considering use of the bus / cycling as an option
- When asked about travelling to other centres young people expressed concerns that they may become isolated and were concerned about others who were less confident than they were to travel to other buildings.
- YP do pay into provision with the money generated being used to offset resources for the centre and to contribute towards trips. 8 felt the

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

money generated is used towards building maintenance (recently YP painted an area in the centre)

Young people supplied a long list of the benefits of attending the provision at the centre the majority of which were about their experiences and benefits of the youth work experience rather than about the building.

A small group had written a poem / rap about the provision and about the positive impact youth work has on their lives, during which they raise the point that they like the provision because “it is outside of school”

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Some responders felt youth provision can best be delivered if it is run jointly with a steering group chaired by independent person, serviced by the local authority and that included multiple agencies.
- Others felt provisions should be provided in local community centres rented at a reasonable costs, and that this could be an effective substitute for sustaining youth provisions in community settings
- There are opportunities for partnership approaches – for example MAPA provision could be included in the Little Horton ward provision, but they have failed to consult and it feels like they have just gone ahead on their own without including others.
- In the future our organisation could support the delivery of youth work by entering a proper partnership (equal partners and shared resources)
- It was felt to not be a difficult task to form a youth consortia in the area to continue the partnership working – there is a commitment to continue to support youth activities in the area for young women (girls and young women’s group)
- We (BYDP) are interested in exploring CAT of premises – We feel this is a win-win situation. We would be interested in running (and paying for the running costs) of the DofE centre, whilst continuing existing provision and creating more youth provision and include NEET in the provision.
- We have also had interest in exploring CAT of premises from a provision who provides services to girls and young women (Womenzone)

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey undertaken in 2009 Building is considered to be in reasonable condition Backlog maintenance is £33,101 (windows, flooring and redecoration) Building is sited between 2 sites of Carlton Bolling School Ease of disposal indicator is Green (considered to be relatively straightforward to do)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£6,897
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£14,200
Income Generation (2013-14)	£0.
Individual attendees	74 (DofE) + 250 (Greenway)
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	3 + Twilight session
Other Centre users	Premises are shared use for district wide Duke of Edinburgh’s Award managed by Bradford South and the locality based provision provided by Bradford East

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

	The building also acts as a central equipment store which provides support district wide to units who operate the award in schools and community settings
--	---

Stakeholder responses:

- Toller is in a good location it is in the heart of the community and central to the delivery of youth work in the Toller area. It offers a local hub for the community. The Youth Work Team are based there and the centre is used to store the District wide resources (minibuses).
- There could have some space for wider community use – possibly in the daytime
- The building is considered to be in a good condition and seems to be popular with young people
- They youth service remodelling may have impacted on attendance, but young people seem to like the provision offered.
- There was recognition that there are other buildings in the area (Girlington CC, Haworth Rd and Farcliffe CC) but these are not considered to be as well located as Toller is for the delivery of youth work also need to be mindful of territorial issues for young people
- Not aware of groups in Toller area who may be interested in CAT
- Toller does offer potential for others to use the building and contribute towards running costs
- The question of schools is worthy of consideration but it is questionable if Young people would wish to return to school for youth activities beyond the school day – we are not against use of schools per say for youth work delivery, but wary about this as not convinced these offer best location for youth work delivery
- Some young people from Toller Ward do travel to other provisions (Heaton), but most young people are not willing to travel.
- The building is not big enough to accommodate a wide range of activities / some rooms are quite small.
- Reach is considered to be an issue, it does not extend out to young people living in other parts of the ward.
- Community members do not really know what is going on (residents young and old).
- Other groups may be interested in using the building (for example elderly groups in the daytime)
- There may be groups in the area who could work together to generate income to support running costs of the building.
- Schools in the area are generally primary schools and would not be suitable for the delivery of youth work.
- Other council premises in the area – Farcliffe Childrens Centre could be used as a last option.
- Toller Youth Cafe does have a fledgling management committee that has £27K for delivery of some specific pieces of work across the Constituency, where the Café is used for delivery some costs could be recharged to this money once they are up and running.
- There is some income generated but this has previously been used to offset activity costs for young people across the Constituency
- The Youth Café / Youth Service in the area does have a little business support, but this tends to be towards activities or pieces of work rather than towards building running costs.

Young People's perspectives:

- YP feel building could have a better layout, and its size limits activities – they say they are unable to do sports there, but they feel the outside area could be made into sports area. They would like to see the building facilities improved (computers)
- YP report attending the centre twice or more times per week. They also attend other provisions in the area (Brathay Trust)
- YP identify fundraising, sharing with other groups and negotiating for others to use the café as ways to increase the funding to support the building. They suggest renting out the space for small parties / meetings and information days suggested.
- YP felt unsure if something like a building improvement challenge project using local business etc would generate income / improve facilities.

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

- YP feel the café is accessible to all young people, they feel they have ownership and it provides them with a safe space.
- YP consider the café to be a central point for them - where they can meet their friends and where they can do volunteering
- YP report they all live within walking distance to the provision, and whilst they do use the bus, but would have concerns about using this in winter months or on darker nights. YP have some concerns about their safety if they were required to walk to other centres.
- YP do not pay in to the provision, but say they could pay in the future.

Partners / voluntary sector responses:

- Youth Provision would be best delivered in the area together - a presence in the area will help publicise what youth activities are available both from any remaining LA youth work and the voluntary sector
- We are tied into our existing premises for the next 15 years so we could not take on a CAT, but there is scope for more working together and for more activities to be run by others in our premises
- We are very happy to work with youth service but recognise that even communications to do this costs time and money or reduces the time staff have to work with our members.
- In our opinion, Bradford Youth services should be continuing to be working with the voluntary sector. I feel that all involved, should be working together and in partnership to work with these young people by an ongoing process of local stakeholders, self and community (local residents) referral. With their local knowledge of young people and their families, the principal community workers / youth workers in the area are in an ideal position to deliver outreach (if required) and will use their links with existing provision including schools, and their current involvement in youth activity provision to develop more pro-actively these 'contacts'.
- By increasing the provision and the availability of alternative and positive activities, the workers and the voluntary sector will be able offer more youth opportunities. This will be communicated to the young people through the workers contact with them, and also through the local stakeholders and other service providers 'networks' in the area. Examples of these other service providers will include the Youth Offending Teams, Youth clubs, BLAGY, MASTS (supported tenancies for 16 – 25 year olds), Social Services, NEET (Not in Employment, Education or Training) teams, LAC (Looked after children (local residential unit s) and local health providers (Teenage Health Drop- in etc).
- In addition, centre hubs and community centres will have a direct involvement in either the management of the project, or participant in activities organised such as training, activities , trips, residentials, workshops and community provision \ events. These experiences will also provide them opportunities for the youths to engage with others, learn new skills including independent living, self-reliance, group living, and respect for others. These experiences may otherwise never be had, and will provide the youths with alternatives to the 'attraction' of such as car crime, drugs and anti-social behaviour.
- The young people believe that a high level of commitment can be generated, maintained and respected if they are a part of the deciding what they get on their estates - they want their voice's to be heard, they want control of their services, resources and activities, and they want to shape what these are to suit their needs and aspirations.
- Bradford Youth service and voluntary organisations in the district should have a good working approach \ Partnership to working with the young people in areas across the district. The approach should be giving young people a choice, fresh perspectives to experiences, equality trust and providing added value. Also, networking extensively should be a priority through partnerships with other agencies \ organisations to meet local needs and put them in to action.
- The underlying ethos of an holistic approach should enable us to continue using personal development, self-esteem, capacity building, body

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents

image, empowerment, health issues and relationships. The emphasis of current work is to develop further around targeted, excluded young people, and will be predominantly issue-based. To effectively undertake this work it is important that we develop our existing partnerships with other agencies and organisations such as, YMCA, Café, and other youth cafés.

- We are in an ideal situation to offer dedicated resources and opportunities that are local and will benefit the immediate communities.
- We are happy to work together with the Youth Service to gain funding and provision of safe, welcoming environment for sessions to be delivered.

Finances and Stats

Condition Survey outcomes	Condition Survey last undertaken in 2012 Backlog Maintenance is £26,215 for floors, gutters and railings The premises are considered to be in reasonable repair They are well located and in a prominent position with a small car parking area to the rear. The premises have recent had investment and upgrade of kitchen area Ease of disposal is identified as Green (would not be expected to be difficult to dispose of)
Running Cost YS (2013-14)	£8,156
Running Cost FM (2013-14)	£13,328 – without cleaning costs
Income Generation (2013-14)	£9,250
Individual attendees	448
Number of nights provision run by Youth Service	3 sessions (Mon, Wed, Fri)
Other Centre users	Ummid Alternative Education Provider – Term Time Only (income generated £9,250 per annum)

Appendix 2 – Summary Documents
Youth Service Buildings Review - Consultation Feedback

Appendix 3 – Rented Spaces

WEST

Summary of other buildings used

Rented

2013-14

Organisation	Costs	Notes	Individual Attendees
Sharing Voices – Manningham	£2,420	No longer using this provision – Young people transferred to other provisions	60
Girlington Community Centre	£3,250	Costs reduced to £1,200 for 14-15 for 1 session per week	65
Heaton Village Hall	£1,500	1 session per week	83
St Martins – Heaton	£1,440	1 session per week	48
Frizinghall Community Centre	£1,750	Was 2 sessions (1 was in kind for girls group which has now ceased) now reduced to 1 session	67 open access
Thornton Community Centre	£1,000	1 session per week	74
Lower Grange Community Centre	£4,800	Was for 3 session per week Now reduced to £1,000 for 2 sessions	220
Clayton Village Hall	£2,800	Was for 2 sessions per week – now reduced to 1 session per week	118
Khidmet Centre	£2,325	2 sessions per week	93
Culture Fusion	£5,600	For 2 session per week for Oct 14-March 15 This has in previous years full costs been significantly more due to the District wide team being based in the building	110 (2014 use)
Culture Fusion	£34,100	For accommodation of the Information Shop for Young People	698 + 7003 anonymous

In Kind / use of partner / council buildings

Organisation	Notes	Individual Attendees
Bangladeshi Youth Organisation	In kind – was 2 sessions now reduced to 1 session per week	98

Appendix 3 – Rented Spaces

SOUTH

Summary of other buildings used

Rented

2013-14

Organisation	Costs	Notes	Individual Attendees
Westfield Church – Wyke	2,500	Was for 2 sessions per week – has now reduced to 1 session per week	117
Delph Hill Centre	2,700	Was for extra sessions linked to PRU work in 13-14 – use has now reduced to 1 session per week	106
Wibsey Rugby Club	2,800	2 sessions per week	131
Queensbury – Victoria Hall	3,030	3 sessions per week	203
St Marys Church - Wyke	Was in kind during 2013-14 is now £15 per session (£660)	1 session per week	90

In Kind / use of partner / council buildings

Organisation	Notes	Individual Attendees
Bierley Life Centre	In kind use of premise for 1 session per week	112
Great Horton Village Hall	In kind use of premise for 1 session per week	111

Appendix 3 – Rented Spaces

SHIPLEY

Summary of other buildings used

Rented

2013-14

Organisation	Costs	Notes	Individual Attendees
Cottingley Cornerstone	1,463	1 session per week	33
Wilsden Village Hall	5,225	1 session per week	89

In Kind / use of partner / council buildings

Organisation	Notes	Individual Attendees
Queens Hall Burley	In kind use of premise for 1 session per week for delivery of D of E Award	99
Harden Village Hall	In kind use of premises for 1 session per week	54
Kirklands Centre – Menston	In kind use of premises for 1 session per week for delivery of D of E Award	15
Ian Clough Hall – Baildon	In kind use of premises for 1 session per week	75
Windhill Community Centre		11
Bingley Youth Café	Worker support to voluntary organisation provision	

Appendix 3 – Rented Spaces

KEIGHLEY

Summary of other buildings used

Rented

2013-14

Organisation	Costs	Notes	Individual Attendees
Bangladeshi Community Association	Were paying £2,252	Now negotiated to be in kind for one session per week	136
Keith Thompson Centre-Braithwaite	£2,200	Continues for 2014-15	95
Holy Family School	Were paying £2,640	Now negotiated to be in kind for one session per week	11
Highfield area –Highfield Community Association	TBC	In negotiations for amount to be paid	186
Oxenhope Community Centre	Is rented but costs covered by Youth Committee		43
Keighley Leisure Centre	Is rented but costs covered by Youth Committee		46

In Kind / use of partner / council buildings

Organisation	Notes	Individual Attendees
Childrens Society	In kind use of premise for 1 session per week	5
Oakbank School	In kind use of premises for 1 session per week	32
Sue Belcher Centre – Brackenbank	In kind use of premises for 2 sessions per week	102
Holden Hall Oakworth	In kind council premises for 1 session per week	43

Appendix 4 – Financial Overviews

**EAST
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW
Full year running costs**

EAST Youth Service Budget			Ravenscliffe	Laisterdyke	Eco Pod	Canterbury	D of E
	2109	Grounds Maintenance	1,000			1,200	
	2330	Rates	7,900	18,075	382	4,950	6,005
	2340	Buildings & Contents Insurance	315	310	23	160	
	2341	Fire Insurance	700	800	41	980	220
	2400	Rent					
	2510	Security Alarms (Kinds Sec 12mnth contract)	405			585	
	2634	Ref Collect	915	750		715	672
	4556	Security Services - Key holding	150				
		Total	11,385	19,935	446	8,590	6,897

EAST FM Budget		Utilities	7,239	11,360		7,730	8,609
		Cleaning	8,700	6,532		4,100	5,100
		Repairs and H&S compliances	1,215	1,170		1,616	491
		Total	17,154	19,062	0	13,446	14,200

EAST Income Generated		Income generated (2013-14)	2,422	0	0	0	0
------------------------------	--	----------------------------	-------	---	---	----------	----------

EAST Library Budget		Rates, Repairs, Utilities, Cleaning, Insurances, Refuse	-	2,371	-	-	-
		Total	-	2,371	-	-	-

EAST Stats		Individuals Attending Nov 13-Nov 14	287	432		40	74 dofe + 86 + 164 anonymous = 324
		Number of nights / sessions per week of provision provided by Youth Service	3 plus 1 afternoon	3		2	3 + twilight

**WEST
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW
Full year running costs**

WEST Youth Service Budget			Toller Youth Cafe	Culture Fusion Information Shop RENTED	Culture Fusion One off & open access RENTED	Notes
	2109	Grounds Maintenance				
	2330	Rates	6,711			
	2340	Buildings & Contents Insurance				
	2341	Fire Insurance	800			
	2400	Rent		34,100	21,520*	*Full year costs with district team based in property
	2510	Security Alarms (Kinds Sec 12mnth contract)				
	2634	Ref Collect	645			
	4556	Security Services - Key holding				
		Cleaning / Caretaking			15,000*	*Full year costs with district team based in property
		Total	8,156	34,100	36,520	

WEST FM Budget						
		Utilities	5,682			
		Cleaning	*TBC			
		Repairs and H&S compliances	7,646			
		Total	13,328	0	0	

WEST Income Generated						
		Income generated (2013-14)	9,250	0	0	

WEST Stats						
		Individuals Attending Nov 13-Nov 14	448	698 (known) + 7003 (anonymous)	742*	* includes one off events and activity delivered by District team
		Number of nights / sessions per week of provision provided by Youth Service	3	5 ½ days	2	

**SHIPLEY
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW
Full year running costs**

SHIPLEY Youth Service Budget			Bingley Youth Project	Denholme POD	Highcroft	Shipley Youth Café
	2109	Grounds Maintenance				
	2330	Rates	3,720	382	6,240	9,399
	2340	Buildings & Contents Insurance	250	52	310	767
	2341	Fire Insurance	250		600	15
	2400	Rent				16,000
	2510	Security Alarms (Kinds Sec 12mnth contract)	**	432	396	616
	2634	Ref Collect	295	232	971	679
	4556	Security Services - Key holding				
		Total	4,515	1,098	8,517	27,476

** Awaiting info from FM

SHIPLEY FM Budget						
		Utilities	3,112	872	5,832	2,201
		Cleaning	6,600		5,669	2,200
		Repairs and H&S compliances			2,713	
		Total	9,712	872	14,214	4,401

SHIPLEY Income Generated						
		Income generated (2013-14)	0	0	4,453	400

SHIPLEY Stats						
		Individuals Attending Nov 13-Nov 14	191	104	198	147
		Number of nights / sessions per week of provision provided by Youth Service	2	2	2	4 daytime + 4 evening

KEIGHLEY FINANCIAL AND STATISTICAL OVERVIEW

Finances are shown as full financial year costs

KEIGHLEY Youth Service Budget			Parkwood Centre	The Warehouse	Silsden Youth Centre	Addingham Youth Centre	Haworth Youth & Community Centre	Notes
	2109	Grounds Maintenance						
	2330	Rates	10,363	598	2,402	1,204	1,082	
	2340	Buildings & Contents Insurance	1,145	250	76		65	
	2341	Fire Insurance	1,610	650	340	384	580	
	2400	Rent						
	2510	Security Alarms (Kinds Sec 12mnth contract)						
	2608	Cleaning premises						
	2634	Ref Collect	725	573	330	321	642	
	4556	Security Services - Key holding						
		Total	13,843	2,071	3,148	1,909	2,369	

KEIGHLEY FM Budget		Utilities	8,056	4,557	3,247	5,214	*13,045	
		Cleaning	14,700	5,500	0	5,600	3,934	
		Repairs and H&S compliances						
		Total	22,756	10,057	3,247	10,814	16,979	

*this includes previous year's electricity costs which were not charged estimated to be around £1,268 (awaiting confirmation of actual figure from energy team – who have had to request from utility company)

KEIGHLEY Income Generated		Income generated (2013-14)	81	100	1,530	0	0	
---------------------------	--	----------------------------	----	-----	-------	---	---	--

KEIGHLEY Stats		Individuals Attending Nov 13-Nov 14	501	227	200	27	57	
		Number of nights / sessions per week of provision provided by Youth Service	6	3	2	2	2	

SOUTH FINANCIAL AND STATISTICAL OVERVIEW

Finances are shown as full financial year costs

SOUTH Youth Service Budget			Buttershaw Youth Centre	TFD Centre	Scholemoor Youth Centre	Wibsey Pod	D of E Centre	Notes
	2109	Grounds Maintenance						
	2330	Rates	5,417	22,293	4,004	577	6,005	
	2340	Buildings & Contents Insurance	205	325				
	2341	Fire Insurance	700	2,545			220	
	2400	Rent						
	2510	Security Alarms (Kinds Sec 12mnth contract)	270					
	2608	Cleaning premises						
	2634	Ref Collect	645	645	719		672	
	4556	Security Services - Key holding						
		Total	7,237	25,808	4,723	577	6,897	

SOUTH FM Budget		Utilities	9,497	22,943	3,371	**	8,609	
		Cleaning	7,300	13,400	0		5,100	
		Repairs and H&S compliances	948	2,209	139		491	
		Total	17,745	38,552	3,510	**	14,200	

* No utility costs supplied – energy unit identifying

** Not including electricity – Review has highlighted that no payments have been made for number of years - the meter has been read and we await the invoice

SOUTH Library Budget		Rates, Repairs, Utilities, Cleaning, Insurances, Refuse	-	22,361	-	-	-	
		Total	-	22,361	-	-	-	

SOUTH Income Generated		Income generated (2013-14)	0	3,468	0	0	0	
-------------------------------	--	----------------------------	---	-------	---	---	---	--

SOUTH
FINANCIAL AND STATISTICAL OVERVIEW
 Finances are shown as full financial year costs

SOUTH Stats		Individuals Attending Nov 13-Nov 14	45	619	130	99	56 + 86 ^	
		Number of nights / sessions per week of provision provided by Youth Service	3	5	2	2	3 (1District + 2East)	

^East provision at D of E Centre is around 250 EU YP – Not all have shared personal information to allow them to be recorded on IYSS systems

SOUTH
FINANCIAL AND STATISTICAL OVERVIEW
Finances are shown as full financial year costs

Governance and Audit Committee Report Youth Service Buildings Review - Appendix 5

This appendix contains additional information in relation to the Youth Service Buildings Review. It outlines draft recommendations and criteria that have been considered when making the recommendations.

1. Draft Recommendations

In light of the information collated as part of the Youth Service Buildings Review, including the feedback given through the consultation and the equality impact assessment, the following recommendations are made to the Executive Committee:

1.1 Shipley Constituency

10.1.1 That alternative estate management arrangements are sourced for the Denholme Youth Café, exploring if possible Community Asset Transfer, with a retained number of hours for the delivery of youth work from the premises. Should the premises not be able to successfully transfer through Community Asset Transfer the Shipley Area Committee would wish to retain the premises.

1.1.2 That the Shipley Youth Café be retained: but the rental agreement be renegotiated to reduce leasing costs. If a significant rent reduction is unable to be achieved at the current location then provision is recommended to relocate to a lower cost accommodation. The Shipley Area Committee would wish for consideration to be given to developing a “friends of”, trust or community based group to take over the running of the premises in the future.

1.1.3 Recommendation from the Shipley Area Committee is that the Bingley Youth Project be retained with the development of a “friends of”, trust or community based group to take over the running of the premises in the future. Following fuller discussion with officers it is considered feasible to relocate existing youth service provision from these premises to neighbouring and voluntary sector premises. Officers would therefore recommend actions that explore this option further with a view to sharing delivery sites in the area.

1.1.4 Recommendation from the Shipley Area Committee is that the Highcroft Youth Centre be considered for alternative estate management arrangements with the Shipley Area Committee proposing to work closely with the East Area Committee to ensure provision can be relocated – potentially to voluntary

sector premises within Swainhouse, Bolton woods or Windhill. There is recognition of the potential to develop wider community access to the premises, particularly from Early Years as the centre accommodates a purpose built nursery annex, but the Area Committee felt the high backlog maintenance and ongoing drainage issues presented an unforeseeable financial burden in the future. Following further discussion with officers and spontaneous approaches made to Early Years by local providers it has been identified that there is potential to generate almost £5K per year with development of an 18 place nursery and 5 evenings after school provision. As this is an area identified as having a shortage of 2 year old Early Education places the Council's Early Years Service would be keen to support development of this within the purpose built annex in the Highcroft Youth Centre. Backlog maintenance costs are accepted as being high, but further discussions with Estates identifies that of the £222K identified for backlog maintenance, approximately £50K of this is considered essential with the remaining balance being advisory / end of life replacements. Taking these developments into consideration officers would recommend retention of these premises, with further dialogue and exploration of developing potential for wider community use of these premises to see if full cost recovery can be obtained with a view to community asset transfer in the future.

1.2 South Constituency

- 1.2.1 That the potential for alternative estate management arrangements for the Scholemoor Youth Centre be explored with local community and voluntary sector groups. There is £34K held in Council budgets which is ringfenced for this property. This money could be allocated to support a Community Asset Transfer of these premises. There are local groups who are already demonstrating commitment to developing provisions and services in this area and they may be interested in considering Asset Transfer, but should this be unable to be secured existing youth provision should be relocated to an alternative delivery site in the area.
- 1.2.2 That alternative estate management is considered for the Buttershaw Youth Centre. Talks with partners and the community to explore potential for alternative estate management arrangements should continue. The Centre is located close to the Sandale Centre – a community based provision that is not considered to be fit for purpose, and there is potential for closer working with this and other local organisations in this area. Should alternative estate management arrangements not be considered feasible then work would need to be undertaken with young people to

support transitions to alternative delivery sites. This is considered by local practitioners to be achievable. The Youth Centre currently accommodates a sports hall which could be a loss to the community, but this is not considered to be detrimental as arrangements may be able to be made to use the local upper school facilities for sessions that are sports based at a cost.

1.2.3 That the Pod in Wibsey is retained as it is a well used and low cost provision – and whilst it has some limitations due to its size, it appears to meet the needs of young people from the surrounding area well. Disposal of these premises would not generate significant income for the Council as the parcel of land on which the container is located is limited in what this could offer in the way of alternative uses.

1.2.4 That the TFD Centre is retained. TFD is a large premises located within the Holmewood Estate. The provision is well used by young people during delivery of youth work provision. It hosts a sports hall and many different parts of the premises, which would support a variety of different uses. It also accommodates the local library service. It is significantly underused at this moment in time and has huge potential for development and increasing use of the building by other and wider community service providers, but this would need to be given appropriate attention to develop this.

1.3 **Keighley Constituency**

1.3.1 That the current agreement that Youth Services meet the running costs be renegotiated and the full running responsibilities pass to the Youth Council. Addingham Youth Centre is already on a lease to the Addingham Youth Council which has 50+ years remaining. This group act as trustees of the premises. As the building is already subject of a long lease there are no benefits to changing this. Youth Work is and can continue to be accommodated within the premises.

1.3.2 That alternative estate management plan is explored for the Silsden Youth Centre, including investigation of any potential for Community Asset Transfer. The Youth Centre also accommodates a Childrens Centre which was funded by Sure Start, also subject of a review the recommendation for this site becoming a 6 hour delivery site would need to also be considered to prevent claw back of funding. Should Community Asset Transfer not be taken up there is potential for youth provision to be accommodated within the recently refurbished Town Hall, and whilst this is not purpose built it would enable the continuation of provision in the area.

- 1.3.3 Ilkley Youth Centre is already on a 20 year lease to the Youth and Community Association. It has had an extension which accommodates a Childrens Centre; funded by Sure Start this has recently been identified to become a 6 hour per week delivery site. It is recommended that negotiation be undertaken to explore extension of the existing lease arrangements to include the Childrens Centre. This will enable the retention of youth work delivery from this property.
- 1.3.4 That Parkwood Centre is recommended for retention having had recent investment funded by Youth Capital Funding and relative low back log maintenance costs it is considered to be a valuable delivery site in the area. It is underused and there is potential to develop and increase use of the premises by the wider community at times when this is not being utilised for youth work delivery. This would also increase and contribute towards running costs of the premises. It is also recommended that a development plan be drawn up to extend use of the site.
- 1.3.5 That Haworth Community Centre is recommended for alternative estate management arrangements, but recognising the building has significant backlog maintenance costs identified this could present limited options. It is recommended that this should be retained, but only in the short term to enable continuation of provision, and identification of an alternative delivery site to ensure this does not increase isolation for young people in this rural community.

1.4 **East Constituency**

- 1.4.1 It is evident through the consultation process that opportunity exists to develop community use of Laisterdyke Youth Centre and some specific requests have been received that would increase use of the site, including an Elderly Day Care Centre and After School Clubs. It is recommended that these are investigated further along with the any 'other' opportunities for increasing community use, before decisions are taken on the future of the property.
- 1.4.2 That Canterbury Youth Centre is recommended to be retained – it is located within the Canterbury Estate, an area of high needs and is the only community building in this area. There is potential to develop a wider community offer from this site. This could also have potential to contribute towards running costs in the longer term, but would need support to develop the offer from the premises.
- 1.4.3 That Ravenscliffe Youth Centre is recommended to be retained with plans to be developed that increase income opportunities and offset running costs. Located within the Ravenscliffe Estate

it hosts a number of services for young people from the site. We are in receipt of a petition of 202 signatories in support of retaining this provision. Other premises in the area could offer alternative delivery sites, but are considered by some to be not fit for purpose. This building already income generates and there is potential for this to be further increased to offset running costs of the premises.

1.4.4 The Eco pod sited in the grounds of Immanuel School in Idle and Thackley Ward is currently not in use for the delivery of youth provision. It is recommended that alternative estate management be explored for this building.

1.4.5 It is recommended that alternative estate management arrangements be explored for the Duke of Edinburgh's Award Centre in Undercliffe. There is potential for increasing use of these premises and we are in receipt of an expression of interest in Community Asset Transfer expressed by a local community group. It is recommended that this be explored as this would enable continuation of youth provision from this site.

1.5 **West Constituency**

1.5.1 That Toller Youth Café is recommended for retention. The building has recently had investment to develop the kitchen / café area, is well located and serves local needs well in its accommodation of provision for new migrant communities. The building also accommodates the district wide Youth Service Resources which are stored at the rear of the premises in 3 shipping containers alongside the 2 Youth Service resource vehicles.

1.6 **Summary of Recommendations**

1.6.1 It is recommended that the Council retains the following properties for the Youth Service to manage and fund, with further investigation being undertaken to explore income generation and increased community use::

- Shipley Youth Café in Shipley Constituency
- TFD Centre in Bradford South Constituency
- The Pod in Bradford South Constituency
- Parkwood Centre in the Keighley Constituency
- Canterbury Youth Centre in Bradford East Constituency
- Ravenscliffe Youth Centre in Bradford East Constituency
- Laisterdyke Youth Centre in Bradford East Constituency
- Toller Youth Café in Bradford West Constituency

1.6.2 It is recommended that exploration of alternative estate management arrangements, the options and interest be investigated for the following premises:

- Denholme Youth Café in Shipley Constituency
- Highcroft Youth Centre in Shipley Constituency
- Scholemoor Centre in Bradford South Constituency
- Buttershaw Youth Centre in Bradford South Constituency
- Silsden Youth Centre in Keighley Constituency
- Haworth Youth Centre in Keighley Constituency
- The Eco Pod in Bradford East Constituency
- The Duke of Edinburgh's Award Centre in Bradford East Constituency

In each case where it is recommended that alternative estate management arrangements are explored with a further report to Executive for final decisions on how these physical resources will be dealt with. This will include further communication with local community and voluntary sector organisations to explore arrangements that will enable continuation of youth work delivery, checks on the strength of community interest including opportunities for Community Asset Transfers. This would align with the recommendations of the Youth Offer Review and become an integral part of the Youth Offer decisions.

1.6.3 The Bingley Youth Project is recommended for retention by the Shipley Area Committee. After fuller discussion officers would wish to recommend further exploration of opportunities to increase joined up working with local voluntary and community sector organisations and to explore the potential for alternative estate management arrangements for this building. It is recommended that these further investigations are set within a 3 month timeline.

1.6.4 It is recommended that extensions or amendments be made to the existing lease arrangements for:

- Addingham Youth Centre
- Ilkley Youth Centre

1.7 **Community Asset Transfer**

There have been 18 organisations in the district who have expressed interest in Community Asset Transfer of premises. Some have specified particular premises of interest to them; others have expressed interest in seeing the range of premises available. Any organisations who have expressed interest will be contacted following the Executive decisions and advised of the due process to be followed should they wish to pursue their initial expression of interest.

2. **Criteria for Evaluation of Findings**

There have been a number of considerations and principles that have been weighed up and deliberated when making the draft

recommendations. These include:

- Feedback from Elected Ward Members, Neighbourhood Area Coordinators, Ward Officers and Youth Service Advanced Practitioners
- Feedback from other stakeholders including Town / Parish Councils, Voluntary / Community Sector Groups
- Feedback from Young People, individuals attending and number of Sessions operating from buildings
- Running costs and the existing and disproportional distribution of Youth Service budget for buildings
Potential to generate income / if a building is already generating income and if there is capacity for increasing use of building spaces at times when not is use by Youth Service
- Equality Duty Considerations and Impact Assessments
- What other Council owned or of Council Interest buildings are nearby / within walking distance
- Partner organisations / voluntary / community sector premises are nearby or within walking distance
- Potential for developing existing partnerships and potential for future sharing of delivery sites that could be developed within Youth sector
- If the site accommodates other Council or voluntary sector run services
- Where sites have Children's Centres or Libraries located within the building and the recommendations of the reviews taking place in relation to these
- Condition comments from Estates Team, identified backlog maintenance and ease of disposal indicators
- Any Estates development plans in early or well developed stages that could be inclusive of youth provision in the future
- Any existing lease arrangements
- Potential for buildings to be Community Asset Transferred and a desire to work closer with communities
- Knowledge of areas of highest need / emerging needs / ability to accommodate and respond to needs within future plans should recommendations be accepted.
- Potential to increase rural isolation for young people

3. Appendices

Summary documents relating to each building are detailed in appendix 2 of the main report.