

North Yorkshire Council

Selby & Ainsty Area Committee

18 September 2025

Briefing paper – Selby Community Centres (former sheltered housing communal spaces)

Report of the Corporate Director - Community Development

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE BRIEFING PAPER

- 1.1 To set out the challenges facing North Yorkshire Council's landlord service with respect to the 10 former sheltered housing community spaces in the Selby locality.
- 1.2 To share with the members of the Selby & Ainsty Area Committee some options presented to the Executive Member for Culture, Leisure and Housing in response to these challenges.
- 1.3 To note that approval was given by the Executive Member of Culture, Leisure and Housing to assess these options on a centre-by-centre basis, with the overarching aim of alleviating the financial burden on the Housing Revenue Account.

2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 Following local government re-organisation in 2023 (LGR), North Yorkshire Councils (NYC) landlord service was established to manage the council's rented portfolio together with other properties and buildings which sit in the separate housing revenue account (HRA). This portfolio of properties includes specialist accommodation for elderly persons (sheltered housing) as well as other communal buildings (community centres), of which the majority are located in the former Selby district.
- 2.2 In 2024, the landlord service embarked on a strategic review of its sheltered housing provision as it looked to move towards a single model of operation (it currently has 3 distinct models). During the course of this review, it has identified a specific challenge with regards to the 10 communal properties it has inherited in the Selby area, and which are referred to as community centres locally.
- 2.3 The briefing paper seeks to set out these challenges in more detail.

3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Sheltered housing schemes for older or more vulnerable tenants can take various forms. Some consist of a single large building with individual flats or bedsits and shared communal spaces, while others feature clusters of bungalows centred around a communal facility.
- 3.2 Historically, communal spaces primarily housed essential equipment such as washing machines and laundry facilities or served as larger kitchen and dining areas for social gatherings and events. These activities were traditionally organised and facilitated by a resident warden

- 3.3 Starting in the 1980s, shifts in demand and funding structures led housing providers to initiate the decommissioning of sheltered housing schemes, especially those consisting of bungalow clusters. Simultaneously, they took the opportunity to transition away from the traditional operating model, which required staff providing services—resident wardens—to live on-site.
- 3.4 The decommissioning process often posed an additional challenge in determining the best use for communal spaces and staff accommodation that were no longer needed. In most cases, providers chose to repurpose these areas by converting them into additional rental units where feasible—an approach also taken by the former Harrogate Council.
- 3.5 As noted above, in the case of Harrogate, they followed the approach taken by the majority of housing providers by remodelling any redundant communal spaces and staff accommodation to provide extra accommodation in all but two cases (the spaces at Station View in Harrogate and Charlton Drive in Knaresborough).
- 3.6 These two communal spaces remain available for use by the tenants and for which they are required to pay a weekly service charge of £2.95. This charge covers their upkeep in terms of management costs, booking facilities, cleaning and utilities rather than any provision for property compliance and maintenance.
- 3.7 Selby on other hand opted to retain all of these communal spaces for use as ‘community centres’ and to allow former residential staff to remain in the properties where appropriate as general needs tenants. As is the norm in Selby, tenants do not pay a service charge for their upkeep which instead is borne by the HRA budget.
- 3.8 Richmondshire opted to largely leave things as they were. As such, this means that the landlord service inherited two such cluster schemes with both resident wardens and shared communal spaces (St Cuthberts Green in Barton and at St Edmonds Close in Brompton). These will need to be addressed as part of the harmonisation of the sheltered housing service.
- 3.9 Recognising that these 10 centres were mostly underused, expensive to operate and required significant investment, the former Selby Council twice undertook a detailed options appraisal on their future use, initially in 2009 and again in 2020 (this second report is set out at annex A).
- 3.10 Ultimately the issues identified in this Area Committee briefing paper are not new. What is different this time around is that following the creation of NYC, we now have a single HRA budget so we can no longer just look at this challenge purely through a Selby lens.

4.0 SELBY COMMUNITY CENTRES (FORMER SHELTERED HOUSING COMMUNAL SPACES)

4.1 Location

The 10 centres are spread out across the former Selby district.

- Anne Sharpe Centre, St Edwards Close, Byram, WF11 9NT.
- Calcaria House, Windmill Rise, Tadcaster, LS24 9HR
- Coultish Centre, Charles Street, Selby, YO8 4DA.
- Cunliffe Centre, Petre Avenue, Selby YO8 8DJ
- Grove House, Grove Crescent, South Milford, LS25 5AZ
- Harold Mills House, North Crescent, Sherburn-in-Elmet, LS25 6DD
- Kelcbar, Kelcbar Close, Tadcaster, LS24 9NX
- Lady Popplewell Centre, Beechwood Close, Sherburn-in-Elmet, LS25 6HU
- Rosemary House, Rosemary Court, Tadcaster, LS24 8HR

- Westfield Court Centre, Westfield Court, Eggborough, DN14 0TT

4.2 Using the most recent Selby Executive report from October 2020 as the starting point for this briefing paper, it is evident that the issues identified in that report have not improved and that due to other factors (mainly the pandemic and LGR) they have in fact deteriorated further still.

4.3 Condition and safety

The buildings themselves are in a relatively poor state of repair due to a lack of investment. Consequently, and as a part of this review, comprehensive stock condition surveys were requested. The results indicate that all 10 centres require substantial and immediate investment totalling some £421,000 which ranges from £16,000 in the case of Grove House, South Milford to upwards of £70,000 in the case of Rosemary House, Tadcaster.

Basic compliance health & safety requirements such as undertaking Fire Risk Assessments had not been completed to a satisfactory standard nor were other requirements such as PAT testing carried out as a matter of routine. These omissions have since been quickly rectified by colleagues in Housing Standards.

4.4 Usage

Aside from the Anne Sharpe centre in the village of Byram, and which is leased by the Health Care First Partnership to operate a GP surgery, the buildings continue to be largely underused. At one extreme, the centre at Westfield Court in Eggborough is barely used at all with just a weekly 2-hour bingo session. However, in truth, all the centres are unused for the majority of the time that they otherwise could be.

4.5 Revenue costs

The revenue spend incurred in the financial year 2023/24 amounted to £341,000 however, as was the case with the 2020 report, it has not proven possible due to historic budget structures to detail the revenue or running costs on centre-by-centre basis. This means that the average of £35,000 per annum is likely to be an under-estimate in some cases and an over-estimate in others.

4.6 Income generation towards the running costs remains incredibly low at just over £10,000 for the last financial year. The bulk of this sum is likely to be attributable to the arrangements in place at the Anne Sharpe centre in Byram. With respect to Byram, the current lease agreement in place with the Health Care First Partnership there generates an income of £5,900 per annum (it should be noted that the lease actually expired in 2014, so it is currently being re-negotiated with the support of colleagues in Property Services).

5.0 MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES

5.1 As outlined in the Selby Executive report, each centre is ideally expected to have a Management Committee in place, operating within the framework of a model constitution to oversee and promote activities within the building.

5.2 Whilst these premises can be hired by third parties at a rate of £13.30 per hour, each Management Committee is also granted up to 12 free sessions per week.

- 5.3 Unfortunately, these governance arrangements were found to be lacking, resulting in considerable uncertainty over who held ultimate responsibility for managing the use of the centres. This, in turn, led to inadequate oversight of the health and safety tasks essential for operating these premises. However, as previously noted, these issues have now been addressed.
- 5.4 A cross-directorate steering group between Housing and Localities was established in September 2024 in response to some safety concerns which had become apparent at one of the centres as well as several other related issues.
- 5.5 With the support of these colleagues in the Localities Team, the Tenant Involvement team has undertaken some soft engagement with the remaining management committees which had been set up by Selby to help run the centres.
- 5.6 Depending on the outcome of any discussions arising from this briefing paper, the same steering group will then be tasked with carrying out more in-depth conversations with these committees as well as other tenants and interested stakeholders

6.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS PRESENTED TO THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CULTURE, LEISURE AND HOUSING

Remodel

- 6.1 As highlighted in the 2020 report, each of these buildings has a distinct design, presenting both unique challenges and opportunities. In preparation for this briefing paper, the consultants (ARK), who are assisting the team with its strategic review of sheltered housing, were tasked with assessing the majority of the buildings to explore potential options for their alternative use.
- 6.2 As part of the brief, the consultants were asked to explore whether the buildings could be redesigned to provide additional specialist accommodation that aligns with their surroundings, given their proximity to properties designed for the elderly. Consequently, replacing them with family housing may not be the most suitable solution in this context.
- 6.3 The proposed designs could potentially support the creation of more than **22** new properties. Some of these would address the challenges of assisting customers with complex needs, particularly those requiring larger bungalows.
- 6.4 It should be noted that ARK were not requested to review the following centres.
- 6.4.1 **The Cunliffe Centre, Selby.** This centre was in the process of being transferred from the HRA to the general fund to provide an alternative home for the Beech Tree PCN who in turn needed to move out of The Summit, which is another building owned by NYC in Selby. Although the original proposal has since broken down and is now unlikely to proceed, the building remains of strategic interest to Selby Town Council and has been included in their double devolution bid.
- 6.4.2 **The Anne Sharpe Centre, Byram.** The PCN previously advised that they wish to remain there and as we have not renewed the lease since 2004 and legally, we would not be able to decline this request. We currently remain in discussions to renew their lease and hope to achieve a positive outcome.
- 6.4.3 **The Coultish Centre, Selby.** This building is relatively well used in comparison to the other centres and has an active programme of events. Like the Cunliffe Centre, it has also been identified by Selby Town Council as a building that it wishes to acquire through its double devolution bid.

6.4.4 ***Kelcbar, Tadcaster.** While ARK considered this as part of their review, additional legal challenges remain for this centre, as leaseholders on the Kelcbar Close estate contribute a service charge towards its upkeep. Any proposed changes would require their consent.

Retain

- 6.5 If we were to retain the majority of these centres, considerable effort would be required to identify new groups and incentivise individuals to utilise them. Given their long-standing lack of desirability and previous unsuccessful attempts at this approach, we must acknowledge the probability of another failure.
- 6.6 Additionally, the HRA would need to invest considerable resources to restore the buildings to a suitable condition during this period.
- 6.7 If we were to retain a number of these centres, we would need to consider introducing a service charge for tenants, like the existing approach taken in Harrogate. However, given the low usage—primarily by non-tenants—this could be perceived as unfair and may face resistance.
- 6.8 An alternative approach would be to discontinue the service charge in Harrogate, acknowledging that the HRA would absorb the resulting negligible loss of income.

Transfer to the general fund

- 6.9 One possible approach would be to transfer many of the centres from the HRA to the general fund at either minimal or no cost. This would enable other directorates to explore alternative uses or engage commercial partners, effectively relieving the housing management team of this challenge.
- 6.10 This approach may present other challenges, as it could be perceived that the HRA and its tenants are being disadvantaged. Careful management would be required to address these concerns effectively.
- 6.11 Similarly, given the current funding climate, the general fund may be reluctant to assume this liability.

Mothball / Demolish

- 6.12 At the other end of the spectrum, if none of the other options are preferred, short-term mothballing of the centres should be considered to mitigate the costs of continued use and eventual demolition.

7.0 IMPACT ON OTHER SERVICES/ORGANISATIONS

- 7.1 A detailed usage exercise conducted in January of this year identified a small number of external organisations, such as Horton Housing, that currently use the centres to deliver community-based services.
- 7.2 However, as demonstrated with the Cunliffe Centre, we successfully supported the two groups using the building in finding alternative locations from where they could continue operating.

8.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 As noted above at 4.1, there are significant and immediate revenue and capital costs associated with the management and maintenance of these buildings which would have to be borne by the HRA.
- 8.2 Likewise in the alternative options described in section 6, there remain some ongoing costs to the HRA whilst these are explored in more detail.

9.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None at this stage

10.0 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 There remains an ongoing risk associated with the buildings, both while in use and if any are mothballed, particularly in relation to compliance obligations and the management of a vacant premises. Ensuring these buildings remain safe and secure is essential, and any future use or interim arrangements will be underpinned by robust risk assessments and appropriate management controls.

11.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.1 The briefing paper clearly highlights the challenges which the landlord service has inherited as well as acknowledging that previous attempts by the former Selby District Council to address them were unsuccessful.

12.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 12.1 The Area Committee to note that approval was given to the Assistant Director of Housing and the Head of Housing Management to assess alternative options on a centre-by-centre basis, with the overarching aim of alleviating the financial burden on the HRA.

APPENDICES:

Appendix A – Outcome of Community Centre Review by Task and Finish Group with Recommendations October 2020

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Nic Harne
Corporate Director – Community Development
County Hall
Northallerton

Report Author
Carl Doolan - Head of Housing Management & Landlord Services

18 September 2025



Report Reference Number: E/20/18

To:	Executive
Date:	1 October 2020
Ward(s) Affected:	All
Status:	Non-Key Decision
Author:	Drew Fussey, Customer, Business and Revenues Service Manager
Lead Executive Member:	Councillor Chris Pearson, Lead Executive Member for Housing, Health and Culture)
Lead Officer:	June Rothwell, Head of Operational Services

Title: Outcome of Community Centre Review by Task and Finish Group with Recommendations

Summary:

In March 2019 Selby District Council's Scrutiny Committee agreed to establish a Task and Finish Group, to work in partnership with the Tenant Scrutiny Committee, in order to facilitate a review of Council-owned Community Centres. This review took place between November 2019 and February 2020, with the aim of making recommendations to the Council's Executive as to the future management of the centres.

Recommendation: That the Executive consider and approve the recommendations as set out by the Scrutiny Committee in this report.

Reasons for recommendation:

Housing Revenue Account (HRA) funded Community Centres and their sustainability remains a key issue for Members and residents alike. The recommendations included in this report are aimed at ensuring that all ten centres are better able to service their community and the Selby District as a whole.

1 Introduction and background

1.1 Previous reviews have taken place regarding Council owned Community Centres. Most notably in 2010, following a report to the Social Board, the decision was made to sell the poorly used centre at Womersley and convert the centre at Kellington into a residential unit. This left the Council with the 10 centres it has today:

- Anne Sharpe Centre, St Edwards Close, Byram

- Westfield Court Centre, Westfield Court, Eggborough
- Coultish Centre, Charles Street, Selby
- Cunliffe Centre, Petre Avenue, Selby
- Harold Mills House, North Crescent, Sherburn-in-Elmet
- Lady Popplewell Centre, Beechwood Close, Sherburn-in-Elmet
- Grove House, Grove Crescent, South Milford
- Calcaria House, Windmill Rise, Tadcaster
- Kelcbar, Kelcbar Close, Tadcaster
- Rosemary House, Rosemary Court

1.2 Primary concerns at this time were around the poor use of the centres, running costs, lack of community engagement and accountability issues. Improvements have taken place since this time, such as the installation of public WiFi into almost every centre, the implementation of a new booking system created and managed by the Customer Contact Centre, and an investment of £78,000 over two years (agreed in 2017) to facilitate security and access improvements.

1.3 However, whilst these improvements are acknowledged, the same concerns regarding community usage and value for money remained present. Subsequently, it was agreed in March 2019 that the Council's Scrutiny Committee would establish a Task and Finish Group to review the Community Centres.

1.4 The scope of the review was to:

- Determine current level of use and public satisfaction with the centres.
- Look at current management models at each centre.
- Confirm the cost of providing the centres to the HRA.
- Explore potential alternative delivery models.
- Explore whether the current service offer meets the future needs of tenants and residents; and if not, what future model may best achieve this.

1.5 The group completed a comprehensive review of the centres over a 4-month period, acknowledging that different solutions may be appropriate for individual centres. It was important that group members visited each centre and consulted with the local community and key stakeholders. A resident-wide consultation also took place to inform the review and options for future use and management of each centre.

1.6 Members of the Task and Finish Group were as follows: Councillors J Chilvers, W Nichols, S Shaw-Wright, J McCartney, and M Jordan. They were also joined by Keith Watkins, a member of the Council's Tenant Scrutiny Panel; and assisted by Council Officer Drew Fussey (Customer, Business and Revenues Service Manager).

2 The Review Process

2.1 Visits

One of the initial tasks performed by the Task and Finish Group was to visit all ten Community Centres and to consider the various aspects of their appearance, usability and governance. Key stakeholders were also invited to attend to share their views. The outcome and notes made as part of these visits are attached in Appendix A.

2.2 Community Consultation

The Task and Finish Group were keen to engage the public in the review. A survey was therefore made available both online and in paper form. The online survey was publicised on the Council's website, as well as being sent to all participating tenants of our 'armchair consultees' group. Paper surveys were left at all ten centres for attendees to complete before collection, and neighbouring properties within the community were hand delivered a copy. Overall, the Council received 203 responses, illustrating a good response rate. A summary of the findings can be found in Appendix B.

2.3 Governance

Daily management of the centres is undertaken by the Housing and Property Services Teams. Each centre also has a constitution (Appendix C) and should have a management committee in place. The committee arrangements vary locally, and some are more formal than others. As part of the review visits arranged for the Task and Finish Group, committee members were also invited to attend and share their thoughts.

2.4 Usage

The management committee for each centre is authorised to have 6 free sessions per week (2 hours per session). Members of the public and community groups can hire the Community Centres for their own use; the current charge is £10.40 per hour and use varies across the centres. Appendix D contains an overview of bookings taken in 2018/19 at each individual centre.

2.5 Income and Expenses

Council-owned Community Centres are solely funded by the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), which is also the recipient of any income generated by the ten centres. This budget covers the cost of repairs and maintenance, centre improvements, utilities, fixtures and fittings, cleaning, general insurance and management costs. As the centres' financial budget is combined with other Council services, it is difficult to identify entirely the costs associated with each individual centre. The overall budget for the Community Centres is provided in Appendix E, along with a breakdown of costs associated with each individual centre.

3 Key findings

3.1 Primary concerns with the centres were under-usage, a lack of community involvement, and a lack of control, clear structure and governance (both in terms of committees and Council management). Whilst there is some good work taking place in individual centres; overall, there is room for improvement in key areas.

3.2 Governance

There is weak governance across the centres, with the exception of Rosemary House, who along with Kelcbar have amended their Constitution to meet local needs. There is confusion over the roles of committees, how they operate and what support is available to them. Many do not report directly to the Council as they are unsure who to report to. This makes it difficult to assess membership and involvement, as well as what activities are taking place in each centre. Issues have also presented in some centres where individuals appear to have taken considerable management control, which although often leading to good work, can alienate the local community and residents who would otherwise use the centres, or use them more frequently.

3.3 Usage

Although it is agreed following the review that there is likely to be additional activity taking place in the centres of which the Council are unaware, it is also fair to conclude that all ten centres are not being used to full capacity; either during their regular opening hours or outside of this, such as evenings and weekends. There is also little strategy in place to effectively advertise the centres to the wider community. This may also stem from a lack of clarity regarding responsibility within Council functions.

3.4 Engagement

There has been a lost opportunity to truly engage with the community on the management and running of the centres. This includes the consideration of more enterprise projects, community-led workshops/projects and charitable involvement. Whilst some of the centres have done well to attract a more varied clientele, very few community groups and agencies are actively engaged with and using the centres on a regular basis. There has also been little to no dedicated Council resource provided to the centres and their committees in regard to how to attract third party interest as well as looking at the potential for external funding opportunities.

3.5 Facilities and resources

In most cases, the centres have suffered from a lack of financial investment regarding their general upkeep and maintenance. Visits to the centres show that, whilst the facilities are adequate, they are not necessarily attractive or suitable for third party hire; especially when considering alternative venues

available within the community. There is also inconsistency around the provision of disabled access, emphasising the importance of ensuring that the centres are DDA (Disability Discrimination Act 1995) compliant.

4 Conclusion and Recommendations

- 4.1** Based on the findings of the review, it is concluded that the centres should remain within the control of the Council for the immediate future due to their strategic importance in terms of the communities they serve.
- 4.2** It is recognised that finances play a significant part in this review, and it is recommended that income generation continue to be pursued in all ten centres. However, this should not be the Council's priority, which instead should be to increase community usage and develop the centres as key community assets (noting that these two aims are not mutually exclusive). Whilst the latter may be less profitable, this will deliver stronger and broader benefits to the community.
- 4.3** As noted, the HRA is used to finance the centres in their entirety, given that the centres were originally intended to service older and disabled Council tenants. However, International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) require that properties are categorised according to the purposes for which the Council holds them. Where the purpose of the property is identified as having changed since their original acquisition, these properties should be moved from one class of assets to another. The Right to Buy policy (allowing tenants to purchase their Council home at a discounted price) means that an increasing proportion of properties on Council's housing estate are occupied by leaseholders or private owners, rather than Council housing tenants. This means that the centres are no longer supplied solely for Selby District Council tenants. Therefore, if the centres were opened up to the wider community and made available for use by general residents rather than tenants alone, it may be appropriate that the General Fund be considered to fund the capital works required identified in the recommendations below but are retained within the HRA.
- 4.4** The group also found that existing staffing arrangements are not clear, meaning responsibility and ownership within the Council is somewhat absent regarding individual officers and teams. At the same time, there are concerns that there is limited capacity to both maintain the daily running of all ten centres, whilst also carrying out more strategic development work. However, it is felt considerable improvements could be made by better defining officer roles in relation to management of the centres. A partnership model of management, looking to the Council to more directly involve colleagues from Housing as well as Communities and Partnerships, Town and Parish Councils, partners such as NYCC, voluntary and charitable groups and local residents; would provide a sense of 'ownership' whereby the Council are supporting the community to help themselves.
- 4.5** With this in mind, the group have made a number of recommendations for Executive Members to consider, set out below:

- That work should be undertaken to assess whether it is appropriate to fund the works recommended below from the General fund whilst retaining the Community Centres within the HRA.
- Does the Council want to consider each centre under an individual business plan or look at them as a whole? If we do want each centre to have its own individual plan, do we want to do this in phases and which centres come first?
- To establish a clear Council staff structure in relation to the management of the centres, including reporting and responsibilities. This will help to tackle the lack of clarity regarding which Council officers hold responsibility for the centres and who the committees should contact.
- To review the Constitutions for the centres to ensure they are standardised and fit for purpose. Each centre should also have a committee with registered members and with a process for reporting back activity to Council officers.
- To establish closer working relationship with Town and Parish Councils, either in regard to developing business plans or establishing the needs of the community.
- To identify local voluntary organisations, community and resident groups (some of which may already be present at the centres), subsequently exploring and encouraging their interest in being involved in the management of the centres. This could be facilitated by the Council's Communities and Partnerships Team.
- That all relevant service areas should consider the centres as venues for delivering services or hosting events, using these centres as an outreach facility to save residents traveling into Selby. They should also be promoted to partners as potential venues for them to do the same, especially regarding NYCC and the local CCG (Clinical Commissioning Group). Consideration also needs to take place as to whether these partner agencies should be charged for the use of the centres, given that an increased income yield could result in Business Rate charges. Using the centres for the delivery of services to reduce travel would also contribute toward reducing the council carbon footprint
- To arrange for an independent valuation of each centre to understand the value of the asset 'as is' as well as the land value.
- That marketing of the centres needs to be improved, both online and within the local community. Residents need to know that the resource exists and where they can find it (e.g. additional signage). They should also be publicised as a resource for all, and not just serving a specific demographic. A social media presence for example, for each of the centres, could help remedy this.

- Finally, that the centres require financial investment and a full schedule of works should be produced for each centre. This should focus on ensuring all centres are DDA compliant and more attractive to outside hire. The Executive should consider funding this work the General fund whilst ownership of the Community Centre's remains within the HRA.

5 Implications

5.1 Legal Implications

This review has provided tenants and residents alike an opportunity to share their views and be involved in the future of the centres, meeting the 'Tenant Involvement and Empowerment Standard' as set out by the Regulator of Social Housing.

Any legal implications arising from future proposals in respect of individual centres will be addressed as part of those proposals, and if required further reports produced to consider any specific legal implications

5.2 Financial Implications

Currently all centres work to a deficit and this is funded by the HRA Rent Payer. Whilst outgoings per annum are relatively similar for each centre, it is evident that different centres bring in varying incomes largely from rental. The income from the laundry service is negligible.

Any income earned is returned to the HRA budget. If there was a push to increase usage via rental space, there would be the need to consider the impact of paying business rates which could possibly eliminate any additional income made dependent upon the earning potential for each centre. For example, if the centres were promoted as a rentable space for commercial purposes such as running slimming clubs; such additional income generation would make the centres liable for business rates.

It is proposed that the centres benefit from additional financial investment in order to improve decoration as well as fixtures and fittings. Current revenue budgets allow for a yearly spend of £25,000 for repairs and maintenance. Once a full schedule of works is produced for each centre, financial viability can be ascertained and works prioritised according to budget.

Any additional financial implications arising from future proposals in respect of individual or all centres will be addressed as part of those proposals.

Consideration should also be given to how the centres can contribute to the lower carbon footprint of the Council.

5.3 Policy and Risk Implications

The review's recommendations provide a number of opportunities to develop a partnership approach to the management of our centres, between different Council directorates, partner agencies, third sector organisations, Council tenants and general residents. As with any proposal regarding partnership working arrangements, roles and responsibilities will need to be clearly identified in order to mitigate risk as much as possible.

5.4 Corporate Plan Implications

This review delivers on our strategic priority in the Corporate Plan 2020-2030 to make the Selby district 'a great place to live' by investing in our properties and communities.

5.5 Resource Implications

Rather than recommend additional staffing resources, the review instead concludes that considerable improvements could be made by better defining current Council officer roles in relation to management of the centres, and by facilitating a partnership model of management. This would require a review of current officer roles and responsibilities.

5.6 Equalities Impact Assessment

An EIA has not been completed as it is recognised that not all the centres are DDA (Disability Discrimination Act 1995) compliant. Carrying out the recommended work would ensure the Centres were accessible to all with a protected Characteristic.

6 Conclusion

The recommendations included in this report are aimed at ensuring that all ten Council-owned centres are better able to service both their community and the Selby district as a whole. If the centres are to provide true social value within their communities, they must adapt to the modern needs of tenants and residents, in order to stay relevant and make a difference.

7 Background Documents

None.

8 Appendices

Appendix A - Outcome of Community Centre visits
Appendix B - Summary of survey results
Appendix C - Copy of Community Centre Constitution
Appendix D - Community Centre usage 2018/19
Appendix E - Community Centre net spend 2017/18 & 2018/19

Contact Officer: Drew Fussey, Customer, Business and Revenues Service Manager

dfussey@selby.gov.uk

APPENDIX A

	External Surroundings			First Impressions					Facilities				
Centre	Parking	Environment	Signage	Entrance	Decoratio n	Information	Contact Info	Event Info	Space available	Furniture & Fittings	Kitchen	Toilets	Wi-Fi
Westfield Court, Eggbrough	Adequate	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Signposted suitably	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needs painting	Need bigger notice board and no contact info for bookings	Not available	Not available	Lounge/kitchen	Good order/appropriate	Good order	Adequate	No
Anne Sharpe Centre, Byram	Inadequate	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needs directional signage	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Not needed	Good but no contact info for bookings	Not available	Available	Lounge/kitchen	New carpet	Cooker needed	Adequate but shared	No
Grove House, South Milford	Inadequate	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needs directional signage	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needs painting. Has new ceiling and lights	Good selection available	Available	Available	Lounge/kitchen	Good order/appropriate	Good order	Adequate	Yes
Harold Mills, Sherburn	4 parking spaces but an issue at school time (school is adjacent)	Clean, tidy, welcoming but standing water in the porch	Needs directional signage	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Not needed	Inappropriate signs by the Committee removed. Needs a notice board	Not available	Not available	Lounge/kitchen	Good order/appropriate	Good order	Good	Yes
Lady Popplewell, Sherburn	Inadequate	Looks tired	Needs directional signage	Plaster not painted after rewire years ago. Floor and entrance porch dirty	Needed	Needs someone to take ownership	Not available	Not available	Lounge/kitchen	All need replacing	Some cupboards locked in kitchen (dirty)	Adequate but needs decorating	Yes
Rosemary House, Tadcaster	Inadequate - residents parking only for the flats	Looks tired. Metal gates due to previous vandalism. Guttering is loose	Needs directional signage. On Google Maps and has its own FB page	Clean but in need of decoration and flooring	Needed	Needs ownership. Committee have their own FB page to advertise events	Available	Committee have their own FB page to advertise but will put up list	Lounge/kitchen	All need replacing	Yes, but needs updating and a new cooker	Adequate but needs decorating	Yes

Calcaria House, Tadcaster	Inadequate	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needs directional signage	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needed	Needs ownership	Available	Not available. Committee asked if NO could explain to tenants on sign up about the centres	2 x lounge and kitchen	Needs decoration and new carpets. Furniture good but very heavy	New kitchen fitted but no cooker. Residents want small lounge made into kitchen as they have large functions at times	Adequate but needs decorating	Yes
Kelcbar, Tadcaster	Inadequate	Clean, tidy, welcoming but small hole in the roof to report	Needs directional signage	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Entrances and toilets need decorating. Committee told these would be painted in 2016/17	Good selection available	Available	Available	Lounge/ kitchen	Good	Has a new kitchen	Adequate but needs decorating	Yes
Coultish Centre, Selby	Good car park and street parking	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needs directional signage	Clean, tidy, welcoming	In good decorative state	Looks cluttered and needs ownership	Available	Not available	2 x rooms and kitchen	Good	New kitchen but small. Needs new crockery etc.	Adequate but needs decorating and disabled facilities need attention	Yes
Cunliffe Centre, Selby	Inadequate	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needs directional signage	Clean, tidy, welcoming	Needs attention throughout	Looks cluttered and needs ownership	Available	Not available	4 x rooms and 2 x kitchens	Needs attention throughout	Needs all new	Adequate but needs decorating and disabled facilities need attention	No

Additional Comments

Westfield Court: No attendees present at visit.

Anne Sharp Centre: 4 residents attended visit and stated that parking is a problem as it is shared with the Doctors Surgery. Heating is also providing on storage heaters and question was posed whether the centre could be fitted with gas central heating.

Grove House: No attendees present at visit. Post office now operates from the centre two days a week. Also has a defibrillator outside.

Harold Mills: No attendees. Noted that cooker is new and unused, but too small.

Lady Popplewell: 31 residents attended the first consultation meeting. They asked if a loop could be fitted for the hard of hearing. They were also upset that the centre is well used but badly in need of refurbishment. There were also complaints about the centre being dirty since the cleaner left in September 2019.

Rosemary House: 16 residents attended the visit plus members of the Committee, who have their own constitution.

Calcaria House: 8 residents attended visit.

Kelcbar: 17 residents attended the visit and the Committee have their own constitution. Also has a defibrillator outside.

Coultish Centre: 12 residents attended the visit but there is no formal Committee.

Cunliffe Centre: No attendees at visit. A very large building with potential to change the layout of the centre.

Summary

Car Parking: 7 centres considered parking would be inadequate for popular events.

External Environment: 8 centres considered clean and welcoming, whilst Rosemary House and Lady Popplewell need work.

External / directional signage: needs improved directional signage and registering on Google Maps. 8 centres also need external notice boards.

Entrance: Acceptable for 9 of the centres but Lady Popplewell in particular needs attention.

Internal decoration: 7 centres need decorating throughout (Coultish Centre and Harold Mills are in good order and Ann Sharpe is acceptable).

Information: 8 of the 10 centres need a tidy to make sure the notice boards are clear and include contact info and an up to date activity list.

Furniture: 5 centres need new furniture, but all need to be considered for more appropriate lighter tables if they are to be more multifunctional.

Toilets: generally seen as adequate but not all centres have disabled facilities that would comply with the DDA. This needs to be reviewed across all to ensure they meet the requirements for all potential users.

Kitchens: 5 centres considered adequate for hosting events. The other 5 are mixed with some needing minor changes and others needed a new kitchen.

Wi-Fi: 8 centres have Wi-Fi but in 2 it is not accessible to the public. Cunliffe Centre and Anne Sharpe have no Wi-Fi.

Community involvement: Overall, 88 individuals attended the visits. Lady Popplewell had the most attend with 31. 4 centres had no attendees – Westfield Court, Grove House, Harold Mills and Cunliffe Centre.

Appendix B

Consultation responses: totalled 203, a mix of online and paper returns.

Age of respondents was as follows:

Under 39 - 5.5%

40 to 59 - 14%

60 to 79 - 59%

80 plus - 21.5%

This means over 80% of respondents were aged over 60.

75% of respondents who disclosed their gender (190 of the 203) were female, with the remaining 25% male.

Almost all respondents stated their nearest village:

Eggborough - 3.5%

Byram - 5%

South Milford - 8%

Sherburn In Elmet - 23.8% /

Selby - 26.7%

Tadcaster - 33%

86% of respondents had used a Community Centre before. Of these, 80.5% in the last month, 7.5% in last 3 months and 7% in last year.

Of those who did not use the centres, the most common reason cited for this was because they did not know what was going on within them, followed by not knowing where they were. A small number also said they did not attend due to transport issues.

Activities respondents would like to see at the centres, in descending popularity:

Bingo - 62%

Café - 56%

Talks - 51%

Music and film events - 51%

Arts and crafts - 50%

Fundraising events - 44%

Skills and learning opportunities - 42%

Health and advice - 42%

Games - 39%

In terms of other activities wanted by respondents not listed, the most frequent were: additional laundry facilities, exercise classes for the elderly, meetings to discuss local issues, jumble sales, play groups, and book clubs.

When asked '*would you consider hiring a Community Centre in future:*' 51% said yes, 13% said no and 36% were unsure.

When asked '*would you like to be involved in running one of our Community Centres:*' 25% said yes, 41% said no and 34% were unsure.

Respondents were also able to provide comments as to how we could improve the centres. Key themes here included:

- Issues with committees abusing their powers

- Lack of advertisement
- No transport to get there
- Committee to be better engaged with the Council
- Improved facilities and redecoration
- Increasing use for all age groups
- More and different events available

Some of the comments are noted below:

'What's on and when needs to be advertised more...we need to get younger people involved to try and get more events on.'

'Most of the villagers don't know it's here. All the white goods in the kitchen need repairing or replacing as they are so old.'

'Maybe we need more advertising to young families for children's parties as residents think it is for old people only.'

'Promote their use by information to the community, more varied activities and involve the community in volunteering. People not near to the centre do not know of it or where it is.'

'Centre needs new kitchen bits - cooker, microwave, pots and pans to enable use of hiring. It also needs greater SDC involvement and running of the place.'

'The community centre is not very inviting in how it looks. It needs a good make over on everything.'

Appendix C

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNITY CENTRE

NAME OF CENTRE AND PURPOSE	The Centre shall be called *. Its purpose is to provide a meeting place and entertainment for Senior Citizens living in * and immediately surrounding villages.
THE COMMITTEE	The Management Committee shall be called the * Management Committee - hereinafter referred to as the Management Committee.
OBJECTS OF THE COMMITTEE	<p>The Management Committee shall be responsible for the day to day running of the Centre and the promotion and regulation of its use by those eligible.</p> <p>Those eligible to use the Centre are all those of pensionable age and the disabled living in the villages referred to above.</p>
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	The Committee shall comprise of no more than 12 Members elected by those eligible to use the Centre (by invitation others not eligible to use the Centre may have their names put forward for election) at the Annual General Meeting.
SELECTION OF THE COMMITTEE	<p>The Annual General Meeting shall elect the Committee each year. Members elected shall serve for a period of one year and may allow their names to go forward for election for further periods of yearly service.</p> <p>The Management Committee shall have power by a two thirds majority vote to co-opt any person to serve on the Committee whom it feels would benefit its work. Co-opted members have no vote in Committee on policy decisions.</p>
THE CHAIRMAN	A Chairman shall be elected annually by the Committee from amongst its members. This election to take place at the AGM. The Chairman will serve for a period of one year. That person may stand for re-election for further yearly terms.
THE HONORARY SECRETARY	At the same first meeting of the Committee each year the Honorary Secretary shall be elected for a period of one year. He/she may stand for re-election for further yearly terms. The Secretary shall take minutes at the AGM and each Committee meeting and record them in a book provided for this purpose.
THE HONORARY TREASURER	The Honorary Treasurer shall be elected at the same meeting to serve for one year and shall keep a record

of all financial transactions pertaining to the Centre. The Honorary Treasurer shall be required to present to the Committee an audited Statement of Account in March which the Committee will put before the AGM for acceptance in April. The Honorary Treasurer may serve for further periods of yearly service.

RULES

1. The Committee shall meet as often as its business requires providing that there shall be at least one meeting each quarter.
2. The Honorary Secretary shall convene the meeting on the instruction of the Chairman by giving at least seven days clear notice to members.
3. A meeting may also be convened by request of at least six members of the Committee.
4. The Annual General Meeting shall be held in April each year and a report of the Centre's activities shall be presented by the Chairman to the AGM.
5. Any changes, amendments or additions to the Constitution can be made only at the AGM. Submissions in writing, duly proposed and seconded by those eligible to vote at the AGM, must be received by the Honorary Secretary at least six weeks before the date of the AGM. Any additions to or changes in the Constitution must be made in the form of a motion to the AGM and before being adopted must be passed by at least a two thirds voting majority of those attending the AGM.
6. Those eligible to vote at the AGM are all members of the Centre - that is all senior citizens and disabled persons living in the villages referred to in the Constitution.
7. The assets of the Committee shall be held for and used for the benefit of all senior citizens and disabled persons living in the above mentioned villages. Should all members of the Committee resign and no-one be elected to replace those members, then all the assets of the Committee shall be immediately transferred to the account of "Selby District Council".
8. In any matter of Policy and Use of the Centre decision rests with the Management Committee whose decision shall in all matters be final.
9. **VOTING AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

All elected members of the Committee shall have one vote each but co-opted members may only vote in non-policy matters. In the case of a tied vote the Chairman shall have a second or casting vote.

Appendix D

Community Centre usage (hours per week) in 2018/19

Commercial = paid regular rental income

Social = committee activities and other social events e.g. bingo, coffee mornings

H&W = promoting wellbeing in the community via clubs etc.

Council = being used by Council for Council business e.g. drop-ins and team meetings

Ad hoc = paid bookings over the year that are not regular

Centre	Commercial	Social	H&W	Council	Ad hoc (p.a.)
Ann Sharpe	28	8	0	0	4
Grove House	0	8.5	2	0.5	0
Coultish Centre	3	10	2h 45mins	1	7
Cunliffe Centre	22	11	3	0	5
Westfield Court	0	2.5	2	2	0
Lady Popplewell	2h 45mins	8	4	0	4
Harold Mills	0	4.5	1.5	0	0
Kelcbar	0	3.5	4	0	6
Rosemary House	0	8	0	0	20
Calcaria	1	9	3	3	0

Appendix E - Community Centres - Net Cost of Service

Account description	2017/18 Actual	2018/19 Actual	Notes
Income			
OTHER INCOME	-612	-160	
FEES & CHARGES	-81	0	
LAUNDRY INCOME	259	-441	
HIRE/LETTINGS - ROOMS	-12,953	-15,057	
Total Income	-13,387	-15,658	
Direct Costs			
GROSS PAY	34,764	30,667	Cleaning Staff Costs
NATIONAL INSURANCE EMPLOYERS	601	460	
SUPERANNUATION EMPLOYERS	4,729	4,603	
APPRENTICESHIP LEVY	163	136	
REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	10,383	12,843	
IMPROVEMENTS TO PROPERTY	15,309	9,009	
GAS	8,086	-1,617	
ELECTRICITY	38,655	26,553	
RENTS (EXPENDITURE)	8,652	8,566	Rent Charge for Warden occupied Units
NNDR	2,475	2,741	
WATER - METERED	16,820	13,389	
FIXTURE & FITTING R & M	6,181	2,894	
CLEANING MATERIALS	744	199	
WINDOW CLEANING	1,694	2,754	
CLOTHING & UNIFORMS	75	0	
GENERAL OFFICE EXPENSES	600	755	
CLIENT COSTS REFUSE COLLECTION	3,176	3,314	
PRIVATE CONTRACTORS - CONTRACT	413	374	
SUB-CONTRACTORS - RESPONSIVE	10,181	11,478	
TELEPHONES - OFFICE	11,138	15,876	
TELEPHONES - MOBILE	72	117	
MISCELLANEOUS	120	148	
GENERAL INSURANCES	61,048	49,430	
Total Direct Costs	236,080	194,687	
Net Position - Direct Costs & Income	222,693	179,029	
Support Services (Indirect Costs)			
OTHER CENTRAL DEPT. SUPPORT	65,080	65,080	Costs of Lifeline Team Managing Centres
Net Position - after Indirect costs	287,773	244,109	
Accounting Adjustments			
BACK FUNDED SUPERANN	8,630	8,683	
IAS 19 ADJUSTMENT	-4,729	-4,603	
DEPRECIATION	32,486	17,074	
REVALUATIONS		42,482	
Total Accounting Adjustments	36,387	63,636	
Net Cost of Service	324,160	307,744	