

DUAL PROVISION & JOINT USE SURVEY

ANALYSIS

Undertaken by P. D. Wright,
Recreation Assistant, Maidstone Borough Council

A Synopsis of Replies

Number of questionnaires sent to Local Authority Recreation Departments 62. Number of replies 62.
Number of questionnaires sent to Local Authority Education Departments 43. Number of replies 63.

63 replies were received from Local Authority Recreation Departments and 43 from Local Authority Education Departments. This represented a 46% response.

Approximately 75% of replies indicated that there was a management committee, and representation favoured the District Council in most cases; although 15% of replies stated that representation was equal from both sides.

1. Which Local Authorities are jointly involved in the Scheme?

The partners in nearly every Scheme were District and County Councils, although one or two schemes involved Community Councils, Parish Councils or Development Corporations.

2. Which Authority initiated and designed the Scheme?

County Councils	— 55% of replies
All parties involved	— 25% of replies
District Council	— 20% of replies

3. What proportion of capital cost did each Authority contribute to the Scheme?

This varied according to each local agreement, as was to be expected, although in most cases, the greater proportion of the capital cost was contributed by the District Council, or the costs were shared equally. The most usual proportion was approx. 60-40 with the District Council contributing the larger amount.

4. Is there a Management Committee on which both Local Authorities are represented?

Approx. 75% of replies indicated that there was a management committee, and representation favoured the District Council in most cases; although 15% of replies stated that representation was equal from both sides.

5. Which Authority is responsible for the programming of time and activities?

District Council	— 45%
Management Committee	— 35%
County Council	— 10%
No fixed rule	— 10%

6. What time is allocated to each Authority?

In virtually every case non-school use is committed to evenings and weekends.

7. Which Authority is responsible for the cleaning, caretaking and maintenance functions?

County Council	— 38%
District Council	— 25%
County Council (maintenance)] — 17%
District Council (cleaning and caretaking)	
Management Committee	— 10%
Any of the parties by agreement	— 10%

8. What day to day management problems are encountered?

Specific problems regularly encountered:

1. **Cleaning** — (i) arrangements difficult because of saturated use, e.g. limited time between end of school day and start of community use.

(ii) standards — school apparently content with lower standard than that required for public.

(iii) not direct responsibility of centre management.

(iv) reluctance of caretakers to do overtime or unsocial hours.

2. **Design of building** — often drawn to educational requirements with little consideration of community use, e.g. often much unnecessary space and lack of changing accommodation.

3. **Allocation of time** — once formally decided upon there appeared to be much inflexibility to change, and so once time is allocated to a school it is difficult to transfer it to community use, even though it is rarely taken up.

4. **Maintenance work** — long delays often experienced.

5. **Operation of licensed premises** — can create problems in school buildings.

6. **Allocation of equipment** — can be difficult on joint use basis.

7. **Communication channels** between partners in a scheme often poor.

8. **Petty vandalism** and lack of attention given to building and equipment especially during school time. The supervision of school facilities during community use has also been noted as a problem.

9. What are the benefits to your Authority of operating a dual provision/joint use Scheme?

The following views were frequently expressed:

1. **Economic** — (i) lower capital expenditure.

(ii) shared running costs.

2. **Maximum use of facility** — buildings used intensely day after day throughout the year.

10. What are the benefits to the public of operating a dual provision/joint use Scheme?

The following ideas were prevalent:

1. **Facility provided** on quite a large scale which otherwise might not exist.

2. **Intensity of use** — give better value for ratepayer and possibly lower charges.

3. **Community provision** —

(i) Direct response to local provisions, so that neighbourhood distribution can be facilitated.

(ii) focus for community interests.

(iii) rural areas able to have access to facilities, which previously concentrated in areas of high population because of heavy capital costs.

(iv) provides link between school and community for many children.

11. What, in your opinion, is essential for dual provision/joint use to be successful?

Opinion was almost unanimous upon the following points:

1. **Working relationship between partners vital** —

(i) good liaison between officers of both authorities essential.

(ii) mutual trust and regular consultation.

(iii) clearly defined areas of responsibility and policy.

(iv) full participation in the negotiation of heads of agreement by all parties.

2. **Planned approach** —

(i) local needs identified.

(ii) predetermined and agreed objectives.

(iii) consultation at every level regarding design, provision and allocation of time and space.

(iv) monitoring of use to allow flexibility and determine priority users.

3. **Commonsense Management** —

(i) essential that senior staff have appreciation of education and recreation priorities and requirements.

(ii) management appreciates potential difficulties and has flexible approach.

(iii) manager has full backing of Management Committee.

(iv) calibre of manager ultimately of prime importance.

4. **Concept of Community Facility** —

(i) should not view Scheme as merely an extension of the school.

(ii) must be adequate provision for casual public use—not just further education evenings.

(iii) a commitment by both sides to the concept.

A number of these points tend to overlap, but I have attempted, wherever possible, to group the responses together under these four main headings, which reflect the emphasis of comments in most replies.

12. Have you any additional comments you would like to offer on the management of dual provision/joint use schemes or on the concept in general?

Obviously, comments in this section varied enormously, although many replies stressed the need for total commitment; a 'give and take' attitude; and the need for a scheme to be established in response to identified needs, and not just to fulfil the aims of the concept. Almost inevitably, many recreation departments emphasised the need for the centre manager to be given complete independent control; whereas a number of education departments considered that school premises would be best made available through the education service.

One or two responses indicated that there was a need to reappraise the concept because the original aim of providing facilities in areas of need at a low cost was not being achieved. It was thus argued that it was better to have separate facilities and achieve one goal, rather than try to meet the demands of two separate functions and satisfy neither.

This somewhat negative attitude was countered by those wishing to see a community approach; although it was felt that more emphasis should now be given to expanding the role of existing schools, rather than consider totally new projects.

Reproduced by kind permission of Peter Wright.

If you wonder how to do a job, get started and wonder how you did it.