

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

Community Centres Assessment

A

Final Report

By

STRATEGIC LEISURE LIMITED

November 2005

CONTENTS

		PAGE
SECTION I	- INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT	01
SECTION II	- INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION	09
	- Background Context	
	- Current Indoor Provision	
	➤ Facility type, location and audit	
SECTION III	- INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – FUTURE PROVISION	19
	- The Need for Future Community Centre Provision	
	➤ Demand Modelling	
	➤ Community Consultation	
	➤ Key Stakeholder Consultation	
	➤ Identified Needs for Community Centre Provision in the City	
	- The Vision for the provision of Community Centre Facilities	
	- The Principles behind the Vision	
	- Local Standards for Provision	
SECTION IV	- KEY ISSUES WITH CURRENT PROVISION – DELIVERING THE VISION	38
	- Key Issues with Current Provision	
	- Delivering the Vision	

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1	- Facility Audit - OCC Community Centre Facilities
APPENDIX 2	- Facility Audit - Private Community Centres
APPENDIX 3	- Adult Learning Centres
APPENDIX 4	- OCC Community Centres - Photographs
APPENDIX 5	- Local Context
APPENDIX 6	- Demographic Profile
APPENDIX 7	- Questionnaire

MAPS

- MAP A** - All Indoor Facilities in Oxford (Indoor Sports Facilities, and (Community Centres)
- MAP B** - All Oxford City Council managed Community Centres
- MAP B1** - Catchment Areas for Community Centres in Oxford – 1km
- MAP B2** - Catchment Areas for Community Centres in Oxford –1.25km
- MAP C** - All privately managed Community Centres
- MAP D** - All Adult Education Centres in Oxford

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

Introduction

- 1.1 Strategic Leisure Limited (SLL) was appointed in September 2003 to undertake the development of a Strategy for future provision of community centres for Oxford. The Development of the strategy will address the requirements of PPG17.
- 1.2 During the course of the study, a number of issues arose which have impacted on the timescale for completion of the work eg Local Plan Inquiry. Also, the initial research highlighted a number of issues which have required additional work.
- 1.3 The Community Centre Strategy covers indoor community centre provision, in the public, commercial, and where possible voluntary sectors. The strategy aims to identify:
 - The current level, location and nature of provision
 - The need for facility provision – current and future
 - The type of facility provision required
 - The local standards for provision (qualitative and quantitative)
 - The community area served by the facilities
 - The Future Role of OCC in providing Community Centres
 - The issues to be addressed (facility provision and operational management) in relation to future community centre provision
- 1.4 With specific regard to community centre provision, OCC planners are aware of locally expressed demand for the following:
 - Demand for a new Community Centre in Marston
 - A replacement community centre for Jericho
 - An African Caribbean Centre
 - A Serbian Community Centre

The Local Context for Provision

Local Strategic Context

- 1.5 OCC is a one of five districts in Oxfordshire. It is located centrally in the county, about 50 miles north -west of London. Oxford is the main urban centre of Oxfordshire; a historic city with a modern service economy as well as a major manufacturing and academic centre. Over 5 million people come to the City per year, primarily to visit the University and bring in the region of £250m to the city's economy. The City has experienced rapid change over the past 30 years, moving from a university and manufacturing town to a new role as one of the largest employment centres in the South East.
- 1.6 A review of the local strategic context is provided below, with a focus on local strategic plans, their key priorities and objectives. It is important to ensure that local priorities of the Council and other key stakeholders are considered in assessing the adequacy of current provision and in making recommendations for the future.

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

Our Vision for Oxford: Building Pride in our City (Best Value Performance Plan 2003).

Improving the Council's performance

1.7 OCC aims to provide services that the people of Oxford can rely on, services that get things right the first time. OCC aims to be a council of which the city's residents can be proud. OCC believes that good services can only be delivered by staff who are motivated and appreciated. The Council will:

- restore and maintain financial stability
- bring all core services up to the standards of those provided by the best Councils over the next three years.

Working with others to develop and deliver shared goals

1.8 The Council, as the democratically elected body for Oxford, should play a more focused and creative role in the life of the city. The Council aims to do this by working more closely with the communities in our city and learning from them. They will:

- Improve the environments where we live and work
- Make Oxford a safer city
- Provide more affordable housing
- Create local prosperity and sustain full employment
- Improve transport and mobility
- Improve dialogue and consultation
- Provide more and improved affordable leisure activities.

Provide more and improved affordable leisure activities

1.9 Oxford offers a rich range of leisure activities, which can contribute to the health, and well-being of the city. The Council wants to increase this range and make them accessible to all of the people in Oxford at a reasonable price.

1.10 Over the last year the Council has:

- Invested almost a half million pounds in the Parks infrastructure and introduced new outdoor leisure facilities in parks across the city. More will be invested in the forthcoming year
- Made plans to invest in new facilities to bring their leisure centres up to the highest standards, including a £2.8 million upgrade in the Ferry Leisure Centre; this work was completed in early 2005.
- Confirmed its commitment to supporting the community centre management associations
- Made the City's open spaces available to properly organised events with mass appeal

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

- Begun to implement action plans resulting from the Best Value review of Community Buildings. The most significant of these is the recommendation to turn Oxford's Town Hall into a major cultural venue. OCC's challenges in the next year are to:
- Continue working with others to bring new leisure facilities to the City
- Encourage diversity of contemporary culture by supporting other organisations to provide the widest possible range of facilities, particularly for young people.

Demographics

- 1.11 Oxford City is 4,560 hectares in size. The 2001 census data identifies a population of 134,248 for Oxford City; the population density is 29.44 persons per Hectare. However, it is understood that due to some omissions in the census data, the final population figure has been calculated as 138,597; on the basis of this figure, the population density is 30.39 persons per hectare. The population figures are taken from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) although concern has been raised over the accuracy of the population figures within the City Council as it is believed that one ward has been excluded from the figures. For the purpose of this study the ONS figures have been used.

Population Profile

- 1.12 The Office of National Statistics (ONS) profile of the Oxford City population shows that the distribution across key age groups generally matches that of the national average. It is important to consider key differences in profile as some age groups have a higher propensity to participate in sport and active recreation than others (particularly young people). Key differences within Oxford City are:
- A much higher percentage of 16-19, 20-24 and 25-29 year olds. The City has the highest number of economically active students and the second highest number of economically inactive students in England and Wales
 - A lower than average population of people in the 0-4, 5-7, 8-9 10-14 and 45-59 age brackets.
 - 87% of the population are white; the next largest ethnic group is Asian or Asian British and comprises 4.8% of the total population. 3% of the population are of Chinese origins and the remaining groups are Afro Caribbean, African or other Black or mixed origin.

Population Growth

- 1.13 Predicting population growth, and subsequent future facility needs has been undertaken using data available from the Office of National Statistics (ONS). In 2001 the City had a population of 134, 248, this is expected to increase to 142,364 in 2003 and then drop slightly to 139,299 in 2011.

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

- 1.14 The age structure for the City is different from regional and national patterns in that it has a much higher population of 19-29 year olds who are mostly the student population within the City.
- 1.15 With the government's plans to increase the number of university students it is anticipated that there will be a sharp increase in the number of 18-25 year olds, residing in the city. This fits in with the Local Plan estimates of an increase of 4,820 extra students.
- 1.16 The South East Plan, produced by the South East England Regional Agency is set to comply with the government's wish that thousands of new homes are built in the areas. This would likely mean that there would be sections of new housing in the area which would have a knock on effect by increasing the population in the City.
- 1.17 The City also has a higher than regional or national average population from Black and Minority Communities making up 12.9% of the population compared to 8.7% in England and Wales. The City now has the third highest population of black and minority ethnic groups in the South East after Slough and Reading. The largest sub group is the South Asian Community who constitutes 4.82% of the population.

Households

- 1.18 The City has marked household population differences compared to regional and national averages for example a higher number of single person households, lower number of family households and higher all student households.
- 1.19 **Headington** and **Wolvercote** wards have high number of pensioner households. **Northfield Brook** has high numbers of households with families, especially lone parents. **St Clements** and **St Marys** have the largest numbers of all student households
- 1.20 The City has a much higher proportion of people living in the rented sector and a lower number of owner occupiers than the national and regional average. There is nearly double the national average of people renting in the private sector. In addition there are a relatively high number of shared households, including houses in multiple occupations. These are mainly located in the more central wards and those to the east of the City centre, where the majority of the private rented stock is located.
- 1.21 The majority of Council and social housing tenants are located on the larger peripheral estates namely **Blackbird Leys, Barton and Rose Hill**.
- 1.22 Approximately 16% of the population of Oxford live in Council owned accommodation, the National average for England and Wales is 13.2%. **Blackbird Leys** has 42% of the total Council tenants living on the estate.
- 1.23 **Blackbird Leys** falls within the worst 10% in England in terms of multiple deprivations according to the 2000 Index of Deprivation.

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

- 1.24 Oxford City has the highest number of properties with no bath, shower or toilet in the South- East (0.61%) whilst the national average for England and Wales is (0.16%).
- 1.25 As of March 2003 average house prices for the City were £200k with detached properties averaging £420k, terraced properties £175k and flat prices averaging £158k whilst the annual average wage is £27.5k.

Deprivation Index

- 1.26 Data from the 2000 Index of Local Deprivation shows that the City is especially deprived in terms of housing. The Index shows that there are 14 City wards in the worst twenty five percent in England and 7 in the worst ten percent.

Economy

- 1.27 The City is generally prosperous however there are pockets of poverty especially in the east and south east of the City. Annual earnings in the City are on average similar to the County figures; however they are less than the regional average.
- 1.28 In Blackbird Leys average income is below the regional average, whilst the higher incomes are concentrated in the central, west and north of the City.
- 1.29 There is generally a low unemployment rate for the City (1.9%, June 2003 is above the regional but below the national average). However parts of the City, notably those in the South and East, show above average levels at 4%, the differences in the two areas illustrate diverging levels of employment and unemployment in the City.
- 1.30 Approximately 23% of the population are registered as students, but this is expected to grow.
- 1.31 20.7% of the population are recorded as being economically inactive; this is primarily due to the large numbers of students within the City population. The national average is 4.7% for England and Wales.

Education

- 1.32 The City has higher qualification levels than the national average, but this varies greatly across the City e.g. in Blackbird Leys 8% of the people are educated to degree level, whereas in St Margaret's the figure is 61%. In Blackbird Leys over 45% of the people have no qualifications at all.
- 1.33 The highest number of people in the South East with a first degree as their highest qualification lives in Oxford City.
- 1.34 The University of Oxford is a major landowner in the City comprising of 39 colleges, 6 private halls and a student population of 16,500 in residence.

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

Car Ownership

- 1.35 Car ownership statistics must also be considered as this could affect ability to travel to community centres.
- 1.36 Car ownership varies between wards; with the exception of Cowley Marsh most wards with high numbers of households with no cars are in the central wards closest to the City Centre, (where there are no OCC community centres in two wards). Carfax (59.37%) and Holywell (54.09%) have the highest non-car ownership levels; they are also areas with the lowest household levels. There are no community centres at all in the Holywell ward, and no OCC community centres in the Carfax ward. The wards Jericho & Osney (42.04%), St Mary's (41.8%) and Blackbird Leys (40.98%) also have relatively high percentages of people with no vehicle; there are three community centres in the Jericho and Osney ward (2 OCC, and 1 private), 1 private community centre in St Marys ward, and three in Blackbird Leys ward (2 OCC and 1 private).
- 1.37 Travel patterns to work vary across the wards:
- St Margaret's ward has the highest % of people who work from home (14.9%)
 - Blackbird Leys has the highest % of people who use the bus
 - Northfield Brook has the highest % of people who drive
 - Holywell has the highest % of the population who walk
- 1.38 From the above analysis, **the key demographic factors which need to be acknowledged in future planning for community centre facility provision in the City are:**
- A lower than average population in the 4-14 and 45-59 age groups
 - the high % of ethnic minority residents in the City, who have specific cultural needs in relation to social and community centre provision
 - the few, but specific areas of deprivation in the City, where the provision of a community facility can be crucial for facilitating access to advice and support eg benefits, housing , and for promoting social interaction
 - the variance in the level of car ownership across the City, and specifically the reliance on public transport in the more deprived areas of Oxford

Local Planning Policy

- 1.39 The Second Draft Oxford Local Plan (SDOLP) 2001-2016, deposited February 2003, sets out relevant planning policies in respect of community centre facilities. *(Reference paragraph 11.1.3).*

Community Facilities

- 1.40 Community facilities such as community centres, halls and places of worship are important in meeting the social and religious needs of the community. Groups with different ethnic, cultural or social backgrounds may wish to have their own particular community facilities. *(Reference paragraph 11.7.1)*

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

- 1.41 OCC seeks to protect current facilities and secure suitable sites for additional facilities as the need arises, provided that they do not cause unacceptable nuisance in the local area.
- 1.42 Community centres provide a vital resource for social interaction in the community. Often they are the only available venue for many types of activity. Numerous community centres are provided by the City Council but there are also others, which are provided by religious and other bodies, which will also be protected.
(Reference paragraph 11.7.1A)
- 1.43 The City Council will seek a contribution towards either the provision of additional facilities, or the improvement of existing facilities, where residential developments are proposed in areas with a deficit in community facilities, or where the facilities are currently substandard, and the proposed development will increase the need for their provision.
(Reference paragraph 11.7.2)
- 1.44 Policy SR.14 of the Second Draft Oxford Local Plan (SDOLP) 2001-2016 states that planning permission will not be granted for development that would result in the loss of community facilities where there is a need for the facility to be retained in its current location. Planning permission will only be granted for the loss of community facilities where:
- It can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for the facility and the needs of the community can be equally well met at other facilities elsewhere; or
 - An equivalent replacement facility is to be provided at an equally accessible location.
- 1.45 In order for planning permission to be granted for new community facilities the site must be:
- Readily accessible to the relevant community by walking, cycling and public transport; and
 - In a location where significant problems of noise and disturbance to local residents can be prevented.
- 1.46 There is at present a shortage of community facilities in some parts of Oxford. Suitable sites have been allocated in Policy SR.14A of the Second Draft Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 for new facilities in these areas. These sites are:
- Canalside Land, Jericho;
 - Catacombs, Littlegate Street;
 - Cowley Marsh Depot Site, Marsh Road;
 - Diamond Place, Ferry Pool Car Park;
 - Donnington School Site, Cornwallis Road;
 - Dunnock Way Site, Blackbird Leys;
 - Land at Titup Hall Drive, Wood Farm;
 - Leiden Road, Wood Farm;

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

- OAC Factory Site, Woodstock Road; and
- Scout Hut, Marston Road, and/or another site in New Marston.

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

Community Centres

Background Context – Community Centres

- 2.1 Oxford appears to be well provided with Community Centres, as there is currently provision through the public (OCC) and commercial sectors across the City (totalling 52). OCC owns 23 Centres that are reasonably well distributed throughout the City. There are an additional 29 private community centres in the City. Apart from the Community Centres there are other organisations that make similar provision, e.g. church halls, university colleges (e.g. St Margarets Institute, managed by the Parochial Church Council of St Margaret's Church) and workplace based centres (e.g. Cowley Workers / Pressed Steel), plus the Adult Learning Centres. A full audit of community centre provision is included as Appendices 1 and 2. Adult Education Centres are detailed in Appendix 3.
- 2.2 Generally the OCC Community Centres are managed by voluntary management committees; they are all registered charities benefiting from substantial voluntary input. The Council, which could not provide the centres without voluntary support, acknowledges this input by providing Community Centres rent and rates free. Generally speaking, the Council is responsible for the maintenance of the fabric of the buildings, and Community Associations are responsible for the contents. The Council's Community Centres maintenance budget is overstretched.
- 2.3 Five of the 23 OCC Community Centres receive direct managerial input from the Council (the Asian Cultural Centre, Barton, Blackbird Leys, Jubilee and West Oxford). There are leases for the centres, which set out the division of responsibilities.
- 2.4 The Council undertook substantial improvements to Community Centres in 2003/4 in terms of Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) requirements to ensure that appropriate access for people with disabilities could be provided. These works were undertaken following a DDA audit of OCC assets in the City, which identified the required works to ensure the buildings meet DDA accessibility criteria.
- 2.5 The Community Centres are widely varied in size, range of activities, state of repair etc, and rely on the input of key individuals (often volunteers) who may be in short supply. The audit of the OCC and Private Community Centres was undertaken on a visual basis, from a user's perspective. Facilities were visited, and a grading (Excellent - Poor), allocated in relation to physical appearance and condition, extent of facilities, infrastructure provision eg car parking, external lighting etc. Excellent describes a facility in good physical condition, clean and well maintained, with car parking, external lighting, signage, and well cared for internal provision. Poor describes a facility which is in a poor state of physical repair, and is not well maintained, often in need of investment. Facilities graded as Poor tend to have none, or less infrastructure provision. See Appendices 1 and 2 for further details.
- 2.6 Oxford's Community Centres provide a diverse range of activities, though there are gaps in provision at certain centres. In particular, activities for young people have been raised as an issue through consultation. Many activities cater for members of

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

the Council's target groups, e.g. people on low incomes, and are accessible in terms of distance to their communities.

- 2.7 Some centres are under-used, whilst some are very well used. At any one time certain community centres are likely to be underused, relying as they do on key individuals and volunteers. However this does change over time and Council input can be very important in supporting programme development. The major improvement in the last year, Littlemore Community Centre (with the help of Sure Start) is an example of the potential of partnership working which may offer further opportunities for the future (perhaps with the Primary Care Trust). Oxford is also fortunate in having Community Centres generally as bases for Government promoted policies of empowering local communities
- 2.8 Eight Community Centres run bars. A bar can be a valuable source of income for a Community Centre; however, it can also be a source of problems.
- 2.9 Currently, OCC has one 'generic' community centre, the Asian Cultural Centre. There are plans for a further such centre, the African Caribbean Centre, and other groups have requested support for similar projects.
- 2.10 From consultation with OCC officers, there is a perception that some areas of the City certain areas are currently under provided for as identified in the Local Plan (summarised at 1.46). However, given the nature of community centre provision, and the way in which such facilities are used by local communities, it is difficult to identify specific areas of under or over provision, except where there are no community centre facilities at all (only two wards in the City Holywell and North. Rather, the opportunity for better, and more effective provision of community centre provision needs to be identified, through partnership, development of alternative provision, and improvement to key sites.
- 2.11 There is a continuing need to take opportunities to improve the existing community centre facilities, as has been achieved in recent years at West Oxford, Littlemore, Barton, Blackbird Leys, Asian Cultural Centre, Bullingdon, Cutteslowe, Donnington, Regal, Wood Farm, Jubilee and Cheney. Proposed new community centres at Jericho and Wood Farm, and an African Caribbean Centre will continue this process.
- 2.12 The OCC 2002/3 Best Value Review of Community Centres considered in depth the buildings and how they are used. Council policy on Community Centres is summarised in the recommendations that were agreed at the end of the Best Value Review.

1	A reassessment of community centre management resources to move towards the geographical management of centres to enable greater area support of community centres
2	The development of a strategic framework for community centres which will also coordinate any consultative and outreach work and the need for cross agency working
3	To carry out a major review of all community centre sites to look at the

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

	possibilities for redevelopment including redevelopment of the community facilities
4	Review the activities across the different community centres and consider best practice. Plan to develop new activities for community centres where possible that will be accessible to all sections of the community
5	Recognise the aspirations of different cultural communities and develop plans where possible to recognise these aspirations and work with different communities to realise them
6	The investigation of opportunities for working with partners to enable centres to become self-supporting, to address gaps in current provision and to ensure better use of existing facilities
7	The development of training modules, initially in specific problem areas, in partnership with agencies, for example, the Oxford Federation of Community Centres
8	To address the key issues of revenue and capital funding through the budget cycle
9	To re-evaluate the Disability Discrimination Work programme
10	To investigate further the possibility of recruiting an External Funding Officer, providing that the post is determined to be self-financing
11	To encourage community associations to develop business plans which can be reviewed by the associations on an annual basis

2.13 The distribution of community centres (public and private) across the City is as follows: The Community Centres identified in the Table 2.1 are also depicted in Maps A – C. Detailed audits of the centres are included in Appendices 1 and 2 respectively.

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

Table 2.1 - Private and OCC owned Community Centres by Committee Area

Committee Area	Ward	OCC Community Centres (see Appendix 1 for further details)	Private Community Centres (see Appendix 2 for further details)
Central, South and West Area	Jericho & Osney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jericho St. Barnabas Community Centre • West Oxford Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Oxford County Primary School
	Carfax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friends Meeting House (Religious Society of Friends) • Oxfordshire Association for Young People • St. Aldates Parish Centre • Corpus Christi College Community Centre
	Holywell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
	Hinksey Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Oxford Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Luke's Parish Hall • New Hinksey First School
		<i>3 Public Facilities</i>	<i>7 Private Facilities</i>
South/Cowley Area	Cowley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florence Park Community Centre • Cowley Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
	Cowley Marsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regal Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morris Motors Sports and Social Club
	Lye Valley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullingdon Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Francis Day Care Centre • Rover Sports and Social Club
		<i>4 Public Facilities</i>	<i>3 Private Facilities</i>
East Area	Iffley Fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donnington Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donnington Doorstep Family Centre • St. Albans Church Hall
	St. Mary's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Mary and John Church Hall
	St. Clement's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asian Cultural Centre • East Oxford Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Union Street Centre for Young People • Jack Howarth House
		<i>3 Public Facilities</i>	<i>5 Private Facilities</i>

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

Committee Area	Ward	OCC Community Centres (see Appendix 1 for further details)	Private Community Centres (see Appendix 2 for further details)
North Area	North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
	St. Margaret's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Oxford Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherwell Upper School • St. Margaret's Institute and Community Centre • St. Andrew's Parish Hall • St. Hugh's College
	Summertown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cutteslowe Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cutteslowe First School
	Wolvercote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolvercote British Legion
		<i>2 Public Facilities</i>	<i>6 Private Facilities</i>
North East Area	Barton and Sandhills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
	Churchill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheney Community Hall • Wood Farm Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
	Headington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Andrew's Parish Hall (Headington Parish Hall) • Lime Walk Church Hall
	Headington Hill and Northway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northway Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marston Royal British Legion
	Marston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mortimer Hall (Marston Village Hall) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oxrad Sports Centre
	Quarry and Risinghurst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risinghurst Community Centre • Headington Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headington Baptist Church Community Centre
		<i>7 Public Facilities</i>	<i>5 Private Facilities</i>
South East Area	Blackbird Leys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blackbird Leys Community Centre • Jubilee 77 Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cuddeston Corner Family Centre
	Littlemore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Littlemore Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

Committee Area	Ward	OCC Community Centres (see Appendix 1 for further details)	Private Community Centres (see Appendix 2 for further details)
	Northfield Brook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dovecote Centre • 26 Kingfisher Green (The Leys Residents Association)
	Rose Hill and Iffley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rose Hill Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
		<i>4 Public Facilities</i>	<i>3 Private Facilities</i>
		<i>23 OCC Facilities</i>	<i>29 Private Facilities</i>
Totals:		<i>52 public and private community centres across Oxford</i>	

N.B Adult Learning Centres – (see Appendix 3 for further details)

*Facilities highlighted in blue are existing buildings, but there is currently no identified community use of these facilities.

2.14 From the above audit, it is clear that there are:

- 7 wards in the City without OCC Community Centre provision Northfield Brook, Headington, Wolvercote, North, Holywell, St Marys and Carfax);
- of these 7 wards, 5 (Northfield Brook, Headington, Wolvercote, St Marys and Carfax, have private sector Community Centre provision.
- The two wards without any dedicated OCC or private community centre provision are Holywell Ward (Central, South and West area), and North Ward (North Area). This assessment is detailed in Table 2.2.

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

Table 2.2 Wards without OCC Community Centre Provision but with Private Sector Provision

Committee Area	Wards with no OCC Community Centre Provision	Wards with no OCC Community Centre Provision, but with Private Sector Provision
Central, South and West Area	Carfax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friends Meeting House (Religious Society of Friends) • Oxfordshire Association for Young People • St. Aldates Parish Centre • Corpus Christi College Community Centre
	Holywell	• NONE
East Area	St Mary's	• St. Mary and John Church Hall
North Area	North	• NONE
North East Area	Headington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Andrew's Parish Hall (Headington Parish Hall) • Lime Walk Church Hall
South East Area	Northfield Brook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dovecote Centre • 26 Kingfisher Green (The Leys Residents Association)

2.15 There are 7 wards in the City without any private sector Community Provision. However, of these 7 wards, 5 have OCC Community Centre Provision; this is detailed in Table 2.3 below.

Table 2.3 Wards without Private Sector Community Centre Provision but with OCC Provision

Committee Area	Wards with no Private Community Centre Provision	Wards with no Private Community Centre Provision, but with OCC Provision
Central, South and West Area	Holywell	• NONE
Cowley Area	Cowley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florence Park Community Centre • Cowley Community Centre
North Area	North	• NONE
North East Area	Barton and Sandhills	• Barton Community Centre
	Churchill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheney Community Hall • Wood Farm Community Centre
South East Area	Littlemore	• Littlemore Community Centre
	Rose Hill and Iffley	• Rose Hill Community Centre

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

Community Consultation

- 2.16 All identified private community centres were contacted through a postal survey, to ascertain the level and type of facility provided, key usage groups, and types of activities provided. There was an extremely poor response rate to the survey with 8 survey returns from a total of 29. This survey was supplemented by telephone calls, but this did not elicit any more information, as contacts could either not be reached, or did not return calls. The information collected is summarised below; a copy of the questionnaire used is included in the Appendices.
- 2.17 A postal survey was sent to 950 community groups in Oxford (September and October 2003), identified from OCC database information, to gain feedback to support the development of the Open Spaces, Playing Pitches and Indoor Facility Strategies for the City.
- 2.18 A total of 41 responses were received to this survey. In relation to existing community centre provision, the following information was collected:
- The most commonly used community centre is St Margaret's Institute (31% of respondents)
 - 41% of respondents stated that they used community centres in the City (these responses came from across 4 postcode areas)
 - Over 50% of the respondents stated that they did not use community centres in the City, as activities are not relevant
 - However, over 45% of the respondents also stated that they were able to satisfy their needs for community centre provision in Oxford, and used the facilities
 - Key reasons for not using existing community centre provision were cited as lack of awareness of facilities, and the lack of relevance of activities provided, and age
- 2.19 Given the poor response to the survey, it was repeated to a number of special cultural interest groups and organisations providing for older people, minority ethnic groups and those with a disability, in June and July 2005. A total of 40 surveys were sent out, and 11 were returned (27.5%). The feedback from these surveys is summarised below:
- The community centres used by the organisations / groups are:
 - East Oxford Community Centre
 - Cheney Community Centre
 - Lake Street Community Centre
 - North Oxford Community Centre
 - Asian Cultural Centre (3 groups use this facility)
 - Risinghurst Community Centre
 - Blackbird Leys Centre
 - Of the organisations / groups who gave reasons for using the community centres, four stated that they held meetings there. Other uses given were 'Activities', 'Dancing' and 'Language classes'

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

- Only the Indian Union and The Oxford Deaf Club gave reasons for not using their local community centre.
- The Indian Union stated that it was too expensive and that the activities were not relevant.
- The Oxford Deaf Club also thought the activities were not relevant and that there was ‘a communication problem for deaf people.’

2.20 The comments above demonstrate that the community centres are used for a range of activities, by different groups. It is also apparent that some centres are used more heavily than others. It appears that for some groups, the existing community centres do not always address specific cultural needs, and that there is a need to consider additional investment to facilitate access and use by those with a disability eg deaf loops in reception areas. Use of the existing community centres appears to be very local, and therefore the provision of accessible community centre facilities in all areas of the City is important. It would appear from the consultation feedback received that the needs of the various minority ethnic groups in the City can be met through existing provision. However, this may need to be considered on a more local basis, given the poor response received to the consultation, in response to specific requests received from community groups.

Key Stakeholder Consultation

2.21 Consultation with key stakeholders involved in the provision and development of community centre provision in the City identified the following priorities for the future:

- Implementing the existing programme of refurbishment and maintenance at centres across the City. £2m was committed over a two year period from 2003 to achieve the identified improvements. These improvements were identified by OCC in relation to the Community Centres managed by the City Council. (Improvements include general upgrading of facilities, addressing disability access, improving lighting etc)
- Developing the existing and future provision of community centres on the basis of a strategic network of local facilities, which provide ‘reasonable’ access to opportunities and activities for all
- Developing and implementing more focussed and local management of the facilities from a strategic perspective
- Optimising the links between indoor community centre and indoor sports facility provision in the City ie where possible, and practicable, providing facilities for both indoor sport and community centre provision on the same site
- Prioritising community centre provision in the areas of greatest need ie the two wards without any provision Holywell and North, and those wards where there is no OCC provision, to ensure accessibility to all
- The priority should be improving existing provision, before developing new community centres, except in the wards of Holywell and North, or developing operational partnerships with the private community centres, to ensure access is available for all

SECTION II – INDOOR COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT PROVISION

- Developing new community provision where needed, and particularly in relation to new housing developments, to provide for changing centres of population, but to recognise that the provision of additional facilities, may have an impact on existing provision
- Developing a better partnership with the existing, and any future private sector community centre provision, to ensure that all such facilities are part of, and contribute to, the overall strategic network of provision across the City
- Optimising the available capital and revenue funding that is available, both within OCC, and in conjunction with e.g. OCC grant aid to voluntary organisations (current funding available is £1.3m), and monies from Area Committees

SECTION III –COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

The Need for Future Community Centre Provision

Demand Modelling

- 3.1 Demand modelling for community centres cannot be undertaken in the same way as for indoor sports facilities, because of the diverse nature of both provision, and activities provided. The need for community centre provision is related more to identified OCC priorities for social inclusion, enhancement of local quality of life, and improvement in community facilities.

Local Standards for Provision

- 3.2 The development of Local Standards for community centre provision is challenging, because of the nature of the provision in question. Community Centres are used for a wide variety of reasons and activities, by the local community, and therefore standards cannot be applied or developed in the same way as for sports facilities, in relation to one type of activity.
- 3.3 The current standard of Community Centre provision is set out below; the existing level of provision, given the conclusions and recommendations of the Best Value Review 2002/2003, has been used as the basis for the development of the current standard. In comparison with some neighbouring authorities, the City of Oxford has a high level of community centre provision, (OCC and private), per head of population; however, the current levels of provision are not located equitably across the City.

Table 3.1

Current Standards of Community Centre Provision		
OCC Community Centres (Public Sector)	Number of Community Centres	23
	Population Oxford City Council	134,248
	Standard for provision of Public Community Centres per 1000 population	1:5,8364
Identified Private and OCC Community Centres	Total number of Community Centres	52
	Population Oxford City Council	134,248
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per 1000 population	1:2,582

- 3.4 There are a significant number of community centres in Oxford, both public and private, across the City. For the purposes of the local analysis, we have assessed the required standard for provision on the basis of both types of community provision; this is because of the varied nature of community centre facility provision, and the fact that each one is able to offer different activities and opportunities. The key factor is that they are local, and do provide a range of indoor space, for informal activity.

Catchment Area Analysis

- 3.5 Each of the local Committee Areas is now considered in more detail in relation to community centre provision.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

- 3.6 The overall level of Community Centre provision by Committee Area in the City is shown in Table 3.2 below. Where possible, each facility has been site audited, and assigned a quality rating from a user's perspective, on the basis of a visual inspection of the building, and the main areas of provision. The details of each facility are included in Appendices 1 and 2, together with a more detailed explanation of the quality ratings applied.

Table 3.2 Current Community Centre Provision by Community Area

Committee Area	OCC Community Centres	Private Community Centres	Total
North Area	2	6	8
North East Area	7	5	12
South/Cowley Area	4	3	7
South East Area	4	3	7
East Area	3	5	8
Central, South and West Area	3	7	10
Total	23	29	52

North Area Committee

Summary Description

- 3.7 The North Area is largely affluent, with high car ownership, and employment. The population of the wards is detailed below. The North Area is less densely populated than much of the rest of the City. This is especially true in Wolvercote, where the population is only 5642 at present. New housing is planned for this ward, and in Summertown and St Margarets wards.

Population Profile

Table 3.3

Ward	Population
North	5,467
St Margaret's	4,605
Summertown	7,041
Wolvercote	5,642
Total North Area Committee	22,755

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.4 North Area Committee Existing Community Centre Provision

Ward	OCC Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Private Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Total Facilities
North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	NONE
St Margarets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Oxford Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cherwell Upper School St. Margaret's Institute and Community Centre St. Andrew's Parish Hall St. Hugh's College 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average (facilities only available evenings and holiday time) Average Good Good (only available to public during vacation periods) 	1 OCC, 4 private
Summertown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cotteslowe Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cotteslowe First School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average (facilities only available evenings and holiday time) 	1 OCC, 1 private
Wolvercote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wolvercote British Legion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good 	1 private
TOTAL QUALITY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 AVERAGE 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 GOOD; 1 VERY GOOD 3 AVERAGE; 	8 (2 OCC Community Centres; 6 private community centres)

Details of the provision at each facility are shown in Appendices 1 and 2.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.5 Existing Standards of Provision North Area Committee (against current standards for Oxford City)

Current Standards of Community Centre Provision – North Area Committee		
OCC Community Centres (Public Sector)	Number of OCC Community Centres	2
	Population North Area Committee	22,755
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per overall Oxford City population	1:5,836
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per North Area population	1:11,377
Identified Private and OCC Community Centres	Number of Community Centres	8
	Population North Area Committee	22,755
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per Oxford City population	1:2,582
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per North Area population	1:2,844

3.8 **The standard for provision of OCC community centres in the North Area is lower than the current Citywide standard.** This assessment identifies the need for additional OCC community centre provision in the North Committee Area, if the City Council wished to address the current lower standard of provision. This needs to be considered in the light of the new residential developments planned for the area; particularly in Wolvercote, where there is currently no OCC community centre provision. The OCC community centres in St Margarets and Summertown have been rated as average; this means the only OCC community centres in this committee area are of average quality. Since the original assessment of the centres was undertaken however, the North Oxford Community Centre has been refurbished.

3.9 **The overall standard for provision of community centres in the North Area is approximately the same as the Citywide standard.** This results from the relatively high level of private sector provision in the North Area, with the exception of North ward, where there is neither OCC nor private sector community centre provision. The private sector community centre provision in Wolvercote is very good; this may go some way to addressing the poorer quality of the OCC provision in this ward. Critically, though, this will only provide for the local residents, if OCC has some influence over how the private centres are run, and the scope of the activities they provide, to ensure they complement the OCC community centre facilities.

North East Area Committee

3.10 Summary Description

The North East Area provides a major entry point to the City. The area contains both affluent and deprived wards, and as a result the population varies between those with cars and those without. There is a high density of social and Council housing in the Barton area; there is a high number of pensioners in this area of the City. Barton is part of an SRB area. 400 new houses are planned for the Barton area. The population of the wards is detailed below.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Population Profile

Table 3.6

Ward	Population
Barton and Sandhills	5,881
Churchill	6,075
Headington	5,619
Headington Hill & Northway	4,887
Marston	6,114
Quarry and Rissinghurst	5,978
Total North East Area Committee	34,554

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.7 **North East Area Committee** Existing Community Centre Provision

Ward	OCC Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Private Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Total Facilities
Barton and Sandhills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barton Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	1 OCC
Churchill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cheney Community Hall Wood Farm Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	2 OCC;
Headington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Andrew's Parish Hall (Headington Parish Hall) Lime Walk Church Hall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average Good 	2 private
Headington Hill and Northway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northway Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marston Royal British Legion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor 	1 OCC;1 private
Marston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mortimer Hall (Marston Village Hall) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oxsrads Sports Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good 	1 OCC;1 private
Quarry and Risinghurst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risinghurst Community Centre Headington Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average Below Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Headington Baptist Church Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently demolished; plans in place to rebuild on same site 	2 OCC;1 private
TOTAL QUALITY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 EXCELLENT; 2 GOOD; 2 AVERAGE; 1 BELOW AVERAGE 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 GOOD; 1 AVERAGE; 1 POOR 	11 (7 OCC Community Centres; 4 private community centres)

Details of the provision at each facility are shown in Appendices 1 and 2.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.8 Existing Standards of Provision North East Area Committee (against recommended standards for Oxford City)

Current Standards of Community Centre Provision – North East Area Committee		
OCC Community Centres (Public Sector)	Number of OCC Community Centres	7
	Population North East Area Committee	34,554
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per overall Oxford City population	1:5,836
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per North East Area population	1:4936
Identified Private and OCC Community Centres	Number of Community Centres	11
	Population North East Area Committee	34,554
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per Oxford City population	1:2,582
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per North East Area population	1:3,141

- 3.11 The standard for provision of OCC community centres in the North East Area is higher than the Citywide standard. The only ward in the area without any OCC community centre provision is Headington. All OCC community centres in the area are rated as average or above except one, and two of the centres are rated as excellent. Although this standard is higher than the current citywide standard, 300 new houses are planned for the Barton area; this increase in local population may require additional community centre provision (depending on the increase in people living in the area; based on current standards, the local population would need to increase by 5,000 approx, before an additional community centre is needed).
- 3.12 The overall standard for provision of community centres in the North East Area is below the Citywide standard as shown in the above table. This results from the relatively low level of private sector provision in the North East area. There is no private sector provision in the Barton and Sandhills and Churchill wards.

South/Cowley Area Committee

Summary Description

- 3.13 The South/Cowley Area is one of the smaller Community Areas in the City, geographically. There is very low car ownership in the Cowley Marsh ward; the area is similar to the North East Area, with a mix of more and less affluent areas.

Population Profile

Table 3.9

Ward	Population
Cowley	5,460
Cowley Marsh	4,886
Lye Valley	6,157
Total South/Cowley Area	16,503

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.10 **South/Cowley Committee** Existing Community Centre Provision

Ward	OCC Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Private Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Total Facilities
Cowley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florence Park Community Centre • Cowley Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average • Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	2 OCC
Cowley Marsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regal Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morris Motors Sports and Social Club 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor 	1 OCC, 1 private
Lye Valley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullingdon Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Francis Day Care Centre • Rover Sports and Social Club 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average • Poor 	1 OCC, 2 private
TOTAL QUALITY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 AVERAGE 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 POOR; 1 AVERAGE 	7 (4 OCC Community Centres; 3 private community centres)

Details of the provision at each facility are shown in Appendices 1 and 2.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.11 Existing Standards of Provision South/Cowley Area (against recommended standards for Oxford City)

Current Standards of Community Centre Provision – South/Cowley_Area Committee		
OCC Community Centres (Public Sector)	Number of OCC Community Centres	4
	Population South/Cowley_Area Committee	16,503
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per overall Oxford City population	1:5,836
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per South/Cowley_Area population	1:4,126
Identified Private and OCC Community Centres	Number of Community Centres	7
	Population South/Cowley_Committee	16,503
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per Oxford City population	1:2,582
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per South/Cowley_Area population	1:2,357

- 3.14 The standard for provision of Public Sector community centres in the South/Cowley Area is higher than the Citywide standard. Although there is OCC community centre provision in every ward all facilities have been rated as average. This is a factor the City Council may wish to address, given that there is very low car ownership in this area of the City, which means that people are more dependent on local facilities.
- 3.15 The overall standard for provision of community centres in the South/Cowley is above the citywide standard. This results from the relatively high level of private sector provision in the South/Cowley_Area, coupled with the fact that this is a small area, with a low population level. However, the facilities rated in the area are poor.

South East Area Committee

Summary Description

- 3.16 The South East Area includes areas of significant deprivation in Blackbird Leys, (in the top 10% of wards in the UK) and Rosehill; these wards have a very high proportion of people in Council and social housing; Blackbird Leys has a very low level of car ownership, the lowest average wage levels in the City, and an extremely low level of people with academic qualifications. Northfield Brook has a high percentage of lone parent families.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Population Profile

Table 3.12

Ward	Population
Blackbird Leys	5,803
Littlemore	5,653
Northfield Brook	6,,393
Rose Hill & Iffley	6025
Total South East Area Committee	23,874

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.13 **South East Area Committee** Existing Community Centre Provision

Ward	OCC Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Private Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Total Facilities
Blackbird Leys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blackbird Leys Community Centre Jubilee 77 Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cuddeston Corner Family Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average 	2 OCC; 1 private
Littlemore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Littlemore Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	1 OCC,
Northfield Brook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dovecote Centre 26 Kingfisher Green (The Leys Residents Association) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Good 	2 private
Rose Hill and Iffley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rose Hill Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	1 OCC
TOTAL FACILITY QUALITY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 EXCELLENT; 3 AVERAGE 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 GOOD; 1 AVERAGE 	7(4 OCC; 3 private)

Details of the provision at each facility are shown in Appendices 1 and 2.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.14 Existing Standards of Provision South East Area (against recommended standards for Oxford City)

Current Standards of Community Centre Provision – <u>South/ East Area</u> Committee		
OCC Community Centres (Public Sector)	Number of OCC Community Centres	4
	Population South East Area Committee	23,874
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per overall Oxford City population	1:5,836
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per South East Area population	1:5969
Identified Private and OCC Community Centres	Number of Community Centres	7
	Population South East Committee	23,874
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per Oxford City population	1:2,582
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per South East Area population	1:3411

- 3.17 The standard for provision of Public Sector community centres in the South East Area is approximately the same as the Citywide standard. However, there is no OCC community centre provision in the ward of Northfield Brook. Of the four OCC community centres, 1 is rated as excellent, while the rest are rated as average.
- 3.18 The overall standard for provision of community centres in the South East is lower than the Citywide standard. This results from the relatively low level of private sector provision in the South East Area. There is no private sector community centre provision in Rose Hill and Iffley, or in Littlemore wards, but one of the community centres has been rated as excellent.

East Area Committee

Summary Description

- 3.19 The East Area has a high population of students, and given its proximity to the City Centre, relatively low levels of car ownership. The East Area is the smallest geographical area in the City, and yet is densely populated.

Population Profile

Table 3.15

Ward	Population
Iffley Fields	5,215
St Clements	5,731
St Marys	5,040
Total East Area Committee	15,966

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.16 **East Area Committee** Existing Community Centre Provision

Ward	OCC Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Private Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Total Facilities
Iffley Fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donnington Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donnington Doorstep Family Centre St. Albans Church Hall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average Good 	1 OCC; 2 private
St. Mary's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Mary and John Church Hall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average (currently no community use) 	1 private,
St. Clement's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asian Cultural Centre East Oxford Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent Poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Union Street Centre for Young People Jack Howarth House 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Average (currently no community use) 	2 OCC; 2 private
TOTAL FACILITY QUALITY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 EXCELLENT; 1 GOOD; 1 POOR 		2 GOOD; 3 AVERAGE	8(3 OCC; 5 private)

Details of the provision at each facility are shown in Appendices 1 and 2.

SECTION III –COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.17 Existing Standards of Provision East Area Committee (against recommended standards for Oxford City)

Current Standards of Community Centre Provision – East Area Committee		
Public Sector	Number of OCC Community Centres	3
	Population East Area Committee	15,966
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per overall Oxford City population	1:5,836
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per East Area population	1:5,322
Identified Private and Public Sector	Number of Community Centres	8
	Population East Committee	15,966
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per Oxford City population	1:2,582
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per East Area population	1:1,996

- 3.20 The standard for provision of Public Sector community centres in the East Area is higher than the current Citywide standard. This assessment identifies that there may be some future need for additional OCC community centre provision in the East Committee Area, particularly in St Mary's, where there is no OCC community centre provision, and where the private community centre is poor, and currently unused.
- 3.21 The overall standard for provision of community centres in the East is higher than the Citywide standard. This results from the relatively high level of private sector provision in the East Area. There is private community centre provision in every ward in the area, but in both St Mary's, and St Clement's wards, there is private sector community provision which is currently unavailable for community use. If these two facilities are excluded from the standards calculations, the overall standard for this area would actually be below the Citywide standard. Given that there are actually two facilities in existence, it should be a priority to develop community use of them, in partnership with the private sector, before considering developing new provision in the area.

Central South & West Area Committee

Summary Description

- 3.22 The Central South and West area is based around the City Centre, and therefore there is relatively low car ownership in some of the wards e.g. Carfax, Jericho and Osney. A relatively large geographical area, the Central South and West area has a relatively low population.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Population Profile

Table 3.18

Ward	Population
Carfax	4,573
Hinksey Park	5,820
Holywell	4,313
Jericho & Osney	5,870
Total Central South & West Area Committee	20,576

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.19 **Central South & West Area Committee** Existing Community Centre Provision

Ward	OCC Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Private Community Centres	Facility Quality Rating (Building)	Total Facilities
Jericho & Osney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jericho St. Barnabas Community Centre West Oxford Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> West Oxford County Primary School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good 	2 OCC; 1 private
Carfax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Friends Meeting House (Religious Society of Friends) Oxfordshire Association for Young People St. Aldates Parish Centre Corpus Christi College Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very Good Operates from a bus Good Good 	4 private,
Holywell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	
Hinksey Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Oxford Community Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Luke's Parish Hall New Hinksey First School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor Average (currently no community use) 	1 OCC; 2 private
TOTAL FACILITY QUALITY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 EXCELLENT; 1 GOOD; 1 POOR 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 VERY GOOD; 3 GOOD; 1 AVERAGE; 1 POOR 	10(3 OCC; 7 private)

Details of the provision at each facility are shown in Appendices 1 and 2.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.20 Existing Standards of Provision Central South & West Area Committee (against recommended standards for Oxford City)

Current Standards of Community Centre Provision – Central South & West Area Committee		
Public Sector	Number of OCC Community Centres	3
	Population Central South & West Area Committee	20,576
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per overall Oxford City population	5,836
	Standard for provision of OCC Community Centres per Central South & West Area population	1:6859
Identified Private and Public Sector	Number of Community Centres	10
	Population South & West Committee	20,576
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per Oxford City population	2,582
	Standard for overall Community Centre provision per Central South & West Area population	1:2057

3.23 **The standard for provision of Public Sector community centres in the Central South & West Area is lower than the Citywide standard.** This assessment identifies the need for additional public sector community centre provision in the **Central South & West** Committee Area if the City Council wishes to address this currently low standard. Critically, many of the area's population are students, who do not necessarily live permanently in Oxford, and who may not choose to participate in community centre activities, given the overall range of facilities available to them. The quality of existing OCC community centre provision is generally above average in this area, with the exception of South Oxford Community Centre. Neither Carfax nor Holywell wards have any OCC community centre provision currently.

3.24 **The overall standard for provision of community centres in the Central South & West is higher than the Citywide standard.** This results from the high level of private sector provision in the **Central South & West** Area. **If the private facility at New Hinksey First School is excluded from the standards calculations, as it is unavailable for community use at present, then the overall standard of community centre provision for the area remains higher than the Citywide standard.** However, given that there is an existing facility at the school, it should be a priority to develop community use of the centre, in partnership with the school.

Quality

3.25 A summary of the current quality of community centre provision across the City is shown in Table 3.21.

SECTION III –COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Table 3.21

COMMITTEE AREA	OCC COMMUNITY CENTRES	PRIVATE CENTRES
North	2 average	1 very good; 2 good; 3 average
North East	2 excellent; 2 good; 2 average; 1 below average	2 good; 1 average; 1 poor
South/Cowley	4 average	1 average; 2 poor
East	1 excellent; 1 good; 1 average	2 good; 3 average
South East	1 excellent; 3 average	2 good; 1 average
Central, South and West	1 excellent; 1 good; 1 poor	1 very good; 3 good; 1 average; 1 poor
TOTAL	5 EXCELLENT; 4 GOOD; 12 AVERAGE; 1 BELOW AVERAGE; 1 POOR (23)	2 VERY GOOD; 11 GOOD; 9 AVERAGE; 3 POOR (24) (5 not rated – 1 operating from a bus; 3 information unavailable; 1 building demolished)

Summary of Analysis

Quantitative

- 3.26 From the local analysis, it is clear that Oxford has a significant number of community centres, although these facilities are not located within every ward. There are 7 wards without any OCC community centre provision; 5 of these wards are served by private sector community centres. There are more private community centres than those operated through OCC; where no OCC community centre exists in a ward, access to community centre facilities is totally dependent on the private organisation operating the facility.

Quality

- 3.27 The quality of the existing facilities may have an impact on levels of use. Of the existing OCC facilities, only 9 of the 23 were rated as above average. This demonstrates the need for ongoing maintenance and investment in the facilities, to improve their condition and general environment.
- 3.28 Of the 29 private sector facilities, nearly 50% were rated as above average (13 community centres).
- 3.29 OCC community centres in the North, and South/Cowley Committee areas were rated as average; Cowley/South is the only Committee area where the quality of all existing community centre facilities is average or below.

SECTION III – COMMUNITY CENTRES – CURRENT STANDARDS AND FUTURE NEED FOR THEIR PROVISION

Accessibility

- 3.30 In terms of accessibility standards, no specific comments were made about the distance, or time users of community centres were prepared to travel to access a facility.
- 3.31 Local community centres/halls provide valuable informal facilities at a local level, and should be accessible to the whole community, for both social and recreational activities. This access is however determined by the management and operating ethos of the individual facilities. On the basis that this type of provision should be locally accessible, and that communities will not use facilities, which are not in their locality, it is recommended that provision of community halls should be similar in principle to the accessibility standards recommended for local parks. This is particularly important in relation to new residential developments, which must be provided with appropriate community facilities, as part of developer contributions. Based on the average walking speed of 4 mph, there is potential to say that all communities should be able to access community halls/centres within 10 minutes-15 minutes walk from home i.e. 1.46 – 2.18km (0.91 – 1.36 miles). However, given that users of Community Centres vary considerably in terms of age eg older people to toddlers, and the fact that walking 10-15 minutes would mean very different things to such users, it is recommended that a distance of 1 km (0.6214 miles) is used as the standard, and that all communities should be able to access a community centre within 1 km from their home. This is illustrated in Map B1. In Map B2, the impact of requiring all communities to be able to access a community centre within 1.25 kms is illustrated. Both maps highlight the current lack of community centre provision in the central north area of Oxford.
- 3.32 There was only one comment made through the consultation about the cost of using a community centre being prohibitive. Given that so many of the community centres are operated privately, unless OCC negotiate a citywide arrangement over costs, there is always likely to be differences in the hire costs of the facilities. Critically, it is the fact that less than 50% of the existing community centres are operated by OCC that presents the greatest accessibility issue, given that OCC has no control or influence over how the private centres are operated.

SECTION IV – KEY ISSUES WITH CURRENT PROVISION

Community Centres – Key Issues

4.1 A number of key issues have been identified in relation to existing community centre provision. These are summarised below:

- Existing OCC community centres differ substantially in terms of quality, range of facilities, and the way in which they are managed; the privately managed community centres are also managed differently, and are not under the control of the City Council; it is the pricing and programming which are of particular concern, as these two factors may make private community centre provision inaccessible for some sectors of the community
- Many of the existing community centres require significant capital investment; although £2m has been invested in the last two years, there remains refurbishment and accessibility work to be addressed, to improve and maintain the fabric of the buildings, and to improve the facilities available for public use eg disability facility provision, improved car parking provision, better external lighting, refurbished indoor hall space
- There needs to be a clear prioritisation of the community centres the City wishes to support, to provide quality, sustainable facilities, meeting the needs of local people; this issue was raised in the Best Value Review of Community Centres, and the same recommendation was made then, to facilitate a more effective, and strategic service
- Future community centre provision also needs to respond to the demographic changes and trends in the City, to ensure it is both appropriate and sustainable
- The 'role' of the community centres also differs within the City; there is an opportunity to provide a more strategic approach to the facilities, to complement the indoor sports provision, within one strategic hierarchy. Some of the existing community centres just provide a space to meet and socialise, while others provide a wide range of leisure activities, for a range of groups. Identifying the optimum use for each facility will help to address this issue; for a truly citywide approach, this assessment will need to apply to both OCC and private community centres.
- There are many private community centres; it is difficult to identify much information about them, their users, and their operations, particularly since the Centres have not responded well to consultation surveys, and telephone calls. There is little current liaison over provision between the OCC provision, and that within the private sector.
- There are key areas within the City which appear to be better provided with community centres, eg the North East Committee Area and the Central, South and West Committee Area, than others; both these areas have a significant number of private sector community centres.

SECTION IV – KEY ISSUES WITH CURRENT PROVISION

- There are some areas of the City which lack OCC community centre provision e.g. the north/north west of the City, and central north east area (see Map B)
- There are two wards in the City with no community centre provision at all (North and Holywell wards)
- There may be an opportunity to link indoor, and outdoor sports provision, with community centre facilities, if new community centres are provided, to develop a network of local centres, providing core community facilities eg a community centre plus a multi-use games area, or a community centre incorporating a hall capable of accommodating one badminton court (the height of the hall will need to reflect this use of the indoor space)
- There is potential for other agency involvement through partnership work in the future development of OCC community centre provision eg Primary Care Trust,
- There is significant opportunity to further develop links with LIFT
- There are potential opportunities for integration and linking of other community facilities on the site to be developed at Temple Cowley, to provide a community centre, with associated facilities
- Jericho – there is a need to identify a site for a community centre as the current lease on the existing building expired in 2004, and the church which owns the building took it back at the expiry of the lease.
- There is a need to develop local standards of community centre facility provision, based on a hierarchy, which establishes the need for provision on the basis of 'reasonable access'.
- The role and remit of OCC sector community centre provision needs to be clearly established across the City, to ensure that there is consistency in facilities and service provided
- Equally, the role of the private community centres needs to be established, as these facilities form part of the overall strategic framework for provision in the City.

Identified Needs for Community Centre Provision in the City

4.2 From the review and consultation undertaken, the priority needs for future community centre provision in the City are:

- A commitment to resource OCC community centre provision adequately, in order that their potential for local use and involvement can be delivered
- The opportunity to develop/refurbish/consolidate provision where appropriate, and particularly where there is potential to create a number of community

SECTION IV – KEY ISSUES WITH CURRENT PROVISION

accessible facilities on one site, to ensure that facilities are of a high quality, and deliver the most effective management and operational options for provision

- Greater consistency in relation to operation and management of OCC community centres, even when facility delivery is dependent on volunteers
- Greater co-ordination between indoor sports facilities and community centre programming, to ensure opportunities are complementary, which will ensure optimum access for the greatest number of people
- An expansion in the role of community centres in relation to local sports development, supported by appropriate development resources, to encourage and facilitate increased participation in physical activity
- Clear recommendations for the operation of bars in community centres
- Increased support for the voluntary management committees in developing both the buildings, and the role of community centres
- More effective programming across the Community Centres

The Vision for the Future Provision of Community Centre Facilities

‘the development of a strategic network of quality, accessible, well-managed and affordable community centres, providing for identified local needs across a wide range of activities’

The Principles behind the Vision

4.3 The principles behind this Vision are:

- Strategic planning
- Meeting local need
- Affordable access (sustainability)
- Better quality
- Greater local focus
- Partnership

4.4 In order to achieve the Vision, and implement these principles the priorities for future community centre provision in the City, and the identified key issues will need to be addressed. The principles have been adopted because they will help guide and inform the decisions to be taken about future provision of community centres, whether new build, refurbishment, or consolidation.

4.5 **Planning strategically** across the City will mean that facilities are located where they are easily accessible, for the catchment area. It also means that the facilities will deliver co-ordinated activity programmes reflecting local needs, which are both affordable and accessible in terms of time, level, and type.

4.6 **Meeting local need** will mean that there is differentiation at each facility in terms of programme, and activities, and maybe opening times, but that facility quality,

SECTION IV – KEY ISSUES WITH CURRENT PROVISION

customer service, and opportunities for participation will be consistent across the City.

- 4.7 **Affordable access** means ensuring that the local community is able to participate in activities, through implementation of a targeted pricing policy, which subsidises those who most need support. It also means that some activities will need to be charged at a more commercial rate to subsidise both other activities, and local participation. Affordability applies to both the revenue costs of operating facilities, and the capital costs of building them. There is no point in investing in new or existing facilities in the City if the user demand is not there to sustain them.
- 4.8 **Better Quality** facilities will encourage increased use of the available facilities, and mean that they are available to a wider section of the community e.g. improved DDA access will open up opportunities for greater use by those with a disability.
- 4.9 **Greater Local Focus** community centre provision needs to be managed at a local level to ensure it responds to, and reflects the local needs and priorities. This approach, which is supported by OCC, is also likely to develop greater ownership of the facilities within a local community, which should, in turn, have a beneficial impact on levels and extent of facility usage.
- 4.10 **Partnership** is key for future facility provision, if OCC is to realise its Vision for strategically located facilities across the City. This is because OCC should not be the only direct provider of facilities for community use in Oxford; OCC should also enable, and facilitate, access to those provided through the commercial sector. Adopting this approach will enable OCC to focus on a number of quality facilities at local level, whilst other sectors contribute to the overall range and level of facilities in the City through complementary provision, for the benefit of local residents.

Delivering the Vision

- 4.11 It is recommended that to address the key issues with existing OCC community centre facilities, and the identified needs of the local community of Oxford, that the recommendations for future provision of community centre provision in the City are implemented. It is recognised that some of the recommendations will need further analysis in the light of ongoing developments/initiatives, which may affect the availability/viability of existing community centre facilities.
- 4.12 It is also recommended that the identified Citywide Standards for the provision of community centres are adopted. Individual standards of provision within each Area Committee should also be adopted, to support the local planning process, and facilitate the appropriate developer contributions across the City, in relation to new residential development, and indoor community centre provision.

Options for achieving the Vision

- 4.13 Initial options for achieving the identified Vision, and addressing the key issues and priorities identified are summarised below. These will require further analysis at the community catchment area level, before strategic recommendations are made.

SECTION IV – KEY ISSUES WITH CURRENT PROVISION

4.14 Potential options are:

- Consolidation of provision at the East Oxford site; there is potential to develop an improved facility, providing for both community centre facilities, and some local indoor community sports use
- Consolidation of provision between Hinksey Pools and the South Oxford Community Centre; given that the existing Community Centre is in a poor condition, the pools only operate on a seasonal basis, and there is a café on site, the potential to link all provision together as one building, with one management structure, which would be more effective than the three management structures currently on site
- Consolidation of provision of community centre and indoor sports facility provision in the south of the City e.g. Blackbird Leys; the successful Active England bid for the Blackbird Leys Sports Centre will result in the development of additional community facilities and services at the Centre; this may provide the opportunity for the community centre to become more integrated with the Sports Centre, so that all local community provision is in one place
- There may be an opportunity regarding the Wood Farm Community Centre; the school wish to take the Community Centre back, but alternative provision could be developed in partnership with the local PCT, adjacent to the existing site
- There is significant potential to develop improved outdoor sports provision at the Rosehill Community Centre
- Development of Bullingdon Community Centre; there is a need to provide additional youth centre facilities on this site, which could link the existing community centre facilities more effectively to the outdoor pitch provision
- New/enhanced community centre provision on the sites identified in the Local Plan
- Development of OCC community centre provision in those wards without existing facilities; Holywell and North wards are the priorities, followed by the other five wards which only have access to private sector community centre provision (these wards are also some of those with low car ownership, making access to local facilities even more important)
- Development of future standards of provision in each Committee Area which meet the identified Citywide standard for OCC provision

A Hierarchy of Provision

4.15 The hierarchy is based on the fact that community centre provision is of a local nature, and therefore its focus is on specific communities, rather than citywide provision. The only exceptions to this are the specific faith, or cultural types of provision.

Local

- Community Centres – provision of a wide range of community activities and opportunities, aimed at very local catchment area

SECTION IV – KEY ISSUES WITH CURRENT PROVISION

Recommendations for Action

- 4.16 The recommendations for future community centre provision in the City relate to both OCC and private sector facilities.
- The existing standards for the provision of community centres should be adopted as the minimum level of provision across the City
 - OCC initiates dialogue with the private sector community centre providers to discuss fees and charges at those private community centres which provide the only provision for a specific ward, to ensure accessibility is available to all
 - OCC identifies the adequate resources to address the investment requirements at the existing OCC community centres, including facilities for those with a disability (all community centres should comply with the DDA)
 - Seek to identify the resources to develop OCC Community Centres in Holywell and North wards as a priority; in addition, OCC provision should also be made in Northfield Brook, Headington, Wolvercote, St Marys, and Carfax wards
 - Housing developments in the Central, South and West Area, and the North Area, should be identified for developer contributions to new provision, given that these are the two areas which are below current OCC standards for community centre provision in the City
 - Opportunities for the development, extension and enhancement of existing community centres through partnership should be a priority, to provide higher quality community facilities for local use
 - Where possible, developer contributions should also be secured to enhance existing community centre provision
 - OCC should address the need for increased consistency in relation to operation and management of OCC community centres, even when facility delivery is dependent on volunteers
 - Ensure increased co-ordination between indoor sports facilities and community centre programming, to ensure opportunities are complementary, which will ensure optimum access for the greatest number of people
 - An expansion in the role of community centres in relation to local sports development, supported by appropriate development resources, to encourage and facilitate increased participation in physical activity
 - Develop clear recommendations for the operation of bars in community centres
 - Increase support for the voluntary management committees in developing both the buildings, and the role of community centres

DISCLAIMER

Forecasts and recommendations in any proposal, report or letter are made in good faith and on the basis of the information before the Company at the time. Their achievement must depend, among other things, on effective co-operation of the Client and the Client's staff. In consequence, no statement in any proposal, report or letter is to be deemed to be in any circumstances a representation, undertaking, warranty or contractual condition.