
REPORT TO:	COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE	AGENDA ITEM:	11
DATE OF MEETING:	18 TH JULY 2002	CATEGORY:	DELEGATED
REPORT FROM:	DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE	OPEN	
MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT:	CHRIS MASON 5794	DOC:	
SUBJECT:	JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	REF:e:\leisure\committe e reports\etwallsecond.d oc	
WARD(S) AFFECTED:	ETWALL, HATTON, HILTON, NORTH WEST, REPTON & WILINGTON	TERMS OF REFERENCE:CS08	

1.0 Recommendations

1.1 That, subject to the agreement of the County Council, two members of the Etwall Leisure Centre Community Group be co-opted, in a non-voting capacity, to the JMC.

2.0 Purpose of Report

2.1 To attempt to address the concerns of the Etwall Leisure Centre Community Group for greater involvement and better communication with the JMC.

2.2 The Etwall JMC, at their meeting on 15th July 2002 is also considering this report.

3.0 Executive Summary

3.1 During discussions with the Community Group, on the current situation regarding the provision of new facilities at Etwall, they expressed the view that they would welcome improved communication with the JMC. One of the ways in which this could be achieved is through the opportunity to send representatives to the JMC.

4.0 Detail

4.1 In the last cycle of meetings, this Committee, together with the JMC, considered a report on the current position regarding efforts to attract funding for new facilities at John Port School. This report was also considered at a recent meeting of the Etwall Leisure Centre Community Group. While the group was very disappointed with the main message of the report, they resolved to continue their commitment to the project.

4.2 An area they felt could be improved was the communication with other partners in the project. While the group has invested a great deal of their own time and effort in raising money, they felt themselves excluded from decisions taken about the Centre. These concerns applied to both the existing operation of the Centre and the delivery

of the project to provide new facilities.

4.3 To be worthwhile, it is suggested that representatives from the group be co-opted on a non-voting basis, but with the ability to speak and comment on issues being considered by the JMC.

4.4 In terms of procedure, although the 1974 Joint Agreement covering the management of the facility is silent on the co-option of representatives, local government legislation does permit the appointment of non-voting co-opted members to joint committees. The power to agree to such co-option lies with the appointing authorities (in this case the County and District Councils) although, if agreed, the actual appointments can be made by the JMC.

5.0 Financial Implications

5.1 None from this report

6.0 Corporate Implications

6.1 None from this report

7.0 Community Implications

7.1 Offering an opportunity for the Community Group to send 2 representatives to the JMC would be a positive example of encouraging greater community involvement in the management and development of important facilities. It will also emphasise to the group, at a difficult time for the project, how much their efforts are valued by other partners.

8.0 Conclusions

8.1 For the Community Group, the opportunity to send representatives to the JMC would partly address their concerns about inadequate communication between the JMC and themselves. In procedural terms the advice is that the JMC could co-opt representatives providing the County and District Council's are in agreement.

9.0 Background Papers

9.1 1974 Etwall Swimming Pool Management Joint Committee Agreement
1982 Agreement covering the management of the Squash Courts at John Port School