

**The Provision of Youth Services in the Borough of Gravesham.**

**A review by the Overview Scrutiny Committee**

**June 2007**

- |          |  |       |   |
|----------|--|-------|---|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Executive Summary</b>   | 1.4.5 | To encourage the inclusion of facilities for young people in new housing developments in the borough.   |
| 1.1      | The Overview Scrutiny Committee agreed to appoint a task group to undertake a review of the provision of youth services in Gravesham.  | 1.4.6 | To act on the findings of the 'Improving 2 Tier Youth provision' review   |
| 1.2      | The task group was chaired by Councillor Jane Cribbon, the other members being Councillors Valerie Ashenden, Malcolm Burgoyne, Colin Jupp and Brian Newell.  | 1.5   | The context in which the review was undertaken was the Children Act 2004 which placed a duty on both district councils and the county authority to improve services for children.   |
| 1.3      | The terms of reference for the review were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to review the services available to young people, taking account of recent survey data, with particular reference to recreational and health facilities;</li> <li>• to map current provision of services for young people and identify any gaps, especially in relation to accessibility and transport; and</li> <li>• to identify all appropriate communication channels to promote the availability of services to young people.</li> </ul> | 1.6   | Evidence gathering<br><br>Evidence gathering sessions were held with Patricia Jefford, Head of Public Health and Community Well Being, John Britt, manager of the Gr@nd, Paul Barron, KCC Acting Assistant Head of Youth Services, Kath Donald, Community Safety, Kim Hill, KCC Warden at Westcourt and members of Gravesham Youth Council. |
| 1.4      | Recommendations to cabinet are:  |       |   |
| 1.4.1    | To continue to press for more youth workers to be deployed in the borough  |       |   |
| 1.4.2    | To re-examine the role of the Youth Action Group in Gravesham  |       |   |
| 1.4.3    | To investigate ways to include all agencies in the exchange of information in support of the delivery of youth services.   |       |   |
| 1.4.4    | To fully involve young people in the design, location, content and planning of any new facilities in the borough.  |       |   |

## 2 Background

Children and Young People's block of the Kent LAA.

### 2.1 Every Child Matters

In 2003 the Government published a green paper called Every Child Matters. The green paper identified the five outcomes that are most important to children and young people.

- Be healthy
- Stay safe
- Enjoy and achieve
- Make a positive contribution
- Achieve economic well-being

Outcome 7 is "To improve participation and engagement by all children and young people in youth, cultural and community activities.

In July 2005 the Department of Education and Skills (DfES) published a paper "Youth Matters" which, in its executive summary, offered for consultation "a new strategy for providing opportunities, challenge and support to young people"

The consultation period ended in November 2005 and the DfES published the responses to the consultation in a document entitled "Youth Matters – next steps" (both these documents are available for download on [www.everychildmatters.gov.uk](http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk))

### 2.2 The Kent Local Area Agreement

The Kent Local Area Agreement (Kent LAA) is an agreement between the Kent Partnership (Kent County Council and the 12 District, Borough and City Councils) and the Government, which has identified 18 outcomes on which the local, regional and national partners have agreed to act together.

The 'Every Child Matters' agenda is supported by Outcome 7 of the

### 3. Outcome of review

#### 3.1 Funding

##### Expenditure by District

	13 to 19	Expenditure	Per Head
Ashford	9700	£ 629,588.27	£ 64.91
Gravesham	9200	£ 587,709.38	£ 63.88
Swale	12000	£ 645,884.95	£ 53.82
Shepway	8700	£ 452,794.32	£ 52.05
Dover	10200	£ 513,733.34	£ 50.37
Maidstone	12400	£ 606,722.02	£ 48.93
Dartford	8000	£ 341,422.50	£ 42.68
Thanet	11900	£ 486,145.44	£ 40.85
Canterbury	15200	£ 523,278.41	£ 34.43
Sevenoaks	9700	£ 334,241.75	£ 34.46
Tonbridge & Malling	10800	£ 343,666.33	£ 31.82
Tunbridge Wells	10000	£ 275,085.02	£ 27.51
KCC	127800	£ 5,740,271.73	£ 44.92

Source: Population Estimates Unit, Office for National Statistics (Crown Copyright)  
Supplied by KCC Analysis and Information Team

##### Notes:

Population figures have been derived from the 2005 Mid-Year Population Estimates  
Population estimates have been rounded to the nearest 100 in line with ONS guidelines

The money available from the Youth Opportunities Fund (YOF) and Youth Capital Fund (YCF) are apportioned as to how many young people there are in each area. Kent has £2.7m to cover both funds for two years.

See below the distribution in 2006/07 of the YCF and YOF funds distributed across the county and in Gravesham specifically. In Gravesham a panel made up of young people from all sections of the community considers the bids and allocates the money. The bidding process takes place 4 times a year. The next deadline for bids is August 2007.

#### YOUTH CAPITAL FUND

Dartford	10000
Gravesham	65000
T.Wells	36000
T & Malling	210000
C'bury	313500
Swale	12000
Dover	96150
Thanet	100000
Ashford	167500
Shepway	74500
Sevenoaks	12000
<b>Distributed to date</b>	<b>1096650</b>

Gravesham Skate Park	38000
Sea Cadets	12000
Jugnu Bhangra	15000

#### YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES FUND

Dartford	27521
Gravesham	44958
T.Wells	24440
T & Malling	28250
C'bury	41287
Swale	59388
Dover	32492
Thanet	43075
Ashford	29197
Shepway	31160
Sevenoaks	31252
Maidstone	19947
County	20750
<b>Distributed to date</b>	<b>433717</b>

Shout UK	3644
Sea Cadets	2600
Ifield School	5000
Saheili Writers	2000
Jugnu Bhangra	5000
Emmanual Baptist	5204
Connexions	5000
The GR@ND	4560
Cobham, Solestreet	3900
The GR@ND	3050
Stepping Stones	5000

The non statutory guidance on the distribution of these funds says:

“The YOF and YCF are ring fenced grants outside Local Area Agreements. However, they should be used with other youth funding to achieve the 5 Every Child Matters outcomes we want to see for all young people, including other related funds such as those provided through the Big Lottery Fund.

The conditions attached to the payment of funds are:

- Their use is to be determined by young people to provide activities and facilities;
- That appropriate support is given by young people, particularly those who are disadvantaged, involved in all levels of participation in YOF/YCF including setting up and running panels, training young people, completing paperwork and leading projects;
- That evidence is collected of how funds are being used by young people and the impact of the funds in providing facilities and activities for young people;
- Information on expenditure, activities and capital projects financed by the funds and the impact on provision is provided to the Government Office.

Each local authority will be expected to develop, in consultation with key stakeholders and young people within their area, arrangements for administering the YOF and YCF. Authorities will also need to publicise how all young people, particularly those who are disadvantaged, might access the fund and have in place open and transparent arrangements for setting out the allocation and decision making process.

YOF and YCF should have a particular focus on hard to reach young people, disadvantaged communities and community cohesion.”

### 3.2 Gravesham Borough Council

Leisure, Public Health and Community Safety had been brought together in one department headed by Patricia Jefford. The managers of the different services within the department work together on a variety of projects.

A superb working relationship had been established with KCC to deliver the Gr@nd Healthy Living Centre.

Among a number of initiatives that have arisen out of the Government paper “Every Child Matters” was a joint Dartford and Gravesham Youth Strategy 2007 – 2010, a “Childrens Consortium – youth sub group” and a Childrens Preventative Action Plan.

There was a lack of youth workers in Gravesham. This issue had been raised at the Youth and Community safety group and with the Head of Youth Services at KCC. To date no response had been forthcoming.

#### **Recommendation:**

**To continue to press for more youth workers to be deployed in the borough**

Some reservations were expressed about the Youth Action Group in Gravesham particularly its lack of influence on youth issues in the borough.

#### **Recommendation:**

**Re-examine the role of the Youth Action Group in Gravesham**

There is a lack of exchange of information between some agencies delivering and trying to deliver services to young people in the borough.

**Recommendation:**  
**Investigate means of including all agencies in the exchange of information in the support of the delivery of youth services.**

It was a generally held belief that the services provided needed to be broad and varied and not just sports based. Beat music, art, street drama, film making were all good tools to get individuals to think about other things. It gave more opportunity for dialogue and interaction with others. This view was backed up by members of Gravesham Youth Council.

Accessibility of services was also seen as a major issue. It was agreed that a focal point in a community was only part of the answer. The location of facilities for young people in church halls or schools can be factors that influence whether an individual or group will go there or not. There is a need for mobile services that can be set up more or less anywhere. Many of the young people had territorial issues about travelling to other estates and parts of the borough.

**Recommendation:**  
**Fully involve young people in the design, location, content and planning of any new facilities in the borough.**

Members of the youth council felt that rural areas like Higham, Vigo and Meopham were completely isolated.

There were large housing developments being undertaken in Gravesham but these didn't appear to include additional facilities for young people.

**Recommendation:**  
**Encourage the inclusion of facilities for young people in new housing developments in the borough.**

3.3 Other reviews of youth provision.

The Kent Improvement Partnership had provided funding for a project entitled "Improving 2 tier youth provision". The purpose of this project is to map the current scope and range of youth service provision, as defined under LAA outcome 7, in the 12 Districts in Kent and map them against the provision of service by KCC and voluntary sector funded initiatives.

From this a pilot will be identified between KCC and a district on ways to improve services to young people through a single point of access. It will form collaborations/partnerships that make it easier for youth to access the local provision from KCC, the local council and partnering agencies. The pilot to be agreed between KCC and a district by 31 May 2007

The pilot will then provide learning and good practice that can be adopted across youth provision in Kent.

The project will improve the delivery of services to local youth and improve the take up of youth support in the locality.

The project manager is Suzi Wakeham of Canterbury City Council. Colin Carmichael of Canterbury City Council is the lead Chief Executive and the project is being championed by

the Kent Community Development Managers Group.

A workshop to interpret and evaluate the findings from the initial phase of the pilot is to be held in December 2007. (The full project overview is reproduced at appendix 2)

**Recommendation**

**To act on the findings of the 'Improving 2 Tier Youth provision' review**



**Appendix 1****Notes on Evidence gathering Sessions**

Evidence gathering session on 2 April 2007

Kim Hill - KCC Warden at West Court

Kath Donald – Community Safety

The provision of youth services is targeted at areas with high levels of criminal damage and lower levels of other crime.

**Does KCC provide youth services in Westcourt?**

No, Kim had had no contact with youth workers in her area of Westcourt and Perry Street.

There is a detached workers team in Vigo on Monday, Cascades on Tuesday and Higham on Thursday and they have tried to get out into some of the urban areas but this has not been very successful.

The detached workers need to have considerable experience to engage with a youth population that brings with it a variety of issues and concerns.

There is a huge problem with recruitment and retention of youth workers due to the anti social hours.

Kim was in the process of starting up a youth club. It was to be based in a church hall but she was struggling for funding. The young people were going to establish the rules and decide what sort of activities they wanted and at what time.

It was essential that these clubs were locally based as many of the young people had territorial issues about travelling to other estates and parts of the borough.

Kath Donald felt that the services provided needed to be broad and varied and not just sports based. Beat music, art, street drama, film making were all good tools to get individuals to think about other things. It gave more opportunity for dialogue and interaction with others.

A typical programme that was just starting up was the 'Beat project'. This project had attracted urban funding of £7500 and offered 3 10 week courses on Wednesday evenings at a church hall and at the end of each 10 week period there was a showcase of the young people's achievements.

**When youngsters are out of school during the day, who picks up on that?**

The warden doesn't know who is excluded or who is truanting. There is no way of finding out. For those that are excluded there is alternative provision if only for one day a week at North West Kent College. However, this alternative provision doesn't appear to make much difference.

More vocational and alternative practical courses are required. Where this has been possible and thanks to a term of dedication from the tutors a change of behaviour has been seen in some students.

The members of the task group were somewhat surprised to hear that a full time course at North West Kent College was only 15 hours a week.

### **What partnership working is going on?**

Kim has been working with the police, housing, community safety, social services, Thamesview School and highways. These agencies need to sit round a table and discuss what the young people actually want.

An ideal opportunity presented itself for the Smile Centre to be developed into a centre where the neighbourhood policing PCs, police community support officers, the youth workers, the wardens and others could work out of. Unfortunately this building is owned by KCC and was surplus to their requirements. Various options had been examined as to how this building could have been made available for use by the local community but all came to nought and the building goes up for auction in May.

There appears to be a gap in provision for 7-11 year olds as they are too young to be part of the youth services and cannot be included in any activities if they have been excluded from school.

Kim said that she had members of the community, in her area, keen to work with young people.

There was a general perception that there was a lack of coordination between different departments and agencies.

Morning briefings take place between representatives from Community Safety and the police but this is more reactive and punitive rather than proactive and preventative.

**Evidence gathering session on 2 April 2007**

Patricia Jefford – Head of Public Health & Community Wellbeing  
Paul Barron – KCC Acting assistant head of youth services  
John Britt – Manager of the Gr@nd

Leisure, Public Health and Community Safety had been brought together in one department headed by Patricia Jefford. The managers of the different services within the department work together on a variety of projects.

A superb working relationship had been established with KCC to deliver the Gr@nd Healthy Living Centre.

Among a number of initiatives that have arisen out of the Government paper “Every Child Matters” was a joint Dartford and Gravesham Youth Strategy 2007 – 2010, a “Childrens Consortium – youth sub group” and a Childrens Preventative Action Plan. The government describes Every Child Matters as “.... a new approach to the well-being of children and young people from birth to age 19.” The document goes on to say “The Government's aim is for every child, whatever their background or their circumstances, to have the support they need to:

- Be healthy
- Stay safe
- Enjoy and achieve
- Make a positive contribution
- Achieve economic well-being “

(The full document is available to download from [www.everychildmatters.gov.uk](http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk))

Some reservations were expressed about the Youth Action Group in Gravesham. It seemed not to be delivering what it set out to deliver and lacked influence on youth issues in the borough. There was a lack of youth workers in the borough an issue that had been raised at the Youth and Community safety group and with the Head of Youth Services at KCC. To date no response had been forthcoming.

Westcourt is a focus area for the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP)

Kent County Council needs to find a way of getting KCC Wardens fully included in information exchange with other agencies.

John Britt gave a brief presentation (copy attached) that outlined some of the different types of services delivered out of the Gr@nd. The centre was externally funded to the tune of £400,000 per year. He said that the services they deliver are centred round identifiable, achievable outcomes.

The Gr@nd had 18,000 enquiries per year of which half were from young people under the age of 16

**How much was spent on Youth Services in Gravesham each year?**

£587,709 which was the 4<sup>th</sup> highest per district in Kent

There were 7 full time youth workers deployed in the borough.

There was no legislation to prevent the setting up of voluntary groups to provide support and facilities for young people in the community. When such a voluntary group was set up a KCC field officer should go along to introduce themselves and show what help and support was available to them. There is training available for part time youth workers.

### **The Children's University does it still exist? Gravesham used to help fund it**

It does still exist and is based at St Lukes Adult Education Centre, 9 Sittingbourne Road, Maidstone. It has a website at [www.kent.gov.uk/education-and-learning/adult-and-community/kent-children's-university](http://www.kent.gov.uk/education-and-learning/adult-and-community/kent-children's-university).

The website says that the "Kent Children's University provides informal educational courses for children, which take place out-of-school-hours. The scheme is open to children of all abilities who attend affiliated schools. We aim to promote life-long learning and improve motivation & self-confidence through enjoyable learning opportunities. The scheme is organised and promoted by Kent County Council through Kent Adult Education Services and has been operating in Kent since 1996".

Its objectives are:

- To raise attainment through informal learning opportunities
- To foster an enjoyment of learning for its own sake
- To improve confidence through recognising achievement

Where services for young people were provided one of their main concerns was access. Mr Barron said that even where a free bus service has been provided it wasn't used and as a consequence was withdrawn. This sort of experiment has to be persevered with they won't work in just a few months. There were also territorial issues whereby young people from one area won't travel to use facilities provided in another whether the travel is free or not.

It was agreed that a focal point in a community was only part of the answer. The location of facilities for young people in church halls or schools can be factors that influence whether an individual or group will go there or not. There is a need for mobile services that can be set up more or less anywhere. Under the 'schools for the future' banner new schools were to be a 'multi – functional' which meant community use being an integral part of their role.

Kent County Council youth services had to balance their resources between their universal services and their targeted work. They tried to assist groups working with excluded young people but it was not their core work.

Mr Barron said that there were two funding streams, the Youth Opportunity Fund (YOF) and the Youth Capital Fund (YCF)

**Evidence gathering session with Youth Council on 18 April 2007**

- Don't have enough Youth Centres
- Those there are don't stay open long enough. 10pm closing would be good. There should be plenty of things to do, well organised and not too expensive.
- £2.50 entry fee is too much. £1 per person, same price for everyone.
- Northfleet youth centre, nothing to do, not organised
- No cinema in Gravesend have to go to Bluewater
- Young people with nothing to do are more likely to get into trouble
- More facilities for skateboarding and BMX
- **Do you know what is going on?**

What activities there are for young people are not publicised widely enough. There are leaflets at the library but they are difficult to find as they are not very well sign posted. The details of the activities going on should be advertised in schools.

- **Would you stay on after school to do things?**

Not interested in staying after school to do things. Have been there all day and want to go home get changed and go somewhere else.

- The play equipment in parks is for the very young only.
- Most people don't know what young people are like. There is a lot of prejudice against young people. There are those who get into trouble and everyone else is tarred with the same brush. A lot of this is down to the media only reporting bad behaviour.
- There need to be activities other than sport. Such as drama, art and music. An artistic centre where people can express themselves. A graffiti wall
- Youth centres need to be places where young people can take ownership and do what they want.
- Transport is very expensive. Buses are old, unreliable and don't run on time. Trainee drivers often miss stops all together. When you ring up to complain they say "nothing we can do"
- Rural areas like Higham, Vigo and Meopham are completely isolated.
- A lot of houses are being built in Gravesham but no facilities for young people.
- Cascades run activities but for 4 days only. They need to be available for longer.
- Volunteers running activities need to be experienced in engaging young people and well trained.

**Appendix 2****Improving Two-Tier Youth Provision**

<b>Project Overview</b>	
What is the purpose of the Collaboration?	<p>The purpose of this project is to map the current scope and range of Youth service provision, as defined under LAA outcome 7, in the 12 Districts in Kent and map them against the provision of service by KCC and voluntary sector funded initiatives.</p> <p>From this a pilot will be identified between KCC and a District on ways to improve services to young people through a single point of access. It will form collaborations/partnerships that make it easier for youth to access the local provision from KCC, the local council and partnering agencies.</p> <p>The pilot will then provide learning and good practice that can be adopted across Youth provision in Kent.</p> <p>The project must work within current budgets and without diminishing the current service provision.</p>
How will this collaboration stretch or improve the delivery of services to each Council's residents?	The project will improve the delivery of services to local youth and improve the take up of youth support in the locality.
How will this collaboration move "improving" Councils to 2* and a positive direction of travel at their next CPA review?	<p>This will impact on measures of extension of localism and involvement in Local Area Agreements.</p> <p>It should impact on BVPIs in Leisure and Culture – potentially on BV170c and other young people activities from a community led base.</p> <p>It should impact on KLOEs related to positive direction of travel.</p>
What will be different when it is finished?	<p>A first piece of work will have scoped the opportunity for collaborative working in youth provision between Districts, KCC and partners. This does not currently exist at a county-wide level.</p> <p>The pilot will work through opportunities for joint working and share the learning and good practice across Districts and KCC.</p>
What are the top three tangible outcomes that will indicate the project has been completed?	<p>A better understanding of the KCC/District opportunities to work together</p> <p>The start of a set of collaborative projects to improve provision</p> <p>Collaboration on use of premises</p>
How will all 14 Councils benefit from the project?	The mapping and pilot exercises will provide baselines and good practice examples to make decisions on the local opportunities for improvement

How much funding is being provided and from what sources?	Up to £10,000 from Kent Improvement Partnership
What is the justification for the provision of the funding?	This project falls out of the CX and Leaders' two-tier improvement paper.
What other resource is involved in the project?	Officer time in supporting the mapping. Officer time in supporting the pilot work.
<b>Who is involved in the project</b>	
Which Officer Group is championing this project?	Kent Community Development Managers Group
Will a memorandum of understanding be completed between the Councils involved and signed off at a senior level?	Yes - covering an agreement to maintain the balance or responsibilities and funding that currently exists so that there is no reduction in service provision or attempts to transfer responsibility for services.
Who is the project manager?	The project Manager is Suzi Wakeham of Canterbury City Council. Colin Carmichael of Canterbury Council is the lead CX.
Who are the officers or consultants involved in undertaking the work? (This could be direct or peripheral involvement)	TBA
Who are the stakeholders in the success of the project?	The youth of Kent Community Development Portfolio Members Community Development Officers Kent County Council Youth Section Children's Consortia Chairs through the Kent Consortium Chairs
Who else will benefit from the project?	Other similar two-tier mapping and service sharing projects can learn from the project process and outcomes which will be published by the Kent Improvement Partnership.
Who is responsible in the Kent Improvement Partnership for monitoring the governance and success of this project?	Dominic Macdonald-Wallace
<b>What are the stages of the project?</b>	<b>What are the milestones and funding requirements for each stage?</b>
Appointment of Consultants to undertake mapping exercise.	By 19 <sup>th</sup> January 2007
Mapping of current service provision locally and by KCC	By 28 <sup>th</sup> February 2007
Use mapping exercise findings to identify a pilot project between a district and KCC	By 30 <sup>th</sup> April 2007
Set up agreement to pilot between KCC and a District	By 31 <sup>st</sup> May 2007
Workshop to interpret and evaluate pilot findings from initial phase of pilot	Dec 2007
Workshop to interpret and evaluate pilot findings from initial	TBA (dependent on pilot complexity)

phase of pilot and potential of roll-out in other Districts	
Please include a timeline of the stages and milestones on a separate sheet	
<b>What could go wrong?</b>	<b>How can we manage the risk?</b>
Data not available	Set out clearly what the data required is and check at outset if Councils feel it is available in accessible format
Lack of commitment in Councils to join mapping exercise	Agree at outset that not all Councils need to engage, but can share in the findings and pilot learning.
The project is more complex than first envisaged	Regular interim reports
KCC will use the project to achieve efficiencies	Ask for MOU which covers this
Districts use project to transfer service provision to County	Ask for MOU which covers this
<b>How will quality of delivery be assured during the project?</b>	
Consultants will file reports on progress of the mapping exercise, to the project manager on an agreed basis.	The reports will be fed into the Community Development Officers group for scrutiny and feedback.
The project managers in the two-tier pilot will file regular reports to the overall project manager.	The reports will be fed into the Community Development Officers group for scrutiny and feedback.
<b>What are the success criteria?</b>	
How will we know it is finished?	Mapping report is published Pilot is run Learning from pilot is disseminated through a workshop
What evaluation will be used at the end to measure success?	A cohort of users of the service will be surveyed, at the start and finish of the pilot, to assess if they recognise the service as being improved
How will the project be closed?	With the workshop delivery
How will the learning from the project be disseminated to all Councils?	Regular updates published in conjunction with KIEP
What evaluation will be used during the project to measure success?	Are milestones being met Are reports being filed to the project manager Are reports being shared with the Officer Group Are officer group recommendations being actioned
How will interim evaluation be reported to the Improvement Partnership?	Bi-monthly reports



### Appendix 3

Websites.

[www.everychildmatters.gov.uk](http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk)

The Princes Trust -

[www.princes-trust.org.uk](http://www.princes-trust.org.uk)

The National Council for Voluntary Youth Services (NCVYS) [www.ncvys.org.uk](http://www.ncvys.org.uk)

The National Youth Agency (NYA) - [www.nya.org.uk](http://www.nya.org.uk)

The Association of Principle Youth and Community Officers (APYCO) [www.apyco.org.uk](http://www.apyco.org.uk)

The National Association of Connexions Partners (NACP) - [www.nacp.co.uk](http://www.nacp.co.uk)

Additional reading

Creating Integrated Youth Support and Development - A joint statement from NYA, APYCO, NACP - [www.nya.org.uk](http://www.nya.org.uk)

The website [www.everychildmatters.gov.uk](http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk) has the original documents and additional information on the following:-

Every Child Matters – green paper published in 2003

Every Child Matters - next steps

Every Child Matters – Change for Children – November 2004

Youth Matters – Green paper (July 2005)

Youth Matters – next steps (March 2006)

Targeted Youth Support – a guide published in April 2007

Dartford and Gravesham Youth Strategy 2007-2010

Active Gravesham Strategy

Sports Development - GBC Overview Scrutiny Committee review October 2006

Tackling Obesity – Kent County Council NHS Overview and Scrutiny Joint Select Committee Review. December 2006 ([www.kent.gov.uk/publications/council-and-democracy/selcom-obesity](http://www.kent.gov.uk/publications/council-and-democracy/selcom-obesity))

Positive About Our Future – a multi agency plan for the whole of Kent, which sets out county wide priorities for Children and Young People

Local Strategic Partnerships: shaping their future – Response from the National Council for Voluntary Youth Services.

([www.ncvys.org.uk/docs/policy/consultation\\_responses](http://www.ncvys.org.uk/docs/policy/consultation_responses))

The Leader Survey

Local authority views on working with the Voluntary and Community Sector to deliver services for young people - January 2006 - ([www.princes-trust.org.uk](http://www.princes-trust.org.uk))

Make Space Youth Review - July 2007 - [www.makespace.org.uk](http://www.makespace.org.uk)