

Appendix C – Alternative options received from staff and management responses

The Markhouse Centre	Management Response
<p>To use council venues that are vacant at present – Continue to run the service from Ferguson centre, which does not require a lot of work and only requires the personal care area to be sorted out and a few cosmetic issues which will not cost a lot. To minimise cost you can take the hoist from Mark House centre and transfer it over there. We also have Trumpington road, which is available and jubilee centre, from which we can run the service and safely do some community work, which we used to do pre-covid however we were told to stop.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to a vacant Council building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council’s wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented does not have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.</p> <p>The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required.</p> <p>Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.</p> <p>The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings.</p>

	<p>It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.</p> <p>Works that are required to buildings in public use are generally of a higher specification or standards and the cost to fit out is therefore higher.</p> <p>Trumpington Road – Similar to the Ferguson Centre, the building is not suitable as it requires substantial capital investment to get it up to standard.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Premises to be re-located to Ferguson Center and continue the service.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not</p>

	<p>recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented doesn't have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.</p> <p>The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required.</p> <p>Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.</p> <p>The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings. It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.</p> <p>Works that are required to buildings in public use are generally of a higher specification or standards and the cost to fit out is therefore higher.</p>
--	--

	<p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Markhouse centre to be re-located to Ferguson centre, as it was planned before covid?</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented doesn't have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.</p> <p>The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required.</p> <p>Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.</p>

	<p>The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings. It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.</p> <p>Works that are required to buildings in public use are generally of a higher specification or standards and the cost to fit out is therefore higher.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Why can't we use the Jubilee Centre for outreach team workers, to work in the community and be centre based?</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to the Jubilee Centre.</p> <p>Jubilee Centre – this building is vacant but is not appropriate as it is too small.</p> <p>This would require capital investment to bring it up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre.</p>

	<p>This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p>
<p>Markhouse Center services to continue by re-locating to a different building and offer our services outside waltham forest.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building and offer the service to residents from outside of Waltham Forest.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Relocation of service to alternate centre base e.g. Ferguson centre, Jubilee centre, Sidmouth house other available centre space, or even split service into two units centre spaces including staff and service users.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running</p>

costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.

For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented doesn't have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.

The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required.

Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.

The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings. It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.

Works that are required to buildings in public use are generally of a higher specification or standards and the cost to fit out is therefore higher.

	<p>Jubilee Centre – this building is vacant but is not appropriate as it is too small.</p> <p>Sidmouth house – this building is in use and occupied by the Dementia Hub. This building is not appropriate for residents with complex needs.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Utilise the Ferguson centre building (Not using the most recent 2022/23 plan to redesign the building with separate spoke building). The original plan for the Ferguson centre were to Add 2 to 3 new changing spaces that could accommodate the hoist and changing beds for service users with complex needs to have personal care in appropriate space with privacy and dignity.</p> <p>Repair to pathway for service uses entrance. Remove carpets in gangways for easy access for wheelchairs and friction less movement for service users with mobility needs.</p> <p>Plaster walls to avoid injury from exposed bricks. Paint and refresh the cosmetic look and some landscaping to bring the existing site up to a standard for use. The boiler within the building is in good working order. The building in ground floor, so there is no need for a lift. The space at the Ferguson centre will also accommodate the training and development team to continue to offer mandatory face to face training as is currently provided in the Markhouse Centre for all in house services within provider services, and continue to</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented doesn't have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.</p>

<p>work in partnership with OT, and outreach services to access a building for training. The existing fit for purpose equipment from Markhouse can be moved over, so there would be no need to spend funds on equipment or furniture.</p>	<p>The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required.</p> <p>Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.</p> <p>The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings. It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Can the service move over to Fergusson Centre. This service is very close to Mark House Centre and needs minimal work done to get it up to standard. Our service can easily run from there and access community facilities.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service</p>

	<p>such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented doesn't have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.</p> <p>The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required. Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.</p> <p>The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings. It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals'</p>
--	---

	<p>strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Find alternative venues to run the service from within the borough as there is no need to occupy a building as big as the current size to run services for 52 people with complex needs. Currently there are other vacant building in the borough that can be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Queen Elizabeth Jubilee Centre, Cathall Road. (Closed) - 313 Billet Road (Old site for Dementia Day services) - Chingford library building, Hall Lane. (Closed) In the north of the borough which resolves the issue of lack of service provision in that part of Waltham Forest. - Ellingham Rd centre – Council building leased to a third sector service for people with mild to moderate Learning disability. Building would be better used for councils in house service provision who support people with moderate to severe learning disabilities and have complex needs. - Trumpington Road, 130 Trumpington Road, E7. 	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council’s wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>Jubilee Centre – this building is vacant but is not appropriate as the service is too small.</p> <p>313 Billet Road – this building is in use and fully occupied.</p> <p>Chingford Library building, Hall Lane – this building is leased to Age UK.</p> <p>Ellingham Rd centre – this building is leased to Ellingham Employment Services Ltd.</p> <p>130 Trumpington Road – Similar to the Ferguson Centre, the building is not suitable as it requires substantial capital investment to get it up to standard.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council’s ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals’ strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve.</p>

	<p>As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Can you Transfer our service to Trumpington road, this is a building we are very familiar with as it used to be respite service which our service users used to access before that too was cut out, the building has many units and is large enough to accommodate the needs of our users and they can easily access the community from this location accessing libraries, parks, shopping centres and has a onsite car park. Office space available also for staff and management paperwork.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>Trumpington Road – Similar to the Ferguson Centre, the building is not suitable as it requires substantial capital investment to get it up to standard.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Can you transfer our service to Sidmouth House to share building with Dementia unit, to my understanding Dementia unit only run x2 days a week, the remaining days they do outreach. So therefore we could safely use the building on the days they are not using it, I am very familiar with this building as we used to use it, there is a lovely park next to it where after having tea we could take some</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not</p>

<p>service users out in the community and park, those who need building base can safely stay in the building with staff, furthermore it can be used as a hub where service users come after their session to have their lunch and personal care. We are all trained to use the manual hoist and we have two here at Mark House which we can take along, reducing cost for inserting ceiling hoist, however Sidmouth house used to have a personal care room and it would cost peanuts to take the ceiling hoist form Mark House and transfer it over to Sidmouth house. There are plenty of toilets there and one could be transformed into personal care room. Furthermore staff are fully trained to manage the building opening and closing etc which is something we used to do and there is already existing office space for management and staff.</p>	<p>considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>Sidmouth house – this building is in use and occupied by the Dementia Hub. This building is not appropriate for residents with complex needs.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Using Ferguson centre as an alternative Day Centre for our service users as planned in 2021. There is a need for minimum repairs to do in this building to bring up to useable standard e.g carpet removal and change it into flooring, adding personal care changing rooms and plastering brick work. Of which I know will not cost much as the TMC building boiler quote.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented doesn't have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as</p>

	<p>well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.</p> <p>The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required. Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.</p> <p>The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings. It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>In 6.2.5 the proposal re Ferguson centre as alternative venue was to have been a bespoke unit that needed an added extension built on to it making the cost much higher to financially deliver. This would not be needed as the existing Ferguson centre would</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p>

<p>suffice as a Day Centre for our users with minimum adaptations needed compared to the report in 2019. Hence limiting the cost to a more feasible place to run for the council.</p>	<p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented doesn't have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.</p> <p>The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required.</p> <p>Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.</p> <p>The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings. It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old</p>
---	---

	<p>boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council’s ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals’ strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Move to Ferguson centre which has been on the agenda for years, To get true costing for the work that needs doing (toilets need reconfigure, flooring and repainting)</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council’s wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>For the Ferguson Centre to be fit for use, it would need to be refurbished, the level of refurbishment would need to be determined however, the building as currently presented doesn’t have suitable insulation and needs works undertaken to the roof and windows as well as the internal changes required to make the space suitable for use by staff and service users.</p> <p>The space would require a new heating and cooling system and this would mean the installation of an ASHP, solar panels on the roof and MVHR. Insulation of the building would be required.</p>

	<p>Externally there is a significant fall at one side of the building and this would need levelling and landscaping in order to not present a hazard and make the external space useable.</p> <p>The Council is unable to remove equipment such as hoists from one building to use in another building, without reference to the manufacturer and installer. It would also require a structural engineer to inspect and report to ensure installation with suitable loadings. It does not represent value for money for the Council to undertake minor ad hoc repairs and not do other works required to bring an old building up to modern standards, making it fit for public use. For example installing a new heating system and not insulating the building is poor practice and would lead to potentially higher bills and running costs for the building. Managing and maintaining an old boiler is not a sustainable strategy and does not represent value for money.</p> <p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>Council has lots of Empty building available use one of those that is appropriate.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p>

	<p>This proposal does not support the Council's ambition for day opportunities, which is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.</p>
<p>The upstairs of the Mark House centre can be used for the Community Learning Disability teams office, for example, Physio, O.T., Psychologists, Speech Therapist, Social Workers and so on it can also continue to be used for training upstairs which is already ongoing and that way the council can be getting income from offering these services, merging the services together under one umbrella being in one building will be better and the investment will be worth it, additionally the building can be rented out over the weekend and evenings for private hire, which will bring in further income.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal for the service to share the building with other health and social care services.</p> <p>These services are already located within other buildings and it would not be appropriate for different client groups to share the space.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise.</p> <p>This would require service running costs to be funded and would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Person centred approach – The Council's ambition for day opportunities is that they should be tailored to individuals' strengths, aspirations, and the outcomes that they wish to achieve. As a building-based service, the Markhouse Centre is more constrained in how it can contribute to the person-centred approach and is less able to provide access to a broader range of community and leisure activities.

	<p>2) Quality of the building - Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. The poor condition of the building and its ongoing deterioration present significant challenges to continuing the provision of day opportunities from this location.</p> <p>3) Firm financial footing - As part of the Council's focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p>
<p>The Mark House centre can be merged with Other day services, or respite services in the sense of sharing the building, in order to generate and bring in more income, for example dementia team.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal for the service to share the building with other health and social care services.</p> <p>These services are already located within other buildings and it would not be appropriate for different client groups to share the space.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise</p> <p>This would require service running costs to be funded and would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>

<p>Invest In the Markhouse Center by continuing it services, the premises are big enough to share the space for a hubs for training, social workers,occupational therpists.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to invest in the building and share the space.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise.</p> <p>This would require service running costs to be funded and would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>Keep promoting and providing the service by keeping half of the building as a day center and invest by turn the other half into respite facility and offer a private service to services outside the borough.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to keep promoting and proviging the service and turn th eother half into a respite facility which could be offered to those outside of the borough.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise.</p> <p>This would require service running costs to be funded and would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>Make Markhouse into a big learning hub with multi hubs sharing the space and for LBWF to invest into making a respite unit, that can be rented out other services out the brough.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to make Markhouse into a learning hub or a respite unit.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey</p>

	<p>commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise.</p> <p>This would require service running costs to be funded and would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>Mark House centre, building can be rented out over the weekend to generate revenue/ongoing training which happens in the week can continue. They can use Mark house day centre as respite.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to use the building/site to generate income, including in the evening and at the weekend.</p> <p>Using the building to generate income would require significant capital investment to bring it up to the necessary standard for the service to continue to operate from there and to make changes to the building to ensure it is fit for purpose for a tenant/other services/organisations to use. This will need to include repairing the lift and a possible reconfiguring of the building to ensure separate access and to appropriately safeguard service users. This would also be dependent on the Council's ability to secure a tenant/other services/organisations who wish to make use of the space. The view of the property service is that it would be unlikely to find a tenant for the building. If a tenant could be secured, the rental income generated is likely to be insufficient to financially sustain the service.</p> <p>Renting out the building over the weekend and in the evening would generate additional management, security and operational costs.</p>
<p>All Learnings hubs under one premises with the Day centre services working and growing together</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to establish a learning hub for day services.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now</p>

	<p>requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise.</p> <p>This would require service running costs to be funded and would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>allowing the T M C to stay where it is and only make use of the ground floor. The service provision can be Community Day Services that provided community and building based activities, accessing leisure, creative art organisations or share the ground floor with other service/unit and allow upstairs for training and physiotherapy, speech, and language therapy unit. Maybe even generate some income from the use of the 1st floor.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal for the service to share the building with other health and social care services.</p> <p>These services are already located within other buildings and it would not be appropriate for different client groups to share the space.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise.</p> <p>This would require service running costs to be funded and would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposal to use the building/site to generate income, including in the evening and at the weekend.</p> <p>Using the building to generate income would require significant capital investment to bring it up to the necessary standard for the service to continue to operate from there and to make changes to the building to ensure it is fit for purpose for a tenant/other services/organisations to use. This will need to include repairing the lift and a possible reconfiguring of the building to ensure</p>

	<p>separate access and to appropriately safeguard service users.</p> <p>This would also be dependent on the Council's ability to secure a tenant/other services/organisations who wish to make use of the space. The view of the property service is that it would be unlikely to find a tenant for the building. If a tenant could be secured, the rental income generated is likely to be insufficient to financially sustain the service.</p> <p>Renting out the building over the weekend and in the evening would incur additional management, security and operational costs.</p>
<p>If you use the building for other purposes i.e. join with Community Learning disabilities team, then fixing the boiler will be cost effective in the long run and the maintenance of the building/boiler/facilities should have been ongoing every five years however this was not done. If work is done and maintained in the future costs will be minimised.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal for the service to share the building with other health and social care services.</p> <p>These services are already located within other buildings and it would not be appropriate for different client groups to share the space.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise.</p> <p>This would require service running costs to be funded and would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>To offer the service to other boroughs and offer a private services on the weekends.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to offer the service to residents from outside of Waltham Forest.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service</p>

	<p>such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposal to use the building/site to generate income, including in the evening and at the weekend.</p> <p>Using the building to generate income would require significant capital investment to bring it up to the necessary standard for the service to continue to operate from there and to make changes to the building to ensure it is fit for purpose for a tenant/other services/organisations to use. This will need to include repairing the lift and a possible reconfiguring of the building to ensure separate access and to appropriately safeguard service users. This would also be dependent on the Council's ability to secure a tenant/other services/organisations who wish to make use of the space. The view of the property service is that it would be unlikely to find a tenant for the building. If a tenant could be secured, the rental income generated is likely to be insufficient to financially sustain the service.</p> <p>Renting out the building over the weekend and in the evening would incur additional management, security and operational costs.</p>
<p>At present it is not feasible for service users to be out all day in the community, and they need a hub or somewhere to go to have personal care, medication and for those people who are autistic they cannot tolerate being in the community all day as they cannot manage certain environments which are noisy, they require their routine to be regular and feel safe, a person with autism cannot simply be told each and every day you will be going out here and</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to provide both a building based and community-based service from another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size</p>

<p>there this will be detrimental to the ongoing challenges autistic people face every day, in managing their emotions and this idea of community services alone will not work as the risk is too high, service users can become challenging in the community posing a risk for themselves and members of the public, a certain aspect of building based needs to be around for emergency situations and to give choice and control, additionally considering the weather, hot, cold, raining, snow and people with medical conditions including epilepsy.</p> <p>Service users who are in the community all day can get frustrated and have outbursts and this can lead to them having a really bad day and feel low, frustrated, upset and can go home feeling like this not having got the best out of their day and therefore being challenging at home, causing difficulty for their parents/carers many of whom are elderly and are very happy with the current day services being provided. We used to run as community day service, this was taken away from us and we have now been working as a building-based service, we can continue our community based/outreach work however still need a building base for safety reasons. i.e. Fergusson centre, Trumpington road which requires minimal work, hoist can be transferred from MH centre and other equipment can be moved over. Trumpington already has hosting facilities as it used to be a respite service.</p>	<p>and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. The poor condition of the building and its ongoing deterioration present significant challenges to continuing the provision of day opportunities from this location.</p> <p>As part of the Council's focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>This proposal would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>Offering a day centre based and community-based service to services user from LBWF and outside boroughs. We used provide joint partnership from other boroughs eg: Tower hamlets and London borough of Redbridge.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to provide both a building based and community-based service to Waltham Forest residents and residents from outside the borough from the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost</p>

	<p>inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. The poor condition of the building and its ongoing deterioration present significant challenges to continuing the provision of day opportunities from this location.</p> <p>As part of the Council’s focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>This proposal would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposal to provide a joint partnership with other boroughs.</p> <p>Most NEL boroughs do not operate in-house day services.</p>
<p>Change the service provision from being building based to both building and community to meet the needs of the service users who want a mixture of service provisions. This can be in a smaller building provision,(possibly be shared building with other services). This also ensures that if community-based sessions are cancelled, the service users still a safe place to be without having to be taken home or spend the time walking around shops in shopping centres.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to provide both a building based and community-based service from another building.</p> <p>This would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not support the Council’s wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey</p>

	<p>commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. The poor condition of the building and its ongoing deterioration present significant challenges to continuing the provision of day opportunities from this location.</p> <p>As part of the Council's focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>This proposal would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>Can LBWF continue with building base service for the service users. Investing and promoting the service by creating opportunities like a respite unit, shared spaces with other hubs and utilising the space / use car park space/ rent out at weekends to generate more revenue.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to continue to provide both a building based and create opportunities to generate revenue.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. The poor condition of the building and its ongoing deterioration present significant challenges to continuing the provision of day opportunities from this location.</p> <p>As part of the Council's focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better</p>

	<p>value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>Using the building to generate income would require significant capital investment to bring it up to the necessary standard for the service to continue to operate from there and to make changes to the building to ensure it is fit for purpose for a tenant/other services/organisations to use. This will need to include repairing the lift and a possible reconfiguring of the building to ensure separate access and to appropriately safeguard service users. This would also be dependent on the Council's ability to secure a tenant/other services/organisations who wish to make use of the space. The view of the property service is that it would be unlikely to find a tenant for the building. If a tenant could be secured, the rental income generated is likely to be insufficient to financially sustain the service.</p> <p>Renting out the building over the weekend and in the evening would incur additional management, security and operational costs.</p> <p>This proposal would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>Alternatively providing T M C with a smaller hub or remodelling the service at 247 with shared community space and day service. We can run community service for our service to allow us to meet our service user's needs.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to relocate the service to a smaller building or to remodel the current building with shared community space.</p> <p>Relocating the service to an alternative building would require substantial capital investment to bring an alternative building up to standard where they could host a service such as the Markhouse Centre. The buildings proposed are not considered to be appropriate to run the service due to their size and condition. This proposal would also incur continued running costs for the service to be funded. This proposal is not recommended as it does not</p>

	<p>support the Council's wider focus on ensuring a firm financial footing.</p> <p>Remodelling the current building would also require substantial capital investment. Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. The poor condition of the building and its ongoing deterioration present significant challenges to continuing the provision of day opportunities from this location.</p> <p>As part of the Council's focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>This proposal would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>Why can't we go back to Community Day Services that provided community based activities, accessing leisure, creative art organisations, adult education and voluntary sectors before they were amalgamated with Markhouse and Morely Centre.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to provide both a building based and community-based service.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. The poor condition of the building and its ongoing deterioration present significant</p>

	<p>challenges to continuing the provision of day opportunities from this location.</p> <p>As part of the Council's focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>This proposal would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>
<p>Reinvest in Markhouse that has been part of the community over 40 years, service user are happy and content using the building,</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to invest in the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. Council's firm financial footing.</p> <p>As part of the Council's focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p>
<p>Sell of part of the car park to reinvest into Markhouse.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to sell of part of the car park and invest in the Markhouse Centre.</p> <p>It would not be practical to sell off part of the car park whilst still retaining enough space for the centre to use.</p>

	<p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise.</p> <p>As part of the Council's focus on maintaining a firm financial footing, we recognise that there are several alternative services available within the borough and in neighbouring boroughs that offer better value for money for the Council compared to the running costs of the Markhouse Centre.</p>
<p>Invest in the service by turning it into a day centre and respite facility, for service users in waltham forest and outside</p>	<p>We have reviewed the proposal to invest in the building and create additional uses such as a respite facility which could be offered to those outside of the borough.</p> <p>Despite a substantial investment of £489,000 in 2016 to ensure the building met health and safety standards, a 2023 building survey commissioned by the council shows that the Markhouse Centre now requires over £1.267 million in additional investment to bring it up to an acceptable condition. Given the current rate of building cost inflation, these costs are likely to continue to rise. Additional work would be required to make the building suitable for respite and therefore this would cost additional money.</p> <p>This proposal would not resolve the three interrelated issues that the rationale for the proposed closure is based on (listed above).</p>