Public Document Pack

ADDITIONAL CIRCULATION



<u>To</u>: Councillor Cooney, <u>Convener</u>; Councillor Jean Morrison MBE and Graham, <u>Vice Convener</u>; and Councillors Allan, Corall, Cormie, Crockett, Delaney, Dickson, Jackie Dunbar, Finlayson, Flynn, Grant, Laing, Milne, Noble, Samarai, Thomson and Yuill.

Town House, ABERDEEN 21 August 2015

COMMUNITIES, HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

The undernoted items are circulated in connection with the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES, HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE** to be held here in the Town House on **THURSDAY, 27 AUGUST 2015 at 2.00 pm**.

FRASER BELL HEAD OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

BUSINESS

COMMUNITIES

9.4 <u>Disability Advisory Group - the Future – additional consultation response</u> (Pages 1 - 2)

Should you require any further information about this agenda, please contact Emma Parr, tel 01224 522607 or email emparr@aberdeencity.gov.uk



Response to Report on Future of DAG

The time scale for response is much too short. Thursday to the following Wednesday is ridiculous. As a user led organisation with many demands on the services we provide for highly vulnerable people we have only had time to produce this very basic response rather than the detailed proposals we would like to have been in a position to provide for consideration had that option been available.

Issues regarding the time scale for response:

Most groups only meet monthly.

Not everyone is electronically connected.

Report is too lengthy to explain / discuss by telephone.

Time scale does not allow for posting out copies.

Many people concerned have other commitments.

These commitments often include appointments regarding health issues.

Others have client contact commitments which must take priority.

Some people are actually on holiday.

The previous system had a number of problems which, if properly addressed, would have avoided the need for this re-organisation:

Failure of the City Council to consult DAG on relevant issues and to listen to their position on others e.g. wheelchair accessible taxis and 'café culture' changes causing frustration in members.

Matters raised by members not properly addressed and no follow up.

Minutes not always accurately reflecting discussion and discrepancies not addressed when raised.

On occasion a lack of respect for DAG members (who, as volunteers, give freely of their time and expertise) displayed by officers and elected members.

There are contradictions in the Report such as members being elected for 1 year with a possible extension to 2 while office bearers can be in post for 3.

From experience the Forum model would make it even less likely that any views expressed would be requested, respected or acted on.

Why Re-name or Re-brand when Disability Advisory Group clearly expresses the purpose and function very clearly?

There is no information included as to who the 'stakeholders' are or what format any discussion on the new format would take or the time scale involved let alone the commitment expected for such consideration. This is a lot to take on trust given the recent history.

This page is intentionally left blank