Review Title: **Bath and North East Somerset Council Community Asset Task and Finish Group Review**
Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel: **Resources Panel**
Panel Chair & Vice Chair: **Cllr John Bull & Cllr Manda Rigby**
Policy Development & Scrutiny Project Officer(s): **Donna Vercoe**
Supporting Service Officer(s): **Andy Thomas**

Process for Tracking PD&S Recommendations - <u>Guidance note for Cabinet Members</u>
The enclosed table lists all the recommendations arising from the above Policy Development & Scrutiny Review. Individual recommendations are referred to the relevant named Cabinet Members (or whole Cabinet in the case of a whole Cabinet referral) as listed in the '**Cabinet Member'** column of the table. In order to provide the PD&S Panel with a Cabinet response on each recommendation, the named Cabinet member (or whole Cabinet) is asked to complete the last 3 columns of the table as follows:

Decision Response
The Cabinet has the following options:
- **Accept** the Panel's recommendation
- **Reject** the Panel's recommendation
- **Defer** a decision on the recommendation because a response cannot be given at this time. This could be because the recommendation needs to be considered in light of a future Cabinet decision, imminent legislation, relevant strategy development or budget considerations, etc.

Implementation Date
- For 'Accept' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be implemented.
- For 'Defer' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be reconsidered.
- For 'Reject' decisions this is not applicable so write n/a

Rationale
Use this space to explain the rationale for your decision response and implementation date. For accepted recommendations, please give details of how they will be implemented.

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
The whole rationale behind the recommendations below is to ensure a 'light touch' approach from Council in accordance with the concept of asset transfer (i.e. passing over responsibility) and allowing the Localism to do its work. So apart from facilitation to set up of a Self Help Structure thereafter the initial costs of asset transfer should be offset in each case by the reduced cost of not having to manage the asset as closely in the future. On-going Officer involvement thereafter should only be associated with exceptional cases of misuse of assets, promotion of best practice generally and dealing with requests to carry out improvements – all of which should be only a proportion of the whole base and be able to absorbed into existing officer time.				
Recommendation 1: Develop a Community Building Value Index which brings together the following three elements**:** a) Financial return on an asset (annual commercial rent £) b) Community benefit (discount rating 0% no benefit to 100% maximum benefit) c) Measure of organisational sustainability (High, Medium, Low probability that organisation will existing in 1,3,5, over 25 years). *Financial Assessment*: *Absorbed within existing work level:* *This at its most basic level would require two officer day's work – ½ day meeting with Property and Local Partnerships and a rep from Resources. Then ½ day's work to test the index against 5 community asset projects and write up guidance notes with a representative from the Resources ONS panel.*	Cllr David Bellotti Cllr David Dixon	Accepted		

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
Recommendation 2: Encourage the use of flexible leases for community asset transfer projects rather than just long term leases for 25 years and over, these could be small leases of 3-6 months initially and once a project becomes established longer term leases of 6-10 years could be made available. ***Financial Assessment:*** ***Absorbed within existing work level:*** *As part of the Property Services lease negotiation/paperwork.*	Cllr David Bellotti Cllr David Dixon	Accepted		Note: So far everyone spoken to asked for as long a lease as possible but acknowledged the need for a short lease option
Recommendation 3: We suggest developing an Officer Group which brings together key representatives e.g. Property Services, Policy and Partnerships, Health and Safety, Business Continuity, to assess the feasibility of community asset proposals, similar to the way the existing Safety Advisory Group operates for events. ***Financial Assessment:*** ***Absorbed within existing work level:*** *Once a quarter – this meeting would probably require less time than the present model where everyone discusses cases in isolation.*	Cllr David Bellotti Cllr David Dixon	Accepted		Note: There are too many meetings already and in principle, this should be property led

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
Recommendation 4: The existing Resources Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel could receive a regular update on progress with Asset Transfers. ***Financial Assessment:*** *On the basis that the meeting takes place, there is no direct financial implication as can be met within existing service resources/budgets.*	Cllr David Bellotti Cllr David Dixon	Defer		Cllr Bellotti stated that he did not think the Panel was the right place to bring individual cases so wanted to amend the wording
Recommendation 5: Facilitate community asset projects with the creation of a self-help group. This would allow 'successful' community asset projects and newly established projects to share information and develop best practice. This could perhaps be done via the Run A Club (http://www.runaclub.com) website or similar The Council should work with existing community groups to develop an 'offer' for community asset groups by working with them to identify what support groups would most benefit from e.g. flexible leases, access to legal/health and safety advise or the opportunity to seek support from other groups. A suggested self-help system of regulation and support should include:	Cllr David Bellotti Cllr David Dixon	Accept		Cllr Bellotti stated that the development of best practice was key to this. Regarding the 'Financial Assessment', he reported that this would be considered in the context of the 2014/15 budget.

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
• Empowering volunteers and allowing them to share information and best practice (see recommendation 2) • Allowing the Council a light touch to ultimately ensure the proper use of public assets, efficiency savings for the Council, presenting advice and bringing in specialities • Avoiding large amounts of office time and money being required to micro manage such a diverse estate • Possibly instituting a voluntary quality standard based on self-inspection akin to the old Hallmark system ***Financial Assessment:*** ***This item would require an initial upfront investment of officer time – probably based in the Policy & Partnerships team.*** *An allocation of half a day a week for 6 weeks to:* • *Identify asset list and associated contact points from Property Services with additional information from various Policy & Partnership officers.* • *Establishing a Steering Group with 4 projects – one rep drawn from Somer Valley, Bath, Keynsham and Chew Valley. One pre-meeting to draft launch 'pitch' agenda, proposals, governance proposals, venue and launch date.*				

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
• *Preparations – send out invites, collate responses, book venue (suggest one of those involved in network as host).* • *Attend on the day – with a view to project taking on a life of its own.* *Thereafter, officer time would be based on interaction in the normal course of pursuing working objectives for teams across the Council.*				