



To: Executive Councillor for Communities:  
Councillor Richard Johnson  
Report by: Head of Communities, Arts & Recreation  
Relevant scrutiny: Community Services Scrutiny Committee 8/10/2015  
Wards affected: ALL

## **Strategic review of community provision, and management arrangements for new community centres at Clay Farm and Storey's Field**

### **Key Decision**

---

#### **1. Executive summary**

This report outlines the proposed approach for a strategic review of community provision to ensure resources are targeted to meet existing and future needs. The review will consider facilities provided by the Council and others, also opportunity for collaboration and engagement with local people and other stakeholders. The report also considers requests by the outside bodies responsible for new community centres in growth sites for the City Council's involvement in management arrangements at Clay Farm and Storey's Field.

#### **2. Recommendations**

The Executive Councillor is recommended to:

2.1 Agree the approach to the review of community provision as outlined in sections 3.4 to 3.8 of the report.

2.2 Approve the proposed management arrangements for Storeys Field Community Centre insofar as they relate to Cambridge City Council and use of its resources.

2.3 Approve the proposed management arrangements for The Clay Farm Centre insofar as they relate to Cambridge City Council and use of its resources

2.4 Delegate any further decisions in respect of Council commitments to implementation of 2.2 and 2.3 to the Director of Customer and Community Services

### 3. Background

3.1 The Council owns eight community/neighbourhood centres.

- Five of these are managed directly (The Meadows, Buchan Street, Brown's Field, Ross Street, 82 Akeman Street)
- Three of the small neighbourhood centres are now directly managed by local groups (Trumpington Pavilion, 37 Lawrence Way and Nuns Way Pavilion).
- Four of the directly managed centres were built in areas of the city where social housing was expanded during the 70's and 80's. They are managed by staff who are skilled in community development The primary purpose is about supporting and helping local people and they provide and affordable space for groups to meet.

Costs of the Council-run centres are shown below (2014/15)

Centre	Discretionary Costs £	Income £	Net cost of centre £	Capital Depreciation £	Central Recharges £	Total cost to Council £
The Meadows	396,810	167,330	229,480	107,630	134,220	471,330
Browns Field	81,740	17,370	64,370	31,830	50,220	146,420
Buchan Street	72,200	25,080	47,120	17,810	95,650	160,580
Ross Street	31,730	24,030	7,700	1,140	18,560	27,400
82 Akeman Street	24,000	9,190	14,810	0	14,190	29,000
37 Lawrence Way*	5,690	0	5,690	0	13,390	19,080
Nuns Way Pavilion*	8,930	0	8,930	0	1,700	10,630
Trumpington Pavilion**	16,000	0	16,000	14,110	1,290	31,400
<b>Totals</b>	<b>637,100</b>	<b>243,000</b>	<b>394,100</b>	<b>172,520</b>	<b>329,220</b>	<b>895,840</b>

3.2 There are a range of other providers e.g. Arbury Community Centre, East Barnwell Centre in Abbey and church hall community facilities. There are new centres planned in areas of major growth, namely Clay Farm, Storey's Field and Darwin Green.

3.3 The Council is undertaking a review of Community Centres. This issue was last considered by members of Community Services Scrutiny Committee in March 2013, when the Executive Councillor for Community Wellbeing took a decision to retain an 'as is' approach between 2013-16, with savings taken of £100,000 over three years.

3.4 The review will involve an evidenced-based, strategic assessment of community provision. It will seek to achieve the following outcomes:

- Stronger communities (for example, inclusive, connected, resilient, vibrant, good places to live)
- Council resources are targeted to known need
- Savings – with a focus on reducing net cost by opportunity for further efficiency and generating increased revenue. This will involve discussion about the option of redirecting of resources.

3.5 The proposed scope of the work is as follows:

- City Council-run Centres.
- Community development resource/support for communities.
- Other Community facilities e.g. those run by churches, local groups and charities.
- Major growth sites.
- County Council libraries.
- The Council's Digital Transformation and Customer Access strategies.

3.6 A project team is being established with engagement from other stakeholders. The work programme will consider current provision, need, opportunity and future focus, and contain the following components:

- An audit of facility provision (to also support new s106<sup>1</sup> and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL<sup>2</sup>) requirements).
- An analysis undertaken with partners of community and population requirements in respect of a range of issues and services
- Anti-poverty strategy<sup>3</sup> (APS) priorities such as support for food banks and credit unions.
- Broader Council engagement with customers, particularly through the Digital Transformation Strategy.
- Consideration of opportunity for collaboration with Property Services and other stakeholders such as the County Library Service.

3.7 The work programme will have three phases:

#### **Phase One 2015/16 Auditing**

- Examination of the Council's centres i.e. profile of catchment, users, type of visits and financial analysis.
  - Aim: Feed into audit and inform decision making.
- Audit of all community facility provision in the city – where it is and capacity.
  - Aim: Establish areas of need.
  - Aim: Outline options for strategic investment.
- Further develop the 'Building Stronger Communities' approach with County Council and other agencies.
  - Aim: Establish opportunity for collaborative approaches.
- Establish management approaches for Clay Farm and Storeys Field, consider Darwin Green.

#### **Phase Two 2016/17 Planning/implementing**

- Consider options for future focus of The Meadows and opportunity for any redirection of resource from there; also any options for possible changes at other centres.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/developer-contributions>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/anti-poverty-strategy> <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy>

<sup>3</sup>

- Develop options appraisal longer term arrangements for the management of the Council's centres.
- Construction at Storeys Field and Clay Farm Centres is completed. Management arrangements in place so that the facilities can open as scheduled in October 2016.

### **Phase Three 2017/18 *Final implementation***

- Implement decision arising from options appraisal.

#### 3.8 Suggested decision making points:

October 2015	Scope of review.
January 2016	Management arrangements at Clay Farm & Storey's Field
July 2016	Strategic approach to investment.
January 2017	Options for future focus at The Meadows and redirection of resources/changes at other centres.
	Options Appraisal: future management arrangements of Council-run centres.

### **3.9 Management arrangements for Storeys Field Community Centre**

3.9.1 As part of the North West Cambridge development, a new community centre is being constructed and will be opened in October 2015. The Storey's Field Community Centre to be managed by a joint venture between the University of Cambridge and Cambridge City Council known as Storey's Field Community Trust (SFCT). The University of Cambridge and the Council each have a 50% stake in the company. Councillors Kevin Blencowe, Sian Reid and John Hipkin have been nominated by the City Council as Trustees. The University has agreed to meet the full cost of the joint venture company operations for the first 12 years after which the City Council will meet half the costs. Details of the SFCT and its meetings are available at this link: <http://www.nwcambridge.co.uk/vision/community-and-amenities/community-centre>

3.9.2 The SFCT recently considered a paper prepared by University and Council staff which outlined options for management arrangements of the centre. The Trustees concluded the optimum arrangement would be a combined approach between the University's estate management company (EMC) and the Council. This would see the EMC undertaking responsibility for maintenance, building cleaning etc, with the Council being asked to provide community development and centre management expertise.

3.9.3 Officers have discussed the principles of how the arrangement could work with colleagues from HR, Legal and Finance and will report back to the Storeys Field trust on 29th September 2015. Some of these principles are outlined below for information:

- The Council should aim to achieve full cost recovery from the arrangement.
- There will be a contractual relationship between SFCT and the Council. The contract fee will be subject to VAT.
- The Council staff will be responsible for the delivery of the community centre business plan, but the Council will not be responsible for any deficit.
- The contract will clearly outline roles and responsibilities of the various parties in particular the EMC.
- The Council will employ the centre management staff on permanent contracts and have responsibility for all employment matters.
- The SFCT will have input to the recruitment and performance management arrangements.
- A performance framework will be agreed and jointly monitored on a regular basis.
- The arrangement is intended to be short-term for example three to five years, after which time if the centre was to remain open but the SFCT decided upon an alternative management arrangement, TUPE would apply and the staff would transfer.
- SFCT will supply all IT and telephony arrangements, with remote access to Council systems for the centre staff.
- There is a query whether the staff would be covered by the Council's fidelity insurance or that of the SFCT. This will be followed up.
- The Council will retain the right to vary composition of the staff team.

3.9.4 The Council has submitted an indicative quote for services to the SFCT and this has been agreed in principle. It includes

- Salary costs and on costs
- Overhead and management costs
- Training costs
- It is assumed that all equipment, administrative and office costs are covered directly by SFCT.

3.9.5 There are minimal risks to the City Council in agreeing to this request. Financial costs are covered and there are benefits to local people in that the centre will have a genuinely outward looking and traditional community development approach

3.9.6 Subject to the in principle arrangements highlighted above being agreed, it is recommended that the Council agrees to supply management services if requested to do so.

### **3.10 Management arrangements for The Clay Farm Centre**

3.10.1 The Clay Farm Centre is being built in Hobson Square and will provide the focal hub for the Southern Fringe growth site. It will be the City's

largest multi-use centre and will include health provision, a library, cafe, police and social care touch down space, community hall, rooms and a youth facility. There will also be affordable housing above the centre managed by Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association (BPHA).

3.10.2 The City and County Councils have entered into a Collaboration Agreement (CA) to create a company limited by guarantee to manage, maintain and provide services to the centre. The company is called the Trumpington Centre Management Company Ltd. The centre will remain in the ownership of the City Council but is leased to the management company for a period of 250 years on a peppercorn rent.

3.10.3 The management company currently comprises three directors, with two nominated by the City Council and one by the county council. The current directors are City Councillors Richard Johnson and Richard Robertson, and County Councillor Barbara Ashwood. Details of the arrangement are available at this link:

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/mgOutsideBodyDetails.aspx?ID=409>

3.10.4 The management company sub lease the housing element on the third and fourth floors to BPHA, the second floor to the health partner for use as a GP surgery, and some office space on the first floor to the police for touch down space. The rest of the first floor will be community meeting and activity rooms with a reading area. The ground floor will include the library, community hall, large meeting and activity room, and a cafe. The management company may lease the cafe to a not for profit organisation or run it themselves.

3.10.5 The business plan for the community centre identifies an annual net subsidy requirement of £200,000. It is intended to cover all aspects of operational costs including staffing. The CA identifies that this will be met by the County and the City on a 40:60% ratio. This is based upon the respective capital inputs by the County and the City to the community centre. The City Council's contribution is £120,000 and this is factored into the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The CA highlights that these respective subsidy levels are capped for both parties.

3.10.6 Delivery is being managed by a project board led by the City Council and comprising partners including BPHA, the NHS, the County Council, and representatives of local residents (Trumpington Residents Association). The management company directors also attend the project board. The management company held their first meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2015. The agenda included an item on management options which had been prepared by Council officers and also highlighted a risk analysis of each. The options considered were:

- Direct management by the management company.

- Overall management by either the City Council or county council.
- Overall management by an external organisation following a procurement process.

3.10.7 The management company have now taken a decision to ask the City Council to manage the centre for an initial period. They are concerned about their capacity and the risk involved in taking on full operational responsibility themselves; they also recognise concern amongst stakeholders about entering into an arrangement with an external provider. They also believe that the City Council both has the necessary infrastructure in place and experience in managing community centres, and this would offer assurance and a good standard of service to both local people and stakeholders, certainly in the first years of the new development.

3.10.8 There are a number of risks to City Council if it agrees to this request:

- The cost to the authority may be greater than the subsidy available. The City and County Councils are currently under no obligation to contribute to this. The management company is unable to address any shortfall itself. Therefore the onus will be on all parties to manage the budget carefully to avoid any requirement for additional subsidy. Possible causes of this could be follows:
  - Income targets are not met (this is more likely in the first few years as the development surrounding the centre continues)
  - Greater levels of expenditure are incurred, for example on maintenance (this is less likely in year one due to retention clauses)
- Extraordinary and/or unanticipated events. In this scenario, the financial consequences would need to be addressed proportionally between the City and County Councils. Formal assurance is being sought from the County Council in this respect.
- There will be an impact on back-office, Communities, Arts and Recreation operations and management resources

3.10.9 There are a number of benefits to the City Council in agreeing to this request:

- It is the majority stakeholder and owns the building and land.
- It is in the City Council's interest for centre to open on time and be managed successfully for local people.
- The City Council has a great deal of experience in community centre management.
- Local people and stakeholders may be reassured that the council has the experience and expertise to make the centre a success.

3.10.10 As with SFCT, the arrangement is intended to be relatively short-term after which time if the centre was to remain open but the management

company decided upon an alternative management arrangement, TUPE would apply and the staff would transfer.

3.10.11 A full library function will be provided by the County via a service level agreement with the Centre. It will be important to agree an approach with the County Council so that library arrangements work in tandem with centre systems and ICT systems are designed to avoid a multiplicity of equipment. The City Council will directly manage all staff – including the library functions – to create an integrated and peripatetic workforce with a shared skill base to deliver all the centre functions. The County Council has agreed to provide support and advisory input to achieve this.

3.10.12 It is recommended that the Council agrees to any request from the management company to supply management services. The review of community provision will consider longer term options in dialogue with the management company, stakeholders and local people. In agreeing to this arrangement the City Council acknowledges the need to meet the requirements of the business plan and carefully manage income and expenditure. The County Council has been asked to provide an agreement in writing to this proposal.

## **4. Implications**

### **(a) Financial Implications**

- The review of community provision project will be carried out within existing resources.
- The proposal for management of Storey's Field community centre does not have any financial implications
- The proposal for the management of The Clay Farm Centre may result in additional financial implications but the budget will be carefully controlled to mitigate the risk.

### **(b) Staffing Implications**

- The review of community provision project has no staffing implications
- The proposal for management of Storey's Field community centre will create additional demand upon management and back-office functions
- The proposal for management of The Clay Farm Centre will create additional demand upon management and back-office functions as well as staffing arrangements and operations at other centres

### **(c) Equality and Poverty Implications**

- **Review of community provision.** An Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) will be carried out as part of the project management process.

- **Management of Storey's Field Trust and Clay Farm Centres – EQIAs** will be carried out as management arrangements and operational plans are developed

(d) **Environmental Implications**

There are no implications at this stage

(e) **Procurement**

Legal Services advise that the proposed contracts with SFCT and TCMC do not clearly fit within the model of the 2015 Procurement Regulations. It is believed any risk of challenge is low.

(f) **Consultation and communication**

- **Review of community provision.** A detailed consultation and communication plan will be drawn up as part of the project plan. In addition to the contact with community facilities planned as part of the audit, in this first stage, consultation with area committees and residents people (both locally and city-wide) will be held to inform need. Information will be distributed via the local press and social media and through local centres and community groups.
- **Management of Storey' Field community centre.** A community engagement plan will be drawn up in discussion with SFTC and local residents
- **Management of The Clay Farm Centre.** A community engagement plan has been drawn up and will be implemented between now and the opening of the centre so that local people have an opportunity to shape how the centre is managed.
- Officers will keep the **Executive Councillor and Scrutiny Committee members** informed and offer opportunity for input at relevant stages.

(g) **Community Safety:** There are no implications at this stage.

## 5. Background papers

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

## 6. Appendices None

## 7. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Debbie Kaye  
Author's Phone Number: 01223 - 458633  
Author's Email: [debbie.kaye@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:debbie.kaye@cambridge.gov.uk)