



Community Asset Transfer in Bristol

Report and Actions
from the
Overview Discussion
at the
Trinity Centre, 16th July 2013

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Historical context.....	3
Community Asset Transfer in Bristol.....	3
Policy context.....	4
Community Asset Transfer Process in Bristol.....	6
Current engagement with CAT in Bristol.....	6
Policy overview.....	6
Youth Links Community Assets Transfer overview.....	7
Questions, Responses & Actions.....	7
Plenary session.....	8
Focus group 1 – Response of existing groups to CAT.....	12
Focus group 2 – Response of groups new to CAT.....	13
APPENDIX I.....	14
List of attendees.....	14
APPENDIX II.....	15
The Community Buildings Federation.....	15

Introduction

On the 16th July 2013 the Community Buildings Federation (CBF) hosted an event that provided an opportunity for an overview of the Community Asset Transfer process in Bristol and the operation of the council's policy. Following concerns expressed at a recent Community Buildings Network meeting, where members identified CAT as a key issue, the Federation organised an information presentation and a Q&A session. John Bos (BCC Community Assets Manager) and Judy Preston (BCC Community Assets and Access Officer) attended the event to explain the council's CAT process and to respond to key questions.

Historical context

In 2004, Sir Michael Lyons' report for government "Well Placed to Deliver? – Shaping the Pattern of Government Service", highlighted the relationship between active community involvement and economic development. In early 2006 after nearly 10 years in power, the last government commissioned him again to conduct a review of local government in England, which in turn led to the white paper 'Strong and Prosperous Communities' in the autumn of that year. Following a sustained political lobbying process by the Development Trust Association and other related organisations, the paper argued for a commitment to 'examine how communities can play a bigger part by managing or owning community assets'. The Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) duly commissioned Barry Quirk, the chief executive of Lewisham Borough Council in London, to undertake a study of the problems and opportunities presented by the transfer of public sector property assets to community groups. His report, 'Making Assets Work', recommended that public authorities be supported to do more and work harder at making redundant assets available to community groups of all kinds.

Following the **Quirk Report**, the government signaled that it intended to press forward with the recommendations it contained and created the Asset Transfer Unit (ATU) jointly with the Development Trust Association (DTA – now incorporated into Locality). It also created the Community Assets Fund in 2007, which funded a series of pilot projects in the 10 regions of England. Since the last election, the incoming government has embraced CAT as part of its 'Localism' and 'Community Rights' agendas and continued to support the ATU.

Community Asset Transfer in Bristol

Bristol has had a number of pilot asset transfer projects over the last 20 years, most promoted under Labour administrations of the city. In 2004, BCC employed Pulse Regeneration to study the success of the existing projects and produce recommendations on the way forward. Its report said, 'To remove the view in the future that transfers are seen as concessions, value will need to be assigned and the transfer viewed as the Council achieving its priorities in relation to the Local Government Act 2000 duty of well being; if this were the case asset transfer would then be placed on a commercial footing and would fall under mainstream procurement'. The report also analysed a number of transfers that had already occurred (e.g. in Southville, Southmead, Easton, Spike Island) and recommended that the Council continue to pursue and refine its policy.

In recent years some further asset transfer projects have been taken forward. The last Labour administration drove through the granting of a long lease to St. Werburghs Community Association and opened discussions with the Malcolm X Centre and Brislington Community Association. The return of a Liberal Democrat administration in 2009, whilst producing a slowing of the asset transfer process, did result in the development and adoption of the council's Community Asset Transfer Policy in the summer of 2010. That policy has been continued by the current administration and is now three years old.

Policy context

The rationale behind CAT in Bristol was brought to public attention recently in Bristol by the council's decision to dispose of leasehold interests in a number of redundant youth centre premises across the city using the council's existing CAT policy and procedures. While the potential opportunities offered by the Bristol Youth Links process have stimulated significant interest among existing community building operator organisations in Bristol and other Third Sector Organisations (TSO's), the adoption of a CAT approach to the potentially contentious decision to close a number of youth centres to reduce costs, has also provoked questions about why the CAT process, previously so beset with compliance issues, is now being promoted so strongly as a solution to these buildings' futures and supported with dedicated officer time. The concern arising is that the Council's policy really has no hard underlying aims and has not been (and probably could not be) externally evaluated.

Although the policy itself contains no specific objectives or quantifiable outcomes, it lists a number of justifications for the Council's engagement with the CAT process. One of these assumed benefits, that a secure tenure of a building would bring advantages to a TSO in terms of financial stability, simultaneously notes that TSO's have access to sources of investment that the council, as a public sector organisation, does not. The other three justifications relate to assumptions that CAT could bring efficiencies and cost savings for the Council and 'directly' support devolved decision-making and local economic development.

In general, these arguments match the tone of those of central government and the national infrastructure organisations like Locality and the ATU, which have been contracted by the government to promote and support the national CAT policy. These tend to promote CAT as a powerful means of 'empowering communities' which also has benefits for public bodies in terms of 'efficiencies' and cost savings. Their justifications seem to have lost sight of Barry Quirk's original emphasis however, which was much more concerned with the benefits of partnership working between the public and third sectors in delivering public services. He foresaw that CAT would essentially form the basis for a 'deal' between local authorities and TSO's in which councils would provide premises (aka 'assets') as their share of a joint investment, and TSO's would provide services, underpinned by strengthened balance sheets, as their share of a joint investment - in projects aimed at improving public services.

Clearly, achieving Quirk's ambitions would require a level of joint working and strategy-making that has rarely been achieved in relation to CAT processes, certainly not in Bristol. The Council's lack of SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound) objectives for its policy and the absence of any clear strategy for the support and development of the community buildings sector to underpin it, seems to have left many TSO's wondering what CAT is really for, how best to engage with it and why they would want to commit large amounts of scarce time and resources into what some perceive as a risk transfer rather than an asset transfer process. Several groups at the Community Buildings Federation Community Asset Transfer meeting referred to the scheme as "community liability transfer".

The CBF has a clear view on this conundrum. Much of the community buildings sector in Bristol faces major problems of under-investment, dilapidated infrastructure, failing business models and low capacity, but it also offers huge opportunities for joint working with public bodies in the way that Quirk foresaw, to rationalise and network good public services, to invigorate neighbourhoods, to transform the quality of life for communities and to drive public engagement in local development and sustainable living. To grasp these opportunities all the stakeholders need to engage in the creation of a long-term vision and commit to a long-term strategy with measurable objectives. The Asset Transfer Unit's own guide to CAT, 'Strategic Fit', stated that "collaboration is vital – rather than councils being dominant – and both councils

and community groups must familiarise themselves with each others' perspectives". This familiarisation between both parties is an area in which the CBF could play, and is set up to play, a pivotal role in.

Little objective evaluation of CAT processes appears to be publicly available, but the evaluation of the Welsh Assembly Government's programme published two years ago by Rocket Science provides some interesting conclusions and recommendations relevant to the Bristol situation. Among these was the advice that the lead authority (in that case WAG) needs to ensure (if not actually itself provide) the availability of adequate funding, both revenue and capital, to support TSO's undertaking CAT. It also mentions the need for a CAT strategy to link a wide range of initiatives and policies to the CAT process. It stresses the importance of promotion of the CAT process by public bodies and the need for the lead authority to exert influence on all its departments to embrace and support CAT activity.

"Similarly, capitalising on the CAT programme as a catalyst to spread the emerging learning and community asset transfer good practice needs more than the funding of individual projects. Upstream and downstream policy integration is required so that links can be made between this agenda and broader social enterprise and third sector aspirations on the one hand and strategic asset management in the context of reforming public service delivery in Wales on the other hand.

This will entail working with estate and property managers throughout the public sector in Wales to nurture understanding of strategic asset management approaches, raising awareness in Local Service Boards of the potential of TSOs to make a substantial contribution to outcomes and integrating wider third sector capacity development initiatives with asset development as a potential root for TSOs to develop the sustainability of their undertakings."

Community Asset Transfer Programme - Process Evaluation Report: CM International UK Ltd 2011

Community Asset Transfer Process in Bristol

Current engagement with CAT in Bristol

There was considerable advance interest in the CBF event with good attendance at short notice. Delegates brought a range of issues and concerns to the debate. Generic discussion about the application process was followed by detailed questions in two workshop sessions, one for organisations considering a CAT project and another for organisations already stewarding council assets under CAT arrangements.

The overall view was that there were some clear actions that needed to be taken forward by the CBF and the City Council. These are summarised in the meeting notes below and supported by desired actions at key points throughout. The CBF looks forward to positive responses from BCC to the proposed action points outlined (where appropriate to BCC), with the view to continuing discussions at the September Community Buildings Network meeting. There was also a clear view among attenders that a more committed engagement of councillors was critical in order for the Council to understand and address the problems and opportunities of community buildings within the city. It was therefore resolved to request the attendance of Cllr. Gus Hoyt, the cabinet member with relevant portfolio, at the next CBF network meeting.

Policy overview

John Bos gave an overview of the council's CAT policy. For more detail, see: <http://www.bristol.gov.uk/page/community-asset-transfer-policy>

He identified key points as:

- The policy only provides for leasehold transfers to groups and does not allow for the transfer of the freehold of a premises. Councillors rejected arguments in favour of allowing freehold transfers when the policy was adopted and decided to retain the freehold interest in all properties. Their view was that this would ensure that the ongoing social value of former council assets was maintained.
- In the majority of cases, transfers will be based on full repairing (internal and external works) and full insuring responsibilities being carried by user groups, so each organisation will need to have a plan in place to ensure ongoing maintenance is carried out and that there is a strategy in place for any major repair works.

Key stages of the process are as follows:

- Stage 1: Expression of interest – overview of your organisation, what premises you are interested in and why those particular premises are right for your organisation.
- Stage 2: Business plan – detailed plan showing that you understand local need, have the capacity to deliver as well as a clear financial understanding of how to make the building work long-term.
- Stage 3: Assessment – The council carries out an assessment of your organisation and proposal, consulting with Neighbourhood Partnership and local stakeholders, as well as other council departments, with the final decision to agree to the CAT taken by the council's Strategic Director or by Cabinet if it is for a lease longer than 35 years.
- Stage 4: Completion – all legal documents are agreed and signed, including lease and related Service Level Agreement (SLA). It is recommended that the group seeking CAT work with a solicitor as part of this agreement process.

John outlined the need for community groups to meet a set of baseline national standards, set out by Community Matters (www.communitymatters.org.uk) in its PreVISIBLE tool kit: This free tool kit gives a structure that organisations can work through to help ensure that they are fit for purpose and legally compliant (<http://www.visiblecommunities.org.uk/index.php?>

[page=10](#))

John's view is that the council is in an unusual position because the number of groups seeking to run disused buildings outweighs the number of buildings available. Therefore, decisions to agree a CAT process are based around an organisation's ability to meet the needs of the widest spectrum of the community, and BCC looks less favourably on groups that service one particular community of interest or demographic.

Youth Links Community Assets Transfer overview

Judy Preston explained that as part of the Bristol Youth Links (BYL) process, she has been seconded from the Neighbourhoods & Communities Department to manage the potential asset transfer of nine youth play facilities. The full brief and details have been advertised here, since 13 June: <http://www.bristol.gov.uk/page/children-and-young-people/bristol-youth-links-community-asset-transfer>

Assets for potential transfer:

1. Southmead Youth Centre (the process for CAT proposals for this asset has been carried out and the decision will be made 24 July)
2. Brentry Lodge Youth Centre, Henbury
3. Lawrence Weston Youth Centre
4. Hillfields Youth Centre
5. Hareclive Youth Centre
6. Eagle House Youth Centre, Filwood
7. Docklands Youth Centre, St Paul's
8. Lockleaze Youth and Play Space
9. Felix Road Adventure Playground, Easton

All have very distinct neighbourhoods and there has been consultation within communities regarding what uses for these buildings local people would like to see in the future.

BCC met in March and the decision was made not to immediately dispose of these assets but to offer opportunities for management by local groups.

Some of the premises are still being used for the delivery of BYL contracts but it is unclear whether these functions will continue or whether they will provide rental income to new operator groups.

Unlike previous transfers, each of these buildings will come with a small funding allocation to support continuing use. This funding of approximately £500,000 includes the costs of seconding of BCC officer Judy Preston to support the process, in addition to the costs of carrying out initial buildings surveys and addressing any key defects. Funding support will also enable interested groups to get free advice from The Ethical Property Foundation, that will also help groups to tender for buildings and to produce initial expressions of interest.

BCC will want most applicant groups to prioritise youth activities. However there will be more flexibility of approach in places where there is no existing community centre provision, such as Brentry Lodge.

Questions, Responses & Actions

Questioners' names are attributed to questions where these were provided. If you would like your name attributed to a question or removed, please let us know. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure accuracy of meeting notes, please email emma@3ca.org.uk with suggested

amendments or proposals for additional action. Please send through any amendments no later than Monday 12 August 2013.

Plenary session

1. Michelle Bradford, LGBTQ Health Forum Bristol – asked whether BCC's emphasis on the widest community remit for CAT transfers perhaps places minority groups or communities of interest at unfair disadvantage.

Response: There is a lack of available buildings and, therefore a need for buildings to be used for the benefit of the widest possible community remit. So, for example, if a building was being used predominately for youth activities on evenings and weekends, BCC would like to see organisations demonstrate how they might open up its use during other times to allow for wider community use with clear, transparent hire rates.

2. Leah, Bristol Old Vic – raised the idea of joint/consortium bidding in order to resolve the above issue so that smaller groups with specific expertise come together to create multi-purpose spaces.

Response: This is an acceptable approach, but there would need to be clarity within the lease agreement about whether organisation is leading the partnership, role, or whether a separate organisation is being constituted to take on the legal responsibilities of the lease.

3. Chris Perry, Public Place – asked at what stage should an organisation enter into the PreVISIBLE process and what the time frames where.

Response: The CAT policy envisages a period of 14 months for the four-stage process, but recent experience suggests that this process can often take up to 24 months. It was generally felt that the sooner an organisation engages with PreVISIBLE and understands the requirements the better therefore. If certain standards have not yet been achieved by the organisation, this allows for it to set out a clear time-frame by which these milestones can be reached.

ACTION 1: The CBF requests more definitive commitment from BCC across all departments to the time-scales set out in the CAT policy, to ensure effective and timely execution of the CAT process.

The CBF requests BCC sign up to a set of baseline communication standards where specific enquiries from departments such as legal and corporate properties are answered within a clearly set out and agreed time frame.

4. Jamie Pike, Coexist – raised an issue around the wide perception from groups and individuals that the CAT process has more of the characteristics of a transfer of liability than a transfer of an asset, and asked to what extent groups are made aware of the potential liability they are taking on.

Response: BCC will provide all information they have available about to the condition of an asset. However it is recommended that the group carries out its own independent surveys and investigations to ensure the understand what they are committing to.

ACTION 2: There has been some conjecture about the availability of s106 funding for the benefit of existing premises and community buildings. CBF requests that this idea be explored more fully by BCC to create a small grant fund that can support community groups in this initial undertaking, to cover aspects such as legal fees, surveys, business plan support, etc.

5. Doug Francis, Artspace Lifespace & The Invisible Circus – asked how the BCC policy of

not transferring the freehold of buildings compares to other CAT processes in other localities.

Response: Most local authorities do not transfer freehold of an asset and BCC wishes to retain assets in order to ensure ongoing social use is protected.

ACTION 3: There is a logical inconsistency about this point since, if BCC were open to the possibility of transferring freehold interests of an asset to a registered charity or Community Interest Company or similar body, then the future use of the asset would be assured by legally binding asset locks.

The CBF therefore asks BCC to reconsider its blanket rejection of freehold transfer, and consider this as an option where organisations can demonstrate clearly that future maintenance of social outcomes can be assured by a legally binding asset lock.

6. Doug Francis – asked about the difficulty of understanding which buildings are available or which disused buildings are run by BCC.

Response: John maintained that the number of buildings owned by BCC that are not in use is quite limited but that information about all BCC-owned buildings can be found online.

7. Kath Applefold, Hartcliffe Community Centre – asked what support does BCC provide to a building it owns if the organisation running it faces any financial difficulties. Currently the centre struggles to make income from rental of hall and office space to cover all overheads and repairs.

Response: A community group should always contact BCC at the earliest possible instance if it is facing difficulties, so that officers are aware of any serious challenges. BCC does not offer grants for operating shortfalls and if a management organisation is not succeeding, it may be better that it comes back to BCC and if necessary, returns the keys and perhaps liquidates so that BCC can find a new way to take the building management forward.

ACTION 4: It is realistic to anticipate that, within the lifetime of a community building, often with no reserves, groups will at some point face cash flow issues or financial shortfalls.

The CBF recognises that in some instances the closure of a building and dissolution of an organisation is unavoidable but asks BCC to commit to and develop a clearer support strategy for organisations managing community buildings and to consider the formation of a crisis grant scheme or zero interest loan fund for organisations that can demonstrate a clear recovery strategy.

The CBF requests a more proactive, supportive approach and standardised response to third sector organisational crisis management and proposes that an elected member meet with CBF representatives to discuss how this could be developed in partnership. This would protect investment already made by BCC to establish get organisations in premises and help to ensure continuity and the retention of valuable organisational and local knowledge.

8. Hugh Nettlefield, Friends of Greville Smythe Park – asked who is responsible for the structural condition of a building.

Response: Most leases are fully repairing and insuring, as it is easier for an organisation to lever funding to carry out works and seek investment in buildings to keep them going. It is important that groups budget for appropriate insurance, surveys, general maintenance and repairs as part of their business plan.

9. Steve Smith, Young Bristol – Young Bristol runs several community buildings as youth centres and these agreements have existed since before the introduction of the CAT policy in 2010. How does this affect their use in terms of specific use for a particular activity/group?

Response: Any lease renewal or review/adjustment will now go through the CAT policy and process, but a lease renewal process will be less onerous than the CAT process outlined above for new leases. However, officers will still want to see a clear business plan and investigation of how youth centres could be used for wider community use outside their core activity times. The key is that BCC wants to see buildings being used when core activities are not in progress and facilities being made available for wider community use and by other groups at all other times.

10. Richard Turpin, Learning Partnership West - LPW is interested in working in partnership with groups aiming to take over youth centres, though they do not have capacity to pay for space use. It is interested in offering services and can provide resources in terms of staffing capacity to run activities from the spaces.

11. How does the Service Level Agreement (SLA) link in with the lease and CAT process and what is the potential for a lease to be revoked if the needs of a community change and the organisation evolves to meet this need but is then in breach of the SLA?

Response: Usually SLA's run for 3-5 years and are based on a more evolving/changing document in response to the needs of a community. The lease may refer to a SLA in which BCC reduces the rental of a premises in return for compliance with the SLA. The SLA is produced in association with the operator organisation. The SLA review point provides an opportunity for the organisation to review and change its service. If the SLA is not being complied with, BCC has the choice to either impose full market rate rent on the premises which the organisation would then be required to pay or, if no agreement is reached, BCC could start proceedings to terminate the lease agreement. The thrust of the SLA is intended to give BCC reassurance that the group will do what they have said that they will do with the building.

12. If a legal dispute arises, who foots the legal bill?

Response: BCC would always seek to find a mutually acceptable agreement with a community group on any issue beforehand, but if this proved impossible, each side would have to bear their own legal costs. However, this is why there is a community buildings team within BCC that understand the needs of the community and where these needs are changing so that they can be reflected in a SLA in such a way that disputes do not arise.

13. With smaller associations and more informal organisational structures what protection do trustees/committee members have?

Response: It is important that groups take advice, understand the liability they are taking on and establish the most appropriate organisational structure to protect volunteers from taking on a personal liability. Avon and Bristol Law Centre can provide more advice around this matter: www.ablc.org.uk

VOSCUR has been funded to carry out organisational health checks and refer organisations to places like A&B Law Centre where free advice can be provided. For more information about this process, visit: <http://www.supporthub.org.uk/how>. Pro bono legal support can also be sought from www.bitc.org.uk/programmes/prohelp

ACTION 5: This service is currently being offered on VOSCUR's website as only available to organisations with a turnover of less than £50,000. As most community buildings turnovers will

exceed this, the CBF requests that BCC ensures that more structured support to community buildings is provided to assist them with the ongoing running of a community asset. Specifically, support is needed around areas such as properties management, income generation and business development planning. A number of CBF members have long experience as building operators and encompass the best practice guidance of this kind available in Bristol. A strategic partnership with the council could make this available to the wider community buildings sector.

14. Alex Harvest, Artspace Lifespace – asked how rates relief changes will impact on community buildings.

Response: If an organisation is a registered charity (or structured in a way similar to a charity) it will get 80% mandatory rates relief. BCC is looking at how best to target limited funds available for discretionary relief (the additional 20%).

15. Kath Appleford, Hartcliffe Community Centre - there are already three community buildings in Hartcliffe with a similar offer, so how would a transfer of local youth centres through the BYL process avoid creating another competing community centre.

Response: The BYL process asks bidders to make clear within the expression of interest and business plan, that they will not be competing with other existing community spaces.

16. Tabitha Moyle, Easton Community Centre – operator groups make significant investments in repairs and improvements during their tenure. At the end of a lease, how can the organisation's investment be protected?

Response: BCC does not want to be in the position of taking buildings back from successful groups. As a lease is coming to an end there will already be discussions under way with regards to the lease renewal.

17. Poppy Stephenson, Bristol Festival Community Group – also raised the question about the capacity of organisations to take on liability for full repairing leases.

Response: In 98% of instances leases will be fully repairing and insuring, with the exception of some short-term leases (under 5 years).

18. What happens if the cost of running a youth club makes a building operation prohibitive? How does a not-for-profit organisation make this work and what happens if no one comes forward?

Response: BCC would seek to find an alternative use or attempt to dispose of the asset through a commercial sale.

ACTION 6: Whilst the CBF accepts the council's current intention to renew leases on well run community buildings, anxiety was expressed that no guarantees exist to protect organisations against future political shifts and potential policy changes. The CAT policy therefore needs to clarify the rights of tenant groups to lease renewal.

The CBF requests that the Council makes amendments within the lease templates to acknowledge and protect any material investment from an organisation in a BCC asset.

19. Katie Turnbull, Forest of Avon Wood Products Co-operative – asked what opportunities groups have to purchase the freehold of a property.

Response: BCC is interested in having conversations with groups who may wish to purchase a freehold if there is a benefit to the project from owning the freehold in the long-term. Potential funding is available relating to this:

http://www.thirdsector.co.uk/bulletin/third_sector_daily_bulletin/article/1188752/grants-

worth-475m-available-buying-restoring-community-assets/?DCMP=EMC-CONThirdSectorDaily

Focus group 1 – Questions from groups operating existing CAT projects

Artspace Lifespace/Invisible Circus, Bristol Festival Community Group, Coexist, Filwood Community Centre, Real Club Wandsworth Community Centre, Trinity Community Arts, Whitchurch Community Centre, John Bos BCC.

Key issues/topics for discussion:

1. Question about whether groups should write their own business plan or if it needs to be produced by someone professional. How 'business-like' does the plan have to be? The Ethical Property Foundation has resources on structuring a business plan and key headings. Groups understand their organisation and the needs of their local community so are best placed to write their own business plans.

The CBF has an ambition to create a pool of like-minded community groups that are perhaps at different stages of the process to act as mentors to other organisations, reading business plans etc. This should not fall to one or two community organisations but be taken up by all members (to support other members) where able. Suggestion to create a memorandum of understanding for the CBF so that members are aware of and agree to a set of shared values and principles.

ACTION 7: CBF steering group to develop a draft MoU for circulation to members before and for agreement at September's CBF network meeting.

2. If community groups are running a council-owned asset and providing a public service, why should they have to also take on the added liability of repairing a dilapidated asset which distracts from service provision?

BCC has limited funding it can draw on for its own repairs and renewals, so even if the need from a community organisation was considered for this limited pot, it would be competing against schools, etc. Better therefore to seek external funding.

3. Small community associations, appropriate structures and implications of organisational structure and liability in relation to lease renewal were raised by smaller in relation to lack of capacity for fund-raising.

The CBF is exploring options for joint purchasing for items such as repairs/insurance to assist buying power of smaller groups and drive down cost.

ACTION 8: CBF to continue to identify ways to increase capacity and to explore these ideas more fully.

4. Can there be greater transparency in what buildings are available for CAT within the BCC property portfolio and what ways exist to access use of disused commercial premises?

Whilst there are lists of council-owned premises, it is more difficult to provide a list of non council-owned premises. However, there is now an empty buildings tax to try to incentivise building owners not to leave buildings empty (though there are some exemptions e.g. listed buildings).

ACTION 9: The CBF requests a follow-up discussion with the relevant BCC elected member to

explore if anything can be done to provide a list of all vacant commercial properties, particularly those of significant interest in terms of size, location, etc., so that arts and community groups can easily make contact with developers and owners regarding temporary use.

Focus group 2 – Response of groups considering a CAT project

A range of Bristol TSO representatives introduced their projects and explained their need for premises. Some, like the Parlour Project on College Green, have applied for a CAT lease and been refused. Others, like Senagambia Kombo Sillah wanted to understand how a CAT stewardship arrangement would support their objectives; and others were concerned about the length and complication of the appraisal process.

Several groups looking for space asked how they could find what buildings might be on offer from the council or what space they might feasibly apply for. One questioner referred to the the guidance in the officer presentation that suitable buildings and spaces were in short supply in Bristol. The CBF view was stated, that in a situation where BCC owns a higher percentage of the land and property within its boundary than most other local authorities in England, this was clearly a political decision that needed to be challenged.

ACTION 10: The CBF requests an opportunity to review with officers and members the process of allocation and disposal of council-owned property with a view to establishing a more consistent and transparent strategy for backing TSO's with capital assets.

No specific requests for information or guidance were made, but it was agreed that there needed to more effective peer-to peer-support methods for groups engaging with the CAT process. There was a discussion about whether social media platforms could be used to provide this.

APPENDIX I

List of attendees

<u>Delegate</u>	<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Delegate</u>	<u>Organisation</u>
Alex Harvest	Artspace Lifespace	Hugh Nettlefield	Friends of Greville Smythe Park
Doug Francis	Artspace Lifespace	Jonathan Platt	GCP Architects
Gayle Fletcher	Artspace Lifespace	Lesley Nel	Groundwork Southville
Hilary Sudbury	Avon CDA/Brave Ltd	Carrie Ellis	Hartcliffe & Withywood Com Pntshp
Lerato Dunn	BCC Neighbourhood Arts Officer	Kath Appleford	Hartcliffe & Withywood Com Pntshp
John Westlake	BITC	John Huskins	Integrate Bristol
Leah	Bristol Old Vic	Richard Turpin	Learning Partnership West
Frances Gard	Bristol South Bathing Establishment	Michelle Bradford	LGBT Health Forum Bristol
Sam Taylor	Bristol Story Lab	Ayannah Griffith	Positive Cycle
Matt Tucker	Bristol Wood Recycling Project	Chris Pirie	Puppet Place
Ali Rowe	Britfest	Iris Eiting	Re:work
Poppy Stephenson	Britfest	Alin Bello	Savannah Development Foundation
Kylie Manning	CIPKW	Buba Touray	Senegambia Kombo Sillah
Rose Manning	CIPKW	Demba Sowe	Senegambia Kombo Sillah
Jamie Pike	Coexist CIC	Malang Darbo	Senegambia Kombo Sillah
Anne Riley	CSV	Aisha Thomas	The City Academy
Angie Enwright	Easton Community Centre	Michele Tedder	The Redland Club
Tabitha Moyle	Easton Community Centre	Jennifer Angus	UWE
Abdi Mohammed	Elays4u	Phillip Baker	Whitchurch Folk House
Amanda Watson	Felix Road Adventure Playground	Natasha Noel	Wordsworth Centre
Deborah Benjamin	Felix Road Adventure Playground	Tamsin Evans	Wordsworth Centre
Katie Turnbull	Forest of Avon	Steve Smith	Young Bristol

Speakers

John Bos	Bristol City Council
Judy Preston	Bristol City Council

Community Buildings Federation

Keith Cowling	Bristol Community Land Trust
Emma Harvey	Trinity Community Arts

APPENDIX II

The Community Buildings Federation

The Community Buildings Federation (CBF) is a collective of community organisations.

Its objects are to:

- connect organisations managing community buildings and assets across the Bristol city region
- champion the facilities and services provided by its members
- share experience, pool resources and help to raise quality standards in the community buildings sector
- develop a strategic vision for the future of community buildings
- create a market of accredited suppliers and good value services to community buildings
- help centres find routes to operate more imaginatively and cost-effectively (i.e. joint purchasing)

The CBF is led by a steering group made up of:

- Alex Kittow - Greenway Centre, Southmead Development Trust
- Alv Hirst - Avonmouth Community Centre
- Clive Harry - The Park Knowle
- Emma Harvey - Trinity Centre, Trinity Community Arts
- Ian Lawry - Wellspring Healthy Living Centre
- Keith Cowling - Bristol Community Land Trust

The CBF vision is to create a collective framework through which organisations operating community buildings can work together to affect change by communicating with a single shared voice.

The CBF organises regular community building networking events, for its members and other colleagues in our sector, in partnership with Bristol City Council. The CBF received financial support from Bristol City Council (BCC) to re-establish the Community Buildings Network programme. The ongoing programme is funded and delivered by the Federation and organised by the CBF Steering Group on a voluntary basis.