



Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Date: Thursday, 11 October 2018

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Council Chamber - Manchester City Council

This is a **Revised and Supplementary Agenda** as one item of business has been withdrawn from the agenda and additional information is provided for item 5.

Access to the Council Chamber

Public access to the Council Chamber is on Level 2 of the Town Hall Extension, using the lift or stairs in the lobby of the Mount Street entrance to the Extension. That lobby can also be reached from the St. Peter's Square entrance and from Library Walk. **There is no public access from the Lloyd Street entrances of the Extension.**

Filming and broadcast of the meeting

Meetings of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee are 'webcast'. These meetings are filmed and broadcast live on the Internet. If you attend this meeting you should be aware that you might be filmed and included in that transmission.

Membership of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Councillors - Hacking (Chair), Andrews, Cooley, Collins, M Dar, Evans, Fletcher-Hackwood, Kirkpatrick, Rawlins and Rawson

Revised Agenda

1. Urgent Business

To consider any items which the Chair has agreed to have submitted as urgent.

2. Appeals

To consider any appeals from the public against refusal to allow inspection of background documents and/or the inclusion of items in the confidential part of the agenda.

3. Interests

To allow Members an opportunity to [a] declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they might have in any items which appear on this agenda; and [b] record any items from which they are precluded from voting as a result of Council Tax/Council rent arrears; [c] the existence and nature of party whipping arrangements in respect of any item to be considered at this meeting. Members with a personal interest should declare that at the start of the item under consideration. If Members also have a prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest they must withdraw from the meeting during the consideration of the item.

4. Minutes

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2018 **were previously circulated.**

5. [10.05-10.30] Community Asset Transfers

9 - 40

Report of the Strategic Director (Development), Head of Corporate Estates and Facilities, Strategic Lead - Parks, Leisure & Events, Strategic Lead - Neighbourhoods (South) and Community Asset Transfer Manager

This report provides information on the Community Asset Transfer (CAT) activity during 2017/18, provides a background to the scheme and the process for progressing a CAT, and the support that is provided to groups by the Council. It also provides case studies on community groups that have successfully progressed a CAT and those that haven't been successful. It also provides a full list of organisations that have completed the CAT process and information on the transfer.

6. [Withdrawn] Strategic Plan for Events

This item of business has been withdrawn from the agenda of this meeting and will be considered at a future meeting.

7. [10.30-10.55] Widening Access and Participation Update

Report of the Chief Operating Officer (Neighbourhoods) **was previously circulated.**

8. **[10.55-11.15] Cultural Ambition**
Report of the Deputy Chief Executive **was previously circulated.**
9. **[11.15-11.35] Manchester International Festival**
Report of the Deputy Chief Executive **was previously circulated.**
10. **[11.35-11.50] Volunteering and Timebanking Update**
Report of the Chief Operating Officer (Neighbourhoods) **was previously circulated.**
11. **[11.50-12.05] Improving Life Chances - Generations Together**
Report of the Deputy Chief Executive **was previously circulated.**
12. **[12.05-12.10] Overview Report**
Report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit **was previously circulated.**

Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:

Rachel McKeon
Tel: 0161 234 4497
Email: rachel.mckeon@manchester.gov.uk

This revised agenda was issued on **Wednesday, 3 October 2018** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 6, Town Hall Extension (Mount Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

Manchester City Council Report for Information

Report to: Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee – 11 October 2018

Subject: Community Asset Transfer

Report of: Strategic Director (Development), Head of Corporate Estates and Facilities, Strategic Lead - Parks, Leisure & Events, Strategic Lead - Neighbourhoods (South) and Community Asset Transfer Manager

Summary

This paper provides the Scrutiny Committee with information on the Community Asset Transfer activity during 2017/18, provides a background to the scheme and the process for progressing a Community Asset Transfer (CAT), and the support that is provided to groups by the Council.

The paper also provides Communities and Equalities Scrutiny with case studies on community groups that have successfully progressed a Community Asset Transfer and those that haven't been successful.

The paper provides a full list of organisations that have completed the Community Asset Transfer process and information on the transfer.

Recommendations

The Committee are requested to:

- Note the process and programme of support that is in place to help local communities who wish to progress a Community Asset Transfer;
 - Note the key issues that face communities who wish to progress a Community Asset Transfer;
 - Note the cases where a Community Asset Transfer has been completed, where a transfer has failed or been abandoned and the current ongoing caseload of transfer 'in progress'.
-

Wards Affected: All

Alignment to the Our Manchester Strategy Outcomes (if applicable)

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of how this report aligns to the OMS
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive	

economy that creates jobs and opportunities	
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Community Asset Transfers support local communities through the provision and use of Council buildings for them to deliver services to their local communities.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	

Contact Officers:

Name: Eddie Smith
 Position: Strategic Director, Development
 Telephone: 0161 234 3030
 E-mail: e.smith@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Julie McMurray
 Position: Head of Corporate Estate and Facilities
 Telephone: 0161 219 6791
 E-mail: j.mcmurray@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

None

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Community Asset Transfer presents local communities with the opportunity to breathe new life into public buildings, to preserve valuable community resources or develop exciting new services for local communities. Since the adoption of the Voluntary Community Sector (VCS) Lettings policy (attached at **Appendix A**) the council has been able to provide leases to community organisations at less than market rent.
- 1.2 It is recognised that managing and maintaining a community facility can be complicated and expensive, particularly where a group has little knowledge or understanding of the potential costs and associated responsibilities. With this in mind, the council has developed a process to work with community organisations that may be interested in taking over a council-owned building, to help them analyse the feasibility of taking over a building. This involves the creation of a business plan that demonstrates how much the building will cost to run and how the organisation will generate sufficient income to meet those costs.
- 1.3 Since the formal launch of the scheme the Council has progressed 21 successful community asset transfers with local community groups, with a further 28 cases are currently in progress. **Appendix B** provides the details of all of the cases that have been progressed, abandoned/unsuccessful cases and those cases which are currently in progress.
- 1.4 Many groups that initially express interest in asset transfer lack the skills or experience to create a business plan, to run an asset or to pursue larger funding opportunities. In order to bridge this potential knowledge gap, an asset transfer training programme has been developed to provide organisations with training and support before they then start considering an asset transfer, full armed with the knowledge and understanding of what is involved.
- 1.5 The training programme, Manchester Community Assets Pilot (MCAP), is delivered in partnership with Macc, the support organisation for the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector in Manchester.

2.0 What is the difference between a Community Asset Transfer and a long lease?

- 2.1 Community Asset Transfer was introduced with the Localism Act 2011 along with the community right to build, the community right to bid and the community right to challenge.
- 2.2 Unlike the other community rights however, there is no prescribed process for CAT. Each local authority has the discretion to pursue asset transfer and create a process that meets local requirements.
- 2.3 In Manchester a process has been implemented that uses modified commercial leases with a peppercorn or low rent (depending upon whether an

organisation is delivering commissioned services for the authority), over a timescale that balances supporting a VCS organisation to attract external investment against managing the risk of a longer-term agreement.

- 2.4 Not-for-profit organisations that have leases in place pre-dating the CAT process are systematically being transferred to leases that meet the VCS lettings policy.

3.0 Programme of Support

- 3.1 There are a number of scenarios in which asset transfer is typically explored.

- A group that occupies and manages a council-owned facility (and may have done for many years), but with wither no formal agreement or a fully commercial lease in place. An asset transfer will create a lease that provides the group with some security (which funders are increasingly looking for).
- A group that occupies a council-owned facility, possibly alongside council-services, but has played no role in managing the site. In these situations, council services may be in the process of leaving the building. An asset transfer secures the site for the group and maintains a community facility for the area.
- A group that is interested in taking over a building that is non-operational and is either unoccupied or will shortly become unoccupied. An asset transfer will present development opportunities for the group as well as provide new community facilities to the local area.
- An asset is sat unused with no obvious interest from a community group. A public exercise will be undertaken that invites local groups to submit expressions of interest in the site. Working closely with the Neighbourhoods team and local members, an organisation will be invited to explore asset transfer.

- 3.2 Each of these scenarios expose organisations to additional risk. Taking on management of a site can be expensive and time-consuming. Inexperienced organisations often believe that not paying a rent equates to a “free” building and lack awareness of the reality of managing a site.

- 3.3 Taking a lease on a site however presents organisations with the opportunity to access sources of funding that the Council is unable to access, and presents them with the opportunity to undergo a rigorous development process that can help them generate significant additional income.

- 3.4 Those groups that express an interest are asked to complete an initial questionnaire that establishes the legal status and capacity of the organisation and, amongst other things, what policies and service-user safeguards are already in place.

- 3.5 This is used as a basis for a development programme designed to quantify the full cost of managing an asset and produce a business plan that details how an organisation would meet those costs. Organisations are then supported to apply for funding to pay for the various steps involved. This funding has typically come from a dedicated community asset transfer fund administered by the Social Investment Business, however other sources of funding such as Awards for All have been used.
- 3.6 More recently however, funding streams used to support organisations through asset transfer have begun to dry up. This has had an impact on organisations being able to undertake condition surveys on assets.
- 3.7 Macc, the support organisation for the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector in Manchester, play an integral role in supporting organisations through the CAT process through their capacity building service and through a bespoke set of training courses designed specifically around asset management. These are:
- **0.5-day Introduction to CAT training:** This training is designed for groups who fairly new to CAT and want to know if it is worth exploring. It is also designed to weed out any groups for whom CAT would be highly unsuitable. Training is run quarterly.
 - **2-day training:** This training builds on the half-day Introduction to Community Asset Transfer. Groups can expect to understand better how asset transfer fits with their own organisational purpose and objects and what is involved in managing a building and the process of asset transfer. This training is run subject to demand and funding.
 - **5-day Manchester Community Asset training:** This training runs over a 3-6 month period and is for groups who are seriously considering a specific asset transfer, can demonstrate that they are suitably ready to explore CAT and are already in conversation with the City Council. This detailed training supports groups to understand the key areas of consideration for asset transfer and how this applies to their own situation.
- 3.8 A number of other locally-based consultants and VCS organisations, such as 4CT, also provide support to organisations considering asset transfer and continue to be a source of referrals into the programme.
- 4.0 Assessing an organisation's readiness for asset transfer**
- 4.1 There are three key areas of development when looking at asset transfer:
- Is the organisation ready for asset transfer?
 - Has an appropriate asset been identified and has the organisation gained a full understanding of the requirements of running and maintaining an appropriate building?
 - Does the organisation have a plan for how it will generate enough income to meet the running costs of the asset?

- 4.2 Only when all of these points have been addressed will an organisation be encouraged to make a decision on whether to submit a formal request for an asset transfer.
- 4.3 At the outset, it is stressed to organisations that exploring these issues does not constitute a binding agreement and either they or the city council can decline to proceed at the end of the process if it is judged that the risks involved are too high.

5.0 Is the organisation ready for Community asset transfer?

- 5.1 Managing an asset can be expensive and time-consuming. It can also involve developing a range of new services to generate additional income to meet the costs associated with the asset.
- 5.2 For many organisations it is therefore important to look at how the organisation is structured and governed to develop and deliver an expanded range of services, as well as the extra burden of asset management.
- 5.3 When considering whether to pursue an asset transfer, an organisation will be guided/advised to ask itself the following questions:
- Is the committee an elected body of local people that is accountable to its members?
 - Does the organisation have a clear and agreed mission, aims and objectives that have been defined through consultation with the local community and evidence of need?
 - Does the governing structure prevent personal profit being made by members of the Board and are any surpluses generated re-invested back into the organisation?
 - Are there written financial procedures for subscriptions, book-keeping, expenses and petty-cash with checks and balances to avoid misuse of funds?
 - Has the organisation developed links with key agencies/stakeholder organisations in the local community/neighbourhood?
 - Do paid-staff and volunteers have clearly defined roles and responsibilities?
 - Are there plans for replacing paid-staff and volunteers people as they leave?
 - Is the organisation aware of the range of skills its volunteers could provide if called upon?
 - Is there experience of managing a facility and an understanding of the requirements and legal undertaking?
 - Are there sufficient operating reserves to cover legal fees and any start-up costs required for a facility?
- 5.4 A capacity-building worker from Macc will assess how many of these questions an organisation can answer by carrying out an organisational health-check. This will establish which of the above points an organisation already meets and where further advice and support may be necessary.

- 5.5 A development plan will be agreed that maps out how an organisation will develop in preparation for an asset transfer.

6.0 Identifying an asset and gaining an understanding of the requirements of the asset?

- 6.1 When a VCS organisation contacts the Estates team, an officer will discuss the requirements of the organisation, gather some background information on the services provided by the organisation and then search for an appropriate property.
- 6.2 Demand for property fluctuates across the city. The Estates Team typically receive a lot of requests for properties in the central wards of the city. Consequently there may be nothing available in the area requested at the time that the query is raised. Organisations are encouraged to consider other parts of the city and their details are kept on file for when a suitable property becomes available.
- 6.3 Organisations are also asked if they'd be interested in working with other local organisations to manage a larger asset than their own organisation would require by itself. This enables smaller organisations to find a base without necessarily undertaking the burden of managing the asset alone.
- 6.4 For some organisations that enquire about asset transfer it is simply not practical for them to pursue for a variety of reasons. The Estates Team and Macc endeavour to try and find appropriate space for organisations within existing facilities. A web service is available to support this through the Macc website.
- 6.5 Once an appropriate asset has been identified, the organisation will need to consider the costs associated with bringing the asset into use and keeping the asset operational.
- 6.6 Understanding how much it costs to keep a building running (both in terms of financial cost and staff time), knowing what the current state of repair is within the building form a critical part of piecing together a business plan and helping an organisation understand how feasible it would be for them to run their own asset.
- 6.7 The Estates Team provide some basic information about the running costs of a property. Organisations are advised to have their own condition survey carried out however and the Estates Team and Macc work together to find funding to have this carried out.

7.0 Creating the business plan

- 7.1 As the previous steps are completed, a business plan is created that brings together the development plan for the organisation, the details of the asset in questions and evidence that the organisation understands the cost of taking on an asset

- 7.2 The business plan is the focal point of the work on asset transfer – it will help the organisation explore the risks of asset transfer, the costs associated and how the organisation will meet those costs.

8.0 Preparing and submitting a proposal

- 8.1 After completing their business plan, an organisation's management group should have enough information to determine whether it wishes to proceed with an asset transfer or not.
- 8.2 If the management group decides it wishes to accept the risks identified through the process a formal request for a transfer is made to the Estates Team. The Estates Team will then seek the views of the Neighbourhoods Teams, local councillors and any other relevant council service before making a recommendation to the head of the Property Development team.
- 8.3 If the decision is a positive one, the organisation will be invited to negotiate a lease. The organisation will require independent legal advice at this point in order for the lease to be agreed.
- 8.4 If the management group of the VCS organisation or the Head of Property Development decides they cannot accept the risks associated with asset transfer, the Estates Team will continue to work with the organisation to see if specific concerns can be addressed and an alternative solution found.

9.0 Case Studies

- 9.1 **Communities on Solid Ground** - Communities on Solid Ground (CSG) is a registered charity delivering services to young people within the Whalley Range area. CSG works in cooperation with a range of other agencies to deliver educational, social, and sports activities to help young people build resilience and choose positive constructive lifestyles.
- 9.2 Discussions about CSG taking a lease on the former play centre in Manley Park began in 2013, prior to the adoption of the VCS lettings policy and the appointment of an officer to oversee development of the programme. Formal discussions regarding a potential CAT began in early 2014. From the organisations perspective however, they had been negotiating a lease for close to three years at the point that the lease was agreed.
- 9.3 Ultimately the group was offered a lease with a reduced, but not peppercorn, rent attached with a lengthy rent free period in recognition of the work to be undertaken by the group on the building. The VCS lettings policy states that organisations delivering commissioned services could not be offered a peppercorn rent due to procurement regulations on providing subsidies.
- 9.4 However, given the blurred lines between many grant agreements and service provision contracts, this delineation can prove difficult for organisations to understand and can seem unfair. In this case it presented a significant barrier

to negotiating the terms of the lease and ultimately the negotiation took approximately 14 months to conclude.

- 9.5 A lack of information about the condition of the building also proved to be a barrier to progress as it necessitated fundraising to have a condition survey carried out.
- 9.6 Since the transfer completed however the group have continued to flourish and the lease provided allowed the group to successfully apply for additional funds from the BBC to improve the asset.
- 9.7 **Levenshulme Old Library Group** - The Levenshulme Old Library (LOL) group formed as a means for local residents to explore ways of re-opening and using the former library following the development of a new joint library and leisure centre in the Arcadia Building.
- 9.8 LOL aspires to develop the building to “be a centre for community art and culture and to act as a catalyst for community activities and groups”. It has a very strong, active trustee board and provides a base for local community radio station All FM to operate from.
- 9.9 The group began forming in 2015 but work on an asset transfer formally began in early 2016. As the group developed over 2016, it considered various governance options, began to piece together a business plan and identified All FM as a key partner to make the site viable.
- 9.10 Issues with the condition of the building soon emerged however and the diagnosis and treatment of dry rot over the summer and autumn of 2017 cast doubt over the viability of the project.
- 9.11 An interim lease was agreed with the group in December 2017 that allowed them to take possession of the site but further disrepair in the form of a crack in the brickwork threw the viability of the project into doubt again until a survey could be carried out and an appropriate course of treatment identified.
- 9.12 Due to the need to observe issues like this over an extended period of time, this issue remains unresolved (though a timeline for further observations and remedying the issue has been agreed) and the group has to work around the temporary props supporting an archway.
- 9.13 Despite a positive working relationship with the council, a lack of information about the heating, water and alarm systems in the building proved time-consuming to unravel and presented a barrier to the group applying for external funds.
- 9.14 **London Road Skateboard Park** - Projekts MCR is a not-for-profit Community Benefit Society aiming to help people through the use of skateboarding and other skatepark-type activities.

- 9.15 The group operates the Pumpcage Skatepark under the Mancunian Way flyover on London Road, delivering over 25 schools sessions a week in and around Manchester.
- 9.16 The group were initially consulted in 2015 regarding the asset transfer. A recommendation to grant a lease was accepted in September 2016 but the lease negotiation took almost another 2 years to complete. Some of this delay was due to difficulties in establishing the precise dimensions of the demise (due to the Mancunian way overhead and the support pillars that run through the site) but equally a protracted legal negotiation meant the process was particularly slow.
- 9.17 **Longsight Youth Centre** – The Wesley Furniture Project provides furniture and appliances at a greatly reduced cost to people on low incomes, leaving care or prison.
- 9.18 Based in Hulme, very high demand meant that the group had outgrown their current base and larger premises to operate from were needed.
- 9.19 The former Longsight Youth Centre was identified as a potentially suitable location and the group underwent training and developed a business plan for the site.
- 9.20 Their proposal was approved and while a lease was being negotiated the group began putting together a detailed work schedule to bring the building back into use.
- 9.21 The group struggled to find contractors able and willing to undertake the work and after several months the council's Capital Programmes team was asked to produce the work schedule.
- 9.22 The resulting work schedule identified a number of significant jobs that the groups own contractors had missed when providing quotes in the earlier stages of the process. The nature of the additional jobs meant that management of the schedule became quite complex.
- 9.23 The organisation determined that while it may have had the resources to carry out the renovations required, the management of the schedule had become too complex for them and presented too much of a risk on top of the job of moving and setting up the new service.

10.0 Key Issues

- 10.1 A lack of up-front information on the condition of buildings and associated fixtures and fittings for prospective tenants has proved a barrier and a source of delays in a number of cases.
- 10.2 This has often lead to work being delayed or abandoned if a significant issue was uncovered that required more investment than a group could manage or could realistically attract from external sources.

- 10.3 Identifying and pursuing properties for asset transfer is often done on an ad-hoc basis. While there is a list of surplus properties, many cases start with organisations enquiring about specific sites that are not currently declared surplus but that we have no plans for.
- 10.4 The reactive nature of this approach exacerbates the problem of having little information up front and adds additional pressure to finding resources quickly to respond to opportunities.
- 10.5 The requirement to charge a restricted rent to organisations delivering commissioned services creates a disincentive to organisations that may be investing large sums in an MCC asset. Since the policy was initially drawn up, the law regarding subsidies to organisations delivering commissioned work has changed and this requirement may no longer be relevant.
- 10.6 Most of the support work for CAT ends up being capacity building by nature; this is very resource intensive and can mean groups are supported for 2+years which impacts heavily on the VCS infrastructure support service that Macc deliver.
- 10.7 The CAT training programmes are outside the scope of the infrastructure contract so obtaining resources to pay for these courses remains an ongoing challenge, making it difficult to plan support for organisations. More training may help manage the demand on capacity-building.

11.0 Potential Future Improvements

- 11.1 It is recognised that the creation of a property information pack for those buildings where groups are considering a CAT would be beneficial. It is the intention to introduce this in the coming year and the service will be aiming to provide the following information to groups considering a CAT:
 - up to date information on the condition of the site
 - Typical utility usage and average maintenance costs from the last 3 years of use (where possible).

This page is intentionally left blank

**Appendix A – VCS Property Policy as approved by Council Executive
18.12.2013 (with amendments 27.7.2015)**

1. Grant full repairing and insuring leases. Where the occupying group is operating on a not-for-profit basis and provides a wider benefit to the community the occupation shall be on the basis of the payment of a peppercorn rent only subject to a valuation signed by the Head of Development which confirms this is a market value on a restricted basis. However, in the interests of transparency and equity, those organisations providing commissioned activities for the Council or partner bodies should continue to pay rental, albeit on a restricted valuation basis reflecting ongoing community use. It should be noted that full repairing and insuring terms would mean that a group would be responsible for all repair, maintenance, running and insurance costs for the building/space they occupy.
2. In addition to granting full repairing and insuring leases as detailed in paragraph 1 above, the Head of Development may also approve leases on a restricted valuation basis (i.e. a valuation reflecting use restricted to community activities) to Registered Providers operating in true partnership with the local community on a not-for-profit basis and where community activities will be generated throughout the lease period as a result of the proposed letting. In such circumstances the Registered Provider will be required to establish a project-specific Board of Management to oversee the operation of the asset and the activities within it which shall incorporate at least 51% community representation to ensure local interests are represented.
3. The community benefit will be measured by considering how the proposed use of the asset, to be specified in a business case approved by the Head of Development, will contribute towards priorities identified by council services.
4. That the City Council's role as a VCS funder and its function as a landlord, are wholly separate and must not be merged.
5. That any future support by services to particular VCS activity in Council premises must be through formal prioritised and approved project funding as required for VCS activities in non-council premises.
6. That all VCS occupancies of council premises must be on a formal lease/licence on full repairing and insuring terms and that any group unwilling or unable to enter into or regularise such an arrangement may lose its tenure.
7. That any lease or occupation granted under the VCS Lettings policy is subject to regular review to confirm that the tenant is complying with the terms of the lease and that the asset continues to be used for community benefit on a not-for-profit basis. The reviews will also ensure that, where appropriate and in accordance with the terms of the Lease, the tenant is undertaking regular disclosure and barring service (DBS) checks and continues to implement safeguarding policies to ensure the safety of children and vulnerable adults.

8. That all existing VCS occupations which do not conform to this policy to be converted at the first opportunity legally available under their current tenure.
9. That where any occupations do not allow immediate updating any present irregularities in conditions of occupancy or management practise with an impact on VAT issues must be resolved as a matter of urgency in consultation the VAT Section of Corporate Services and local members as appropriate.
10. That charges for sessional use of council space be formalised on a premise by premise basis by services in consultation with the VAT Section of Corporate Services.

Appendix B – List of successful, unsuccessful and ongoing cases

1 Cases end for a variety of reasons throughout the process. A strong emphasis is placed on the process being about allowing an organisation to take an objective view of the feasibility of an asset transfer at a particular point in time, so a decision not to proceed is not viewed as a failure. Support continues to be provided to organisations that decide not to proceed, either to explore alternative ways of transferring the asset in question or to search for alternative options.

2 List of completed transfers

Building / Asset	Organisation
Cringle Park Beehive (aka Beehive)	Manchester Steiner Kindergarten
Former Northenden Library	Northenden Players
Sheunglok Center	Wai Yin Chinese Society
Withington Baths	Love Withington Baths
Pakistani Community Centre	GM Pakistani Association
Northfield Community Centre	NEPHRA
Cringle Park Pavilion	Levenshulme Amateur Boxing Club
Burnage Community Centre	Burnage Good Neighbours
BMAG	N-Gage
St Barnabas Churchyard	Growing in the City
London Road Skateboard Park	Projekts Ltd.
Platt Fields Park Boat House	Coffee Cranks
Levenshulme Library	Levenshulme Old Library Group
Hulme Hall	Mothers Against Violence
Broadhurst Park Surestart	4CT (temporary agreement)
Rushford Park Changing rooms and artificial pitches	Manchester Youth Academy
Fallowfield Library	Friends of Fallowfield Library
Old Parsonage Gardens	Didsbury Parsonage Trust
Manley Park Children's Centre	Communities on Solid Ground
Broadway Baths	Broadway Community Development Group
John Gilmore Centre	Ardwick Lads Boxing Club

3 Abandoned or unsuccessful transfers

Building / Asset	Organisation	Reason
Longsight Youth Centre	Wesley Furniture Project	Renovation costs exceeded budget.
103 Princess Street	Real Junk Food	Business plan involved subletting commercially.
Heathfield Hall	Representative group	Group felt that they lacked the capacity to continue.
Alexandra Park Lodge	Friends of Alexandra Park	Group felt that they lacked the capacity to continue.

Stirling Centre	Stirling centre management group	Group felt they lacked the capacity to take responsibility for the site.
-----------------	----------------------------------	--

4 Ongoing cases

Building / Asset	Organisation
Former Levenshulme Baths	CEDE Foundation
Broadhurst Park Surestart	4CT
306a Yew Tree Road	Community Minded
Boggart Hole Clough Bungalow	Autizma
Chorlton Park Visitors Centre	Friends of Chorlton Park
Barrington Street Centre	Group of local residents
Victoria Baths	Friends of Victoria Baths
Slade Lane Neighbourhood Centre	Inviting Expressions of interest from local VCS groups
Simpson Memorial Hall	Faith Network for Manchester
Platt Fields Park Bowling Pavilion	Platt Fields Market Garden
1-3 Morrowfield Avenue	Cheetham Hill Advice Centre
Mersey Bank playing fields changing rooms	Fletcher Moss Rangers
Heathfield Hall	Inviting expressions of interest from local VCS groups
Gorton CC	Reconstituted management committee with support from 4CT
103 Princess Street	The People's Centre
Claremont Resource Centre	African Caribbean Care Group
The Dower House (Heaton Park)	Manchester District Beekeepers Association
Manchester Tram Museum (Heaton Park)	Manchester Tram Museum committee
Debdale Park Bowling Pavilion	Debdale Park bowling group
Rondin Road	Gaskell Garden Project (3 year project)
Land at Parrswood Road	The Fox Hole project
Didsbury Park Surestart	Inviting expressions of interest from local VCS groups
Chorlton Park Surestart	Inviting expressions of interest from local VCS groups
Fog Lane Park Pavilion	Inviting expressions of interest from local VCS groups
Greenbrow Road Nursery	Tree of Life
Cringle Playing Fields changing room	Cringle Park Rangers
Crumpsall Park Visitors Centre	Rainbow Surprise
Timpson Road playing fields	Wythenshawe Town FC

Appendix C – Case Studies

Community Asset Transfer Case Study

Organisation Name: Community on Solid Ground
<p>Please give a brief introduction of COSG and it's work/purpose:</p> <p>CSG is an active and effective charity delivering services within a community context within the Whalley Range area of South Manchester. CSG works in co-operation with agencies and in consideration of the residents of Whalley Range and neighbouring communities.</p> <p>Its respected Youth on Solid Ground project specialises in working with and for young people and is open to and accessed by all sections of the youth community. It is inclusive and representative of the largely Black, Asian and ethnic minority make-up of local residents – all are welcomed and encouraged to look beyond difference and towards friendship and working together. The success of the approach is evidenced to reduce neighbour nuisance, anti social behaviour and inter-community conflict within the immediate area and further afield.</p> <p>Our chief aim is to support the community to interact with activities and opportunities to develop integration, community cohesion and social inclusion. We promote the health and wellbeing of all community members through active participation and engage all sections of the community, including 'hard-to-reach' young people. We use educational, social, and sports activities to help them build resilience and choose positive constructive lifestyles. We empower people to increase their confidence, motivation, skills, employability and quality of life. This helps people develop self-esteem and achieve their full potential and contribute to the community as mature and responsible individuals.</p>
<p>Name the MCC asset transferred to COSG and the area it is located in:</p> <p>Manley Park Play Centre, Whalley Range</p>
<p>State the approximate start date of the asset transfer process:</p> <p>2013</p>
<p>State the date of the actual asset transfer:</p> <p>24/03/2016</p>
<p>*Estimated number of hours/cost of asset transfer process to your organisation? *If known:</p> <p>Staff were involved with initial community consultation and staff and Trustees completed business planning and health checks. Our Operations Manager dedicated time for over a year and a half communicating via emails, calls, meetings.</p>
<p>Why was asset transfer necessary and important for COSG?</p> <p>The Business Plan review and consultations in 2013 demonstrated service user, staff, Trustee and volunteer support for CSG to take advantage of the local authority's community asset transfer programme and develop a central community hub in Manley Park. As an established, local, inclusive organisation CSG was well</p>

placed to manage the centre to meet local demand. Residents expressed an interest in a range of activities, from health and fitness activities, social activities and information and guidance hub. Young people told us they would use the centre more if it was open after schools and during weekdays. The girls said there were not many other safe places to go and would like a combination of sport, play, educational and art activities.

What was your experience of the asset transfer process?

Think about:

- What went well?***
- What could have been better?***
- What support did you receive and from whom?***
- What difference (if any) did the support make to your experience of the asset transfer process?***
- How could the process of asset transfer be improved further?***

CSG were storing equipment in the centre, and were interested in the opportunity to manage it, we contacted the council, councillors and Manchester Community Central (Macc).

Macc supported us with fundraising and business planning and strategy which was a general beneficial exercise for our organisation. They put us in touch with Can Do Communities and we secured a £10,000 grant for a feasibility study on the centre including professional and legal advice and mentoring, access to a charity solicitor on asset transfer and process and check lease and contractual documents, condition building survey, a funding workshop, an organisational health check, appendix to the business plan.

Following the condition survey we approached One Manchester and thanks to their crucial corporate responsibility programme investment of £20,000 we were able to bring the centre to a safe and usable standard for the public. We replaced doors, windows, the heating system, electrical wiring and parts of the roof, soffits, gutters and facias boards. Following the renovations including work undertaken by WRPS Roofing we were able to acquire the building. One Manchester's CEO Dave Power said of the work: "We are really pleased we were able to help the community centre renovate their building. Now it can be enjoyed safely and I think this really shows how businesses and One Manchester can have a positive impact in the community".

We experienced challenges with negotiating with the council during the process. We would recommend that the process values small grassroots organisations delivering free services and recognise that charities lack the capacity of a resourced commercial business. The process should be simpler and less costly as charities lack funds to cover their own and council legal fees and the unpredictability of the risk of rent increases. The time spent on organising the process and planning diverted resources from fundraising and service delivery.

After a challenging year of negotiations CSG became very concerned that the council Officer would change the locks to remove CSG's access. Unlike some other community focused centres, CSG had an existing tiny MCC youth fund contract to deliver a free youth drop in. This meant that CSG was not offered a peppercorn rent and was therefore unable to commit to a deal.

Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Although the council needs to assess the capability of applicants, the council should partner with small organisations to transfer the asset and cover the maintenance costs.

Despite the fact CSG is established, without the support of Macc, One Manchester and Can Do and the SiB grant, the process would have been impossible.

Due to a positive relationship with the BBC Children in Need they offered significant investment that we hope positions us to get a longer lease. We featured in The Deninger's programme and the BBC gave us a running track, performance stage, café seating area, treehouse and sports pitch and trampoline worth tens of thousands of pounds.

Case study provided by: Group Name: Community (Youth) on Solid Ground

Board member name: Q Iqbal

Date: 10/ 09/ 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

Community Asset Transfer Case Study

Organisation Name: Levenshulme Old Library CIO
Please give a brief introduction your organisation and it's work/purpose: To be a centre for community art and culture and to act as a catalyst for community activities and groups.
Name the MCC asset transferred to your organisation and the area it is located in: Levenshulme (old) municipal Library, Cromwell Grove, Levenshulme
State the approximate start date of the asset transfer process: At least three years ago when the community started to discuss and organise around the idea – unsure when it started from MCCs perspective, & we got the keys in Jan 2018.
State the date of the actual asset transfer: 22 nd Jan 2018 – although from the CIO trustees view the process will not be complete until we have a long term lease.
*Estimated number of hours/cost of asset transfer process to your organisation? *If known: <p>These are really hard to calculate but one of our core trustees has estimated that to get to this point over 3 years he has probably spent a day a week on average on the project. That is over 150 days of volunteer time , and maybe contributed another 50 days in the preceding two years as we worked up our initial ideas and business model. So 200 days in total.</p> <p>If we average another 10 trustees/volunteers spending an average of a day a month each, in meetings, training, setting up and running the charity, visiting other projects, fundraising activities and the like, over 3 years that might be estimated as another 360 days. A total of around 560 days of volunteer time to get the building open functioning. We note that the national lottery value one hour of volunteer time as over £10 in kind (match funding). So 560 days of volunteer time equals 560 x8 x10 = £44,800.</p> <p>On top of this we have fundraised to pay our project manager. We might estimate that has cost £10,000 to date and is ongoing. Plus £600 so far to legal fees, though we expect it to be much more before the process is complete. So at least £55,000 direct and in kind.</p> <p>Separating out what is the asset transfer process costs, and what are the overall project costs is tricky of course. But remembering the building has only be re-opened for less than 8 months the figures above would probably reflect essential paid and unpaid commitment made towards the asset transfer of a surplus council building by just this one community group, in terms of their work needed to simply occupy and get the building running reasonably sustainably.</p>
Why was asset transfer necessary and important for your organisation? This 1904 Carnegie building is seen as a community heritage asset and there is a widespread fondness for it, the idea of losing it was regarded with some dread.

When the CIO consulted, the community were very clear what they wanted for the building and expressed quite passionately that they did not want to lose it.

What was your experience of the asset transfer process?

Think about:

-What went well?

The active involvement of local councillors, the commitment of the lead MCC Officer, the professional advice from our advisors and infrastructure organisations (such as Steve Conway and MACC), and in particular from One Manchester Housing, has been invaluable in bringing a complex and difficult process together. Asset transfers are not easy, and require flexibility on all sides, and very time consuming, especially for volunteer led organisations. Every building is unique and needs a bespoke arrangement. Without being able to raise seed funding to employ our project manager we wouldn't have got this far.

When crucial decisions were needed the council officers we engage with have done what they can to facilitate the process. But we are aware how time poor they are, and that adds huge pressures on our side too. The process isn't complete by any means yet. We still don't have the long term lease we need to secure external funds. But progress has been made and a much loved, supremely functional building has been given a new lease of life. Activities are happening in it, with the building reopened after two years standing empty and we remain confident, despite the many years of hard work to get to this point.

-What could have been better?

Understanding the internal structures of the council with different responsibilities and roles is a problem for community groups seeking asset transfers. So, for example, when the building was transferred from Leisure to Estates after it ceased operating as a library meant both a lack of continuity, a new set of relationships to build and delay and uncertainty for our group. Communication and dedicated officers with sufficient time to manage and support the process is essential, as is advice from infrastructure organisations or access to impartial technical advice. Around, for example lease agreements, governance, fundraising or structural surveys.

For example, accessing accurate running costs for heating and lighting was a problem, and made it harder to develop our business plan. So the council collecting together a package of core technical information on the building, including architectural drawings, maintenance schedules, staffing roles and requirements, past condition surveys would all be really helpful. As would being able to network or partner more with other organisations going through this process. The council could improve is the internal coordination between the original department holding the asset (Leisure and libraries in our case), the estates department, the planning department, the CAT team and the legal department (the latter which we understand has been outsourced, and not easy to engage with.) But that requires a dedicated resource for asset transfer.

-What support did you receive and from whom?

This has been listed above. Of course we have also had great support from our community. We also brought quite a lot of internal experience of how to do

community building management and what is involved in asset transfers, and drew on some external pro-bono advice from architects and the like where we could. But this can only take us so far. Having the advisors named above, plus more dedicated architectural support and technical buildings advice would have been very helpful, and especially additional support and information on legal matters. Overall a lot is around good project management and brokering, and this is a problem with asset transfer generally (not just within MCC's estate).

-What difference (if any) did the support make to your experience of the asset transfer process?

We couldn't have achieved what we have without access to support, both within and external to the council. Asset transfer should be seen as a long term endeavour, with considerable risks on either side. Benefits and sustainability will take time to show and achieve, and it should be remembered that community leaders making this happen are not paid, and commit significant time, and have to learn many new skills to deal with both the short and long term complexities of asset transfer.

-How could the process of asset transfer be improved further?

Transfer needs resourcing to work, both internally within the council and to prepare the community to be able to take on such responsibilities. Otherwise there is a risk that the process becomes less about transferring assets and more about getting rid of liabilities, and hoping the community can step up. Access to free or brokered technical advice and a clear framework or policy for supporting asset transfers over the longer period is crucial. As is maintaining a partnership approach to asset transfer connections with the council (and its partners in Health, Housing, Education and Regeneration etc) over the long term.

For example being able to buy into council maintenance, caretaking, security and other contracts in a flexible way, for perhaps 2-3 years after the building was transferred, would have helped us.

Ultimately it's the quality of relationships, backed by a clear policy and resource for asset transfer, and the commitment of individual public servants, working with community volunteers, that make asset transfer exciting and possible.

Are there any other comments you would like to make?

The absence of a long term lease is adversely affecting our ability to raise further funds, this negatively impacts our ability to improve the building and this in turn affects our financial sustainability and raises our organisational risk levels. Occupying under a Tenancy at Will is conveyed to our tenant-partner stakeholders who also do not have the security of a proper lease.

Also the time it is taking to carry out two major repairs (the boiler and the unstable arch) is seriously affecting operational capabilities (the crack in the wall cordoned off area) and raises a very serious risk of losing the ability to heat the building through next winter – this would be catastrophic and halt all activities placing all stakeholder organisations at high risk.

Case study provided by: Group Name:

Levenshulme Old Library CIO

Name: Phil Murphy

Date: 17/9/2018

Community Asset Transfer Case Study

Organisation Name: John Haines
Please give a brief introduction your organisation and its work/purpose: Projekts MCR is a not-for-profit, Community Benefit Society aiming to help people through the use of skateboarding and other skatepark-type activities. We operate the Pumpcage Skatepark under the Mancunian Way flyover on London Road and we deliver over 25 schools sessions a week in and around Manchester. The work Projekts does is having a high impact on increasing female participation in sport and developing community, both around the activity itself and within the local area. Our ambition over the next 12 months is to expand our facility in order to generate new growth and widen our reach.
Name the MCC asset transferred to your organisation and the area it is located in: Pumpcage (Projekts/Mancunian Way/City Centre) Skatepark under the Mancunian Way flyover on London Road. M1 2PG. Based on the border of Ardwick and City Centre wards.
State the approximate start date of the asset transfer process: c. Jan 2015
State the date of the actual asset transfer: 15 Aug 2018
*Estimated number of hours/cost of asset transfer process to your organisation? *If known: In terms of direct costs, excluding Projekts' staff time, the CAT incurred a minimum of £6,000, which includes road closure and legal fees. Time spent in meetings directly related to the CAT were relatively minimal, perhaps an hour or two a month at most. Work on developing the business plan was significantly higher, partly due to regular updates and amendments as the financial circumstances changed over time or that more information was available, which altered the work we planned to do. But it's difficult to put a figure on exactly how much staff time has been spent on the CAT without going back through the records in details.
Why was asset transfer necessary and important for your organisation? A 25 year lease on the land was essential for gaining financial investment from funders, banks and other loan providers, which we needed in order to develop the facility. Within three months of securing the 25-year lease, Projekts has secured over £500k investment through a combination of grants and loans, all of which required the 25-year lease.

What was your experience of the asset transfer process?

Think about:

-What went well? There were no objections to our application from MCC, which was a wonderful start to the process. Steve Higgins was very supportive and had an excellent knowledge of the process, which gave us a good sense of what we needed to do and when. The most positive result is that we were granted a lease that meets our requirements well, allowing us to draw down funding and loans and to deliver the project as described in our business plan.

-What could have been better? The process could have moved significantly quicker, particularly agreeing the terms of the lease. Communication between the lawyers and other parties was frustratingly slow and at times it felt as though the process had completely stagnated. The letters from lawyers were often opaque to any unfamiliar with legal jargon, which was why it was so helpful to have a lawyer on our board to translate for us.

-What support did you receive and from whom? We had a variety of support from a number of sources. We received funding for the prefeasibility process from Locality and had some support from Can Do Communities. We received advice from Gateley Solicitors, from Sport England and a great deal of support from Steve Higgins (MCC), we also recruited a solicitor to our Board of Directors during this process, who was an invaluable asset.

-What difference (if any) did the support make to your experience of the asset transfer process? Without the support I can't imagine how we would have completed the lease by now.

-How could the process of asset transfer be improved further?

I think there are at least three ways that the process can be improved:

- 1) Create of process drawing with estimated dates showing what the process involves and how long each stage might take and why.
- 2) As CATs are usually for the purposes of creating a sustainable business/organisation and that these businesses are often reliant on the lease/ownership in order to remain in operation and that these business will often have a significant benefit to the community, speeding up the lease negotiations by having a round table discussion fairly early on in the process (e.g. once the business plan is agreed and the prefeasibility is finalised) would expedite the process significantly and help to form a relationship between the individuals involved and thus reduce potential the likelihood of misunderstandings or conflict.
- 3) Avoid sending out template draft leases to CAT applicants until the business plan has been read and understood by the person writing the lease. Anything that restricts the applicant from delivering their business plan should be removed from the draft lease before being sent to the applicant.

Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Our board of directors, staff team and the skateboard community are enormously grateful to Manchester City Council for granting us this lease. It has opened countless opportunities for growth and development, created jobs, built community and enhanced a facility that helps make up the unique fingerprint of Manchester.

On a personal note, I would like to thank Steven Higgins for the tireless work he has invested into our organisation throughout the CAT process. He is an asset to the not-for-profit community of Manchester and to everyone who benefits from that community.

Case study provided by: Group Name: Projekts MCR

Name: John Haines

Date: 11 Sep 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

Macc Report on Community Asset Transfer

Report to: Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee – 11 October 2018

Subject: Community Asset Transfer

Report of: Martin Preston, Deputy Chief Executive, Macc
Sarah Whitelegg, Capacity Building Manager, Macc

Summary

- This paper provides the Scrutiny Committee with information on the Community Asset Transfer support and engagement process with reference to Macc's learning.
 - The paper also provides initial recommendations for improving and supporting Community Asset Transfer in the City of Manchester and with reference to good practice in other parts of the country.
-

Contacts:

Martin Preston, Deputy Chief Executive
martin@macc.org.uk
0161 834 9823

Sarah Whitelegg, Capacity Building Manager
sarah@macc.org.uk
0161 834 9823

Background documents (available for public inspection)

Manchester City Council Report for Resolution/Information

Bradford City Council: Community Asset Transfer <https://bit.ly/2NyZYvQ>

Bradford Council: Register of Community Asset Transfers <https://bit.ly/2PoDIXg>

Macc's guide to Community Asset Transfer <https://bit.ly/2x4cHR4>

Manchester Community Assets Pilot (MCAP) Report (available on request)

Observations:

The ensuing observations are put forward from:

- Macc's experience of working closely with the Community Asset Transfer Manager at Manchester City Council
- Macc's experience of supporting groups with Community Asset Transfer
- Macc's experience of delivering Community Asset Transfer training and learning from the Manchester Community Assets Pilot (MCAP) Partnership work
- Initial analysis of approaches to Community Asset Transfer adopted elsewhere in the UK and most notably in Bradford

- 1.0 Both the Estates Team and Macc are inundated with requests from groups to find an asset for transfer or as a request for a particular asset. It is difficult to field the high number of requests within the current process and to manage expectations of groups.
- 2.0 Many groups who make requests for an asset transfer are not ready to manage an asset and usually require considerable capacity building support.
- 3.0 Stronger groups that are closer to readiness for successful asset transfer still require capacity building support to get through the process.
- 4.0 The Community Asset Transfer process is set out in the paper Manchester City Council Report for Resolution/Information along with Macc's support offer. These processes help to manage the approach to Community Asset Transfer but there is room for improvement which would help to manage the demand, improve the support process and the application process and provide a better experience for the groups.
- 5.0 Asset transfers arise as follows: a group requests a particular asset or a group requests any asset that meets their stated requirements.
- 6.0 Groups have to contact the Community Asset Transfer Manager to ascertain what assets are available which increases workload.
- 7.0 However, experience of the ensuing process can vary considerably due to a number of factors: how long the asset has been and will remain available for transfer; how much interest there is in the asset from community groups; whether other parts of the Council have intentions for an asset/needs that have to be met by that asset; whether realistic costs are available for the asset; finding funding to meet some of the outlay costs that are necessary in ascertaining viability of an asset transfer.
- 8.0 For most assets, availability is not predetermined publicly and is subject to whether groups are already engaged in support from Macc and/or the Community Asset Manager. Where more than one group is interested in an asset, there is encouragement for groups to work together rather than in competition.
- 9.0 For some assets, details of the asset are published and a timescale is set for groups to express an interest. This is referred to as an 'open process' and

effectively, all groups expressing an interest have the same amount of time to prepare their business plan and register their interest.

- 10.0 Once interest has been expressed in an asset and a business plan submitted and accepted, lease negotiations begin. This can vary from short-term leases to actual asset transfer. Full repair and insuring terms mean that groups must be able to cover the costs of repair, maintenance and any alterations to the asset. In order to secure funding for works of this nature, capital funders stipulate that groups must have a minimum lease of 25 years. In effect, a group needs a minimum of a 26/27 year lease as by the time the funding bid is submitted, processed and if successful, awarded, a 25 year lease is diminished and only 23-24 years remain.

Recommendations

- 11.0 Having one single entry point for groups interested in asset transfer would help manage the demand and filter out groups who are not ready or not suitable for asset transfer. The first and only point of entry in Bradford for Community Asset Transfer is through Bradford City Council's Community Asset Transfer Team which health checks the groups and if eligible, refers them to infrastructure support for help to create a business plan. In Manchester, point of entry could either be the City Council or the local infrastructure support organisation for the City (currently Macc).
- 12.0 Increasing the number of open processes for asset transfer would be beneficial: it would help to manage the demand from groups; help to inform the decision making process; help to create a fairer process for groups applying and could be better aligned with other strategies and policies.
- 13.0 Longer leases for asset transfer, with a minimum of 30 years would be helpful where a group is assessed successfully as being ready and able for asset transfer. This does not erase the need or suitability of short term leases in some cases. Bradford City Council offers leases of up to 100 years.
- 14.0 An updateable, published list of available assets may assist the transparency of the asset transfer process in Manchester and assist in managing the number of enquiries made and the transparency of Community Asset Transfer.
- 15.0 There is a strong and valuable training offer in place in Manchester and bespoke one-to-one support. This could be complemented and supported by a clearer Community Asset Transfer process and better resources.
- 16.0 The Community Asset Transfer training programme would benefit from regular, secured funding to enable quicker responses to the need in Manchester and in order to ensure groups are well supported and informed with regard to undertaking Community Asset Transfer.
- 17.0 There would be considerable benefit to Manchester City Council exploring other good practice currently in operation in other parts of the country, e.g. Bradford.

- 18.0 Macc recently visited Bradford City Council (BCC) and met their CAT team; CBAD (the equivalent infrastructure support organisation in Bradford) and Locality. Bradford's approach is similar to Wigan's and contains some really useful learning. There would be great benefit in having a wider conversation between Macc, Manchester City Council and Bradford City Council's CAT Team.
- 19.0 BCC have invested quite significantly (both in terms of capacity and resources) in their efforts to ensure that CAT is as successful as it can be. There is a strong and successful partnership approach to CAT between the council and the infrastructure support which includes the imminent transfer of five town hall premises into community ownership. The Community Asset Transfer legal team are currently assessing these and all are close to CAT completion.
- 20.0 Bradford City Council has a dedicated Community Asset Transfer team of three surveyors and a programme co-ordinator. The team has plans to recruit a fourth surveyor as soon as possible. The Council has invested resources into this team and also provides additional Community Asset Transfer specific funding for groups to cover costs such as legal fees and basic building repairs. This funding overcomes the hurdle many groups face in finding funds to carry out condition reports, feasibility studies, etc.
- 21.0 Bradford does not yet have a comprehensive training programme in place for asset transfer (and is interested in learning from Manchester's example). However, Bradford does offer Community Asset Transfer information and learning events through a partnership approach of the Council and the local infrastructure support.
- 22.0 Cllr Alex Ross-Shaw, Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Planning and Transport at Bradford City Council, has expressed a sincere interest in connecting with his relevant counterpart/s in Manchester to share some of Bradford's experiences and learning on CAT and Bradford City Council have also kindly offered Manchester three tickets for their upcoming CAT learning and information event on 30th October (5.00-7.00pm) for a member of Macc, a member of the Estates Team and an Exec Member of Manchester City Council to attend.