

Highland Community Planning Partnership
Community Planning Board – 19 December 2018

Agenda Item	6.
Report No	CPB 16/18

Community Asset Reviews

**Report by Community and Democratic Manager
Highland Council**

Summary
This report suggests an approach to developing our use of property across the public, voluntary and community sectors to better support the delivery of outcomes identified as Community Planning Partnership (CPP) priorities.

It suggests a place based approach that takes cognisance of local circumstances and opportunities to improve the use of property resources to drive impact on needs. It highlights an approach to engaging communities in that process that would allow community partnerships alongside communities to make choices about where to invest and disinvest to support the delivery of local priorities

It asks Board Members to comment on the approach, the places that might be in scope and how CPP agencies could contribute to the process.

1. Background
The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 sets out clear requirements in terms of the public sector –

- working in partnership
- being more local
- engaging with communities
- identifying and targeting inequality

CPP partners across Highland are now in a position where there are clear priorities set out in the Highland Outcome Improvement Plan (HOIP), effective multi-agency local partnerships in place, and the development of locality plans identifying those communities and people most in need supported by robust data.

A key element of delivering the improvement required involves agencies and communities delivering services that are integrated, collaborative and targeted. However our use of assets to support this type of delivery has lagged behind.

Typically our use of assets can often be described in the following terms-

- can be driven by a “because it’s there approach”
- some of the estate is ageing, expensive and not fit for purpose
- some has been retained because of local political/community pressure rather than current needs
- there is often no coherence between the estate provision between partners and community bodies
- there is often no link between **outcomes/need/service** and **provision/estate/capital investment**.

2.	<p>Community Asset Review Approach</p> <p>A community asset review process would start with local community partnerships engaging with local communities to-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop a community partnerships view of community asset requirements linked to locality plans • ensure outcomes/need drive service/buildings not vice versa • engage the community at the beginning not the end • apply the Commission on Highland Democracy principles in terms of where, how and with whom the engagement takes place <p>The key outputs for the process are-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better outcomes for communities • Sustainable revenue budgets <p>The benefits of the process would be –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows agencies and communities to invest/dis-invest to improve outcomes • Improve integration-between public agencies, third sector, communities <p>Discussion at the Chief Officers Group highlighted the need to take cognisance of-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the possibility of carrying out pilots in a small number of areas of over-provision • the benefits of co-location; the importance of savings being re-invested in communities • the need to join up with the review of operational depots and stores • the Local Governance Review and the potential for a targeted, outcome-focussed approach, whether it be place-based or issue-based, aimed at reducing inequalities • the need to identify the biggest issues/areas of greatest risk
3.	<p>Community Asset Review-Potential Models</p> <p>Our approach to community planning acknowledges that different communities have different needs and are starting from different places. The suggested approach to community asset reviews acknowledges that each review will have a different starting point, focus and result. The common factors though are that it-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • engages the community with specific focus on people/groups who are experiencing the issues we seek to target in our plans • allows development that reflects the local context • authorises the local ability to invest /dis-invest between buildings, service delivery and agencies <p>In considering where this approach could be piloted it is key that communities and agencies feel this can be a positive development for them. The following models and geographies might offer a positive starting point-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where we have already made significant investment and require to rationalise legacy property-Wick? • Where we are about to make significant investment in the next couple of years-Alness/Broadford/Tain or another?

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where there is a fragmented public/voluntary/community sector presence with diminishing numbers of staff/agency presence and end of life property – a public/community service hub new development could be progressed and drive service change-Portree? |
|--|---|

Recommendations

<p>The Board is asked to comment on the approach, the places that might be in scope and how CPP agencies could contribute to the process.</p>
