



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

**POLICY, RESOURCES & GROWTH
COMMITTEE
ADDENDUM TWO**

4.00PM, THURSDAY, 14 JULY 2016

FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE, SHIP STREET, BRIGHTON

ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
30 BRIGHTON AND HOVE SOCIAL VALUE FRAMEWORK	1 - 6
Extract from the proceedings of the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee meeting held on 11 July 2016 (copy attached).	
38 STANMER PARK - REDEVELOPMENT OF TRADITIONAL AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS	7 - 8
Proposed amendment from the Green Group (copy attached).	

Subject:	Brighton and Hove Social Value Framework – Extract from the Proceedings of the Neighbourhoods, Communities and Equalities Committee meeting held on 11 July 2016	
Date of Meeting:	14 July 2016	
Report of:	Executive Lead Officer for Strategy, Governance & Law (and Monitoring Officer)	
Contact Officer:	Name: Penny Jennings	Tel: 29-1065
	E-mail: penny.jennings@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Wards Affected:	All	

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

Action Required of the Committee:

To receive the item referred from the Neighbourhoods, Communities and Equalities Committee and to approve the recommendations made specifically to the Policy, Resources and Growth Committee.

Recommendations: That the Committee agree the recommendation in the report, together with the additional recommendation from Neighbourhood's, Communities and Equalities Committee set out below.

That the Policy, Resources and Growth Committee

- (1) Sign up to the Framework and Pledge on behalf of the city council; and,
- (2) That any exceptions to the agreed framework be approved by the Procurement Board.

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOODS, COMMUNITIES AND EQUALITIES COMMITTEE

11 JULY 2016

MAIN MEETING ROOM – THE FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE

Present: Councillor Daniel (Chair) Councillors Moonan (Deputy Chair), Simson (Opposition Spokesperson), Littman (Group Spokesperson), Bell, Gibson, Hill, Lewry, K Norman and Penn.

DRAFT MINUTE

PART ONE

12 BRIGHTON & HOVE SOCIAL VALUE FRAMEWORK

- 12.1 The Committee considered a joint report of the Acting Director of Public Health and the Executive Director of Finance and Resources seeking the Committee's endorsement for a new "Social Value Framework" (Appendix 1 to the report) for the city and a new Social Value Guide" for Commissioners, Procurement Teams and Providers (Appendix 2 to the report). It was noted that the report was also intended to provide an update on work carried out to achieve the recommendations from the scrutiny panel on Social Value which had been completed in January 2015.
- 12.2 The Social Value Guide for Commissioners, Procurement Teams and Providers would ensure that a practical toolkit was available to commissioners and procurement officers on how they should apply social value in the commissioning and procurement process including measuring and monitoring performance. The Framework and the Guide had been developed by a cross sector citywide steering group as part of a national action learning programme on embedding and increasing social value in health commissioning with the programme itself funded by the Department of Health and independently facilitated by the Institute for Voluntary Action (IVAR) and Social Enterprise UK.
- 12.3 The Community Engagement Coordinator, and the Category Manager, Corporate Procurement, detailed the work which had been carried out in concert with and support of other partners which had resulted in the Framework which was being put forward for approval by this Committee and which was also being put forward to the forthcoming meeting of the Policy, Resources and Growth Committee for approval.
- 12.4 It was explained that the Social Value Scrutiny Panel had identified that in these times of financial constraints, Social Value needed to be viewed as a tool to facilitate discussion with other organisations in the city on how to

provide the best services possible with enhanced benefits for individuals and communities locally. It had been clearly identified that business cases needed to be made and all had been strongly of the view that this did not conflict with social value. It was intended that the framework would provide a toolkit which would give a clear and easily understandable context going forward.

- 12.5 The Chair, Councillor Daniel, commended the report and the work which had taken place in order to bring it forward stating that the contribution made by voluntary sector, health partners and others had been valuable in shaping the framework.
- 12.6 Councillor Simson commented that having sat on the original scrutiny panel she also welcomed the work which had been undertaken in preparing the framework and asked for clarification of some of the terminology used. Councillor Simson stated that the definition of the social framework and guide referred to in recommendation 3 on page 289 of the agenda was in line with that used by the scrutiny panel. This appeared to differ from the explanation used elsewhere in the report. Councillor Simson was also of the view that it was important for the council to use the framework as far as practicable as part of a broader approach when assessing how it provided and delivered its own services, not only in relation to procurement.
- 12.7 The Community Engagement Manager, responded that the terminology used was not contradictory as in some instances the framework would be used in the context of broader added value to include for example economic and environmental benefits, how it would be used/applied might differ and could be complex to define in some instances. Examples were given to illustrate this point, for example in the case of volunteering relating to mental health services, different types of volunteering could result in response to differing identified needs, the framework would be used in order to stretch that process. It was further explained that this process was being applied to the council itself when services were being redesigned.
- 12.8 The Category Manager, Corporate Procurement, explained that in concert with the framework it had been recognised that it was important to look at what data was collected and what use that data was put to in order to ensure that structures and processes were streamlined.
- 12.9 Joanna Martindale, Hangleton and Knoll Project welcomed the report and the opportunity for the voluntary sector to be involved and to guide the process. It was important to note that long terms aims could often be achieved as a result of short term targetted funding. The work carried out by the University of Sussex was valuable. It was important for like to be compared with like and for data and data sharing to be consolidated as within the community and voluntary sector different organisations could collect data differently and have different expectations.
- 12.10 Councillor Gibson welcomed the report and in particular the fact that the framework would also be used to inform assessment of what we “the council” did as an organisation and how we could do it better. He considered it would be beneficial for training to be provided for members in order that they had a

good understanding of how this could work in practice. Councillor Gibson asked whether and to what extent this would come into play when contracts were awarded, for example given issues around supply of affordable housing in relation to low wages in the city, whether consideration could be given to ensuring that “living rent” could be applied to new development(s).

12.11 The Chief Executive, explained in response that whilst all elements were weighted and taken account of when decisions were taken in respect of planning or housing for example, factors such as the capital cost of a scheme and how that would be paid back had also to be considered. All those factors had to be balanced against one another when formulating recommendations and reaching decision(s).

12.11 Councillor Moonan noted Councillor Gibson’s point in respect of the desirability of providing further training for Members, stating that she was happy to bring that suggestion forward at the Member Development Working Group of which she was a member.

12.12 Councillor Penn referred to the examples that had been provided detailing the work carried out by other authorities, referring to the IT assessment which had taken place at the London Borough of Lambeth and asked whether similar work would be put into place in the city. It was explained that now the guidance was in place implementation and examples of best practice elsewhere could and would be looked at.

12.13 Councillor Littman stated that he was pleased that the framework had been brought forward considering that it would become increasingly important over time, asking whether this would be applied to services and goods the council sold, as well as when they were buying in. The Assistant Director, Property and Design explained that when bids were made this was taken into account and there was usually a quality/price split. Councillor Simson asked whether the percentage applied would be different for different contracts and it was confirmed that this was so.

12.14 In moving to the vote, the Chair, Councillor Daniel proposed an additional recommendation that any proposed exceptions be approved by the Procurement Board. This was seconded by Councillor Simson. The proposed additional recommendation was put to the vote and members voted unanimously in support of it.

12.15 **RESOLVED** – That the Neighbourhoods and Communities Committee:

- (1) Notes the work completed by the Communities, Equality and Third Sector Team and Procurement to progress the recommendations of the Social Value Scrutiny Panel report January 2015 (Appendix 3)
- (2) Endorses the Social Value Framework and recommends that the Policy, Resources and Growth Committee sign up to the Framework and Pledge on behalf of the city council;

- (3) Endorses the Social Value Commissioner, Procurement and Providers Guide and instructs commissioners and procurement officers to use it with immediate effect; and
- (4) That any exceptions to the agreed framework be approved by the Procurement Board.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND – That the Policy, Resources and Growth Committee

- (1) Sign up to the Framework and Pledge on behalf of the city council; and,
- (2) That any exceptions to the agreed framework be approved by the Procurement Board.

Note: Members voted unanimously that the recommendations including the additional one proposed by the Chair, Councillor Daniel and seconded by Councillor Simson be approved.

AGENDA ITEM 38

**STANMER PARK –
REDEVELOPMENT OF TRADITIONAL AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS
GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**

That an additional recommendation be added at 2.2 as shown in ***bold italics***.

2.2 That Committee notes that existing tenants in some of the buildings proposed for redevelopment are pursuing activities consistent with objectives set out in 2.1 and have expressed strong interest in maintaining their leases.

Proposed by: Cllr: Sykes Seconded by: Cllr: C. Mac Cafferty

Amended recommendations to read:

- 2.1 That Committee approves the redevelopment of the Stanmer Traditional Agricultural Buildings in accordance with the conclusion - Option 4, as this option produces the best income return on the estimated capital expenditure and will deliver all of the council's wider objectives including:
- Gateway to National Park
 - SDNPA area office
 - Visitor Information, education and Interpretation spaces
 - Community and event space
 - Recreation areas and vibrant working hubs
 - Improved access to local Heritage, the Countryside, Agriculture and Food Production
 - Craft workshops and Artisan retail outlets
 - Delivery of a sustainable management plan for the wider Park and village
- 2.2 That Committee notes that existing tenants in some of the buildings proposed for redevelopment are pursuing activities consistent with objectives set out in 2.1 and have expressed strong interest in maintaining their leases.
- 2.3 That Committee authorises the Acting Executive Director Economy, Environment and Culture, Assistant Director Property & Design and Head of Legal Services to approve terms for the disposal of 16 non-core assets from the council's Agricultural Estate as set out in the part two report.
- 2.4 From the disposal of these non-core assets and the disposal of non-core assets previously approved for disposal on 11 July 2014 of which 50% is to support the council's capital investment strategy, the total net capital receipt to

be used to provide match funding for the Parks for People bid and funding for the development of the traditional agricultural buildings.

- 2.5 That Committee authorises the Acting Executive Director Economy, Environment and Culture, Assistant Director Property & Design and Head of Legal Services to approve terms for the disposal of 2 potential residential enabling development sites within Stanmer, subject to consultation.