

Appendix 1

CITY NEIGHBOURHOOD HUBS

1. OBJECTIVES OF CITY NEIGHBOURHOOD HUBS PROGRAMME

1.1 City Neighbourhoods' main objective is to establish hubs in the heart of communities, bringing appropriate services closer to those who need them by forging stronger links with local people. The neighbourhood hubs will host a variety of services, based on the specific needs and context of the local area. They are to be delivered by council staff together with a range of partners, including statutory and third sector organisations and residents.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 In Autumn 2015 the NCE Committee and the Programme Board agreed four Phase One areas to begin work. The decision was based on a needs analysis, underpinned by the Public Health report on Resilience, service KPIs, and existing infrastructure. The areas were:

- Moulsecoomb & Bevendean (including Moulsecoomb Library)
- East Brighton
- Hangleton
- Hanover and Elm Grove

2.2 These areas were chosen because they represented the range of 'need' across the city and have varying degrees of existing infrastructure, both from a community and property perspective.

2.3 Following the initial needs analysis which identified the four phase one areas two of the areas have been prioritised; Moulsecoomb and Whitehawk, chosen to answer two fundamental questions:

1. How do we create a neighbourhood hub from existing infrastructure? (Moulsecoomb)
2. How do we use a neighbourhood hub so that it is of real value to the local community? (Whitehawk)

3. PROGRESS TO DATE

3.1 In principle, existing properties can enable the move towards neighbourhood working. Subject to viable business cases and planning permission, buildings can be redeveloped, reconfigured, or released as capital receipts to help fund further development, but additional funding from external sources is likely to also need to be explored.

- 3.2 Three high-level options for creating or improving on a neighbourhood hub in Moulsecoomb and Whitehawk have been developed in partnership with local communities, residents and partner organisations, including local businesses.
- 3.3 Working groups were established in each area, including key stakeholders from the following areas:
- Community groups
 - Local residents
 - Further education
 - BHCC services (e.g. library, children's centre, housing, community safety)
 - CCG/NHS colleagues
 - Police
 - Primary school
 - Youth club
- 3.4 To further inform the development of business case options and ensure that the three Neighbourhood workstreams remained aligned, the programme managers for Community Collaboration, and Enforcement also attended the working group meetings.
- 3.5 The each working group met four times and discussed a specific theme on each occasion:
- Purpose of the hubs
 - Required Infrastructure (Buildings, ICT and Equipment)
 - Data & Information
 - Roles & Skills
- 3.6 Through these themed discussions, the working groups mapped the current position, and where we want to end up. The gap between these two states represents the work that needs to be done, and is the basis for the business case.
- 3.7 Existing service reviews, restructures and the four year budget cycle were considered throughout the discussions to ensure that proposals were realistic and not in conflict with any other modernisation work happening across the organisation.

4. OPTIONS

4.1 M1: Do nothing (Moulsecoomb & Bevendean)

- 4.1.1 Services continue operating in isolation, working with community groups and residents in a disjointed way. Services continue to use their own intelligence in isolation to make service decisions.
- 4.1.2 Retain and continue to maintain buildings in a poor condition (67 Centre, Hillview Contact Centre, Moulsecoomb Library). The costs will grow exponentially as the quality of the buildings deteriorates.

- 4.1.3 There would be no change to the way staff work. Referrals and sign-posting to preventative services would remain inconsistent.
- 4.1.4 Residents would continue to need to visit a variety of locations in order to access the services they use.
- 4.1.5 This option is not preferred.
- 4.2 **M2: Sell some buildings and reinvest in remaining stock (Moulsecoomb & Bevendean)**
 - 4.2.1 Services (Youth, Library, Contact Centre) co-locate with existing complimentary services (e.g. Children's Centre, School, Social Work Hub)
 - 4.2.2 Release the 67 Centre, Hillview Contact Centre, Moulsecoomb Library as potential redevelopment sites and capital receipts to fund development of remaining buildings so they can accommodate the displaced services subject to viable business cases. These buildings are in varied states of disrepair, and it is not financially viable to continue to maintain them.
 - 4.2.3 Explore the redevelopment of the sites for a combination of housing and student accommodation or other revenue/capital generating uses. The Bridge could be relocated nearer to existing buildings, potentially on some of the land near the sports centre.
 - 4.2.4 The level of potential capital receipt that can be obtained for disposal of these assets will vary depending upon redevelopment value of each site. Optimum uses of the site and ways to redevelop will need to be explored. For example, if the sites are sold for affordable housing they are unlikely to generate a significant capital receipt which will impact upon funding available to reinvest in the remaining stock. Land or assets sold for the development of student accommodation is likely to generate a greater capital receipt but may be less likely to secure a planning permission. The business case will look at the associated redevelopment, existing and future land use and other risks and possible options for generating capital receipts.
 - 4.2.5 Co-located services are better able to share information to offer a more joined up service, and integrated registration (to a certain extent). For example, school pupils automatically registered at library, children 'graduate' from Children's Centre to Youth service.
 - 4.2.6 Residents have to visit fewer sites than they currently do (Children's Centre, Social Work hub, Moulsecoomb Primary school, Housing Centre), but the remaining sites are still separated by obstructive geography and access routes. Provision for the existing community centre based next to the library would be included in any housing development on the Selsfield Drive site, so this would remain separated from other council buildings.
 - 4.2.7 This option may be financially more achievable subject to a detailed business being developed, but does not deliver all of the benefits associated with a truly co-operative delivery model. Some of the synergies between services are also impractical in reality e.g. Children's Centres co-locating with Youth Services.

4.3 **M3: Sell some buildings and build a new hub (Moulsecoomb)**

4.3.1 Services (Youth, Library, Contact Centre, The Bridge, Community Centre, GP surgery) co-locate in a new neighbourhood hub and deliver services in a joined up way, making better use of referrals and sign-posting to support/prevention services, learning from the model being developed at the Whitehawk community hub. This could lead to additional savings in the form of shared resources and integrated management structures.

4.3.2 The 67 Centre, Hillview Contact Centre and Moulsecoomb Library could be released as potential development sites and capital receipts. The land could be redeveloped into combination of affordable housing and student accommodation and other potential uses will be explored. As described in paragraph 4.3.3 the level of capital receipt will vary depending upon the redevelopment value of each site. The current high level estimated capital receipts need to be tested (approx. £2.0M value) and could potentially be supplemented with funding from the Asset Management fund and external funding which will need to be explored further to test the viability of building a new community hub on land adjacent to the sports centre. A new build could represent better value in terms of long term maintenance costs but will require a viable business case in terms of initial design feasibility, studies to test out planning policy, and capital development costs to ensure a sustainable building for the future.

4.3.3 This could create a single registration point for all services located in the new hub, backed up by robust data sharing agreement and consent process. Shared knowledge leads to more effective sign-posting and appropriate referral to intensive services like social work, helping managing demand. Linked to 'My Account' being developed by CFDA

4.3.4 This option would achieve the original ambition of the programme, and meet the benefits presented in the previous outline business case, but delivering it is beyond the financial reach of the council alone. Additional bids to external funding streams (Primary Care Transformation Fund, Interreg 2seas, Local Enterprise Partnership etc.) will need to be explored as part of the detailed business case alongside the estimated value of capital receipts

4.3.5 This is the preferred option.

4.4 **W1: Basic Improvements (Whitehawk)**

4.4.1 Improve the signage to the hub which will make access and navigation between buildings easier and more coherent.

4.4.2 Improve the external lighting to tackle the issue that residents have raised about feeling safe.

4.4.3 Improve collaboration between the services through regular hub meetings and sharing of opportunities, data and risks.

4.4.4 This option is about making basic improvements to the library hub site, and improving sign-posting to the neighbouring buildings e.g. Wellsbourne Health Centre and Roundabout Children's Centre.

4.4.5 This is not the preferred option because it does not realise all of the benefits established in the outline business case.

4.5 **W2: Hub Manager (Whitehawk)**

4.5.1 This option is in addition to the basic improvements outlined above.

4.5.2 A Hub Business Manager will be recruited – this person will be local, either someone who works in the hub already (i.e. council officer, Hawks café staff), an active community member, or from a local business or organisation. The duties of this role will be informed by a Hub Action Plan, but could include:

- Promoting hub facilities and generating income through hiring meeting rooms and hub spaces
- Recruiting, inducting and managing volunteers to work across hub (hub services can opt into this offer)
- Devising and implementing hub comms plan (as agreed by Hub Delivery Group)
- Managing day to day operational delivery of hub services
- Fundraising to generate income to develop and deliver hub activities. The annual target for this will be in line with cost of salary for Hub Business Manager, so that the role brings into the hub at least as much as it costs to deliver this role.

4.5.3 A Hub Delivery Group, chaired by the Business Manager meet quarterly to share ideas, raise/resolve issues and plan collaborative work for the coming quarter. Members of the delivery group include representatives from:

- Community groups
- Local residents
- Further education
- BHCC Hub services (e.g. library, children's centre, housing)
- CCG/NHS colleagues
- Police
- Primary school
- Youth club

4.5.4 This is not the preferred option due to the increased revenue cost and concerns that this model is not sustainable.

4.6 **W3: Hub Co-ordinator (Whitehawk)**

4.6.1 This option includes the basic improvements outlined in W1.

4.6.2 This option includes the duties and representatives outlined in W2, but without the Business Manager role.

4.6.3 Instead of a Hub Business Manager, the duties outlined in option W2 would be delivered jointly by a hub working group. The working group that was

established at the start of the programme will continue to meet to develop the hub action plan.

4.6.4 This is the preferred option as agreed by the working group.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

5.1 As part of the development of Neighbourhood Hubs there will be broad engagement with the local residents and communities within the area. This will enable us to develop the services and activities to allow for the specific needs of the communities but also look at how to work collaboratively with the current community resources, the residents and communities within the area. A community engagement plan will be developed to support the process in due course. The cost of delivering a broad and independent engagement exercise has been factored in to the business case.

6. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

6.1 To progress the City Neighbourhood preferred options, assurance is sought that the approach outlined above is agreed in principle, so that the full detailed financial business cases to support their implementation can be developed in confidence

6.2 Pending agreement of the preferred options for Whitehawk and Moulsecoomb by the Corporate Modernisation Delivery Board in July, resources will be allocated to develop full financial business cases

6.3

	Q3 15/16	Q4 15/16	Q1 16/17	Q2 16/17	Q3 16/17	Q4 16/17	Q1 17/18	Q2 17/18	Q3 17/18	Q4 17/18	Q1 18/19	Q2 18/19	Q3 18/19	Q4 18/19
Programme Established														
Presentation to NCE Committee														
Working Groups Meetings														
Working Group Findings Presented														
Resident Engagement														
Full Business Case Developed														
Moulsecoomb Hub Development														
Whitehawk Hub Development														
Hangleton and Hanover Working Groups														
Resident Engagement														
Full Business Case Developed														