

1.00pm - Thursday 17 March 2011

Falsgrave Community Resource Centre.

Minutes

Present: Tom Fox (Chair), Richard Weightman, David Billing, Jim Dillon, Andy Sharp, Steve Oldridge, Ken Taylor, Steve Smith, Richard Grunwell, Barrie Mason, Angela Atkinson, Shaun Tyman, Pam Reeve, Wendy Clews, Jo Ireland

Tom Mutton (for agenda item 2)

1. **Introductions/welcome**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.

2. **My Barrowcliff**

Tom Mutton gave a presentation summarising progress to date in developing the "My Barrowcliff" Action Plan and outlined key themes and issues. The plan is now in draft stage and consultation is currently taking place. Work continues on the ground in respect of the Gallows Close improvements and further funding bids are being pursued both for Gallows Close and other projects across the estate. Funding secured to date includes £81k from the Community Fund (as recommended by the LSP), £47.5K from Sanctuary Housing and almost £5k from the Rural Area Voice Your Choice. Safer Communities Partnership has also allocated around £20k.

It was noted that although external funding was being pursued, the action plan was mainly about the use of mainstream resources. For example, Groundwork is currently working with the Council to develop a caretaking scheme.

BM highlighted the need to manage expectations, especially as funding is tight, particularly for Highways issues.

WC advised that Create would be willing to assist with any arts projects. DB asked about the involvement of local schools. TM advised that both Northstead and Barrowcliff schools had been involved with the process to date and were keen to be involved in practical delivery (e.g. spring cleans) as well as through consultation. AA asked about the involvement of older people. TM advised that specific consultation had been undertaken with the Pop In Club (Wreyfield Drive) and issues relating to older people are highlighted in the action plan.

It was agreed that the LSP "My Barrowcliff" Action Group be granted delegated powers to approve the final plan at their meeting of 7th April 2011. Thereafter copies of the final plan will be circulated to all Board members.

KT highlighted that the high level support through the LSP for this project would be key to the successful implementation of the 5 year plan. Many of the actions are about more joined up and integrated service delivery and there is a need for some

alignment of resources, especially when resources across the board are tight. In terms of ongoing monitoring of progress it was agreed that the LSP Action Group should continue to meet (perhaps 2/3 times a year) to have oversight of progress being made and to deal with any difficulties or blockages that may occur.

3. Changing Role of the Community Partnership

Jl recapped on current partnership arrangements, key issues and current functions of the partnership.

TF introduced the discussion session and suggested that in the current climate there is still a need for a board such as the community partnership. There are lots of partnerships operating in the Borough but none has an overall brief to set the strategic priorities for the Borough. There is still a legal requirement to produce a community strategy and therefore a need to ensure that local priorities are linked to service delivery and commissioning decisions. It is also important that there is a place where different perspectives and sectors, including community voices, can come together.

Members then split into two discussion groups to consider how the partnership might change and operate in the future to ensure it was fit for purpose. Key points from the discussion included:

Group 1 (facilitated by Jo)	Group 2 (facilitated by Tom)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One of the benefits of the LSP is that it stands outside of politics and is not politically driven. - It brings together a wide range of perspectives, the community voice is valued and listened to and this involvement should be retained. - The Board is and should continue to be a strategic body but to do this effectively it needs sufficient understanding of what is happening on the ground. (different perspectives and links with community/partnerships help with this) - There needs to be the right partnerships/structure underneath the Board for it to work effectively and clear links between this wider structure and the Board. - Action groups can help to progress specific issues. - The LSP gives legitimacy and dynamism to partnership working generally. - Communication could be more effective. The LSP has never had a shared communications strategy. - The public health agenda will be 	<p><u>Involved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - needs to be links to the LEP and private sector. - Health input is important <p><u>Communication</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communication strategy, needs to include locality arrangements and links with other partnerships, e.g. LEPs - Website could be improved. Think about internal and external facing. Could include members area with targeted information for members. - Communication with communities important <p><u>Local Priorities for communities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perception and reality? - Objective criteria important - Area Forums - My Barrowcliff is a good example <p><u>Effective Operation of Board</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Value of face to face - Bi monthly about right <p><u>Relationships with key partnerships</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSE has a specific role. Need to ensure clear focus. - Avoid duplication - Links to private business. Need to develop a local "mini LEP". <p><u>Successes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Area Forums - Participatory Budgeting

<p>very important in the future and should be a clearer priority for the Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Barrowcliff approach has been effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People involved in difficult decisions - Importance of elected members
---	---

It was agreed that a small working group would look at the issues raised and work up some specific proposals for discussion at the next meeting in May.

4. Funding/Service Issues

DB advised that there had been a loss of funding from various sources for the Safer Communities Partnership and this had resulted in the loss of the analyst post. A wider discussion followed about the potential loss of local control over community safer issues as a result of the elected police commissioner model, also concerns raised about the costs of this.

WC advised that in respect of arts council funding beyond 2012, all arts organisations were having to reapply. This will impact on Create, SJT, Crescent Arts and others. Decisions will be made at the end of March. Also some loss of other arts funding which is affecting arts organisations locally. Concerns have been raised about the economic impacts and lobbying is taking place.

KT advised that Groundwork nationally was looking at a 30% central funding reduction, with funding continuing to reduce over the next 3 years.

RW advised that regarding the voluntary and community sector there was still uncertainty about PCT funding levels. Also loss of small grants e.g. County Area Committee funding was impacting, especially on smaller groups.

BM updated that NYCC had set an interim budget (approved in February) which used some reserve income. A further budget will be prepared in May which sets out where additional savings will be made.

JD advised that the Borough Council was making £2.9m of savings, attempts have been made to minimise the impact on front line services and to look at ways in which services could be provided differently, but this scale of savings has impacted on services such as Park Rangers.

5. Apologies

Were received from Janet Jefferson, Javad Ali, Stephanie Sturrock, Chris Parsons, Lindy Rowley, Richard Thompson, Richard Gunton, Simon Cox, Craig Gaskell.

6. Minutes of the last meeting (20 January 2011) and matters arising

Minutes were agreed as a true record.
No matters arising.

7 Agenda Planning

Items for future meetings were agreed as:

- Feedback from discussion session re. the changing role of the Community Partnership.
- Circulation of final "MyBarrowcliff" Action Plan

Any requests for agenda items to be made to JI prior to next meeting on 25 May 2011.

8. Election of Chair

JI advised that an election for Chair of the Community Partnership was due at the next meeting (May 2011). Nomination forms are available from the Community Partnership Manager and should be submitted to JI prior to the next meeting on 25 May 2011.

9. Any other business

As this was SO's last meeting, the Chair thanked him for his support and commitment to the partnership and wished him well for his retirement.

12 Date of next meetings

All meetings to commence at 1pm.

Wednesday 25 May 2011 – University of Hull, Filey Road, Scarborough (TBC)

Thursday 21 July 2011 - Falsgrave Community Resource Centre **(from 1pm)**

Thursday 22 September 2011 – Green Lane Centre, Whitby