

BOARD MEETING OF THE SOUTH DERBYSHIRE
LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

Held at the Civic Offices, Civic Way, Swadlincote
on 17th March 2005 at 9.30 a.m.

PRESENT:-

Local Authority Sector

Frank McArdle (Chief Executive, South Derbyshire District Council),
County Councillor Joyce Sanders, District Councillor Heather Wheeler.

Other Public Sector

Andy Wright (substitute for Chief Superintendent Tony Hurrell)
(Derbyshire Constabulary) (Chair), Karen Jones (Trident Housing
Association), Nina Ennis (Derbyshire Dales and South Derbyshire
Primary Care Trust) (arrived at 10.20 a.m.)

Private Sector

Karen Bradley (Toyota UK), John Oake (Sharpe's Pottery Heritage and
Arts Trust), George Tansley (Etete Limited)(Left at 11.25 a.m.)

Voluntary/Community Sector

Reverend Bob Hollings (Churches Together), Graeme Royall (South
Derbyshire Citizens' Advice Bureau)(arrived at 10.00 a.m.), Jo Smith
(South Derbyshire CVS), Helena Stubbs (Derbyshire Rural Community
Council).

Member of the Public In Attendance

Mrs. B. Cowley (resident of Egginton).

Also in Attendance

South Derbyshire District Council

Ian Reid (Deputy Chief Executive), Sally Knight (Head of Policy and
Economic Regeneration), Kevin Mason (Economic Development Officer),
Malcolm Roseburgh (Community Regeneration Officer), Sue Grief (Write
Away) and Debbie Cook (Democratic Services Officer).

Derbyshire County Council

Jane Cox (Partnerships Co-ordinator), Martin Smith (Transport).

Derby City Council

Christopher Hegarty.

LSP/51. **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THE MEETING**

In the absence of both the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board, John Oake was
appointed Chair for the Meeting.

LSP/52. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence from the Meeting were received from District Councillor Barrie Whyman M.B.E. (Vice-Chair), District Councillor John Wilkins, Chief Superintendent Tony Hurrell (Chair), Clare Williamson (Learning and Skills Council), Susan Bell O.B.E. (National Forest Company), Sharon Forton (Derbyshire Chamber), Graham Keddle (Nottingham East Midlands Airport), Glenys Williams (Old Post Regeneration Association) and Maria Hallam (GOEM).

LSP/53. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Board Meeting held on 13th January 2005 were taken as read, approved as a true record and signed by the Chair.

LSP/54. **DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT**

Frank McArdle referred to the report on the Agenda introducing Local Area Agreements, aiming to strengthen partnership working in Derbyshire. The report stated that Derbyshire had the foundations in place to deliver challenging Local Area Agreement (LAA) outcomes which reflected national and local priorities. Mr McArdle advised the Board that it was being asked to endorse the principles of the agreement. It was expected that sustainable communities would become operative in 2006/07. The framework document circulated was to be developed over time and it was currently at its second draft stage. The voluntary sector would be engaged in the next level of underpinning the document. George Tansley referred to Derbyshire County Council being the accountable body and queried its influence. In response, it was advised that Derbyshire County Council had raised a caution that such agreements encouraged more bureaucracy on the County Council but it was looking at ways to persuade the Government Office that this issue was a matter of trust. Derbyshire County Council realised that it gave a problem and would attempt to ensure that all funds were passported. Councillor Mrs. Wheeler advised that it would be sensible for the LSP to write to Derbyshire County Council emphasising that bureaucracy needed to be minimised in this regard and was advised by Mr. McArdle that Derbyshire County Council were not looking to impose further bureaucracy. Jane Cox (Derbyshire County Council's Partnerships Co-ordinator) advised that the LAA's were being managed by the Derbyshire Partnership Forum. County Councillor Joyce Sanders agreed to take back the comments to the County Council. To conclude, the Board agreed to write to Derbyshire County Council confirming the LSP's understanding of the situation and in the meantime endorse the principles of the agreement.

(At this point in the Meeting, Mr. McArdle gave his apologies and left the Meeting. Ian Reid subsequently substituted for Mr. McArdle accordingly).

LSP/55. **PRESENTATION BY DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 2**

Martin Smith of Derbyshire County Council referred to the County Transport Plan for 2006-2011. This plan incorporated the policies and objectives of Derbyshire County Council with regard to transport. It was not a bidding document, it was a set of indicative financial indications. Initial funding for the plan was £17.8 million but this was less than the County Council had received previously. Over the five year period of the Plan this funding rose to £20.8 million and of that, $\frac{2}{3}$ was for maintenance and $\frac{1}{3}$ was the integrated

transport block allocation (road safety, bus enhancement etc.). It was reported that only road schemes under £5 million would be considered under the auspices of this plan. Any project over £5 million would be subject to a separate bidding process. The Board was advised that large schemes had not been undertaken in the past through the Local Transport Plan due to the perceived unfairness to the rest of the County. It was reported that the Local Transport Plan needed to identify where and how money was to be spent and whether schemes offered value for money. The purpose of the presentation was to ascertain from the Board how it wished to be involved in the production process of the plan. A joint transport plan with neighbouring authorities was currently being developed and would form part of the Local Transport Plan. A provisional plan was to be produced by the end of July 2005.

(At this point in the Meeting, Graham Royall arrived.)

Christopher Hegarty of Derby City Council referred to the City Council's Transport Plan. The Derby Joint Local Transport Plan covered and the travel to work area surrounding the City. This Plan would concentrate on the four areas:- improving accessibility, reducing congestion, improving road safety and improving air quality. For the first two years of the Plan, the funding received would be reduced compared to that received previously. The major scheme currently in existence, being the Derby Inner Ring Road costing more than £5 million was discussed. Public consultation had been undertaken at ten locations in the City between November and December 2004, the result of which indicated that the public wished to see more spending on public transport. The Board was advised that action needed to be taken to reduce the projected 30% increase in traffic in the City by 2021. Officers were open to suggestions of schemes. At the end of the five years, £3.9 million would be available to spend accordingly.

John Oake referred to passenger rail and efforts being made to reintroduce the Ivanhoe line. He also talked about sustainable leisure and tourism for the area, referring to cycleways and footpaths etc.

With the permission of the Chair, Mrs. Cowley made a plea for help at Egginton with public transport provision as elderly residents of the village were having difficulty getting to the nearest Post Office outside the village. Jo Smith of the CVS referred to the Community Strategy's Opportunities for All section, which looked at how such issues could be addressed. She stated that lots of volunteers had information to assist in this area and there was a need to capture all this knowledge and feed into the consultation process on the County Transport Plan. The Deputy Chief Executive referred to the LSP Forum being an ideal opportunity for such consultation.

It was agreed that the County Transport Plan consultation could be undertaken at the LSP Forum Meeting on 28th July 2005 and the Provisional Transport Plan could be placed on the agenda for that Meeting accordingly.

(At this point in the Meeting, Nina Ennis arrived).

LSP/56. LOCAL AREA AGREEMENTS

Owing to the delayed arrival of some Board Members, the Meeting had until this point been inquorate. The previous item on Derbyshire County Council's Local Area Agreements was therefore discussed again and the Board agreed to endorse the principles of the Agreement.

LSP/57. LSP BOARD – STRUCTURES AND WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

The Board was advised that at the present time all of the work of the Partnership was directed through the Board. Whilst all partners could bring matters to the attention of the Board, the agenda was formulated by the District Council (as secretariat) in consultation with the Chair. Theme based Task and Finish Working Groups had been established to support the development of the Community Strategy. Initially, the Board took the view that it did not want to place the Working Groups on a more permanent footing until the Community Strategy themes had been confirmed. However, at the end of last year a Vibrant Economy Group was established formally in order to manage and monitor funding bids to Derby and Derbyshire Economic Partnership in the context of an agreed Business Plan. The District Council had also provided administrative support to the Working Groups. As the Community Strategy was shortly to be finalised, it was felt an opportune time to review current structures and working arrangements to ensure that they supported the delivery of agreed actions.

The Board was advised that the proposals focused on two areas:- Working Groups and the need for a Strategic Co-ordination Group that would act as an interface between the Board and the Working Groups. It was proposed that six Task and Finish Working Groups based on the agreed themes of the Community Strategy should now be established formally. These groups would be responsible for delivering the Community Strategy, monitoring trends within their thematic area and planning for the future. The Vibrant Economy Group would have additional responsibilities in relation to funding bids and business planning, as at the present time. In terms of membership, there was an opportunity to build on existing partnerships, such as the Crime and Disorder Partnership to rationalise further working arrangements. With respect to administrative support, it was proposed that this should rest with the Chair and his/her own organisation. It was felt the added benefit of this approach was that it would provide development opportunities for employees who might not necessarily be involved in partnership working on a day to day basis.

The Strategic Co-ordination Group would be a newly formed group to sit between the Board and the Working Group. It was envisaged that membership would comprise the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board along with the Chairs of Working Groups. The District Council, assisted by Derbyshire County Council would provide administrative and technical support. The main responsibilities of this group would comprise:-

- (1) Formulating the agenda for Board Meetings.
- (2) Managing performance
- (3) Ensuring a co-ordinated and consistent approach to cross-cutting issues, and
- (4) Managing finances and developing plans to put the Partnership on a sound financial basis in the long term.

George Tansley advised that in certain circumstances the Chair of a Working Group would need to be changed according to the particular topic being discussed. Sally Knight advised that Tony Hurrell had stated he did not want the proposed arrangements to result in a “Board 2”. Jo Smith advised that it was important that the Strategic Co-ordination Group focused on progressing action rather than developing policy.

The recommendations as outlined above were received and welcomed in principle. It was agreed that further discussion should be held regarding the Board’s constitution and delegated powers.

LSP/58. **FINALISING THE COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

Members were reminded that at the AGM and Forum event held on 27th January 2005, a series of breakout sessions were held to explore with local people and other stakeholders priorities and actions for inclusion in the Community Strategy. During February, meetings of the six thematic working groups were held to consider the views and ideas expressed at the Forum and to begin the process of confirming priorities and developing the Year 1 (2005/06) Action Plan. The Working Groups had considered that changes should be made to two of the twelve priorities presented at the Forum as follows:-

Theme 1 – Safe Communities

The Working Group was proposing that “Crime Prevention and Reduction of the Fear of Crime” should be replaced by “Reduction in the Fear of Crime” to reflect the fact that the District had a low crime rate and to reinforce feedback from the Citizens Panel about the need for help-lines etc.

Theme 2 – Creating Opportunities for All

The Working Group was proposing that “Reducing Social Exclusion by providing fair and equal access to services for everybody” should be replaced by “Improving Social Inclusion by providing fair and equal access to services for everybody” in order to be more positive about this issues. A full list of the priorities including the proposed changes was circulated and the Board approved these priorities for inclusion in the Strategy.

The Board was advised that Working Groups had also begun the task of identifying action for inclusion in the Year 1 Action Plan and it was fair to say that some groups were at a more advanced stage than others. A list of the main action areas proposed by the Working Groups from which more detailed proposals would be developed was circulated. It was reported that during the process of confirming action areas, a number of cross cutting issues were identified by Working Groups. These included communication and consultation, resources, rural proofing, transport, environmental sustainability and workforce skills and development. The approach adopted had been to refer the issue to the most appropriate Working Group (principally, Opportunities For All). However, the Board would need to reassure itself of the robustness of this approach. A further issue for the Board concerned plans by the Healthier Communities Working Group to develop an action relating to housing as part of its second priority “Better support to vulnerable people and families to improve their health and wellbeing”. Unfortunately, this had not been explored at the Forum Event due to time constraints. The Working Group considered that this issue should be revisited prior to finalising the action areas. A proposal for the

Board to consider was outlined as “reducing the number of vulnerable people and families living in non-decent homes”.

The Board approved the action areas circulated including the housing proposal outlined above and authorise the Chair of the Board to take the necessary action to ensure that cross-cutting issues had been addressed satisfactorily in the Strategy.

Form and Content of the Community Strategy

The Board was advised that it was proposed that the Community Strategy should be a concise document of approximately a dozen pages backed up by a detailed Action Plan, which would be reviewed and “rolled forward” annually. It was also proposed that a public relations/media professional should write the Strategy document based on the following framework:-

- (1) Introduction to the Community Strategy
- (2) The Area (factual), promotional and positive
- (3) How we got here
- (4) The Themes – challenges, priorities, action areas, what will change

The Board was advised that there was a need to produce the final version of the Strategy by the end of March in order to focus on the more important task of delivering action that would benefit the citizens of South Derbyshire. The Board agreed to endorse the proposed form and content of the Strategy, agreed the use of a public relations/media professional to write the document and authorise the Chair of the Board to approve the final version of the document prior to printing and distribution. Arising from the above resolution, it was agreed that an electronic version of the proposed Community Strategy would be circulated to Board Members electronically prior to its printing and distribution if time constraints allowed.

Nina Ennis queried distribution of the Community Strategy and was advised that this was to be considered. Reverend Hollins asked if there were any plans for a ‘road show’ to distribute the document and was advised that such an idea could be incorporated into the promotional strategy which included taking the document to the District Council’s Area Meetings etc. Helena Stubbs of the Derbyshire Rural Community Council expressed concern that the Opportunities for All Thematic Group was quite small and stated that this issue needed to be addressed.

Year One Action Plan

The Board was advised that some work needed to be undertaken by Working Groups to translate the action areas into specific actions/projects with clear targets and outcomes that would be evident to the people of South Derbyshire. Like the Strategy document, there was some urgency in finalising the Action Plan so that delivery could commence as soon as possible. The Board agreed to ask Working Groups to complete their sections of the Action Plan by mid-April 2005 and authorised the Chair of the Board to approve the final version of the Action Plan. The Board was advised that the Chair of the Board had previously advised that he wanted accountabilities to be made clear within the Action Plan.

Nina Ennis thanked Ian Reid and his team for the work, which had been undertaken on the Community Strategy. Ian Reid reflected those thanks back to the Members of the Thematic Groups for the work they had undertaken.

LSP/59. **DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL LSP FUND**

Jane Cox advised the Board that as a partner of all the Local Strategic Partnerships throughout the County, Derbyshire County Council was keen to support the work and ongoing development of the District-based partnership. The County Council had therefore established a fund to support projects undertaken by LSPs. Grants were available to support projects that developed further the LSP and/or the Community Strategy. Examples of projects that could receive grants from this fund were outlined. The Board was advised that the County Council would ensure the grants for projects were fairly and equally shared across District-based LSPs throughout Derbyshire. The share of the grant that each LSP would be entitled to for projects should be proportionate to the number of Districts covered by the LSP. This would ensure that LSPs that covered more than one District were not disadvantaged by the process. The general conditions for this Scheme and an application form was circulated for information.

LSP/60. **CONSULTATION WITH HARD TO REACH GROUPS**

Jo Smith declared a prejudicial interest in this matter and left the room for the duration of the item. John Oake declared a personal interest in this matter.

The Board was advised that the South Derbyshire CVS, supported by People Express were tasked with consulting Hard to Reach Groups on the Draft Community Strategy. The definition of 'hard to reach' was very broad, being those people who had traditionally not had the opportunity to comment either on how or what services were delivered or to contribute to the planning process. The results of this process were reported to the Board at its last Meeting and presented to the Forum at the Annual General Meeting in January 2005. The Board was informed that because of the very short timescale available, the pre-Christmas timing and the fact that this consultation closely followed the Crime Audit meant that some of the identified groups were not accessed. In particular it was not possible to make sufficient contact with the Black Minority Ethnic (BME) and Gay Lesbian Bisexual and Transsexual (GLBT) Groups which probably represented a substantial 10% of the District's population.

The development of the Strategy and its consultation process had revealed the need for consistent and meaningful consultation. One of the recommendations to the Board as part of the proposed Community Strategy's Action Plan would be to determine and agree a consultation and communication protocol including the Hard to Reach Groups. In addition, the Board was aware that although the Community Strategy would soon be completed it would need to be monitored and updated regularly. The Action Plan would need to be reviewed annually and new targets/proposals suggested. The timetable for this process would need to be linked with the Forum and Annual General Meeting and would therefore require a consultation process to be carried out prior to these events. It was reported that the CVS remained happy to be the consultation vehicle for the Hard to Reach Groups. The original consultation exercise was to have cost some

£15,000 but there was an underspend of £4,000 (as there was insufficient time to include BME and GLBT Groups). Nevertheless the CVS had indicated that a more inclusive consultation exercise could be undertaken for approximately £13,000 (although unplanned events would be additional and more expensive). To be able to provide such a service and in order to plan work and adjust staffing levels the CVS had requested that the Board give consideration to providing an annual amount for such services.

Councillor Mrs. Wheeler expressed concern that there had been no consultation undertaken with BME Groups. She wanted confirmation that this was going to be undertaken before committing further. Ian Reid, advised that the Council now had BME representation on the Values and Attitudes Group and engagement with BME groups was improving. George Tansley stated that the cost for such work should reduce over the years as the organisation should become better at it. Nina Ennis queried whether the Board gave a steer as to the Groups it wished to reach. It was felt that there was a need to identify a plan where gaps were identified and consider how to target such Groups. The Board needed to be mindful that if the work was to be undertaken by the CVS, future planning was required. It was agreed to discuss this matter at a future Board Meeting. The Board agreed to consider offering the South Derbyshire CVS a Service Level Agreement to carry out consultation with the Hard to Reach Groups. It also agreed that before this could be achieved a more definite consultation strategy with options for delivery should be the subject of a future report to the Board.

LSP/61. **BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE 2004/05**

(John Oake declared a personal interest in this matter).

The Board was reminded that it had been contracted by DDEP to deliver a number of projects originally submitted within a Business Plan to spend £150,000 of DDEP grant in the financial year 2004/05. The Council, acting as the accountable body for the Partnership had issued individual funding agreements to the lead partners for projects detailing financial and output targets based on their approved submissions. As reported previously, due to the loss of the Swadlincote Regeneration Route Project, approval was sought from DDEP to amend the original Business Plan. A request was approved for an increase in grant of £12,500 to the National Forest Business Grants Project and a grant of £12,500 for a new project to start work on the tourist information facility at Sharpe's Pottery. Details of project progress for the West Street Redevelopment (Phase One), the Findern Access Centre, the National Forest Business Grants, the Grid, Credit Union Outreach Services and tourist information point at Sharpe's Pottery (Phase One) were outlined. The Board noted the progress made in relation to the 2004/05 Business Plan.

LSP/62. **DDEP EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST/BUSINESS PLAN 2005/06**

The Board was reminded that DDEP had confirmed a grant of £150,000 to the South Derbyshire Local Strategic Partnership in the 2005/06 financial year. The grant allocation was made up of £90,000 capital and £60,000 revenue and must be at least 50% match funded with a minimum total project value of £50,000. Projects must contribute to both the LSPs Economic Development Strategy and to DDEP Tier 3 Outputs and complete spend by 31st March 2006. The timetable for project submissions was that initial proposals should be submitted by 28th February 2005 and full applications made by 30th April 2005. In order to comply with the guidance

and meet the prescribed timetable the Board agreed to reconvene the Vibrant Economy Theme Working Group and task it with realising a Business Plan for 2005/06.

It was reported that the Group had now met four times and agreed for six projects to be forwarded as expressions of interest following a prioritisation exercise assessing various projects' potential to deliver economic development outcomes and Tier 3 outputs, attract match funding and fit with the priority issues and actions within the Draft Community Strategy. This had been summarised in a separate document to the Board.

Expressions of interest for four of the six projects (National Forest Business Grants, Swadlincote Area Regeneration Study, CVS Social Enterprise and DCC Access to Work) were sent to DDEP. DDEP were advised that two further projects would be submitting expressions of interest outside the prescribed timetable. In the case of the Tourism Information Facility project (Phase 2), the delay was caused by further detailed preparation work being undertaken by a consultant. In the case of the business support network project, more time was needed to clarify match funding and other issues. The Board was advised that DDEP had indicated informally that the four submitted and two delayed expressions of interest were suitable projects for their consideration and suggested that they worked-up into full applications. This request had been passed on to lead partners. In line with DDEP's offer and the needs of two of the projects (CVS Social Enterprise and DCC Access to Work) priority early consideration had been requested so that subject to a successful appraisal, the projects could commence as early as possible. DDEP were able to accommodate the request although it did potentially leave the Partnership with some difficult decisions in relation to finalising the Business Plan. It was reported that to date, the Vibrant Economy Group had proceeded on the basis of supplying DDEP with project information requiring grant above the £150,000 allocation. This was done deliberately in case of project failure or availability of additional funds. However, due to the potential early approval and start of two projects and the late submission and unknown costs of two other projects, then submitting a neatly finalised plan might be problematical. The Vibrant Economy Group was scheduled to meet on 22nd March 2005 and would address this issue. The Board was asked to note that the District Council had been asked to work-up facelift works on SDDC industrial sites as a contingency project in the event of other projects failing to deliver.

The Board noted the progress made and approved the direction reported in relation to the 2005/06 Business Plan.

LSP/63. **NEWS FROM PARTNERS**

Jane Cox of Derbyshire County Council reported that the Derbyshire Sports Forum had now completed its review and was in the process of appointing a director who would attend the Derbyshire Partnership Forum in September 2005. Discussions would be commenced at this time with a view to looking at actively engaging partners.

John Oake advised that Sharpe's Pottery had recently asked for publicity to recruit volunteers. A false headline had however stated that Sharpe's had a crisis due to annual visitor numbers. John Oake advised the Board that these headlines were incorrect and in fact the facility was delivering above the service level agreement and according to it just needed more volunteers.

Nina Ennis advised that the PCT was to receive additional monies in 2006/07. The local PCT had the sixth highest growth coming being 13.1% additional money for 2006/07 and 11% the following year. An additional £12 million would be received next April and accordingly there was a need to link the PCT planning process with the Community Strategy.

LSP/64. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Councillor Mrs. Wheeler expressed concern that for the initial part of the Meeting the Board had been inquorate. She stated that she would be discussing this matter with Members of the District Council as it was most unsatisfactory.

LSP/65. **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

It was agreed that the future Board Meetings to be held on 19th May 2005, 7th July 2005, 15th September 2005 and 24th November 2005 would all be held at the Civic Offices, Swadlincote. It was noted that a Forum was to be held on Thursday, 28th July 2005 and a Forum AGM on Thursday, 19th January 2006.

J.OAKE

CHAIR

The Meeting closed at 11.40 a.m.