

**LARGER PRINT COPY AVAILABLE  
PLEASE TELEPHONE: 01493 846325**

**GREAT YARMOUTH LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD**

**11 July 2005 - 4.30 pm**

**PRESENT:**

Representing Great Yarmouth Borough Council:  
Councillor Barry Coleman (in the Chair).

Representing the Community Empowerment Network:  
Rosa Alfonso, Adrian Barnes and Chris Warner.

Representing Norfolk County Council:  
Richard Potts.

Representing Norfolk Constabulary:  
Inspector Carol Congreve.

Representing Parish Councils:  
Michael Clifford.

Representing Great Yarmouth PCT:  
Bernard Williamson.

Claire Collen (Advisor to the CEN), Superintendent Berni Cartwright (Norfolk Constabulary), Richard Packham, Roy Beiley, Narji Darwish and Sarah Davis (Great Yarmouth Borough Council Officials) and Tim Leonard (LSP Officer) also attended.

Liz Mowl (Waveney District Council) attended by invitation.

### **1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN**

Members were reminded that under the LSP's Constitution the Board Chairman would normally be the Borough Council representative in view of the Borough's statutory responsibility for the development of the LSP. The Board was asked therefore to appoint a Chairman for the 2005/06 Municipal Year.

**RESOLVED:**

That Councillor Coleman be appointed as Chairman of the LSP Board for the 2005/06 Municipal Year.

### **2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Members were reminded that, under the LSP's Constitution, the Board Vice-Chairman would normally be a representative from the community/faith/voluntary or private sector but not one of the theme Fora Chairmen. The LSP Officer reported that unfortunately he had not had an opportunity to consult the Community Empowerment Network and Chamber of Commerce in relation to nominations for the post of Vice-Chairman. He suggested therefore that details of the expected role of the post-holder be produced with nominations being considered at the next meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

That the LSP Officer be requested to produce details of the role with nominations being considered at the next Board meeting.

### **3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received Brendan Bergin (Great Yarmouth Borough Council), Ray Adcock (Norfolk Constabulary), Chris Mowle and Sam Ralph (Norfolk County Council), Sue Howl (GO-East) and John Murfitt (representing the Economic Forum).

#### 4. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 April 2005 were confirmed subject to the deletion of the word "Councillor" relating to Bernard Williamson who represented Great Yarmouth PCT.

#### 5. MATTERS ARISING

##### (a) **Second Homes Council Tax - Next Steps**

The Board received the LSP Officer's report setting out the next steps for spending the Second Homes Council Tax funding. The LSP Officer reported that, following the Board's decision on 11 April, the Working Group had met several times and their proposals had been discussed and modified at the meeting of the LSP Executive on 24 June. It was noted that a two-stage procedure was proposed with the first stage being to invite expressions of interest by identified organisations and bodies and a small sub-group of five people drawn from the LSP Executive would then meet twice to consider all the expressions of interest received and determine which ones it wished to receive a full application from and which of the full applications should then be recommended for final approval. A timetable for determining the allocation of Second Homes Council Tax was also suggested. Members were reminded that the only monies so far invested had been for the two Environmental Rangers.

**RESOLVED:**

That the proposed procedure and timetable for dealing with Second Homes Council Tax funding as detailed in the LSP Officer's report be approved.

##### (b) **Local Area Agreements**

The LSP Officer reported that following the Board agreeing to submit an expression of interest to become a Local Area Agreement pilot this had been consolidated by Norfolk County Council and the other districts subsequently resulting in a successful bid. He added that a lot of clarification was still needed and LSP representatives would be attending a meeting shortly to discuss the mechanics of the Local Area Agreement process with a Norfolk perspective. The point was made that the process would have to be undertaken on a short timescale but

hopefully it would be possible to have a broad framework in place in the first year. Concerns had been expressed regarding County and Borough machinery and funding reaching all sectors. The point was also made that Great Yarmouth was different from Norfolk and if the strategy reflected Norfolk then it was not likely to reflect Great Yarmouth, and could end up being bland or meaningful for only part of Norfolk. Members were informed that a suggestion had been made that sub-county Local Area Agreements be developed but at this stage it was unsure as to whether GO-East officials had ruled this out. The Board was reminded that this was the second round of pilots with five out the six areas being two tier authorities.

Claire Collen reported that the voluntary sector had focussed on the Safer Stronger Community Fund and realised that, whilst they needed to be engaged across the four blocks, it was unclear as to where they fitted in. She added that this was a massive shift in the way funding was provided and stressed the need to ensure that Great Yarmouth's voice was articulated at County level.

Liz Mowl from Waveney District Council, who had been among the first round of pilots, reported that they had had similar concerns and although a broad framework had been put in place quickly; there was still a long way to go to resolve issues such as governance arrangements, who spends what and how. She also indicated that Waveney had particular problems and was very different to Ipswich and she was therefore pleased to hear about the possibility of sub-regional LAAs. The Chairman reported that the issue had been discussed at a recent Conference and there was an uncertainty as to the type of governance ie Unitary or District. It was likely however that two tiers would remain but would need to work together differently.

Members noted that discussions were ongoing regarding the reconfiguration of health provision which could either take a sub-regional, Norfolk or Great Yarmouth and Waveney route and could result in difficulties if there was a Norfolk LAA. The point was made that the LAA process could have a possible impact on the LSP structure. The LSP Officer acknowledged that this was a possibility but suggested that the LSP's thematic groups be retained at present.

**Mr Williamson declared an interest in the following item on the grounds that he was a School Governor:-**

## 6. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

The Board received the LSP Officer's report detailing the recent review of the Performance Management Framework and in particular the traffic light assessment and scores for all the themes. He reported that concern had been expressed regarding the fact that some of the health data supplied was two or three years old and it was very difficult to obtain up to date information. He indicated that, using the traffic light assessment, the LSP Executive had recommended that the overall score should be amber/green. The point was made that there was a need to work with all the lead agencies to try to reach the targets set, as it was impossible for one agency to deliver them by themselves. It was acknowledged that some successes had been achieved but problems had been experienced particularly in relation to learning and health.

Richard Potts reported that schools and the local authority recognised individual/school/student improvements. The NRF submission for the Education Action Zone had expected there would be an improvement but it was not known if other circumstances had affected what the schools were dealing with. He pointed out that there were many issues to consider and everything should not be based just on a few local results. He agreed however that all partners needed to work together to address the issues. Members noted that the Childrens Services change was likely to bring the issues together and would hopefully result in improvements and area based data. He queried the target setting process and suggested that the providers and funders needed to be brought together more closely and look at schools individually to produce appropriate targets. He added that schools had been partners but not engaged on an individual basis and therefore the link between the funders and the schools as providers needed to be strengthened. Concern was expressed at the results for English and Maths in particular, however, Richard Potts responded that there was a significant number of children in Great Yarmouth where English was a second language and this could be the reason but without the intelligence available it was difficult to say for sure. He stressed is concern that people would look at the blanket figures and say there was failure but this might not be the actual case.

It was pointed out that there was a need to look at which schools received NRF funding in order to assess the benefits and how the money was spent. The Board was reminded that because the EAZ had been in operation, all the bids had come from them rather than the Local

Education Authority. Roy Bailey added that it had been difficult to assess how the money was being used due to the plethora of funding streams available. He also indicated that the EAZ co-ordinators had stated there was a need to improve all the schools across the Zone rather than just the NRF areas. The rate of improvement had been above the national average and now the Education Cluster and Trust were in place it should be possible to have more specific data available.

The Board considered the target results and it was noted that many of the existing initiatives had already or would shortly result in improvements. The point was made that the issues raised together with details of the successes achieved, needed to be brought out as part of the GO-East review on 10 August. Mr Williamson reported that all the quarter targets in the Local Strategic Health Plan had been met and a query was raised as to whether consideration should be given to the targets set, ie if they should be tied in with floor targets.

**RESOLVED:**

(i) That the traffic light assessment suggested by the LSP Executive be confirmed.

(ii) That the improvement plan and priorities be noted.

(iii) That it be noted that GO-East will be conducting a review meeting in Great Yarmouth based on the PMF exercise at 2.00 pm on 10 August 2005.

## **7. NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND**

The Board received the Social Strategy Officer's report detailing suggested criteria for using any unspent NRF during 2005/06 to facilitate the delivery of the Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy. It was noted that the current balance available for allocation was just over £46,000 although it was likely that other slippage would be identified as the year progressed. The LSP Executive on 24 June 2005 had suggested that the underspend should be allocated as follows:-

(a) Funding should be allocated to existing NRF projects (ie any NRF projects receiving funding in 2004/05 and/or 2005/06) and should:

- Meet need in “hot spot” areas where NRF is already being used and/or
- Provide short term “bridging” funding for existing NRF projects to allow greater time for them to become sustainable/main streamed.

(b) Projects selected must demonstrate that:

- They are “well run” (in terms of complying to NRF procedures etc)
- They are able to spend the extra funding rapidly.

(c) Proposal should be made for “small” amounts of funding

The Board also received information relating to the decisions taken by the Board Chairman in respect of variations to NRF projects and permission was requested to carry forward funding from 2004/05 to 2005/06.

RESOLVED:

(i) That the arrangements for dealing with the unspent NRF money during 2005/06 as detailed in the Social Strategy Officer’s report be approved.

(ii) The decisions taken by the LSP Board Chairman in respect of variations to NRF projects be endorsed and permission be granted to carry forward funding from 2004/05 into 2005/06.

## **8. LEARNING FORUM DEVELOPMENT/LINKS WITH GY LEARNING COMMUNITY**

The Board received the Learning Forum Sub-Group’s report setting out draft proposals for development of the Learning Forum to make it “fit for purpose” in addressing the learning needs of the Borough. Claire Collen referred Members attention to the vision proposed for the Forum and requested the Board to approve the framework to help deliver outcomes. She also referred to the proposed membership which had been extended to ensure key players were represented including the Police and Health, bearing in mind the relationship between cross-cutting issues. The LSP Officer suggested that, in line with the rest of the LSP, the membership should also include a standing invitation to all the other Fora Chairmen as this ensured linkages across the partnership.

RESOLVED:

That the Sub-Group's report be endorsed and the Learning Forum's membership be amended to include all the other Fora Chairmen in a non-voting capacity.

**9. ANNUAL COMMUNITY CONFERENCE**

The LSP Officer reported that the Conference would take place on the morning of the 9 November 2005 and it was possible that agenda items could include economy and learning. He requested that any further suggestions for inclusion be made to him as soon as possible.

**10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next meeting would take place on the 10 October 2005 at Cobholm & Lichfield Resource Centre.

**11. PARKS STRATEGY – RESPONSE FROM THE SOCIAL FORUM**

Members were informed that at the last Social Forum meeting the Environmental Strategy Manager had given a presentation in relation to the new Parks Strategy. The Social Forum Members had expressed concern that, despite the investment being made by the Council over the next two years, a number of play areas would remain devoid of equipment for some considerable time. It was felt that the lack of leisure facilities could have an impact on anti-social behaviour and therefore affect the quality of life for local residents. It was also pointed out that provision of play equipment was linked into the Every Child Matters agenda for a healthy lifestyle.

The Board Chairman reported that the Council had allocated £150,000 for play in the current year and was working in conjunction with several Parish Councils who were adding to the play equipment in addition to using Section 106 money where available. He added that possibly one or two areas would be sold off for development with the funding being ringfenced for play for that community. He stressed that it was the Council's top priority to ensure that all areas were invested in as far as possible. Members were reminded however that Borough Council funding was extremely tight bearing in mind high inflation and the low

level of Government grant received. The Chairman also reported that play areas was only a small part of the open space strategy and the Council's Policy Development Committee would be looking at this issue during the autumn to assess whether the Council was providing facilities for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and to ensure that it serviced its communities.

A query was raised as to whether any additional funding could be attracted using "blue sky thinking" however the Chairman responded that Officers had looked at many possibilities and it was unlikely the community would be able raise sufficient money bearing in mind a single multiplay cost £10,000.

## **12. REPORTING BACK MECHANISM**

A suggestion was made that LSP Board agendas should include Fora minutes to ensure they were kept abreast of Fora activities. Concern was expressed that this would leave Board Members inundated with paper and a further suggestion was made that Fora Chairmen/Facilitators produce an A4 sheet of the main activities.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the LSP Officer be requested to co-ordinate with the Fora Chairmen/Facilitators to produce notes on each Forum's activities to each Board meeting.

## **13. CLOSURE OF MEETING**

The meeting ended at 6.20 pm.