

'West Cheshire Together' Thematic Leads meeting
--

Date: Monday 21st September 2009
Time: 1.30pm
Venue: Committee Room 2B, County Hall, Chester

Attending:**Representing:**

Steve Robinson (<i>Chair</i>)	Childrens Trust
Keith Evans (<i>for Ian Whitehead</i>)	Health & Wellbeing
Jim Hughes	Health & Wellbeing
Tim Jackson	Safer & Stronger Communities
Sara Mogel	Business, Enterprise & Culture
Cllr Lynn Riley	Safer & Stronger Communities
Jane Staley	Environmental Sustainability
John Stephens	Childrens Trust
Debbie Washington (<i>for Mark Wilson</i>)	Business, Enterprise & Culture

Apologies: Helen Bellairs (Health & Wellbeing), John Salt (Environmental Sustainability), Ian Whitehead (Health & Wellbeing) and Mark Wilson (Business, Enterprise & Culture)

Visitors: Laurence Ainsworth and Andrea Mageean (Cheshire West and Chester Council)

Support: Alison Armstrong and Lyn Raynor (Cheshire West and Chester Council)

Item No.1	Welcome, introductions and apologies Steve welcomed all to the meeting and apologies were noted.
Action - Decision	None required
Item No.2	Minutes and matters arising from last meeting: 17th August The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as an accurate record. Debbie reported that the Future Jobs Fund project was poised to commence, with a specific manager recruited to take this forward, grant letters awaiting return and Job Centres currently working on identifying suitable candidates. Jim referred to a recent meeting around the social marketing 'Dr Foster' intelligence where the main health areas and objectives had been agreed. National and demographic data would be added by Dr Foster to give a thematic and geographic insight and

	<p>the issue of funding was being pursued separately by Jim and Alistair, possibly through the DORIC board via a CWIEP bid (approx. £60k).</p> <p>Item 5: Alison reported on recent meetings/discussions with CWAC Members and various partners on <i>“linking the strategic with the local”</i>. The outcome of all discussions will be collated into a report to the next Thematic Leads meeting and also the LSP in October should there be any need for recommendations for change.</p> <p>A table of themes/priorities for Chester APB was circulated for information and discussion centred around the aspiration to identify at least one cross-agency priority within each APB area which could be successfully delivered by 31st March 2010.</p> <p>The need for clearer links between the APBs and Thematic Groups was reiterated and it was suggested that these two groups periodically meet jointly and minutes be tabled as a standing agenda item. As well as completing the loop, this would also assist with governance and accountability i.e. demonstrate the APBs are achieving what is set for them by the Thematic Groups.</p>
Action - Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome of various discussions on <i>“linking the strategic with the local”</i> to be collated into a report to the next meeting of the Thematic Leads and, if necessary, the October LSP meeting; • The November meeting of the Thematic Leads to be a joint meeting with the APB Chairs (and thereafter periodically hold joint meetings as necessary); • Minutes of APB meetings to be tabled as a standing agenda item at the Thematic Leads meetings; • To note that the next meeting of the Thematic Leads will not be a joint meeting with GONW (reported in the previous minutes).
Item No.3	<p>Local Area Agreement: delivery planning</p> <p>It was noted that three of the five Thematic Partnerships had signed off their LAA delivery plans. John reported that the CYPP delivery plan was being reviewed and Ian reported that the HWB plan was currently being re-written (the August meeting had been cancelled). It was agreed that these need to be in place as soon as possible as it could potentially expose us under CAA and mid-year reporting was due shortly.</p>
Action - Decision	<p>The two remaining LAA delivery plans to be finalised and signed off as soon as possible, preferably before the next meeting of the Thematic Leads where mid-year reporting would be considered.</p>
Item No.4	<p>Joint Local Development Framework Core Strategy / Local Transport Plan / Sustainable Community Strategy</p>

	<p>Consultation Statement</p> <p>Andrea Mageean referred to the consultation statement which set out how the formal consultation period for all three documents will take place. It was noted that a high level “joint” approach had been identified (Nov-Dec), despite differing specific consultation requirements and timescales within the three strands. The consultation timetable was highlighted (pages 19-23) and it was noted that the individual Thematic Partnerships would be included. Reference was also made to Appendix 2 which was a collation of results from the two Partnership events held in June and July and could form the basis of the draft SCS - ideas were sought on this approach.</p> <p>It was reiterated that, ultimately, the SCS would be the over-arching document and that other documents were an “add-on” – the SCS would also be finalised before the LTP. The need for real and genuine influence and agreement from all perspectives on all three documents would be a challenge and it was agreed to give this consideration and return to it at a future meeting.</p> <p>It was suggested that the format of the consultation material be user-friendly, with a summary or quick guide to specific themes.</p> <p>There was a query on the three proposed themes (Appendix 2) being different from the current five Thematic blocks and it was pointed out that these three themes were “high level” and designed to move away from the silos of the five Thematic blocks, looking broader and outside specific areas.</p>
Action - Decision	The five Thematic Partnerships will be part of the consultation – Thematic Leads to look at their results at a future meeting and give consideration to how real and genuine influence and agreement can be obtained across the partnerships.
Item No.5	<p>Comprehensive Area Assessment – Audit Commission initial draft</p> <p>Laurence Ainsworth reported on the latest position from AC following the sharing of initial draft text around the Area Assessment. It was noted that the document was incomplete and under-developed, with stark and blunt language. However, it provided an opportunity for us to challenge some of the content and this has already been done in the main, though Laurence was seeking any final comments urgently by close of play today for inclusion.</p> <p>It was noted that the previous six “red tags” (areas of concern / underperformance) had now reduced to two following submission of additional information – these were “housing” and “health inequalities”. It was also noted that it was early days regarding the</p>

	<p>submission of 14 “green tags” (areas of outstanding and innovative practice) and feedback was awaited on these. The AC will come back to us in October and the final document is due for publication on the “Oneplace” website in December.</p>
Action - decision	<p>Any further and final comments on the draft text to be sent to Laurence Ainsworth by close of play 21st Sept.</p>
Item No.6	<p>Interim Place Survey – suggested approach</p> <p>This item was designed to generate discussion on the long-term information needs of “West Cheshire Together” in terms of understanding how peoples’ perceptions change. The Government carries out a “Place Survey” every two years and it has been suggested that something be carried out in the interim, badged under the Partnership. However, it would need to be commissioned quickly and a Practitioners Group was being formed to take this forward.</p> <p>In the ensuing discussion, the following was raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Council would meet the costs in the first year but, beyond that, discussions would need to take place on collective resourcing; ○ Joined up working on research and consultation would be beneficial for CAA purposes and this interim measure would represent good practice; ○ It was felt to be less about the quality of the survey and more about the quality of the resulting analysis, though the questions would clearly be important – it was hoped that questions from partners would also be incorporated; ○ Whilst cost was an issue, it was felt the real cost would be in responding to survey results and, ultimately, in delivery; ○ It was noted that this would be a postal survey, which would give different responses than telephone or face to face. However, Citizens Panel “Focus Groups” would help provide more qualitative responses; ○ There was a suggestion that third sector/community groups already in existence be used and it was also hoped the Practitioners Group would explore creative ideas such as using unemployed people to carry out face to face consultation.
Action - Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Partners to forward names for the Practitioners Group to Alison Armstrong by close of play on 25th Sept; ● Member endorsement to be sought before progressing; ● A report be brought back to the Thematic Leads once the Practitioners Group has met.
Item No.7	<p>Thematic Partnerships – Progress, Work Programme and emerging issues</p>

	<p>HWB – Keith Evans raised the issue of employers signing up to a Charter on Mental Health and hoped partners would sign up. There was an £80 administration cost and it was suggested Keith explore ways of reducing this cost for employers.</p> <p>Jim reported that all efforts were currently being channelled into rewriting the HWB delivery plan.</p> <p>CYP – John Stephens reported on a recent successful workforce development day which provided a good start with good engagement.</p> <p>SSC – Tim Jackson mentioned performance was examined at the last meeting and all indicators were green with the exception of NI 20 (assault with injury crime rate) which will be quite a challenge as good results had been achieved last year. A sub-group had been set up under Jon Betts to tackle this specific area.</p> <p>ES – Jane Staley reported that all indicators were green at present and mentioned some early work around energy efficiency (NI 186 - per capita reduction in CO² emissions). Due to budget constraints, there was a request for any ABG funding to help with this. Alison mentioned looking into utilising the Second Homes Taxation grant (from the former LSPs pre-LGR).</p> <p>BEC – Sara reported the group was about to move from “virtual” and would hopefully have a Board in place after the Planning & Delivery workshop on 1st October. Once in place, the Board can then begin to look at targets.</p>
Action - Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keith Evans to explore ways of reducing the £80 administration cost to employers of signing up to the Charter on Mental Health; • Consideration be given to using ABG to assist with NI 186; • A report to be brought to the next meeting around the use of the Second Homes Taxation grant for LAA delivery.
Item No.8	<p>Any other business</p> <p>There were no further items of business.</p>
Action - Decision	None required.

Details of next meeting: Monday 19th October, 1.30pm – 3.00pm,
Committee Room 2B, County Hall Chester.

Signed (Chair): Date: