



Greater Peterborough Partnership Board

Minutes of the away day held on 19 March 2008

Present	John Bridge	GPP Chairman
	Gillian Beasley	Chief Executive, Peterborough City Council
	Superintendent Nigel Trippett	Representative of the Commander, Northern Division, Cambridgeshire Constabulary
	Steve Compton	Acting Chief Executive, Opportunity Peterborough
	Ken McKay	Chairman of the Environment Capital Partnership
	Elizabeth Ingram	Vice Chairman of the Health Partnership Board
	John Dewis	Voluntary and Community Sector representative
	Trevor Gibson	Lead Director for Block 2 of the Local Area Agreement
	Ed Murphy	Voluntary and Community Sector representative
	MJ Ladha -	Chief Executive, Peterborough Racial Equality Council
	Lindsey Burrows-McGill	Chair of the Voluntary and Community Sector Forum
	Marie Flanagan	Voluntary and Community Sector Representative
	Cllr Lamb	Representing Angela Bailey
Advisors	Richard Astle	GPP Director
	Louise McManus	LAA 2008-11 Project Manager
	Sue Churchill	Learning and Skills Council
	Janet Capstick	Go East
	Saul Spevack	Head of Marketing Opportunity Peterborough
	Helen Edwards	Legal Advisor
	David Sturgess	PCC Head of Performance and Project Management
	Caroline Parsons	PCC Head of Communications
	Paul Keymer	GPP
	Anna Barrett	GPP
	Martin Whelan	Partnership and Parish Support Officer, Peterborough City Council
	Steve Bowyer	OP, Director of Strategic Growth
	Peter Heath Brown	PCC Planning Policy
	Rob Brown	PCC Planning Policy
	Sue Marsh	PCC Planning Policy
	Steve Winstanley	PCC Planning Policy
	Simon Pickstone	PCC Planning Policy

The Chairman thanked the temple for their hospitality.

1. Apologies

Apologies were recorded from Elaine Fulton, Angela Bailey, Marco

Cereste, Sandie Burns, Cllr Holdich, Clive Morton, Denise Radley, Andy Liggins, Malcolm Burch, Paul Phillipson, Ian Glew

2. Minutes of the meeting held

The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record, with the following issues raised as matters arising;

- *Presentation to the GPP Board on the Community Safety Partnership* – Gillian Beasley confirmed that the plan was currently being finalised, and would be finalised in time for a presentation at the next meeting.
- *Community Strategy* – Members were advised that the Community Strategy was approved by Full Council on 28 February, and that a summary would be produced. The Board was informed that the document would be available in early April.
- *LPSA* – The Board was advised that the evaluation had been completed. Members were informed that the evaluation group would be meeting on 2 April to shortlist bids. Clarification was sought on the timings. Richard Astle confirmed that it was hoped to confirm the short list on 2nd or 3rd April.

3. Marketing Peterborough Update

Saul Spevack outlined the work undertaken to date on the “marketing Peterborough” project. Members were informed that a significant number of interviews had been undertaken since the last meeting, to identify the perceived strengths and weakness of the City. It was agreed that without a consistent message, opportunities to promote the City were being lost. Good practice from other cities was highlighted, and the Board was advised that marketing was more than a logo or strap-line, and that many of the most successful brands lacked one or other of these.

Clarification was sought on the mapping process. Members were informed that the discussions were still at an early stage, and decisions were still to be taken.

The importance of tackling internal issues was emphasised. The Board agreed that it was important to ensure that the residents of people believed in the brand, and acted in manner which supported the brand.

Ken McKay highlighted a similar project undertaken by the Development Corporation in the 1970s and 1980s. The Board the success of the “Peterborough Effect” initiative.

Concerns were expressed at the timescale for the project, and whether it was too long. Members were reassured that projects of this nature required a minimum of six months to deliver. It was agreed that earlier projections of July 2008 completion were unrealistic. The Chairman emphasised the importance of who runs the project, and who pays for the project. In response Steve Compton confirmed that Opportunity Peterborough are happy to lead the project, but that other partners would be need to contribute resources. The difference between OP and the Development Corporation were emphasised.

Richard Astle emphasised the importance of not developing “a compelling new vision for the City”, and encouraged partners to build on the Community Strategy vision.

Janet Capstick highlighted the importance of a consistent message with regional partners.

The Board agreed to the approach proposed by Steve Compton. The Board agreed that it was important for partners and the wider public to take ownership of the vision.

4. LAA 2005-08

Richard Astle provided a brief overview of recent progress on the LAA;

- *Block 1* – (2 Amber, 2 yellow) – Progress in all areas. Continued progress on NEET figures. Challenging performance in relation to education attainment was highlighted.
- *Block 2* – (3 red, 2 amber, 1 yellow and 3 green) – Concerns highlighted about the continued lack of data. Good progress on the Cohesion measure acknowledged, but the Board agreed that it would be impossible to quantify absolute success. Good progress was noted on empowering local people measures. Gillian Beasley confirmed that the Community Safety Partnership was actively seeking to resolve the data issues.
- *Block 3* – (2 red, 1 amber, 2 yellow and 1 green) – The Board was advised that the smoking and sexual health targets will not be met. The Board welcomed the greatly increased breast feeding rates, which had been supported through the reallocation of LPSA money. Members were informed that the older peoples targets remained on track.
- *Block 4* – (4 ambers, 1 yellow) – The Board noted that the economic data continued to be very positive, however a number of areas continue to present challenges. Members were informed that the adult skills strategy group was continuing to develop, and had recently commissioned the production of an adults skills strategy.

The Board agreed that it was important to learn the lessons of the 05-08 LAA. In principle members agreed to a standalone meeting in early June to consider this issue.

In the discussion that followed the following points were raised

- Essential that the lessons are learnt, otherwise it will undermine the next LAA.
- Clarification on whether it will be possible to bring the meeting forward, in order to influence the next LAA. Members were advised of the challenge which such an approach would create. Janet Capstick confirmed that Go-East would be expecting a final summary document.
- The importance of championing issues such as alcohol. Gillian Beasley highlighted a brief presentation given by Sue Mitchell to the Community Safety Partnership. Agreed that the alcohol strategy should be circulated to all members.

MW

5. LAA 2008 – 11

Louise McManus and Richard Astle provided an update on the development of the LAA. Members were advised that the local indicator set

was currently being finalised, and it was confirmed that the LAA was now progressing through the City Council decision making process.

Richard Astle summarised the key points raised at the high level meeting on 14th March by Peter Unwin, the Central Government negotiator responsible for Peterborough.

- Ensuring Buy in – Embedding the stick of rock approach to the Community Strategy.
- Detailed Intelligent understanding of local needs and joint solutions – Utilising priority and steering groups to deliver a cross cutting approach, which can only be delivered through cross cutting working.
- Mainstreaming Ambition within the regional agenda – Placing at the core of the local approach, mainstreaming the regional agenda.
- To lever Change in behaviour and culture and push the boundaries – For example pushing for delivery teams to include wide representation. Increasing focus on part of statutory agencies to focus on the LAA day.
- Generate Ownership within Communities – 17th outcome has been developed, developing pride in Peterborough. .

Clarification was sought on the target setting process, and whether there would be time for partnerships to consider the targets. Members were assured the process would allow for the targets to be considered by partnerships. Go-East confirmed that whilst there were a number of delays, it was important for the deadlines to be met.

Clarification was sought on the local indicators. Members were advised that there was a reluctance to introduce new indicators, and these would only be used when necessary.

Ed Murphy questioned whether the review with Peter Unwin had identified a positive direction of travel, and if not what barriers existed. Members were advised that the review had identified a negative direction of travel in relation to skills and prosperous people. Richard Astle highlighted current work in relation to this area of work.

6. GPP Governance

Richard Astle outlined the proposals the governance proposals. The Board was advised that the key proposals were;

- GPP Board meeting quarterly - Guardian of Sustainable Community Strategy and Local Area Agreement – Focus on vision and priorities, but not quarterly performance management. Retains representative membership. 3 meetings a year plus annual forum. Each meeting themed around on the of SCS priorities.
- GPP Executive - Sits above partnerships and report on behalf of the GPP to Scrutiny, Cabinet and Full Council.
- Partnerships – Development of four clusters focussing on performance management.
- Outcome Based Focus on delivery
- Reduction in number of partnerships
- Retained VCS
- Unified Officers Group

The following further proposals were made about existing Partnerships;

- Culture Partnership is re-launched as the Outcome Delivery Group for the “Pride in Peterborough” outcome.
- PREP becomes the GPP Growth Partnership
- Neighbourhood Investment merges with the Investing in Communities Board. A further proposal to merge, the aforementioned two and the Cohesion Board was raised.

The Board agreed that it was important not to lose good work already undertaken by the Cohesion Board, however a merger at a later date was not ruled out. It was agreed in principle to review the groups on an annual basis.

Members agreed that it was important the role of the Executive and Board are clear to avoid confusion.

Jawaid Khan highlighted the similarities between the work of the Cohesion Board and the Neighbourhood Investment partnership. Members expressed concern that this approach would result in a loss of focus for the Cohesion work, and should be avoided.

Janet Capstick highlighted the session on 3rd March regarding the relative roles of the Board and the Exec. It was agreed that it was important for the two groups to have distinct and clear roles. Sue Churchill requested that the diagram should be expanded on to include many of the other links. Members were advised that the potential complexity of the diagram precluded such an expansion.

The Board agreed to the structure proposed, and it was further agreed to fine tune the arrangements by email. Janet Capstick was thanked for her work.

David Sturgess gave a presentation on the development of a dynamic performance management and problem solving function.

Members were advised that the City had been successful in obtaining £144k from the Regional Improvement Partnership to roll out the programme. It was noted if successful it would be rolled out across the region and nationwide. The Board was informed that the Health Check approach piloted in Peterborough was now being used as a diagnostic tool for Local Strategic Partnerships.

Ken McKay sought clarification on whether structures or people were most important. The Board was informed that both areas significantly influence performance, and it was important to create the structure to allow people to develop innovative solutions.

Jawaid Khan emphasised the importance of developing mechanisms to ensure that data is shared. Members agreed that this is an important consideration which should be addressed through the process.

Marie Flanagan queried how the VCS fits in. Members were assured that it was vital for the VCS to be fully integrated into the solution.

Members welcomed the proposals and agreed that they are a positive way forward.

The Board adjourned for a break. Following the break, the Board considered three strategies at the core of the development of the City.

7. Integrated Growth Strategy

Steve Bowyer introduced the key findings of the strategy. Members were advised that it could be downloaded from the Opportunity Peterborough website, and would form the basis of the evidence in support of the core strategy.

Members requested a summary of the IGS. Steve Bowyer explained that due to the complexity of the strategy, it not been possible to include an executive summary. It was confirmed that members could either receive the information by CD or via the website.

Richard Astle asked how does it reflect the community strategy. Members were advised that the previous version had been used, however it was confirmed that all the themes in the new Community Strategy had been incorporated. The Board was informed that no similar exercise had been undertaken elsewhere in the UK.

Steve Bowyer confirmed that the document had no statutory power, however members were informed that it would be used as part of the evidence basis for the Core Strategy.

8. Core Strategy

Peter Heath-Brown introduced the Core Strategy. Members were advised that draft for consultation would be presented to Cabinet on 31 March for approval. It was emphasised that the Core Strategy is not site specific. Questions were deferred until after the conclusion of item 9.

9. Minerals and Waste

Sue Marsh and Steve Winstanley provided an update on the Minerals and Waste strategy. The requirements for sites were outlined to the members. The Board was informed that the strategy included site specific recommendations.

Ed Murphy sought clarification on the disparity between the housing/jobs figures in the current strategy vis a vis those from the Development Corporation plans. Members were advised that the differences were due to the changing nature of the population.

Rob Brown highlighted the current situation of 17,000 people commuting into Peterborough every day which was very high compared with other authorities. Members agreed that the current situation was unsustainable, and there needed to be a greater variation in the housing stock.

Members expressed surprise at the relatively low percentage of waste resulting from domestic source, and sought clarification on whether the effects of code 6 implementation had been factored in. Steve Winstanley confirmed that enhanced recycling, reuse and calculation mechanisms had been factored in, but that code 6 effects had not been fully incorporated.

Steve Winstanley emphasised the difference between waste management and waste strategies. Following discussion it was agreed to continue the discussion off line.

10. Any Other Business

Cllr Lamb sought endorsement from the Board on whether the PCT should apply for Healthy City status. The Board supported the proposal.

The meeting closed at 5.10 p.m.

