

**MINUTES of MEETING of the
COMMUNITY PLANNING
IMPLEMENTATION GROUP held at
HADDINGTON on 16 JUNE 2006**

Councillors in Attendance

Cllr P O'Brien
Cllr W Innes

Officer Attendance:

Mr J Lindsay, Chief Executive
Mr J Lamond, Head of Policy and Business Management
Ms J Cochran, Head of Community Support
Mr T Shearer, Head of Community Wellbeing
Ms S Smith, Economic Development Manager
Mr B Duncan, Corporate Policy Manager
Ms M Galloway, Principal Officer Community Education
Ms S Virdee, Policy Officer

In Attendance:

Mr D Jones, COSLA/Young Scot (Items 1-3 only)
Mr S Baxter, Association of Community Councils
Mr J Ryan, Tranent Social Inclusion Partnership
Mr E Stark, Voluntary Development East Lothian
Mr D White, Community Health Partnership
Mr R Taylor, Lothian and Borders Fire and Rescue Service

Attending:

Ms S Hervey (clerk)

Apologies: Apologies were received from Cllr N Hampshire, Cllr G Meikle, Mr P Collins, Mr A Blackie, Mr A McCrorie, Mr A Forsyth, Superintendent M Gordon, and Ms V Noone.

Prior to the business of the meeting, Mr Lindsay congratulated Ms Virdee, who had been offered and accepted a post with Heriot Watt University.

1. MINUTES OF MEETING OF 14 FEBRUARY 2006

The minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

2. DIALOGUE YOUTH PRESENTATION

Mr Jones gave a presentation on Dialogue Youth, originally a modernising government initiative for 12-18 years which had formed interesting and innovative ways of working and involving young people in the context of Community Planning. He spoke in detail about new technologies which had been harnessed to engage young people, in particular the multi application Young Scot Card. Mr Lamond confirmed that all high school pupils in East Lothian from S1-S6 were in possession of a Young Scot Card. Mr Jones spoke about the Young Scot portal www.youngscot.org, the Young Scot e-Roadshow, which delivered portable laptops to events, the Young Scot youth info line and text messaging service, and new podcast technology which had been integrated into the website service. He concluded his presentation by showing a video promoting the Young Scot card and Dialogue Youth made in South Ayrshire. For a full copy of the presentation, please contact the clerk of this committee.

Mr Lindsay thanked Mr Jones for his input, and asked for more detail as to the take up rate of Young Scot cards in East Lothian. Mr Lamond confirmed that the card would be available for 100% of young people in East Lothian and that the service had already been joined up with secondary school canteen and both school/public library facilities with further services to come in the near future. Taking into account young people who were not in full time education, uptake would be close to 100% overall; as the card had been perceived as a valuable commodity. Mr Jones remarked that Ms Caroline Davis had been positively promoting the Young Scot card as part of her post in Musselburgh.

Councillor Innes indicated that he had been impressed at the success of the project and felt that it had been a worthwhile initiative, but asserted that he had thought it would be better associated with corporate planning for young people rather than Community Planning. Mr Jones responded that if Community Planning was interpreted as meeting the needs of citizens, then Community Planning Partners would benefit from taking forward young people's engagement, via the Young Scot brand. Mr Shearer added that both the Council and Community Planning Partners had a statutory requirement to engage with young people.

Mr Lindsay mentioned that it had been valuable to have an insight into the achievements of the Dialogue Youth initiative, and that he had been pleased to hear that East Lothian had been making full use of the Young Scot card facility.

3. DIALOGUE YOUTH REPORT

Mr Lamond spoke to the report, acknowledging the assistance of Mr Blackie and Mr Shearer. East Lothian had run its own Dialogue Youth Unit for three years, which had underpinned the national agenda. In order to secure continued operation of the service, alternative methods of funding would need to be made available, as current funding received from the latest short term stream, the Changing Children's Services Fund would end in August 2006. The table on pages 8 and 9 contained a brief list of some of the

projects completed by Dialogue Youth, and further information could be made available via the ELLP website, <http://www.ellp.info/home.asp> .

Mr Lamond reported that there were monies remaining from the Community Planning Partnership Capacity Building Fund of c£35,000, funding which should be matched on a pound for pound basis. Although final approval for allocation of this finance would need to come from the partnership, Mr Lamond had not been aware of any restrictions on this spending and proposed that funds should be diverted to enable continuation of East Lothian's Dialogue Youth project. Mr Lamond advised that if the Community Planning Partnership agreed to the proposals, there could be the potential for realigning the scope of the project to better match overall Community Planning Objectives.

Mr Lamond expressed his support for the continuation of the Dialogue Youth project within East Lothian, although some national initiatives would still be available to young people it would be more beneficial for the local community and especially young people within the community to continue with a supporting local scheme. The proposals contained in the report would essentially fund the project until March 2009.

The total costs involved with the project, including one full time member of staff and the running costs of the Gatehouse Facility in Musselburgh were approximately £40,000 per year. To fund the project up to March 2009 would therefore cost £115,000, and Mr Lamond proposed that the Community Planning Partnership should allocate £63,000 from their capacity building fund. East Lothian Council's Children's Services and Community Services had each pledged around £13,000, leaving a £25,000 shortfall that would ideally be provided by other Community Partners.

Mr Lamond summarised that it was his belief that the proposal would represent an excellent achievement from a limited financial outlay, but that the Community Planning Partnership would need to determine whether they wished to support the proposals contained in the report. He concluded by reporting that a meeting with Superintendent Martin Gordon had resulted in Lothian and Borders Police supporting the proposals and agreeing in principal to supplying some of the funding necessary for bridging the funding gap. He outlined the recommendations contained in the report to the Group.

Mr Lindsay responded that the crux of the matter had been the need to continue funding for this successful and worthwhile service, and noted that Lothian and Borders Police had agreed in principal to supply some of the shortfall within the funding proposals. Mr Lamond stated that Lothian and Borders Police had indicated that it would be ideal to share the shortfall with one or more Community Partner(s).

Councillor Innes intimated that although he would be happy to support the initiative, he felt that the decision should not be made in isolation, possibly at the expense of other worthwhile projects which the Group had not been aware of.

Mr White stated that the Dialogue Youth project had been very well respected and also well received, and that an opportunity to work a re-examination of their objectives would

be very welcome. He agreed that finance could be accessed either from the Community Health Partnership Board or from local funding to help make up the shortfall in finance. Mr Lindsay thanked Mr White for his support.

Councillor Innes expressed concern that other projects, such as the Bridges Motorcycle Project could be under financial pressures in the near future. Mr Lamond indicated that a project such as the Bridges Motorcycle Project would not necessarily be appropriate in terms of the Community Partnership Capacity Building Fund, as it had not been designed to support mainstream services. He pointed out that the proposals had not utilised the whole of the fund, but that alternative improvements that had previously been suggested for the fund, such as improving communications or funding a post to work entirely within Community Planning, would not be wholly viable if the proposals were approved.

Councillor Innes agreed that the proposal had been based on a significant need, but emphasised that the Council Departments which had agreed to help to fund the project would also need to find savings in their budgets in order to support Dialogue Youth, and his concern would be that another significant shortfall could emerge but that financial support would no longer be available. Mr Lindsay suggested that the proposals could be agreed subject to the remaining shortfall being sourced. Councillor Innes stated that the group should be mindful that the decision could effect the work of another project, but that the proposals would need to be approved at this meeting as the relevant finance would be required from August 2006. He recommended that this kind of item should not be brought to the meeting in isolation in future.

Mr Lindsay assured the group that the situation at the Bridges Project would be investigated.

Decision

CPIG agreed:

- i) to note the valuable contribution made by the Dialogue Youth project to date, both nationally and locally within East Lothian.
- ii) to support the outline proposal detailed in the report including the allocation of partnership capacity building monies.
- iii) that major partners including Health, Police, and Communities Scotland should follow East Lothian Council's lead in committing towards the funding shortfall identified in the report.
- iv) that East Lothian Council on behalf of the partnership should take steps to secure continuation of the Dialogue Youth Project/Staff in East Lothian until March 2009.

4. NEW FUTURES SUCCESSOR FUND

Ms Virdee spoke to the report, outlining that the New Futures Successor Fund had been announced by the Scottish Executive early in 2006, and had been made available to areas which had New Futures Funding projects in place, specifically to help with integration of these projects into the local infrastructure.

The proposal contained in the report recommended that the £85,000, which would be shared over the next two years, should be allocated to the Bridges' Jumpstart project, which aided employability and gave guidance for literacy, numeracy, computer skills and confidence building. Ms Virdee reported that the Community Planning Partnership had completed Stage 3 outlined at paragraph 3.5 of the report, as a specially formed sub-group had carried out assessment exercises over the past few months.

Ms Virdee drew the Group's attention to paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8, emphasising potential difficulties with monitoring and evaluation work. She concluded by pointing out that some discussion about how East Lothian should take forward activity around employability issues in light of the national Employability Framework was necessary.

Mr Lamond expressed concern that the Community Planning Partnership had been increasingly expected to take responsibility for monitoring and evaluation of this kind of project. He wondered whether in the future it would be appropriate to top slice funding to meet the costs of evaluation and monitoring processes but acknowledged that this would have a knock on effect with the funding for projects themselves. He recommended that a firmer line could be taken relating to the Community Planning Partnership's obligations to evaluation, with reference to the finite resources that were available.

Councillor Innes expressed concern that the Scottish Executive were setting their own priorities which were not necessarily the priorities of the community. Mr Lindsay advised that the project had been connected with Community Planning as it crossed a number of different agencies. Ms Virdee added that, as with other Scottish Executive funding pots, guidance suggests that CPPs look at the possibility of 'mainstreaming' project activity.

Councillor Innes asserted that when short term projects funded by the Scottish Executive had been dropped, Community Planning Partnerships had been expected to fund them, instead of concentrating on their own objectives. He stated that Community Planning could not be effective unless the community was empowered, not merely consulted, but allowed to make budgetary and policy decisions. Mr Lindsay responded that budgetary restrictions could make this impractical. Mr Lamond noted Councillor Innes' frustration, but remarked that to take action in this instance would have a detrimental effect on an important local project and would not be advisable.

Mr Lindsay intimated that he recognised Councillor Innes' concerns, but that financial implications related to the Scottish Executive would need to be recognised and respected by the Community Planning Partnership. He noted that at present the community had not been involved, but that he had been confident that the reorganisation of the area into new wards could lead to a re-examination of the entire system. Councillor Innes pointed out that there had been enthusiasm for the process of Community Planning but very little delegation of authority to the community. He likened the situation to Community Councils, emphasising that it had proved successful when budgets had been allocated to the Councils. Mr Lindsay agreed that the position should be examined more closely in the near future, but added that devolution of the budget could complicate structures.

Ms Cochran advised that although focus on employability services had been recommended by the Scottish Executive, it had also been seen as a matter of importance by several other agencies. She agreed that there could be an expectation for the Community Planning Partnership to fund the projects when the funding from the Scottish Executive was reallocated.

Ms Smith reported that in terms of economic development, the employability framework had been focussed on several other areas in Scotland, of which the only east of Scotland local authority included had been Dundee. Edinburgh City Council had been invited to apply for funding, and had contacted East Lothian Council, Midlothian Council and West Lothian Council as they had been advised to widen their bid for funding to these surrounding areas. She elaborated on the ideas behind employability, that it had worked in partnership with agencies such as Job Centre Plus, in order to help those most excluded; and agreed to bring any further information to a future meeting of the CPIG.

Councillor Innes recommended that East Lothian Council should not divert attention away from more important work, especially given that East Lothian only had approximately 1.6% of unemployment. Mr Lindsay stated that there had been many issues raised throughout the discussion and that they should be addressed at a later date.

CPIG agreed:

- i) to support the Bridges Project bid for New Futures Successor Funding.

5. EAST LoTHIAN REGENERATION OUTCOME AGREEMENT ANNUAL REPORT

Ms Virdee spoke to the report, informing the Group that it had been a requirement to produce an Annual Report for the East Lothian Regeneration Outcome Agreement. She drew the Panel's attention to the excellent examples of joint working between Tranent and Prestonpans, especially via some planned events which had helped to forge links between staff and communities.

She explained that although the report had not been finalised, she had recommended it should be brought to the Group, and advised that the report only covered mandatory reporting areas as per Communities Scotland's guidance. She stated that, as outlined in the report, it would be unlikely that all of Regeneration activity outlined in the ROA would continue after 2008, and that the Group should note that an exit strategy for the Social Inclusion Partnership could be necessary if there were no prospects for future funding.

Mr Ryan commented that the Report had been a challenging process. Mr Lindsay recommended that the CPIG note the progress that had been made. Ms Virdee advised that there should be further discussion as to how to take forward activity post 2008 when the ROA expires.

CPIG agreed:

- i) to note the intention to submit an Annual Report to Communities Scotland by the end of June 2006 and note the content of the emerging draft Annual Report as contained within the appendix to the report.
- ii) to note that work underway in Prestonpans had been on an ad hoc basis and had been dependant on external regeneration funding.
- iii) to note that it would be unlikely that Regeneration activity on the current scale taking place in Tranent would continue after 2008 and that this would have implications for the staff, projects and particularly the young people of Tranent.

6. THE EAST LOTHIAN COMMUNITY PLAN AND COMMUNITY PLANNING NEWSLETTER

Mr Lindsay spoke to the item, reminding all partners that SMART targets would need to be added to the Community Plan as soon as possible; as measurable targets would allow for the Community Planning Partnership to note improvements in performance.

Ms Virdee clarified that she had received further information regarding inclusivity from some partners since the papers had been circulated for the meeting and would make sure these were demonstrated more clearly throughout the documents. She agreed that SMART targets would need to be added to the newsletter as well as the plan itself, and that measurable targets would be the most sensible way forward. There was discussion as to which partners were still to forward their targets. Ms Virdee advised that if there were any outstanding issues with the partnership agreement on pages 65 and 66 of the papers, representatives should contact her by June 23. This would also be the deadline for submission of targets.

Councillor Innes remarked that although it would be necessary to engage with young people as part of Community Planning, the community had been suspicious of the amount of resources allocated solely to working with young people. He felt that if the allocation had been seen to be part of a structure then the wider community would be

more supportive of this work. He highlighted that it would be important to separate Community Planning from Corporate Planning, as again the wider community had been suspicious of this perceived overlap. He recommended that Community Planning should not carry out their agenda without the knowledge and approval of the community, and that the lack of tolerance of young people could be reversed by involving the community in the youth work agenda.

7. AOCB

Mr Duncan spoke to a tabled report on the Scottish Executive Integrated Services Modelling Project, advising that Midlothian and East Lothian Councils had been invited to attend a workshop on the 26 July. This date had been accepted and 8 partners would be invited to attend. The list at Appendix A of the report outlined the discussions which had been taking place during other workshops, and East Lothian Council would be expected to supply a topic of discussion for the workshop they were to attend. Mr Duncan concluded by assuring the Local Councillors present that there would be a separate set of discussions for all elected members.

Mr Lindsay reported that he had received a letter written jointly by the Chief Executives of Stirling and Clackmannanshire Councils advising that they planned to join up all their front line services with a view to reducing costs by £4,000,000 per year. In addition, Glasgow and Edinburgh City Councils had been allocated £2,000,000 to employ a consultancy to examine their processes and explore the possibility of replacing each task with the process which required the least financial outlay. There was discussion of this idea and its implications. Mr Duncan pointed out that in ABL benchmarking studies it had been common that East Lothian Council's processes had been used as a model for best practice.

Councillor O'Brien warned that the democratic process should not be compromised in an attempt to cut costs. Mr Duncan drew the Group's attention to the attached paper which was an excerpt from Tom McCabe, Finance and Public Service Reform Minister's think piece, *Transforming Public Services: The Next Phase of Reform*.

Mr Lindsay recommended that it would be important to remain part of the discussions for these proposed reforms. Councillor Innes suggested that the workshop theme supplied by East Lothian Council should be the localised implementation of Community Planning, adding that the community should be involved in the proposals for reform, and that the Scottish Executive should not be viewed as the main vehicle for change.

Ms Virdee reported that the Choose Life national action plan's first report is due to be submitted shortly. A copy of the draft report would be circulated after the meeting and any issues should be raised by 15 July 2006.

CPIG 16 06 06

Ms Smith advised that the Local Economic Reference Group had secured representations from Queen Margaret University, the business sector, and East Lothian Council's Economic Development Business Group.

Ms Virdee spoke to the tabled report from Audit Scotland, drawing the group's attention to the full list of recommendations. Copies of the larger report would be available from the web address on the back page of the report. Mr Duncan intimated that the report had been welcomed as it had outlined some ongoing issues both regarding Community Planning Partnerships and their relationship with the Scottish Executive.

Mr Shearer announced that the East Lothian Tenant's and Resident's Panel had requested that a representative be invited to join the CPIG. The request was agreed by the Group. Ms Virdee confirmed that a meeting was already scheduled to take forward this action.

Mr White reported that he had recently received a circular promoting a Development Opportunity under the banner of Integrated Health Improvement Planning and Delivery Consultation. It was anticipated this might help to bring improvements to the Health for Life agenda. Mr White agreed to discuss this further with Mr Lamond and report back the CPIG in due course.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting was set for 10 October 2006, 10am, in Conference Rooms One & Two, John Muir House.