

Links are in red

From: "Skirton, Sara" <skirtons@mendip.gov.uk>
To: "Mendip LSP" <MendipLSP@mendip.gov.uk>; "Thomson, David" <thomsond@mendip.gov.uk>; "Brown, Stuart" <browns@mendip.gov.uk>; "Roger Kershaw" <RJKershaw@somerset.gov.uk>; "Peter Grainger" <PGrainger@somerset.gov.uk>; "Dicken, Claire" <dickenc@mendip.gov.uk>; "Roger Martin" <rogerandann@coxleyhouse.fsnet.co.uk>
Cc: "Perkins, Kate" <perkinsk@mendip.gov.uk>; "Temple, Jill" <templej@mendip.gov.uk>; "Harrison, Sue" <harrisons@mendip.gov.uk>; <netta@eliminwells.org.uk>; "Community Strategy Project Group" <CommunityStrategyProjectGroup@mendip.gov.uk>; "McKenzie, Peter" <mckenziep@mendip.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, 19 May, 2004 16:47
Attach: 8 Communications Update.doc; 5 Community Strategy for Mendip - Developing Action Plans.doc; 7 Financial Protocols for Council Tax on Second Homes monies.doc; 6 Mendip Food and Drink Festival Update and Request for Support.doc; 1 Agenda 25.05.04.doc; 3 MSP Minutes - 16 March 2004.doc
Subject: MSP Board Meeting 25th May 2004 - Agenda

Dear MSP Board member, please find attached the agenda and papers for the meeting of the MSP Board on **Tuesday 25th May**, commencing at **3pm in the Conference Room at Whitstone Leisure Centre, Charlton Road, Shepton Mallet BA4 5BG**.

The following documents should be attached to this message:

- 1 [Agenda 25.05.04](#)
- 3 [MSP Minutes -16th March 2004](#)
- 5 [Community Strategy for Mendip – Developing Action Plans](#)
- 6 [Mendip Food and Drink Festival – Update and Request for Support](#)
- 7 [Financial Protocols for Council Tax on Second Homes monies](#)
- 8 [Communications Update](#)

Regards

Sara Skirton
Community Planning and Consultation Officer
01749 341340

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses by MCI's Internet Managed Scanning Services - powered by MessageLabs.
For further information visit <http://www.mci.com>



Mendip Strategic Partnership

Board Meeting 25th May 2004

3pm in the Conference Room, Whitstone Leisure Centre, Shepton Mallet

Agenda

1. Apologies

2. Public Participation

3. Minutes of the meeting of 16th March 2004

4. 'Back on My Feet' - showing of a video produced by Mendip YMCA

Karen Deverell of Mendip YMCA will introduce a short video which gives real examples of the positive impact voluntary agencies can have on people's lives

5. Community Strategy for Mendip – Developing Action Plans

Report on progress to date in developing action plans to support the community strategy

6. Mendip Food and Drink Festival Update and request for Support for Community Involvement

Updating report and request to MSP Board for financial support

7. Financial Protocols for Council Tax on Second Homes Monies

Report from Roger Kershaw, Corporate Director, Somerset County Council

8. Communications Group Update

Updating report for information

9. Shepton 21

Verbal update for information

10. Budget Report

Verbal report for information

11. Any Other Business

12. Dates of future meetings

Suggested dates for Board meetings for the remainder of 2004 are 13th July, 28th September and 30th November, all commencing at 3pm, venues to be arranged



The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Minutes of the meeting of The Mendip Strategic Partnership held on Tuesday 16 March 2004 at 3.00 pm in the Small Hall, Glastonbury Town Hall, Glastonbury

PRESENT: Ron Ballantine - Chairman
 Penny Baker - Mendip Association of Chamber of Commerce
 Cathy Bakewell - Somerset County Council
 Ian Bennett - Strode College
 Pat Champion - Jobcentre Plus
 Gaynor Clarke - Jobcentre Plus
 Nick Cottle - Somerset Association of Local Councils
 Karen Deverell - Mendip YMCA
 Richard Dixon - Mendip Environment Forum
 Pastor Stephen Fowler - Elim Christian Centre
 Roger Kershaw - Somerset County Council
 Chief Supt. Andy Marsh - Avon & Somerset Police
 Ian Wallace - Young Somerset
 Cllr. Bill MacKay OBE - Mendip District Council

ALSO

PRESENT Lina Bolton - Robson Rhodes

OFFICERS

PRESENT: Stuart Brown - Mendip District Council
 Simon Eames - Mendip District Council
 Sarah Guscott - Mendip District Council
 Sara Skirton - Mendip District Council
 Jill Temple - Mendip District Council
 David Thomson - Mendip District Council

Agenda Item Number	Agenda Item	
1	Apologies Peter Chapman Penny Church	Mendip Housing Limited Citizens Advice Bureau (Vice Chair)

	Cate Mack Zena Pollard Elaine Pugsley Cllr. Harvey Siggs	CPRE Mendip Economy Forum NCH Mendip District Council
2	Public Participation None	
	The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Lina Bolton from the District Council's Auditors, Robson Rhodes who was present for the duration of the meeting.	
3	Minutes of the meeting dated 3 February 2004 Agreed as a correct record.	
4	<p>Mendip District Council's Corporate Performance Assessment (CPA) – Self Assessment Document</p> <p>Stuart Brown explained that a Self Assessment for Mendip District Council had been undertaken and he would identify the areas where there were strengths and the areas where it was believed that further improvement was required. He explained that he would not be commenting on internal risk procedures as the MSP would not be familiar with these.</p> <p><u>Ambition</u></p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Vision • New Priorities • Bottom up approach to Community Planning • Working towards a Community Plan and own Corporate Plan within the Council to be completed by October 2004 • Securing funds externally to help deliver priorities <p>Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To continue to develop a longer term Ambition • To play a full role in the MSP <p><u>Prioritisation</u></p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities provide very clear focus • Business Planning Process translates priorities through the Business Plans • Reasonable balance between Priority and Non Priority areas <p>Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising Community Awareness • Investing in organisation capacity to help deliver ambitions <p><u>Capacity</u></p> <p>Strengths</p>	

- Strong political and officer leadership
- Good track record in staff development
- Very well established Standards Committee
- Positive commitment to Partnership working
- Willingness to explore Service Delivery

Improvements

- Work force and succession planning
- Member training
- Wish to develop the role of Town, Parish and City Councils – hoping to do through the Area Boards and the MSP

Achievement of Quality and Improvement

Strengths

- Performance Indicators – Top quarter and moving in right direction
- Good performance in Priority areas
- Overall good levels of customer satisfaction
- Good record of partnership working
- Addressing areas of poor service performance
- Glastonbury Festival – vast improvement in this area

Improvements

- Need to improve the Scrutiny function within Mendip District Council
- Public awareness and communication needs improving
- Need to inform the public what is improving and what is not
- Need to work on the regeneration of Shepton Mallet

Future Plans

Strengths

- A number of plans and strategies are in place
- Good Asset Management
- Good Capital Strategies

Improvements

- Need a longer term plan detailing where the Council is going over the next 8 – 10 years – however, an Improvement Plan is being developed

Stuart Brown asked whether the Board thought it was a fair reflection of the Council and whether there were any omissions that could be fed in.

The following points were noted:

- Concern about the cuts in public transport and the impact it will have upon people in villages and hamlets
- The intention to develop a long term Financial Strategy was noted, however it is all about being realistic about future plans and the impact

	<p>that the budget cuts will have had upon ambitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A long term Vision is needed for the protection and enhancement of the environment • A desire to see the Council engaging in the wider community • Entirely supportive of the emphasis on public awareness but there should not be too much emphasis on press and public relations • How would the loss of the Bio Diversity and Sustainability posts affect the ability to progress the Community Plan? • Issue about Partnership Working – cuts in the areas relating to Partnership funding. Difficult to see where it is a strength • Service Delivery element - enabling does not come through <p>The Chief Executive explained that encouragement for longer term Corporate Planning would be very valuable. There were bridges to be built with the Town and Parish Councils across the district. Mendip District Council was working with the County Council to try and ensure that the Strategic and Community Plans were linked. The concerns relating to environment and transport funding were fully understood and the reduction in these budgets had been very difficult decisions to make. He advised that the comments made by the MSP would be taken into consideration in the final draft of the assessment to reflect the community concerns.</p>
5	<p>Bringing Glastonbury Together – SRB Programme and Forward Strategy</p> <p>Sarah Guscott explained her role in the SRB programme and advised that it had had a difficult first couple of years although some of the problems had been common to other regenerative programmes. SRB had specific rules and regulations governing its operation, and these cut against the understandable desire in the community to make decisions swiftly and according to where they saw the needs. She detailed the history of the scheme and referred the Partnership to slides which she circulated around the table. The Glastonbury Project had now turned itself around and had shown good individual project activity.</p> <p>The Partnership was asked to give its support to the SRB Board in seeking key agency commitment to the SRB programme and the forward strategy for the regeneration of Glastonbury.</p> <p>Points and queries were raised and the following responses given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3 in the report. Had the project made a difference in these areas? • There were outputs and outcomes to achieve and they were not as far along the outputs achievement as had been hoped at this stage. 16 projects had been supported so far. The project was still working its way through processes and was below where it should be with business support. • How would Year 6 be used?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It had taken some time to get the project up and running. The RDA had confidence in the projects moving ahead ie they had more of a strategic focus and direction. The RDA could see it developing and want to see a successful end project. • A lot of administrative support and whole leadership facilitation was needed. Did this come from Mendip District Council? • Mainly. Almost a year was needed before funding was allocated. <p>Chief Supt. Andy Marsh advised that he had seen SRB working successfully in others areas. It presented great opportunities for the Police and they would like to give support.</p> <p>Ian Bennett acknowledged that the onus fell on Mendip District Council to keep the project going and felt that officers of the Council, particularly Sarah Guscott, should be congratulated.</p> <p>The Strategic Partnership was referred to the list of projects carried out that had been circulated earlier.</p> <p>The Chairman asked that the MSP be kept involved if at all possible.</p>
6	<p>Mendip Local Development Scheme</p> <p>Simon Eames advised that the report had been approved at Council's Cabinet the previous night. It outlined the key changes to the Statutory Development Plans System brought forward by Government. The Government had been looking to simplify the system, however new complexities had been introduced. Mendip District Council had made effective use of the current Development Plan and was regarded as having stretched the current system to its full potential. The adopted Local Plan had been highly regarded for the way in which it was introduced.</p> <p>Simon explained that the changes included the statutory requirement to produce a Local Development Framework and to have this in place within three years of the commencement of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which was currently expected in June/July 2004.</p> <p>The plans were intended to be positive and reflect the needs of the whole community. The Framework would be a key delivery mechanism for the Council's Corporate Plan and would need to accord with National Planning Policy and Regional Spatial Strategy. The Framework had to be prepared in accordance with the Project Plan and getting the scheme correct was crucial.</p> <p>The group noted that Cllr. Harvey Siggs had extended an invitation to a Partnership member to join a small group of Mendip District Council Members and Officers in developing the Mendip Local Development Scheme.</p> <p>Richard Dixon pointed out that Cate Mack was involved in the regional side</p>

	<p>by way of being a regional assembly member.</p> <p>Ian Bennett queried the migration from the old scheme to the new one.</p> <p>Simon explained that the existing adopted Local Plan would be saved for three years from the commencement of the Act. The Council was required to have a new plan at that time. Officers would be able to identify parts of the Local Plan to take forward and some of the more strategic aspects of the Local Plan could be updated and developed.</p> <p>It was noted that the scheme had to be submitted to the Secretary of State each year and that it would be a “living” document which would roll forward on an annual basis.</p> <p>It was agreed that Richard Dixon would discuss with Cate Mack whether she would wish to be nominated as the Board Member to work with the Group or whether it would be more appropriate for Richard Dixon himself to represent the MSP on this Group.</p> <p>Nick Cottle also volunteered to be part of the Group if required.</p>
7	<p>Community Strategy for Mendip</p> <p>The Chairman congratulated Sara Skirton and her team for bringing the Strategy forward.</p> <p>Roger Kershaw suggested that consultation on the draft should be more of a validation exercise than full public consultation. There was an issue about developing key activities in the Action Plan.</p> <p>Sara Skirton advised that she had been in discussion with Richard Dixon as Vice Chair of Communications and they were looking more at agency consultation rather than public consultation, although it would be open to anyone. The intention was to have a major launch of the finalised Strategy in September.</p> <p>Points and queries were put forward and the following responses given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the presentation in the Council Chamber the impression was that road safety featured more strongly in the “Feeling Safe” section than crime and disorder although that does not come through in the document. • A lot of emphasis was put on road safety in the Cake Consultation. One of the reasons to go out to wider consultation was to flesh out these points. Road safety – a number of agencies would need to get together. It was hoped to strengthen these elements in the Action Plans. • Alcohol consumption – the “Staying Well” section should be reviewed.

	<p>Government was seeking to be proactive in looking at alcohol consumption and this should have more priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alcohol can be put in as a separate bullet point to give it a higher priority • Agency consultation would result in good feedback. However, further work should be carried out prior to consultation - there should be more consistency in the wording in the Strategy. The final two lines in the first paragraph under Environment should be deleted. <p>The Chairman referred to the Line Chart on Page 10 and requested that this be replaced with a Column Chart. He suggested that Richard Dixon go through the document and give his comments relating to consistency directly to Sara Skirton.</p> <p>Nick Cottle suggested that the Strategy be sent to all Parish Councils for discussion at their Parish Council meetings and feedback to the MSP.</p> <p>The Chairman asked that Nick Cottle contact them for their responses.</p> <p>He thanked the Partnership for their comments and advised that these would be incorporated into the Document. The Working Group would then put the Strategy out to consultation between April and June.</p>
8	<p>Council Tax on Second Homes</p> <p>Roger Kershaw explained that the Local Government Act contained legislation to reduce the automatic half price discount on second homes. It had been agreed that the income generated would be allocated to the Local Strategic Partnerships. The Avon and Somerset Police did not make a similar agreement and so a proportion of that levy would not be available for use by the LSP. The total amount available was likely to be approximately £97,500. The report proposed a set of criteria for allocating the resource.</p> <p>He stated that given the fact that the County Council had allocated its share of the resources to the MSP it was proposed that a sum of approximately £10,000 be earmarked for use by the SSP in developing their joint objective of promoting Somerset. It was proposed that a sub group of the MSP be established to recommend spending proposals to the next meeting that reflect the recommendation in the report. He advised that the payments would be year on year and not a one off payment.</p> <p>Cathy Bakewell explained that she was not keen on small working groups. She felt that the Community Strategy was excellent and, once the document was finalised, issues would be highlighted and prioritised to use the funding accordingly. Funding would be continuous as long as there was Council Tax on second homes.</p> <p>A letter was circulated from the Avon and Somerset Police Authority advising</p>

	<p>that its Revenue Budget and Capital Programme for the next financial year had been approved which included an earmarked sum of £220,000 for increased partnership working within the Authority's area. The sum represented the estimated additional income receivable by the Authority from the reduced discount on second homes for all billing authorities.</p> <p>Chief Supt. Andy Marsh suggested that the Community Safety Partnership did not invest in crime and disorder unless it was match-funded. Some of the funding available to this Strategic Partnership should be pursued to go towards crime and disorder.</p> <p>Richard Dixon reiterated that the funds were not to replace Council spending. He was conscious that the Community Strategy was being taken forward with a strong environmental influence and pointed out that it was being taken forward without Bio Diversity and Sustainable Officer posts within the Council. Expenditure therefore by the MSP regarding the above might be a way forward for the future.</p> <p>The Chief Executive pointed out that unless bids were put forward sooner rather than later the money would remain static.</p> <p>The Chairman explained that if the ideas and proposals link into the Community Strategy there might not be a need to delay. He asked that the Board bring back ideas and proposals to the next meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed that the MSP endorsed the proposed criteria for allocating its resources as set out in the report.</p> <p>Points for and against the proposal to establish a small group were noted and the proposal would be discussed at the next meeting.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Partnership Working – Community Safety This item was taken with Item 8.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Shepton 21 Sara Skirton referred to the leaflet circulated relating to the MCTi Community Participation Event to be held in Shepton Mallet that weekend asking anyone with an interest or link with Shepton Mallet and the Hinterlands to come along and take part in the process.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Communications Group Richard Dixon explained that he had met with Andy Towner and some changes had been agreed to the Website ie elimination of redundant pages and slight growth for the Website. He was pleased with the way that suggestions by members on the voluntary sector papers had been taken forward.</p>

	<p>There had been discussion about the distribution of the initial draft Community Strategy but it had been decided to recommend that the MSP economise on the printing of the initial draft.</p> <p>An approach had been made from Nic Jefferies with possible e- Government assistance for the Website.</p> <p>The Chairman asked the Board for their comments on whether the draft Strategy should go onto the website. Discussion then took place on whether the draft document should be made publicly available on the website for the consultation period or put on a separate website. It was acknowledged that the main purpose of the consultation was to obtain “agency” views but it was felt by some that the public should not be excluded from commenting at this stage.</p> <p>In keeping with Freedom of Information, it was agreed that the Consultation Draft would be made available to all via the MSP website.</p>
12	<p>Budget Report</p> <p>Sara Skirton referred to the report giving details of the Partnership Budget and advised that the detailed accounts could be inspected by Board Members at any time at the Council’s offices.</p>
13	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>The Chairman advised that the Department of Health had launched an extensive consultation on Health Improvement. The PCT amongst others had been asked for their involvement. Mendip PCT had been asked to concentrate on older people, getting as many agencies involved as was possible and it was planned that the MSP should be part of this.</p> <p>The Chairman also explained that he was standing down as Chair of the PCT when his appointment ended on 31 March 2004. He would continue as the PCT representative on the MSP and was prepared to continue as Chairman for the present, but if anyone felt this was inappropriate they should let Sara Skirton know.</p>
14	<p>Date of future meeting</p> <p>25 May 2004 – venue to be decided.</p>

The meeting finished at 4.35 pm.

The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item: 5

FROM: MSP Task Group Date: 25th May 2004

SUBJECT: **Community Strategy for Mendip - Developing Action Plans**

1. SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report informs Members of progress made by the multi agency MSP Task Group towards developing action plans to achieve the aims set out in the draft Community Strategy.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The draft Community Strategy that is currently out for consultation sets out the MSP's agreed long term vision for Mendip and a number of long term aims to help achieve that vision.

2.2 The draft Strategy does not explain how those aims are to be achieved, therefore detailed action plans are required, to support the Strategy and demonstrate that the aims contained in the strategy are realistic and achievable.

3. PROGRESS TO DATE

3.1 Acknowledging that the Task Group was not starting with a blank canvass, it began by undertaking an audit of existing partner action and business plans from 2004/05 onwards to carry out a 'gap analysis' which would highlight those themes and aims for which there appeared to be little or no provision in existing partner action plans.

3.2 Work to date suggests that only the themes A Place to Live, Feeling Safe and Staying Well appear to have a fairly comprehensive range of agreed and resourced partner actions to support them. Actions have been identified for other themes, such as Food, Environment and Ways to Learn, but some of the detail, including how they are resourced, still needs to be worked up. Some themes, including Getting Around and A Sense of Community, have few actions attached to them at present.

3.3 It should however be noted that the audit is not yet complete. Reasons for this include the fact that not all Task Group members were able to attend the meeting on 21st April and not all partners have yet finalised their action or business plans. A further Task Group meeting is planned for 7th June when it

is hoped we can at least finalise the audit of those partners represented on the Task Group.

3.4 Additionally the action and business plans of voluntary sector organisations have not yet been audited since there is not currently an MSP voluntary sector representative on the Task Group, due to capacity constraints.

3.5 The audit is only the first stage of the action planning process. True Community Planning action planning is about partners agreeing joint actions to achieve agreed aims and pooling resources to achieve them. This is beginning to happen in some sectors, particularly around the Food theme, and it is hoped that there will be more collaborative working when partners develop business and actions plans for 2005 and beyond.

4. DEVELOPING PRIORITIES

4.1 Government Guidance indicates that Community Strategies should contain clear priorities. At present, the draft Community Strategy is fairly broad, covering eleven themes. Whilst all these themes are arguably important in promoting the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of the district, the MSP may wish to select particular or fewer themes to focus on in the first instance.

4.2 The gap analysis should provide information to help the MSP to decide which themes it particularly wants to concentrate on in the near future, which might be on the basis of concentrating on those themes that are already priorities for partners or concentrating on themes which do not currently feature highly in partner business and action plans. The availability of the second homes Council Tax monies is likely to play a role in this decision making.

4.3 The finalised version of the Community Strategy, due for publication in autumn 2004, will need to reflect any priorities agreed by the MSP.

5. MOVING FORWARD

5.1 The intention is to have completed the audit of action plans in time to provide a comprehensive gap analysis to the MSP at its next meeting in July, when the Board will also receive the results of any stakeholder feedback on the draft Strategy. Once the Board has this information, possible next steps might include

- Determining if gaps indicate that certain aims or themes are not current priorities for the MSP or whether they are priorities that need to be achieved through other means / other agencies.
- Considering how the second homes Council Tax monies might help the MSP achieve aims in the Community Strategy

- Whether establishing themed working groups might help progress. There are some existing multi agency groups that might be prepared to take on responsibility for action planning for certain themes, such as the Public Health Network.
- Having agreed priorities, consider how the draft Strategy can be revised to reflect those priorities.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 The MSP Board is asked to note the progress made to date and consider how best to ensure that all partner action plans, particularly those of voluntary sector organisations represented on the Board, are incorporated into the audit.

Lead Officer: Sara Skirton
01749 341340
skirtons@mendip.gov.uk

The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item: 6

FROM: **Kate Harris – Agricultural Development Officer** Date: 25th May 2004

SUBJECT: **Mendip Food and Drink Festival Update and request for Support for Community Involvement**

1. FOOD AND DRINK FESTIVAL 17TH -24TH OCTOBER 2004

1.1 The intention to run a festival of local food and drink was reported to the MSP in November 2003. Since then there has been considerable progress towards the running of the event. A high profile launch took place on Wednesday 12th May at the Charlton House Hotel at which local producers, hoteliers, public, community and voluntary sector organisation restated their commitment to working together to make the festival a success.

2. FESTIVAL AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 The purpose of the festival is to provide a focus for a vibrant celebration of food in Mendip with multiple benefits for businesses, residents and visitors:

- Economic benefits: increased business for Mendip enterprises; increased inter-trading between enterprises
- Social & educational benefits: community events; educational activities; activities that link organisations in different sectors, e.g. a producer collaborating with a local school
- Health benefits: activities linking food to healthy lifestyles including cycling and walking, providing healthy options in schools
- Cultural benefits: events in museums and visitor attractions that encourage understanding of the historic and cultural roots of food production and farming in Mendip
- Environmental benefits: encouraging people to come to events on public transport, bicycle or foot; encouraging catering and hospitality businesses to reduce food miles by sourcing ingredients as locally as possible and choosing seasonal foods.

2.2 All events in the programme are to be hosted by organisations in Mendip. Visitors to the Food Festival events will be attracted from outside Mendip and from the local area. For the purposes of the Festival the definition of 'local' is from within 40 miles or, in the case of foods that are not produced within 40 miles, from as close as possible. The Festival supports the principle of Fair Trade for foods that cannot be produced in this country.

2.3 These aims and objectives fit very closely with the long term aims set out in the Food chapter of the draft Mendip Community Strategy. The draft Food Action Plan identifies the Mendip Food Festival as contributing to the achievement of 4 of these long terms aims.

3. REQUEST FOR FUNDING TO SUPPORT COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL ACTIVITIES AS PART OF THE FOOD AND DRINK FESTIVAL

3.1 Mendip District Council has committed £2,500 to the running of the festival and a further £2,500 has been committed by Communities First in Rural Somerset. This funding will primarily be directed towards the co-ordination and promotion of the festival. Further private sector sponsorship is being sought to supplement this public sector funding.

3.2 The experience of the Exmoor Food Festival is that it is important to be able to offer small grant support to local schools and community groups in order for them to be able to take an active part in Food Festival activities. The Festival is timed to include Apple Day (21st October), and this offers a clear opportunity for schools and community groups to undertake Apple Day activities – around local growing and eating of apples. Funding can be used for any farming or food related project for example tastings of other local produce, undertaking farm visits, or projects with a longer term focus.

3.3 Given the close fit between the aims and objectives of the Food Festival and the work on food issues proposed in the Mendip Community Strategy the Food Festival Co-ordination Group hope that the MSP would look favourably on a request for funding of £1,000 to be allocated to a grant fund for School and Community Groups. The availability of the small grants would be advertised to all local schools and to Community Groups held on the MSP database of voluntary and community sector organisations.

Contact Officer : Kate Harris – Agricultural Development Officer 01749 341313
Somerset Agricultural Advisory Service, Mendip District Council
On behalf of the Food Festival Co-ordination Group

THE MENDIP STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

AGENDA ITEM:7

FROM: Roger Kershaw,
Corporate Director, Date: 25th May 2004
Central Services, SCC

SUBJECT: **Financial Protocols for Council Tax on Second Homes Monies**

1. SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 At its meeting in March 2004 the MSP Board received a report informing it of the decision to allocate the revenue raised on Council Tax on second homes to the LSP for each district area for spending against its key priority areas.
- 1.2 The report also proposed a set of criteria for allocating that resource.
- 1.3 Attached is a copy of the financial protocol for the monies, developed by County and District finance officers.
- 1.4 Roger Kershaw, Corporate Director - Central Services, Somerset County Council, will explain the protocol in full at the Board meeting and will put forward proposals for how the MSP might develop a spending programme.

Contact Officer: Roger Kershaw
RJKershaw@somerset.gov.uk

Financial Protocol for LSP

1. The LSP should not be a separate entity from each district council. Each district will act as the accountable body, with arrangements being drawn up within the terms of reference of the LSP as regards decision-making. This will ensure preparation of group accounts or separate VAT registrations are not required.
2. The LSP will be bound by the relevant authority's financial procedure rules.
3. Management and budgetary control will be carried out via a nominated budget holder.
4. The LSP will produce plans on a medium term basis (over 3 years) as soon as practical. Each year a detailed budget will be approved by the LSP, the funding partners will give their approval via their two representatives on the LSP.
5. The nominated budget holder will produce an annual report for the LSP and funding partners and also responsible for taking reports to the LSP on a quarterly basis comparing actual against budget.
6. The LSP will agree on terms of reference and procedures for delegating budgets and for agreeing grants.
7. The LSP needs to agree on and document procedures for decisions making.
8. The LSP budget will be assigned its own unique cost centre. This cost centre will be need to be separately identified at the year-end as a project budget, to allow any under/ over spend to be separately accounted for.
9. The LSP budget will be calculated by comparing the tax base pre removal of second homes discount, compared to the tax base after the removal of the discount and then multiplying by the tax rates for the two Councils. This will then be translated into the following budgets:
 - Income collectable from Council Tax (collection fund)
 - Transfer to General Fund re LSP (collection fund)
 - Transfer from Collection Fund (LSP revenue budget)
 - LSP expenditure budget (LSP revenue budget)
10. The LSP budget will consist of the budgeted income from the second homes and then matched against an expenditure budget. (The breakdown of which to be decided by the budget holder).
11. The expenditure budget may need to include provision for LSP administrative support (including on cost), accommodation, etc.
12. A copy of the tax base showing the variation totals need to be sent to SCC once tax base is set. The funds will pass directly to the LSP, via the separate revenue budget. The payment will be made by reducing the next precept to SCC following the approval of the budget by the LSP. Any deficit of income due from second homes will be borne by the Collection Fund.

knowledge of LSPs would be useful to help the on-going improvements to the site.

4. DRAFT COMMUNITY STRATEGY CIRCULATION

4.1 The draft Community Strategy for Mendip has been made available as a consultation document in a number of ways:

- Publication on the MSP website, with a link from the MDC website
- Hard copies sent to all Parish and Town Council Clerks and District Elected Members
- Emails or letters sent to key stakeholders, including participants in the Great Cake of Life, informing them of how they can access the publication and comment on it.

4.2 At the time of writing, five requests have been received from stakeholders for hard copies or CD Rom versions, as a result of the letter or email they received about the publication of the draft.

The consultation period ends on 25th June.

Chair: Zena Pollard
Vice Chair: Richard Dixon
Lead Officer: Sara Skirton