

Links are in red

From: "Skirton, Sara" <skirtons@mendip.gov.uk>
To: "Mendip LSP"

Cc:

Sent: 20 September 2006 10:59

Attach: 9e Priority Report 26-09 -Tackling Climate Change.doc; 10 MSP Funding Programme 2006-07.doc; 10a BFSG notes 21.08.06.doc; 4 MSP Minutes 20.06.06.doc; 7 MDC New Corporate Plan.ppt; 8 Community Partnerships.doc; 9 Monitoring five Priorities Action Plans.doc; 9a Notes of Monitoring Group Meeting 12.09.06.doc; 9b Priority Report 26-09 -Affordable Decent Housing.doc; 9c Priority Report 26-09 - Voluntary and Community Sector.doc; 9d Priority Report 26-09 -Mendip Economy.doc; 1 Agenda 26.09.06.doc

Subject: MSP Board meeting 26 September 2006 - Agenda and papers

Dear MSP Board Member

Please find attached the agenda and papers for the meeting of the Mendip Strategic Partnership Board to be held on Tuesday 26 September 2006 in the Council Chamber at Mendip District Council, commencing at 3.00 pm.

The following documents should accompany this message:

- 1 **Agenda**
- 4 Minutes of the Board meeting of 20 June 2006
- 7 Mendip District Council New Corporate Plan – PowerPoint presentation (handouts will be circulated at the meeting)
- 8 Community Partnerships
- 9 Monitoring the Five Priority Action Plans
- 9a Notes of Monitoring Group meeting 12.09.06
- 9b Priority Report – Affordable Decent Housing
- 9c Priority Report –Voluntary and Community Sector
- 9d Priority Report – Mendip Economy
- 9e Priority Report – Tackling Climate Change
- 10 MSP Funding Programme 2006/07
- 10a BFSG Notes 21 August 2006

I will be sending copies of the **funding proposals for each of the five Priorities for 2006/07 as a separate e-mail**. These are for reference in relation to agenda item 10.

The priority report for Investing in Children and Young people will be circulated later this week.

Kind Regards

Sara

Sara Skirton
Team Leader – Community Planning and Communications
01749 341340

Links are in red

From: "Skirton, Sara" <skirtons@mendip.gov.uk>
To: "Mendip LSP"

Cc:

Sent: 20 September 2006 12:14

Attach: YMCA Application re Routes.doc; PCSO bid 2006-07.doc; PCSO electric bike bid.doc; Mendip Environment Community Interest Group bid 2006-7 .doc; Strengthening the VCS bid 2006-07.pdf; Tackling Climate Change Locally bid 2006-07.doc; Children and Young People bid 2006-07.doc; Regen. Economy Bid 2006-07 detailed project proposals.doc; Affordable Decent Housing Bid 2006-07.doc

Subject: MSP Funding programme 2006/07 - Copies of funding proposals, for reference only

Dear MSP Board Member

Please find attached the funding proposals submitted by each of the five MSP Priorities for 2006/07:

- Regenerating the Mendip Economy
- Strengthening the Voluntary and Community Sector
- Investing in Children and Young People
- Tackling Climate Change Locally
- Affordable Decent Housing for All

Also attached are bids received from:

- Police – for contribution towards PCSO in Glastonbury
- Police – for bicycles for PCSOs
- Chair of Environment Forum – to set up a Community Interest Company
- YMCA – for contribution towards Routes project

It is suggested that these papers are not printed out as they are for reference only and have already been considered by the Budget and Finance Sub Group. The Group's recommendations are contained in agenda item 10 which was attached to my previous e-mail.

Kind Regards

Sara

Sara Skirton
Team Leader – Community Planning and Communications
01749 341340

Links are in red

From: "Skirton, Sara" <skirtons@mendip.gov.uk>
To: "Mendip LSP"

Cc:

Sent: 22 September 2006 13:20
Attach: 9f Priority report 26-09 - Children and Young People.doc
Subject: RE: MSP Board meeting 26 September 2006 - paper marked to follow

Dear MSP Board Member

Please find attached item 9F, which is the monitoring report for the Investing in Children and Young People Priority, and which was marked to follow on agenda item 9.

Regards

Sara

Sara Skirton
Team Leader - Community Planning and Communications
Mendip District Council
Cannards Grave Road
Shepton Mallet
Somerset BA4 5BT
01749 341340



Mendip Strategic Partnership
Board Meeting 26 September 2006
3pm in the Council Chamber, Mendip District Council

Agenda

- 1. Apologies**
- 2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair**
To elect the Chair and Vice Chair of the MSP Board for the forthcoming year
- 3. Public Participation**
- 4. Minutes of the meeting of 20 June 2006**
- 5. Climate change strategy for Mendip** Presentation from Baker Associates
- 6. Next stages of the Local Development Framework consultation**
Brief update from Baker Associates
- 7. MDC new Corporate Plan presentation**
- 8. MDC Community Partnerships** Potential for linkages between Mendip Strategic Partnership and Mendip District Council's Community Partnerships
- 9. Monitoring the Five Priorities Action Plans**
Notes of Monitoring Group meeting held on 12 September 2006 and progress reports for the MSP Priorities
- 10. MSP Funding Programme 2006/07**
To consider recommendations from the Budget and Finance Sub Group for allocation of second homes Council Tax monies 2006/07
- 11. Grantfinder database programme** Sarah Guscott, MDC
- 12. Engaging with the Community** Verbal report from Sara Skirton
- 13. Local Area Agreement update** Verbal Update
- 14. Shepton 21** Update for information
- 15. Glastonbury SRB** Update for information
- 16. Any Other Business**
- 17. Dates of future meetings** 28 November 2006 at 3pm in the Council Chamber at Mendip District Council offices

Mendip Strategic Partnership

Minutes of the meeting of the Mendip Strategic Partnership held at 3.00 pm on Tuesday 20 June 2006 in the Council Chamber, Mendip District Council

PRESENT:	Penny Baker Ron Ballantine Richard Dixon Stephen Fowler Caroline Gamlin Michael Hammond Roger Kershaw Andy Marsh Amanda Meanwell Zena Pollard Elaine Pugsley Tony Shepherd Harvey Siggs Linda Tucker	MACOC Chairman Mendip Environment Forum – (Vice Chairman) Elim in Wells (Faith Representative) Mendip Primary Care Trust Barnardos Somerset County Council Somerset East Police District Mendip Housing Mendip Business Exchange National Children’s Home Mendip Community Support Mendip District Council English Nature
-----------------	---	--

MENDIP DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICERS PRESENT:

Stuart Brown Eve Harris Jo Milling Sara Skirton Rob Thurston	Business Manager – Corporate Finance and Resources Trainee Committee Officer Senior Policy Officer – Community Planning Team Leader - Community Planning and Communications Service Manager, Street and Landscape Services
--	--

Agenda Item Number	Details	Actioned by
1	Apologies Apologies were received from Ian Bennett, Alan Brunt, Pauline Clarke, Mark Holden, Councillor Elizabeth John and Sonia Pike.	
2	Public Participation Councillor Roy Mackenzie asked the Board if they had any views on the possible re-organisation of local government organisations, for example making Somerset a unitary authority. Or would the partnership form a view after the issue of the white paper report.	

	<p>The Chairman thanked Councillor Mackenzie for his question and explained that Board members were aware of this issue as it was on the agenda nationally. However it is still only in its early stages and there are no proposals on the table yet regarding Local Authorities or Local Strategic Partnerships. The Chairman expressed his view that, as a partnership, the Board should wait until the white paper report is published and then make their comments on how it will effect their organisations individually.</p> <p>Roger Kershaw told the Board that County were not taking any particular stance on the issue and were waiting the report to be published, which he believed would be sometime during the winter.</p> <p>Councillor Harvey Siggs explained that he had attended a meeting with the previous minister when discussions were first taking place and he came away from the meeting with the impression that if local authorities were working well as they were in Somerset then it would seem pointless to change them.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the Board for their participation and asked if there were any more members of the public would like to speak under this item. There were none.</p>	
3	<p>Minutes of the Meeting on 7 March 2006</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as a correct record of proceedings</p> <p><u>Matters Arising</u> Local Development Framework –page 5 The workshop which took place in April was very successful and the Chairman informed the Board that there is to be a follow up session. Sara will circulate details to the Board when dates and times have been confirmed.</p>	
4	<p>Neighbourhood Policing</p> <p>Andy Marsh from Somerset East Police District gave a PowerPoint presentation about neighbourhood policing. The presentation will be circulated with the minutes from the meeting.</p> <p>Andy explained that the ways of policing had now moved forward. An example of this was the areas in which police were now patrolling; the old beats have now been replaced with the ward boundaries of the Council.</p> <p>Andy informed the board that an extra 108 community police officers were going to be assigned to the Somerset East police district. For the first year the government will give 100% funding for these officers but after that year funding will go down to 25%. It is then up to the police to find the extra funding through partnership working.</p>	

	<p>Andy went on to explain that these new community officers would be going into the homes of those residents living in the community and are able to promote issues such as healthy living and some fire safety.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Andy for his presentation and wished him and his team every success with the policy.</p>	
5	<p>Outcomes of Children and Young People’s Participation Project</p> <p>Michael Hammond presented details about the children and young people’s participation project. Michael also handed members present an invitation to attend an event on Friday 28 July to celebrate the completion of the ‘Mendip Participation Project’. The event will take place at the Merlin Theatre, Frome College from 12 -2 pm.</p> <p>Michael explained that the 78 children and young people chosen to take part in the project were picked by the Mendip Area Planning Group. The ages ranged from 2 to 19 years and the group were of mixed gender and backgrounds. A large number of observations and views had been captured during the project.</p> <p>The full report detailing the outcomes of the project will be available in July.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Michael for his presentation and congratulated him on all the hard work that had been put it to making it a successful project.</p> <p>The question was asked about what Play Rangers were; Michael explained that Play Rangers was a scheme which allowed children and young people to play, under supervision, outdoors and other places they might not have been allowed to play before</p> <p>The presentation will be circulated along with the minutes from the meeting.</p>	
6	<p>Community Partnerships</p> <p>Stuart Brown gave a verbal update on the work currently being undertaken by MDC in relation to their Area Boards.</p> <p>Stuart explained that when the Area Boards were first set up there was a lot of community involvement as the meetings heard issues relating to development control, planning and licensing. However, since these had been removed from the Boards, public interest in the meetings has diminished. The IDeA recently reviewed the effectiveness of the Area Boards and made recommendations for improvement. A Scrutiny working party was set up to look at ways the Boards could be improved, and they came to the decision to reinvent them as the Community</p>	


	<p>Partnerships.</p> <p>At the current time the partnership meetings are being tested as the changes have not yet been made to the Council's Constitution. The main changes for these meetings will be more engagement with the community, local business, police, colleges and any other organisations that would like to get involved.</p> <p>Stuart informed the Board that the West Mendip Community Partnership meeting that took place last week was very encouraging.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Stuart for his update and noted that it was likely that the MSP would want to have links with the Community Partnerships. How this would be achieved would be for further discussion.</p> <p>Stephen Fowler asked how Parish Councils were going to be included in these new partnership meetings. Stuart explained that they would be invited to attend and contribute towards the meetings.</p> <p>Richard Dixon asked how these new Community Partnerships were going to report back to the MSP Board. Stuart told the Board that this was an issue he would like them to think about. Sara said she thought it would be part of her team's role to help keep the MSP up to date with the decisions and issues raised by the three Community Partnership meetings.</p>	
7	<p>Monitoring the Five Priorities Action Plans</p> <p>The Chairman informed the Board that he would take each of the five actions plans individually, enabling the meeting to deal with issues that may arise singly.</p> <p>b) <u>Investing in Children and Young People</u> It was noted that the actions for Frome were all completed. However actions for Street and Glastonbury, Shepton Mallet and Wells were delayed, largely due to recruitment delays.</p> <p>Elaine Pugsley informed the Board that even though these areas were behind target, behind the scenes things were still moving ahead.</p> <p>c) <u>Regenerating the Mendip Economy</u> The Chairman stated that work on the actions noted on page three of the report had not yet been started; he asked Malcolm Williams, Business Manager for Community and Regeneration to update the Board on how the strategy was progressing.</p> <p>Malcolm informed the Board that the draft strategy was still being consulted on internally at the moment and still had to go through the Council's Scrutiny process, but confirmed that it would come</p>	

	<p>to the Board as soon as it could.</p> <p>d) <u>Tackling Climate Change Locally</u> All actions are on target and no issues were raised on this subject.</p> <p>Jo Milling informed the Board that a consultant could be approaching their individual organisations shortly to ask questions about environmental factors within their organisations.</p> <p>e) <u>Affordable Decent Housing For All</u> Jennie Wheeler informed the Board that the actions were on going, and good progress was being made in areas such as the gypsy and travellers sites.</p> <p>Zena Pollard thanked Jennie and everyone who took part in the Council's housing information day as she thought it was very useful and informative event.</p> <p>f) <u>Strengthening the Voluntary and Community Sector</u> Tony Sheppard explained that the newspaper that was due to be printed and circulated twice a year had been put on hold, as the individual putting the paper together had left. However the post had now been advertised and applications had been received.</p> <p><u>Notes of the monitoring group meeting</u></p> <p>a) It was noted that the action papers had been reviewed.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>Mendip Play Strategy</p> <p>Michael Hammond explained that there had been a considerable shift in Government towards helping play schemes for children and young people. Part of this was in connection with research carried out which has shown that children and young people are spending more and more time in front of television and computer screens.</p> <p>Rob Thurston informed the Board that resources were now in place which meant that the Play Strategy could be taken forward. Work is also being carried out with other Councils, including County, to ensure that the individual strategies work together.</p> <p>Rob explained that the strategy would be finished by the end of November, which would enable Mendip District Council to apply for funding by March 2007. He went on to explain that the work would take place in three stages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepping and scoping, which would take place between June and July • Undertaking an audit and review, which would take place between July and September • Analysis of results, the strategy would be written up from this, which would take the time scale up to November 	

	<p>The Chairman thanked Rob for his update and asked which partners were involved. Rob explained that they were currently going through a critical stage of listing the key partners.</p> <p>Tony Sheppard told Rob that he had had a number of small groups coming to him asking for funding for play areas, and therefore he wanted to know whether or not these small groups had been consulted for the partnership. Rob replied that the aim of setting up the partnership was to ensure that there was effective representation from the whole sector, and work was being carried out to make sure that a suitable partnership is in place.</p>	
9	<p>MSP Funding Programme 2006/07</p> <p>The Chairman began the discussion on the funding programme for 2006/07. He explained that it was recommended in the report to use the same process as the one used for the financial year 2005/06. This included leaders of each of the five priority groups bidding for a set sum of money for projects. The Chairman then passed the discussion over to the Board.</p> <p>A query was raised about the amount of money that had still yet to be claimed from the 2005/06 financial year's pot of money. Sara explained that she is expecting progress reports from the five areas for 2005/06 and could bring the reports along to the next meeting of the Board.</p> <p>After further discussion the Board agreed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The leads for each of the five Priorities be invited to submit against £60,000 of the available £102,938 second homes Council Tax monies for 2006/07 • The BFSG meet prior to the next MSP Board meeting to assess the bids and draw up recommendations • The remaining amount to be held in reserve pending consideration of other initiatives that relate to the aims of the Community Strategy. 	
10	<p>MSP Board Partnership Agreement</p> <p>Sara Skirton introduced the revised partnership agreement. The Board were informed that they did not have to agree to the revised version at this meeting, but could email Sara with comments and questions.</p> <p>However, after some discussion the Board agreed to adopt the revised partnership agreement and terms of reference and thanked Sara for the work done on them.</p>	
11	<p>Local Area Agreement Update</p> <p>Roger Kershaw updated the Board on the issues surrounding the Local Area Agreement (LAA). Roger explained that the</p>	

	<p>agreement had now been signed and members of the Board had received the set of targets agreed.</p> <p>Roger informed the Board that the group had been waiting for the white paper to be issued, but in the absence of this the chief executives of the local authorities in the district have drawn a list of priorities. Four sub groups have been arranged and they will monitor the priorities set. County Council will deal with performance information and Roger told the Board that he will report back the results.</p> <p>Roger asked Board members to think of four or five key actions that they would like to see picked up by the LAA and carried forward.</p>	
12	<p>Shepton 21</p> <p>Zena Pollard thanked all those that had attended the recent launch. Zena informed the Board that there had been a lot interest expressed from both the public and the members of press who were present.</p> <p>Zena explained that a meeting will be taking place on Wednesday 21 June, where the group will be discussing how the project can move forward.</p> <p>The Chairman asked Zena for the group to take into consideration issues identified in the Mendip Community Strategy when looking at ways to move the project forward.</p>	
13	<p>Glastonbury SRB</p> <p>Sonia Pike was not present at the meeting, so an update will be given at the next meeting of the Board on 26 September.</p>	
14	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>None</p>	
15	<p>Dates for future meetings</p> <p>Dates for 2006 were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 26 September - 28 November <p>All commencing at 3pm in the Council Chamber at Mendip District Council offices.</p>	

The meeting finished at 5.20 pm



Mendip District Council
A New Corporate Plan
- Looking ahead

www.idea.gov.uk



What is the current Mendip Vision?

To provide freedom and encouragement for individuals to satisfy the aspirations that they have for themselves and their families within the security and obligations of a stable and law abiding district.

That people believe Mendip is a place where:

- individuals have the encouragement and pride to satisfy their aspirations.
- they have pride in themselves and their communities
- self belief, self respect and self help

www.idea.gov.uk





Some of the key themes


Forward looking

Pride in Mendip

Self Help

Value for Money

www.idea.gov.uk



Possible objectives - Mendip District Council
will look to:

Enhancing Mendip as a place to live

Enabling an environment where individuals
and businesses can prosper

Encouraging and supporting communities and
individuals to improve the quality of their life

Ensuring value for money is provided in all
services

www.idea.gov.uk



Enhancing Mendip as a place to live:

Reduce crime by 15%

Improve environmental enforcement ('War on Litter')

Reduce rubbish and increase recycling

Improve local air quality

Increase choice and quality of homes (Planning Policy and CABE)

Enabling local communities to enhance their locality

www.idea.gov.uk



Enabling individuals and businesses:

Deliver the enterprise strategy

- Further develop the Mendip Business Exchange
- Sustainable growth for Mendip businesses
- More business friendly planning policies (LDF)
- Business stakeholders to inform strategy

Increase quality of tourist visits and length of stay (look at options on delivery of TIC's)

- Good value accommodation
- Support to Owner Managed Businesses (OBM's)

Use Mendip's Procurement Strategy to support local business

www.idea.gov.uk



Encourage the quality of life:

Better leisure and recreational opportunities for all ages

Improve access to services

To give people and groups a “hand up” not “hand out” to create self reliance

Increase opportunities for affordable housing

- Focus on empty homes
- Village exception sites
- Emphasis on shared ownership

www.idea.gov.uk



Ensure value for money:

Use of IT, new ways of working and reduced red tape

Stable council tax

Provision of ‘one stop shop’ facilities

Improve communication, plain english and customer awareness

Customer research

Guide to services and standards

Appropriate partnership working

VFM reviews

Raise awareness of Services

Proactively manage assets to improve future income

www.idea.gov.uk





So is there a new Mendip Vision?

Mendip – a place to be proud of – where people, communities and businesses are encouraged to achieve their potential

www.idea.gov.uk

I&DeA
improvement and development agency

Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item: 8

FROM: Cllr Elizabeth John -
Portfolio Holder
(Corporate Finance and
Resources)

Date: 26th September 2006

SUBJECT: Potential for linkages between Mendip Strategic Partnership and Mendip District Council's Community Partnerships

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In November 1999 Mendip District Council established Area Boards (Frome; Glastonbury and Street; and Shepton Mallet and Wells), each with responsibility for a range of functions including determination of Development Control and Licensing applications.

In 2004 the decision was taken to remove both Development Control and Licensing decision making from the Area Boards and to centralise these functions into a Planning Committee and Licensing Committee respectively.

Over recent years the Area Boards have been subject to some criticism from External Audit Commission Inspectors and the Council's External Auditor. In addition, there has been a feeling that the Area Boards have not been providing the value to the Council that was originally envisaged.

This issue was taken up by a Scrutiny Board Review Group, following the preparation of a Report commissioned through the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) (Executive Summary attached as **Appendix B**), to identify areas for improvement. Following the work of the Scrutiny Review Group, working closely with representatives from the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA), a Report detailing the findings of the Review Group was considered by Council in May of this year. The Report (attached as **Appendix A**) made a number of recommendations on a way forward that would enhance the value of the Area Boards to both the Council and local communities.

Following consideration of the Report, and for reasons outlined in the Report (**Appendix A**) Council agreed to re-launch, and re-badge, the Area Boards as "Community Partnerships". It was clearly felt that these Partnerships, whilst breaking down the perception of bureaucracy and officialdom, could add more value at a local level and encourage more engagement with the Council. The following Community Partnerships have now been established:

- a) Frome Community Partnership
Glastonbury and Street Community Partnership
Shepton Mallet and Wells Community Partnership

The Partnerships meet bi-monthly, with the option (at the Chairman's discretion) to hold a further three meetings per year.

It has also been agreed that the Community Partnerships should develop a much more pro-active role in the local community, which could include any or all of the following:

- 1) Consulting on, and developing, a local Community Plan;
- 2) Ensuring that all relevant partners and the general public are actively engaged in the above;
- 3) Monitoring the performance of local services (eg street cleansing, groundcare, etc);

2. POTENTIAL LINKAGES TO MENDIP STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

The Report to Council, and indeed the prior Reports to both the Scrutiny Review Group and the Scrutiny Board itself, identified the potential benefits to be gained from the Community Partnerships linking in some way with the Mendip Strategic Partnership (MSP). This would enable the MSP to gain an improved understanding of issues within Mendip at a very local level, whilst at the same time allowing issues of a more strategic nature, although perhaps identified locally, to be escalated to the MSP where applicable.

It is suggested that should the MSP consider that the development of linkages with the Community Partnerships would be beneficial to all the Partnerships, and more importantly, to local communities, then it might like to consider how this is best achieved. The suggested options are as follows:

1. That the MSP nominates a representative to 'sit' on each of the Community Partnerships
2. That the MSP requests each of the Community Partnerships to nominate a representative to 'sit' on the MSP

In either case, some consideration will need to be given as to how information flows back and forth between the Partnerships, for example through verbal reports, written reports, minutes, etc.

3. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the MSP considers:

- i) Whether it would be beneficial to develop linkages between the MSP and each of the Community Partnerships, and
- ii) If the development of linkages is agreed, how this should best be achieved and delivered.

Contact Officer: Stuart Brown (ext 364)

CABINET

Agenda Item:

Ward: All Wards**Portfolio:** Corporate Finance and Resources**FROM:** Area Boards Working Group**Date:** 8th May 2006**SUBJECT:** Review of Area Boards

Summary:	This Report presents the findings of the Area Boards Working Group (a Working Group of the Scrutiny Board), having been established to review the workings of the current Area Boards and to make recommendations for their future shape and role.
Recommendation:	Cabinet are asked to consider the contents of the Report and make recommendations for the future development and role of the Area Boards with a view to the Report (with amendments) then being presented to full Council.
Links to Priorities:	Links directly to the Priority of Better Resource Management, and indirectly to both the Priorities of Cleaner Safer Streets and Greater Prosperity
Impact on Business Plans:	Depending on how the Area Boards are developed, and how their role emerges, there may be an impact on a number of Business Plans across the Council.
Financial Implications:	Potential financial implications should the decision be taken to increase the number of meetings. A further update on the financial implications will be provided at the Cabinet meeting.
Legal Implications:	None identified
Crime and Disorder Implications:	Potential future development of the Area Boards will facilitate Members taking a greater role in Community Safety issues. New legislation (expected in the Autumn of 2006) will require the Community Safety Partnership to demonstrate better linkages with the community, using Members as the conduit. There is clearly a role for the Area Boards in this, with Member nominations from each Board being the preferred approach.
Equalities Implications:	An enhanced role for the Area Boards would enable improved communications and engagement with the communities of Mendip, including hard to reach groups.
Risk Assessment:	Potential for detrimental impact on the Council if it fails to engage with local communities.

Scrutiny Recommendation (if any)	Scrutiny Board endorses the views and recommendations of the Area Boards Working Group.
---	---

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The original Area Board structure was established in November 1999 with each of the Area Boards being responsible for a range of functions including determination of Development Control and Licensing applications.

In 2004 the decision was taken to remove both Development Control and Licensing decision making from the Area Boards and centralise them into a Planning Committee and Licensing Committee respectively.

Over recent years the Area Boards have been subject to some criticism from External Audit Commission Inspectors and the Council's External Auditor. In addition, there has been a feeling that the Area Boards have not been providing the value to the Council that was originally envisaged.

In late 2005, the Council commissioned the IDeA (using Capacity Building Funds) to review the workings of the Area Boards with a view to making recommendations on a way forward that would enhance their value to the Council and local communities.

During the same period the IDeA were also commissioned (again using Capacity Building Funds) to review the Scrutiny function. The Report on the way forward for Scrutiny was considered and approved in March 2006, and this included an acknowledgement that greater added value could be provided by Scrutiny through the establishment of Task Specific Time Limited Working Groups.

One of the Groups established was an Area Board Working Group who were tasked with considering the contents of the IDeA Report on Area Boards and reporting back to the Scrutiny Board for further debate. This has now taken place and Cabinet is now asked to consider the Report.

2. THE WORKING GROUP

The Working Group comprised Cllrs Les Bennett, Dick Skidmore, Philip Gait and Roy MacKenzie assisted by Bob Ross, Principal Consultant, IDeA, Stuart Brown, Business Manager - Corporate Finance and Resources and Gael Hepburn, Service Manager - Corporate Support, Strategy & Research.

3. THE IDeA REPORT

The IDeA Report identifies a number of key strengths of the Area Boards as follows:

- Their activities are welcomed by Members of the Council
- They provide the basis of a forum for consultation with the public and a range of stakeholders

- There are examples of activities where the Area Boards have contributed to the development of local communities and individual local issues
- They provide a forum for informing Members of local issues and services and more general issues that may affect the local community

However, the Report also identifies a number of areas for improvement:

- Their role has become unclear over time and there is a lack of specific outputs
- They are poorly attended by Members of the public and other key stakeholders
- Their Membership was not inclusive of all local stakeholders
- The linkage between the Area Boards and the Local Strategic Partnership is not clear
- The Area Boards are primarily reactive to local issues that arise rather than adopting a proactive approach to community development

In conclusion, the IDeA questioned whether the Area Boards justified the considerable use of resources that they currently utilise, and if not, whether they should either be abandoned or made more effective.

The full IDeA Report is contained within **Appendix A**.

It was acknowledged that the Area Boards do provide the basis for good local consultation, community development and performance management, but that if they are to be retained then their role, membership and working practices need to be re-defined.

4. MEMBER FEEDBACK

Whilst the IDeA did consult a number of Members, Stakeholders, etc in drawing their conclusions the Working Group also felt that it would be appropriate to ask Members four specific questions in relation to the Area Boards as follows:

1. What in your opinion are the strengths of the Area Board arrangements?
2. What in your opinion are the weaknesses of the Area Board arrangements?
3. What improvements, if any, would you recommend for the Area Boards?
4. How would you further develop public interest in Mendip District Council?

20 responses to these questions were received, and a summary is provided as **Appendix B**.

5. ISSUES CONSIDERED

i. Name of Area Boards

The Working Group feel that the name “Area Boards” does little to explain to the public what their role is, and actually creates a potential barrier by creating a perception of bureaucracy and officialdom.

It is therefore felt that the Boards need to be re-named so as to more accurately reflect their role, and in so doing, hopefully attract more people from outside of the Council to become involved. It is suggested that they could be re-named as “Community Partnerships”, resulting in the following:

- b) Frome Community Partnership
- c) Glastonbury and Street Community Partnership
- d) Shepton Mallet and Wells Community Partnership

The Working Group feel that this better reflects the role that the ‘Partnership’ should have in the local community and demonstrates that the Council wants true engagement with other parties and groups in order to deliver the needs of local communities.

Another option would be re-naming them as the West Mendip, Central Mendip and East Mendip Community Partnerships, which then more completely embraces the rural Parishes.

ii. Frequency of Meetings

The frequency of meetings was discussed at length with the conclusion being reached that, whilst there was a view that the frequency of meetings should be increased, the frequency should remain broadly as is.

Hence it is suggested that meetings should be bi-monthly, but with the option (at the Chairman’s discretion) to hold a further three meetings per year. It was also suggested that no meetings should be held in July, August and December.

iii. Future Role of Area Boards

The IDeA have acknowledged that the Area Boards do provide a basis for good local consultation, community development and performance management.

The Working Group feel that since Planning and Licensing have been removed from the Area Boards, they have become less focused, with an ill-defined role. It is suggested that they should develop a much more pro-active role in the local community, and take a role in the performance management of the Council by monitoring the delivery of services, locally.

The IDeA suggest the following potential functions in addition to those already undertaken:

- 4) Consulting on, and developing, a local Community Plan;
- 5) Ensuring that all relevant partners and the general public are actively engaged in the above;
- 6) Monitor the performance of local services (eg street cleansing, groundcare, etc);
- 7) Subject to discussion with the Mendip Strategic Partnership, there are potential benefits in each of the “Community Partnerships” nominating a representative to

serve on the Strategic Partnership. In this way, issues of local importance can, if necessary, be escalated.

In conclusion, the Working Group suggest that the role of the potential “Community Partnerships” should be redefined within the Constitution and focused on delivering a service to local communities.

iv. Future Membership of Area Boards

The Working Group feel that the current membership precludes the potential of taking a more ‘Partnership’ role with the local community. It is therefore suggested that, should the concept of “Community Partnerships” be favoured, then in order to gain the benefits of such a partnership, the membership should be broadened to include the following:

- a) A representative from the local business community;
- b) One or more representatives from the local City/Town and/or Parish Councils;
- c) A local representative from the Police Authority;
- d) One or more public representatives from the local communities (these positions could be sought from nominations and/or advertisement);
- e) The appropriate Area Regeneration Officer(s).

v. Linkages with Mendip Strategic Partnership and Community Safety Partnership

Should the prospective “Community Partnerships” be supported by Council, then it would be appropriate to consider how these might relate to the Mendip Strategic Partnership (MSP).

If, as suggested by IDeA (see Section 5 (iii)) each of the “Community Partnerships” were to develop its own Community Plan (reflecting the key areas for achievement for the local community) then it would be logical for these to have a conduit into the MSP in order that similar, but disparate issues, arising across the district can be escalated to the Strategic Partnership if it is felt that this would be beneficial.

Hence, as referred to in Section 5 (iii) and subject to more detailed discussions with the MSP, there may be a significant benefit to the local community in having a representative of each “Community Partnership” serving on the Strategic Partnership.

Similarly, the suggested “Community Partnership” approach will facilitate greater involvement in Community Safety issues and allow Members greater influence in this important area of work.

New legislation, expected in Autumn 2006, will require the Community Safety Partnership to demonstrate improved linkages with local communities, using elected Members as the primary conduit. There would clearly be a key role for the proposed “Community Partnerships” in taking this issue forward, with Member nominations from each of the “Partnerships” being the preferred and most logical approach.

vi. Role of Officers on Area Boards

The Working Group consider that the role of Officers on each of the proposed “Community Partnerships” would be important. Clearly, Officers working within the geographical area of each of the “Partnerships” would be in a position to add enormous local knowledge and value to the work. Similarly, Officers managing contracts delivering key services to the local community would have a key role, and could indeed use each of the “Partnerships” as a method of obtaining key feedback on the performance of contracts at the local area.

If Scrutiny Board is minded to support the suggestion of “Community Partnerships”, and the general role that they might undertake, then it would be entirely appropriate to ask Corporate Management Team how it might suggest supporting, through Officers, each of the proposed “Partnerships”. This would clearly need to be addressed prior to any further discussion at either Cabinet or Council.

vii. Potential areas of Work for Area Boards

A number of potential work areas for the proposed “Community Partnerships” have already been referred to elsewhere in this Report.

However, the Working Group also feel that each of the “Partnerships” would benefit from having a key role in, for example, the determination of local grants applications, and local housing issues. With respect to the latter, the Working Group feel that the local knowledge held amongst the range of membership referred to in Section 5 (iv) may greatly assist this key area.

It is also suggested that outside bodies, funded in part by the Council, could be invited to attend from time to time to demonstrate their impact on the local community.

viii. Changes to Working Practices

The Working Group are entirely supportive of the principle of developing local “Community Partnerships”, but are very aware that they will inevitably fail to succeed and prosper if they follow the same working practices as the current Area Boards.

As such, the Working Group feel that the following to working practices should be considered:

- a) All meetings irrespective of the area “Community Partnership” should be held in the Council Chamber, unless there is a specific item that warrants a local venue;
- b) The layout of the meetings should be less formal in order to emphasise the partnership approach and reduce the ‘Council feel’ of the meeting. A number of different approaches could be trialled;
- c) The Agendas should allow for two public speaking ‘slots’ – one at the beginning of the meeting and one halfway through;

- d) Public speakers should be allowed, at the Chairman’s discretion, to come back on the points they have made, in order to encourage healthy debate;
- e) The Agendas should be structured around perhaps one or two key local issues, that are of importance to the local community;
- f) Press releases should provide advance notification of the key items on the Agenda in order to generate local interest, local attendance and healthy debate;
- g) Interested parties for each Agenda should be specifically advised of the Agenda and invited to attend;
- h) A web page, linked to www.mendip.gov.uk should be developed for each “Partnership”, therefore allowing the public to ‘post’ questions for future debate

6. OPTIONS FOR THE WAY FORWARD

Referring back to the IDeA Report, which probably reflects the views of many Members and Officers, the basic options available are to either abandon the use of Area Boards, or to radically overhaul their role, focus, composition and working practices, in order for them to perform a more valuable role for the local communities and the Council.

The option put forward in this Report, of creating so-called “Community Partnerships” has been debated at length by the Working Group and is considered to be a significant development opportunity that, if managed correctly, will be of significant benefit to the communities of Mendip.

7. RECOMMENDATION

Cabinet are asked to consider the contents of the Report and endorse the recommendations for the future development and role of the Area Boards. Subject to Cabinet’s approval, this would then need to be considered by full Council in view of the need to make changes to the Constitution to reflect these changes.

Contact Officer: Stuart Brown (ext 364)

Executive Summary

1. This review was initiated and undertaken at the request of Mendip District Council (MDC). The purpose of the review was to examine and make recommendations on the role, number, membership and working practices of its three Area Boards.
2. The review found that in general the Area Boards had considerable key strengths as follows:
 - Their activities are welcomed by Members of MDC
 - They provide the basis of a forum for consultation with the public and a range of stakeholders
 - There were examples of activities where the Area Boards had contributed to the development of local communities and individual local issues
 - They provided a forum for informing Members of local issues and services and more general issues that may affect the local community
3. However, the review also found that there are a number of key areas where there were difficulties that affected the effectiveness of the Area Boards as follows:
 - Their role had become unclear over time and there was a lack of specific outputs
 - They were poorly attended by Members of the public and other key stakeholders
 - Their Membership was not inclusive of all local stakeholders
 - The linkage between the Area Boards and the Local Strategic Partnership is not clear
 - The Area Boards are primarily reactive to local issues that arise rather than adopting a proactive approach to community development
4. The first key question facing MDC in relation to the Area Boards is whether they justify the considerable use of resources they currently utilise. If not then they should either be disbanded or made more effective. The Review Team feel that they do provide the basis for good local consultation, community development and performance management. However, if they are to be retained changes are recommended to the role definition of the Area Boards, their membership and working practices. Detailed recommendations on these points are given in the following section.
5. The members of the Review team were most cordially received and would like to thank all those who contributed to the review for their hospitality and openness in the giving of their views and suggestions.

The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item: 9

FROM: MSP Monitoring Group Date: 26 September
2006

SUBJECT: **Monitoring the five Priority Action Plans**

1. SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 12 September the Monitoring Group met to consider progress updates from the nominated lead or representative for each MSP Priority. The notes of this meeting accompany this report as Appendix A.

1.2 Progress reports for four out of the five Priorities also accompany this report as appendices B-E. The report relating to Investing in Children and Young People will be sent to follow.

1.3 A representative from each Priority has been invited to attend this meeting to answer any questions Board members may have.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Members of the MSP Board are asked to note progress on each of the five MSP priority action plans.

Contact: Sara Skirton 01749 341340
skirtons@mendip.gov.uk



**Notes of the Monitoring Group Meeting
held 12 September 2006, 10.00 am
at Mendip District Council**

Present from MSP: Ron Ballantine (Chair), Andrew Freeman,
Michelle Hawkes, Tony Shepherd

Present from MDC: Sarah Guscott, Allison Herbert, Phil Miller, Jo Milling,
Sara Skirton

Apologies: Richard Dixon, Mark Holden, Roger Kershaw,
Norma Underwood

1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions The Chair opened the meeting and round table introductions were made.</p>	
2.	<p>Notes of Monitoring Group Meeting 5th June 2006 These were agreed as a true record of that meeting and there were no matters arising.</p>	
3.	<p>Progress Update on Each Priority Action Plan Proformas for tracking progress on the action plans had been circulated to the leads for each priority for completion. Updates will then be provided to the MSP Board meeting on 26th September. The Group reviewed each progress report in turn.</p> <p><u>Affordable Decent Housing for All</u></p> <p>Phil Miller brought the Group up-to-date with progress made on each objective in the action plan.</p> <p>He was pleased to report that membership of the LAA Multi Agency Steering Group and the Somerset Enabling Group has created a number of opportunities for identifying suitable pieces of land. Phil commented on problems encountered in adopting the report completed by Ark Consultants within Mendip. Queries have arisen over the ratios of affordable housing units and clarification is currently being sought from the consultancy.</p> <p>The Group expressed concern over the fact that Mendip's relationship with the Preferred Developers' Partnership is not as strong as it has been in the past because of the Council's reduction in its future capital programme. This will impact on the ability to obtain matched funding from the Housing Corporation. Phil undertook to appraise the Corporate Management Team of the</p>	<p>PM</p>

Group's concern and its offer to assist in any way it can.

Mendip District Council has now been invited to meetings of the West of England Partnership. This will allow the Council to have an input into the work of that group.

The Chair thanked Phil for providing a comprehensive update.

Strengthening the Voluntary and Community Sector

Tony Shepherd reported that the Somerset Compact has been launched which is a written agreement between the voluntary and community sector, and public sector, to improve their relationship for mutual advantage. This, together with the formation of a joint agency Policy Commission, should result in better joint working and a simplification of the funding application process.

He was pleased to say that, as at the beginning of September, Mendip had been invited to sit on the Management Committee of the Somerset Voluntary Sector Network. This will assist with strengthening involvement in the Somerset Strategic Partnership.

Work has started on the production of a regular community newspaper and the appearance of a monthly column in the Mendip Journals has produced around 30 enquiries. There is, unfortunately, a lack of any significant progress so far in attracting specialist skills and expertise from the private sector. However, Tony has made contact with several local solicitors and accountants. They have indicated they might potentially be prepared to offer 30 minutes' free advice to voluntary organisations on an ad hoc basis. Other suggestions put forward included holding workshops for members of MACOC and the Mendip Business Exchange, as well as the compilation of a centrally held register of organisations prepared to offer assistance.

The Chair thanked Tony for providing a comprehensive update.

Tackling Climate Change Locally

Jo Milling gave a verbal update to the Group. She reported that the Climate Change Sub Group is now meeting on a regular basis. Baker Associates have produced a first draft of a Mendip Climate Change Strategy which will be taken to the full MSP Board at the end of September.

Unfortunately, the bid made to Defra's Climate Challenge Fund for locally based communications work was unsuccessful.

The Project Officer for the "Community Choices for Sustainable Living" project has now generated four schemes across the district,

<p>centred around Glastonbury, Frome, Beckington and Draycott, with a further two in prospect.</p> <p>The majority of the ongoing work relates to the Invest-to-Save Bid and awareness-raising about energy efficiency. Four of the larger partner organisations are currently being audited, so the CSE is gathering information about energy bills, use of energy in building, work-related travel costs, etc. This will link across to the awareness raising campaign which will be launched in November.</p> <p>Following a suggestion from the Chair, Jo undertook to make contact with the Diocesan representative on the environment Rev David Osborne and Pastor Stephen Fowler to establish whether there might be any synergy in a joint identification of environmental issues for the Diocese.</p> <p>There was general agreement on the need to look more laterally at establishing as many linkages as possible across the district to ensure partner organisations are not working in isolation on discrete pieces of work.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Jo for providing a comprehensive update.</p> <p><u>Regenerating the Mendip Economy</u></p> <p>The Group noted that the Business Leaders' Group now meets regularly. The Economic Strategy is nearing completion and will be taken before the MSP Board in due course.</p> <p>The Glastonbury Town Plan has been produced and it is hoped that Sonia Pike will be able to provide further information at the full MSP Board meeting later in September.</p> <p>The MCTi 'Shepton 21' Group is seeking to forge more formal links with the MSP and Sara Skirton will be holding discussions with the Area Regeneration Officer on how best to take this initiative forward.</p> <p>Linked with the Economic Strategy is the production of a Promotional and Investment Strategy following consultants' investigation into Mendip's enterprise culture and their work on increasing the number of small- and medium-size enterprises starting and developing in the area.</p> <p><u>Investing in Children and Young People</u></p> <p>The Chair noted that there was no representative from this priority available to bring the Group fully up-to-date with progress made since the last meeting. Concern was expressed that very few changes appear to have been made to the proforma which was</p>	<p>JM</p>
--	------------------

	<p>circulated prior to the meeting. It was accepted that there is much background work being carried out in relation to the establishment of locality teams and their associated support networks, as well as with the development of further participation projects.</p> <p>However, the Chair requested that Sara meet with Mark Holden, a representative of the Priority group, to make him fully aware of the Group's concerns and to obtain an update on progress being made with the action plan.</p>	SS
4.	<p>2005/06 Second Homes Money Award to Regenerating the Mendip Economy</p> <p>Allison Herbert provided the Group with a more detailed explanation of the request made of the Budget and Finance Sub-Group for a realignment of the original funds awarded of £22,500. As the emerging Economic Strategy has been produced using in-house resources, a request was put forward to use the resulting savings on taking the Business Investment Project forward. This would entail the initial building and consequent maintenance of a website which would consist of a network of links to provide a 'virtual highway' of information to businesses seeking to relocate to the Mendip area.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Allison for her clarification and reiterated that the Budget & Finance Sub-Group had recommended approval of this revision of expenditure to the full MSP Board.</p>	
5.	<p>Progress Towards Developing Outcome Measures</p> <p>The Group reviewed the discussion document circulated prior to the meeting. To date, Sara Skirton and Sarah Guscott have met with the leads or representatives for four of the five Priorities to try to devise measures which are meaningful in order to evaluate the impact of partnership working on the Priorities.</p> <p>Some of the measures are now finalised while work still continues on establishing baseline and trend data for others.</p> <p>The group noted progress and agreed that further discussion would take place as necessary with Priority leads.</p>	
6.	<p>Engaging With Our Communities</p> <p>Sara Skirton provided a verbal report on progress regarding the audit of partners' community consultation and research activity. Several replies have been received and these are being incorporated into a database. This will be an extremely valuable exercise in sharing data across partnerships and building up a knowledge base of our communities.</p> <p>Replies from other partners are still awaited and it is hoped that a</p>	

	more detailed report can be brought to the MSP Board meeting in November.	
7.	<p>September MSP Board</p> <p>It was agreed that progress reports on each Priority action plan will be reported to the September Board meeting. A representative from each group will be invited to attend to answer any questions arising.</p>	
8.	<p>AOB</p> <p>Phil Miller reported that MDC is having a housing stand at the Wells City Plan consultation event planned for the weekend of 16/17 September.</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting was closed at 10.50 am.</p>	

**MSP Five Priorities
Progress Report to MSP Board 26 September 2006**

Priority: Affordable Decent Housing for All - Action Plan

Details of progress on actions due to have commenced by end August 2006

Status key O= on target, C = completed, D= delayed, R=reviewed

Priority: Affordable Decent Housing for All - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
Investigate the opportunities created by working together in partnership (e.g. Local Area Agreements and Local Public Service Agreements)	Membership of the LAA Multi Agency Steering Group	Mendip Strategic Housing Partnership	Jul -05	Jul -08	Build on the opportunities presented by the LAA	O	
	Joint stakeholders in the LAA		Ongoing	Ongoing		O	Stronger Communities
	Delivery, monitoring and review of the Housing Strategy		Jul -05	Ongoing		O	
	Review referrals from different organisations and agencies to ensure links are made (i.e. fuel poverty, hospital discharge, home safety)		Nov -05	April - 07		O	Joint Post funded to review referral process, also to provide Multi-Agency Toolkit to reduce duplication

Priority: Affordable Decent Housing for All - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
Develop a sound understanding of the housing markets and housing needs and develop monitoring systems	Through Somerset Strategic Housing Partnership, utilise the research taking place with Ark Consultants	Mendip Strategic Housing Partnership	Jun -05	Dec -05	Overall, to develop a means of providing up to date information on housing markets and housing needs in Mendip	O	Ark report now complete including gypsies and travellers. Joint Part Time Research Post recruited for County. Role of post to continually update the needs information and to provide data to support strategic level of housing.
	create and maintain systems and databases to provide up to date housing markets and housing needs information	MDC / other adjacent District Councils and Unitary Authorities	06	Ongoing		O	See above
	Continue to work towards joint Housing Condition Survey	MDC / Public Health	ongoing			O	Will be commissioned early Autumn
	Research and implement Choice Based lettings	MDC	Jul -05	Jan -08		O	Joint funding for the county has been granted towards the costs of implementing CBL. At the same time Somerset Strategic Housing Officer Group (which includes Portfolios) is taking forward a joint IT project on which CBL will sit. Co-ordinator posts for IT and CBL have now been appointed. Tenders have been

Priority: Affordable Decent Housing for All - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
							received by the IT group for the IT Contract.
	Continue to develop Rural Enabler surveys	MDC / Somerset Community Council	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	Partial funding granted through Defra, the remainder from PDP
Articulate Mendip's interests at County and Regional level (Regional Housing Strategy, Regional Economic Strategy and Regional Spatial Strategy)	Reply to consultation documents	Mendip Strategic Housing Partnership	Ongoing	Ongoing	To continue to influence Regional and County policies and Strategies whilst being aware of our housing market area in the north of the region and making links to integrate where appropriate	O	Receiving assistance from GOSW and the Housing Corporation regarding our difficulties to link with our Housing Market (the West of England). WoE had refused to work with either Mendip or West Wilts. GOSW and HC have recognised this and accept our stronger links with Somerset county. Mendip and West Wilts have since met WoE.
	Membership of the Somerset Strategic Housing Officer Group	MDC	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	Mendip has held the Chair for the last (very busy) year and has overseen the IT and CBL work, the Needs survey, the county LAA. Mendips role as Chair has now ended. Mendip still plays a key role in the decision making process. Shadow Member now attends group.

Priority: Affordable Decent Housing for All - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
	Membership of the Commissioning Body for Supporting People	MDC / PCT / Probation / Somerset Partnership	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	Officers still a key member of the CB and Shadow Member now attends.
	Membership of the Somerset Strategic Planning Conference and South West Regional Assembly	MDC	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	
	Analyse and initiate links with the West of England Partnership and set up appropriate liaison	MDC	Nov -05	Ongoing		O	GOSW and the Housing Corporation trying to assist with this although it is now recognised that our links with Somerset are very strong and should not be dismantled.
Investigate the full range of opportunities to secure resources to deliver sufficient affordable housing in Mendip	Utilise capital funding from MDC until March 2006	Mendip Strategic Housing Partnership	Ongoing	Mar -06	Ensuring that the resources and funding available are used efficiently to produce as much affordable housing as possible	C	Completed
	Utilise funding from MDC to research alternative ways to provide affordable housing	MDC	Nov -05	Mar 2006		O	
	Bid for capital and revenue funding from Supporting People for supported housing	Mendip Strategic Housing Partnership	Oct -05	Ongoing		O	Shrinking pot so have to put forward a good business case

Priority: Affordable Decent Housing for All - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
	Prepare, implement and monitor the Mendip Local Development Core Strategy	MDC	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	LDF to feature in the Mendip 'Housing Information Day'
	Efficiently use funding - Registered Social Landlords own and private funds and Housing Corporation Funding	MDC's Preferred Development Partners, Housing Corporation				O	
	Efficiently use Supplementary Planning Guidance to provide housing through planning gain	MDC	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	
Ensure engagement of young and elderly people in the planning and housing processes.	Establish Children and Young Peoples Commissioning Body to secure the delivery of the consultation activity in the preparation of the Local Development Framework	MDC / Somerset County Council / Somerset Children's Fund / Somerset Youth Volunteering Network/ Young Somerset	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	

Priority: Affordable Decent Housing for All - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
	Continue to ensure communication through agencies working with young and elderly people	MDC / Health / Police / YMCA / CAB	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	Ongoing improving through LAA. Involvement in appointments for countywide posts for POPP
Facilitate the delivery of sustainable homes in terms of their construction and design	Promote, through the planning system, energy efficiency and resource efficiency in the design and siting of new development	MDC	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	High spec written for PDP
	Review Scheme Development standards with the new Preferred Development Agreement	Mendip Strategic Partnership / MDC / Preferred Development Partners	Oct -05	Apr -06		Delayed	New Agreement deferred until April 2007 but work has commenced
Raise local people's awareness of the need for adequate numbers of homes to be accommodated in the district	Initiate a partnership awareness raising campaign	Mendip Strategic Housing Partnership	06/07	Ongoing	Facilitate greater communication between all agencies involved in housing and publicise what we are doing	C	Housing Information Day took place on June 1 st . All 'stakeholders' invited and all those applicants on the needs list (waiting list) about 3000 people. Partners were involved in presenting the day
	Local Development Framework community engagement process	MDC	Ongoing	Ongoing		O	LDF part of the Housing Information Day

MSP Five Priorities

Progress Report to MSP Board 26 September 2006

Details of progress on actions due to have commenced by end August 2006

Status key O= on target, C = completed, D= delayed, R=reviewed

Priority: Strengthening the Voluntary and Community Sector - Action Plan

Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons/ Notes
Simplify the funding application process	develop the local compact Countywide, including how to access longer term, consistent funding	MDC and all voluntary and community groups		Mar. 06	draft Compact for discussion	Completed	
					Compact 2nd Draft	Completed	
					Launch Compact	Completed	
Strengthen support for voluntary groups	Compile comprehensive list of community groups	MCS, Somerset Gateway		Mar. 06	database containing a minimum of 250 contacts	Reached target, but still identifying more groups	
	Link community groups to MCS			Mar. 06	Increase membership of MCS to 200	On going activity	

Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons/ Notes
	Develop Somerset links via Change up programme	MCS, Sedgemoor Vo. Bureau, West Somerset Community Support, Vista		Mar. 06	On going		County wide progress slow. Trying to develop contacts through SVSN.
	Develop training programme	MCS, Adult Learning & Leisure		Mar. 06	On going		Further training sessions organised for October 2006ro
Strengthen the Voluntary and Community Sector involvement in the Somerset Strategic Partnership (SSP)	Review and increase the number of Voluntary and Community sector representatives on SSP	MSP, SSP - voluntary sector representatives		2006/07		On going	Trying to develop contacts through SVSN.
	SSP Voluntary and Community Sector representatives to meeting with Mendip's Voluntary Sector via network meetings	MSP, MCS, SSP - voluntary sector representatives		2006/07		On going	Trying to develop contacts through SVSN.
Market voluntary	Undertake 'Value of the Voluntary Sector' survey	SCC - Community Initiatives		2005/06		On going	

Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons/ Notes
agencies and their strengths to statutory agencies and generally. - build up faith and trust	Quantify the value of Mendip community and Voluntary sector	Social Services, PCT, Police, GOSW, LSC, CAB, SYVN, NCH, Age Concern		2005/06		On going	
	Produce newspaper for the community	MSP, MCS, MDC		Mar. 06 then twice a year	Regular feature	On going	New appointment made to replace loss of Administrator. Setting up an editorial panel and developing format for the newsletter..
	Monthly column in local papers	MDC, MCS, Mid Somerset Series		Jan 06 and ongoing	Regular feature	On going	
Attract specialist skills and expertise from the private sector	Establish links to Businesses and Business Link	MSP, MDC, local companies, Business Link		Dec 05 and ongoing		Lack of any significant progress	

MSP Five Priorities

Progress Report to MSP Board 26 September 2006

Details of progress on actions due to have commenced by end August 2006:

Status key O= on target, C = completed, D= delayed, R=reviewed

Priority: Regenerating the Mendip Economy - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons / Notes
Commission, consult upon and seek approval of an Economic Regeneration Strategy for the Mendip area	Consolidate Subgroup – complete exercise of forming a broadly based subgroup to lead on the regeneration priority	Initially MDC as Priority lead	Oct -05	Jan -06	Broadly based Subgroup established' representing broad spectrum of interest - 6 – 8 representatives	C – 18 reps	First meeting of Business Leaders Group convened in December 2005, scheduled to meet quarterly
	Scope out draft strategy, including components for rural development and tourism, taking account of strategic Somerset framework	Subgroup	Oct /Nov 05	Dec / Jan -06	Draft Document	C	Over-arching aspiration confirmed together with 8 key themes from Business Leaders Group.
	Consult upon draft strategy	Subgroup	Jan -06	Feb -06	Robust consultative response achieved, and reported back to the MSP Board	C – 70 businesses represented	Consultation with business took place as part of the MBE on 26.02.06 and reported to MSP monitoring group meeting on 07.02.06 Consultation work on draft strategy completed although pressures of work have precluded Project Officer from producing final copy.

Priority: Regenerating the Mendip Economy - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons / Notes
Sustaining Regeneration initiatives in Glastonbury	Working out robust mechanisms for local agencies to build on the investment made by SWRDA and other partners through SRB funding between 2000 – 2006	SRB Partnership/ MDC/ SWRDA	Jun -05	Mar / Apr -06	Adoption of the 'forward' strategy for the 'Bringing Glastonbury Together' SRB programme, to maintain the impetus of regeneration work	O	Town Plan produced and adopted by the SRB Board. Currently being printed. A discussion paper is under consideration by the Council's Portfolio Holder and is due to be presented to the West Mendip Area Partnership on 12 th September.
	Reinvigorating the partnership to deliver a regenerated Morland site	SWRDA/ MDC/SCC/ Wessex Water/ Environment Agency	Ongoing	Summer -06	Main infrastructure completed	O	MDC is a member of the partnership team and staff are dedicated to working with SWRDA on key issues
Devising and implementing a Community Strategic Plan for Shepton Mallet and its Rural Hinterland	Appraising and endorsing the work undertaken by the MCTi 'Shepton 21' Steering Group	SWRDA/ MSP Sub group/local community		Mar/Apr -06	Adopted Community Plan for Shepton Mallet	C	Launched 17 May A dedicated member of staff has 75% of their time allocated to ensure that the outcomes in the Strategic Plan are achieved.
	Participation in prioritizing of initiatives stemming from strategic plan	Community/ local stakeholders /local agencies	Spring - 06 onwards		Prioritized list of projects/initiatives to be pursued as key projects for Shepton Mallet and the surrounding rural area	O	A representative of the MCTi 'Shepton 21' Group serves on the Mendip Business

Priority: Regenerating the Mendip Economy - Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons / Notes
							<p>Leaders' Group.</p> <p>'Shepton 21' is currently rationalising itself in terms of membership and MDC is helping in achieving that re-organisation.</p> <p>Ongoing prioritisation has led to identification of an initiative that could benefit from MSP financial support (ESR feasibility study)</p>
Creating a more enterprising and business friendly culture in the Mendip area	Cascading out to other partners the developing good practise on the 'business ambassador' initiative and other measures to assist enterprise development	MDC/SCC/ other statutory bodies/FSB/ Chambers/ Business Link	May -06		Increasing the number of SME's starting and developing in the area	C, O	<p>Links to Economic Strategy and Promotional and Investment Strategy</p> <p>Membership of the Somerset Economic Leaders' Group Officer Meeting (which is the officer support group for the Economic sub-group of the SSP) ensures all models of good practice are cascaded across the county.</p>

	Enhancing liaison between the business community and other local partnership bodies by extending the number of participating agencies to the Mendip Business Exchange programme	MACOC/FSB /MDC	Mar - 06		Enhanced partnership working and networking between businesses and local agencies	C	Mendip Business Exchange programme is being adopted
Promoting Mendip as an attractive, sustainable location for Business	Investigate what makes Mendip an attractive location for small enterprise	MDC/ consultants	Apr - 06		Clear understanding of conditions for successful marketing of Mendip	C	Project completed by consultants Promotional and Investment Strategy is taking this work forward
	Devise targeted marketing exercise using partnership other funding, based on research/strategy	MSP Subgroup/ MDC/ consultants/ Owners of employment land & premises	Oct - 06	Dec -06	Increase the number of SME's relocating in area	C, O	Completed – but ongoing in terms of implementation of plan
	Consider range of grant schemes targeted on particular sectors of the local economy, based on strategy work outcomes and recognised need-including tourism and the more rural areas	MDC/Mendip Business Exchange/ Business Link	Oct - 06	Ongoing	Increased levels of activity in target sectors	O	Financial support has been sought from the MSP for the provision of retail training for market town traders. A further target may be the promotion of a cluster of environmental technologies in the Frome area

Item 9 Appendix E

MSP Five Priorities

Progress Report to MSP Board 26 September 2006

Details of progress on actions due to have commenced by end August 2006

Status key O= on target, C = completed, D= delayed, R=reviewed

Priority: Tackling Climate Change Locally – Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
Map stakeholders	identify and engage with those agencies with a stake in the causes and / or effects of climate change	MSP Leading with MDC and Consultants	Oct 2005	Nov 2005	Relevant stakeholders identified and engaged in sub group	O	Stakeholders have been identified and membership of the sub group agreed.
Develop Sub Group	set up a Climate Change Sub Group, responsible to MSP Board, to oversee actions below	MSP Leading with MDC and Consultants	Oct -05	Nov -05	Climate change sub group meeting on a regular and ongoing basis.	O	<i>The sub group is meeting on a regular basis to take forward the action plan. The last meeting was held on 5th Sept.</i>
Strategy Action Planning	Develop a Mendip Climate Change Strategy, signed up to and taken forward by all MSP Partners, to include the following:	Consultants, reporting to MSP sub group	Feb -06	Dec -06	To have published an agreed climate change strategy.	O	<i>Consultants are working on the climate change strategy and have produced an initial draft MSP partners have been invited to supply strategies which are relevant so the consultants asses their impact on climate change.</i>
	communication strategy for raising awareness of the				Climate change strategy to include communications	O	<i>The bid to Defra's Climate Fund for locally based communications work was</i>

Priority: Tackling Climate Change Locally – Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
	issues and to help change behaviours				strategy.		<i>unsuccessful., but will be revisited in the light of the findings of the climate change strategy.</i>
	medium term action plan for mitigating the effects of climate change				Climate change strategy to include recommendations for medium term action for mitigation.	O	<i>Awaiting completion of climate change strategy in December 2006. Work to commence Jan 2007.</i>
	medium term action plan for adapting to the effects of climate change				Climate change strategy to include recommendations for medium term action for adaptation	O	As above
	recommendations for longer term action				Climate change strategy to include recommendations for longer term action	O	As above
Implementation	Implement measures to tackle climate change identified in the strategy and action planning process, with particular regard to funding opportunities which may arise.	MSP sub group and partners	ongoing		Implementation of measures identified in strategy and action planning process.	O	<i>Mendip Partnership for energy project underway, with initial information gathering phase of auditing underway.</i> <i>STSD engaged to deliver “Community Choices For Sustainable Living” project in Mendip. The project officer is working with 4</i>

Priority: Tackling Climate Change Locally – Action Plan							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Status	Reasons /Notes
							<i>community projects and has started work on the information pack. There is considerable interest from the community in taking projects forward.</i>
Strategy Implementation and Review	Ensure integration of strategy actions into the plans and strategies of partner organisations	MSP / Sub Group	ongoing		To continue to influence plans and strategies of partner organisations.	O	Work in progress through actions identified above.
	Review effectiveness	MSP sub group	ongoing		Carry out continuous sub group review of effectiveness of mechanisms for influencing strategies and plans of partners.	O	Awaiting actions identified above.
	Ensure ongoing awareness raising / education / behaviour change within partnership and communities	MSP sub group and local community	ongoing		To continuously improve understanding of climate change and actions to tackle it among the local community.	O	Work in progress through actions identified above

**MSP Five Priorities
Progress Report to MSP Board 26 September 2006**

Details of progress on actions due to have commenced by end August 2006:

Status key O= on target, C = completed, D= delayed, R=reviewed

Investing in Children and Young People							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Progress to Date	Comments/notes
Establish Locality Teams	<u>Frome</u>						
	Set up Locality Steering Committee	CYPPG and Frome Inclusion partnership	Sep-05	Oct-05	LS Committee in place	C The Frome LSC has been formed and is now meeting on a regular basis	Locality Steering Group is well established and guiding the Locality Team Manager as per its Terms of Reference.
	Appoint Locality Manager		Dec 05/Jan 06	Jan-06	Locality Manager in post	C LM has been appointed.	
	Audit existing services	Frome Locality Team	Jan-06	Apr-06	Audit Completed	O The audit is in progress and a gap in services for young people in The Mount area of Frome has been identified.	Will be progressed further when the Locality staff team is in place. This is likely to be April 07.

Investing in Children and Young People							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Progress to Date	Comments/notes
	Develop participation programme	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Sep-06	Dec-07	Consultation about five outcomes of ECM	C Workshops took place and report was presented and distributed Jul 06.	First phase of participation project completed. Finding are being considered by Mendip Children and Young People Planning Group (MCYPPG). A further application for Phase 2 has been submitted to MSP. This application will be to help disseminate the model amongst a range of agencies including MCYPPG. A work plan for Phase 2 is being developed by Barnardos (Children's Fund)
	<u>Street & Glastonbury</u>						
	Set up Locality Steering Committee	CYPPG and Street & Glastonbury Community Learning Partnership	Dec-05	Jun 07	LS Committee in place	O The Street/ Glastonbury LSC has not yet been set up, however meetings are being held to encourage agencies and schools to work together..	A meeting has been set for Oct 6 th at Brookside School . This is a chance for agencies and schools to information share and plan ways forward. Part of the meeting will be feedback from the schools audit of needs in the locality.
	Appoint Locality Manager		Apr-06	Jun-07	Locality Manager in post	O The LM post will be recruited around June 07	The LM posts will be recruited to in Street/Glast and then the appointments will be taken up in April 08 for Shepton /wells
	Audit existing services	Street & Glastonbury Locality Team	Jun-06	Jun-07	Audit Completed	O	This will most likely take place after the LT manager is in post in April 08. However, there has been some preparatory work done prior to this via the S/G LSC.

Investing in Children and Young People							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Progress to Date	Comments/notes
	Develop participation programme	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Sep-06	Dec-07	Consultation about five outcomes of ECM	○ Phase 2 of the participation project funding by MSP will allow MCYPPG to include some locality planning for Street and Glastonbury	The MCYPPG is presently forming and action plan from the report of Phase 1 of the participation project. Phase 2, if funded, will allow some specific participation work to be done in Street and Glastonbury.
	<u>Shepton Mallet & Wells</u>						
	Set up Locality Steering Committee	CYPPG and Shepton & Wells Partnership	Mar-06	Jun-08	LS Committee in place	○ An interagency meeting will shortly be set up for the Shepton Mallet and Wells locality	There is a slight lag behind the work in Street and Glastonbury but it will follow the same pattern.
	Appoint Locality Manager		Jun-06	Jun 08	Locality Manager in post	○	
	Audit existing services	Shepton & Wells Locality Team	Sep-06	Jun 08	Audit Completed	○	
	Develop participation programme	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Sep-06	Jun 08	Consultation about five outcomes of ECM	○	

Investing in Children and Young People							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Progress to Date	Comments/notes
	Use audit to identify gaps in service provision	Locality Teams	Apr-06	Jun 08	Gaps identified	0	.
	Develop action plan to address gaps in service provision	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Oct-06	Jun-08	Action Plan completed	o	
Achieve Every Child Matters 5 Outcomes 1. Be Healthy	Use audit to identify gaps in service provision	Locality Teams	Apr-06	Jun 08	Gaps identified	0	For Frome LT this will be achieved by 06. For Street/ Glastonbury & Shepton Mallet/Wells Localities they will be slower to set up. In the meantime the participation Consultation Project results and agencies own operational plans will highlight gaps in the interim period and these gaps will be filled as appropriate under the guidance of the CYPPG.
	Develop action plan to address gaps in service provision	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Oct-06	Jun-08	Action Plan completed	0	See above
	Develop participation programme	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Sep-06	Dec-08	Consultation about five outcomes of ECM	0	See above
	Play/Activities Programme	Locality Teams	Jun-07	Autumn 07		0	See above
2. Enjoy and Achieve	Use audit to identify gaps in service provision	Locality Teams	Apr-06	Jun 08	Gaps identified	0	See above

Investing in Children and Young People							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Progress to Date	Comments/notes
	Develop action plan to address gaps in service provision	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Oct-06	Jun-08	Action Plan completed	0	See above
	Develop participation programme	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Sep-06	Dec-07	Consultation about five outcomes of ECM	0	See above
3. Achieve Economic Well-Being	Use audit to identify gaps in service provision	Locality Teams	Apr-06	Dec-06	Gaps identified	0	See above
	Develop action plan to address gaps in service provision	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Oct-06	Jun-07	Action Plan completed	0	See above
	Develop participation programme	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Sep-06	Dec-07	Consultation about five outcomes of ECM	0	See above
4. Make a Positive Contribution	Use audit to identify gaps in service provision	Locality Teams	Apr-06	Dec-06	Gaps identified	0	See above
	Develop action plan to address gaps in service provision	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Oct-06	Jun-07	Action Plan completed	0	See above
	Develop participation programme	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Sep-06	Dec-07	Consultation about five outcomes of ECM	0	See above

Investing in Children and Young People							
Objective	Action	Who	Start	Finish	Target /Output	Progress to Date	Comments/notes
5. Stay safe	Use audit to identify gaps in service provision	Locality Teams	Apr-06	Jun -07	Gaps identified		
	Develop action plan to address gaps in service provision	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Oct-06	Jun-08	Action Plan completed	○	See above
	Develop participation programme	Locality Teams & CYPPG	Sep-06	Jun 08	Consultation about five outcomes of ECM	○	See above

The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item: 10

FROM: Team Leader Community Planning and Communications, Mendip District Council Date: 26 September 2006

SUBJECT: **MSP Funding Programme 2006/07**

1. SUMMARY OF SECOND HOMES MONIES 2004-07

2004/05 Second Homes monies

1.1 All organisations who were awarded monies in 2004/05 have now submitted claims. Wanstrow Village Hall Committee was awarded £2,000 but only claimed £1,880. Unless a further claim is received by end September 2006 the underspend of £120 will be carried forward to 2006/07.

2005/06 Second Homes monies

1.2 The MSP was given £121,490 from second homes Council Tax monies for 2005/06.

1.3 £103,930 was allocated to the five Priorities, £15,000 to the Police and £1,005 made up part of an award to CAB.

1.4 At the time of writing, £66,271 remains to be claimed by the Priority leads. 2005/06 allocations have to be spent by March 2007. We have had assurances from each Priority lead that this will happen and we will keep a close watch on this.

1.5 There is an additional £1,555 that remains uncommitted from 2005/06 monies which has been rolled forward to 2006/07.

2006/07 Second Homes monies

1.6 Second Homes Council Tax Monies available to the MSP for allocation in 2006/07 comprise:

- £101,383, made up of £80,600 from Somerset County Council and £20,783 from Mendip District Council.
- The uncommitted sum of £1,555 carried forward from 2005/06 monies

This gives a total Second Homes monies 'pot' of £102,938, to be allocated in 2006/07.

1.7 The BFSG had previously proposed that £60,000 of this money be made available for each of the five Priority Sub Groups to bid against.

1.8 The identified lead agencies for each of the five Priority Sub Groups were invited to submit proposals for funds that would help the development and delivery of the emerging Priority action plans.

2. MSP'S OWN (NON-SECOND HOMES MONIES) 2006/07

2.1 £16,236.81 is available to the Partnership, the residue of initial contributions from Somerset County Council, Mendip District Council, Mendip Housing Limited and Mendip Primary Care Trust.

2.2 Detailed accounts may be inspected by Board Members at any time during office hours at the Council's offices.

3. BUDGET AND FINANCE SUB GROUP 21 AUGUST 2006

3.1 The Budget and Finance Sub Group (BFSG) last met on 21 August 2006. The minutes of that meeting accompany this report as Appendix A and the main issues are highlighted below.

Proposals from the five MSP Priorities

3.2 The main purpose of the meeting was to consider the proposals put forward by each Priority Sub Group. These proposals have been made available by email attachment to the agenda for the meeting.

3.3 Table A on page 4 shows the requests submitted by each Priority, with the BFSG recommendation shown in the final column. The total of these recommendations is £62,118

Other proposals received

3.4 In addition to the proposals submitted by the Priority leads, the BFSG received additional requests for funding which it considered at the meeting of 21 August 2006. These requests are listed in Table B on page 4. The BFSG recommendation is shown in the final column.

3.5 With regard to the recommended award towards provision of the PCSO service in Glastonbury, discussions are underway with the Police to determine exactly what sum is sought. Information since the BFSG meeting on 21 August indicates that this amount is likely to be considerably less than £20,442.50.

3.6 Taking into account 3.5 above, the sum of the recommendations for these additional proposals is a maximum of £29,952.50. The actual total is likely to be less once the amount required for the Police Community Support Officer in Glastonbury is clarified.

Total BFSG recommendations

3.7 The sum of the recommendations for the five priorities plus the additional proposals is a maximum of £92,070.50. If all the BFSG recommendations are approved by the MSP Board, this would leave at least £10,867 still to be allocated in 2006/07.

Proposed change to use of 2005/06 monies

3.8 £22,500 was awarded to the Regenerating the Mendip Economy priority in 2005/06. Some of this money was to go towards production of the Economic Strategy. It was envisaged that external consultants would be engaged but in the event most of the work has been carried out by MDC Officers. A request was therefore submitted to the BFSG to use £16,000 of the 2005/06 allocation of £22,500 to develop and manage a Business Investment Website.

3.9 The BFSG agreed to recommend that this change be approved, subject to further clarification which was obtained at the Monitoring Group meeting on 12 September 2006.

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 The Board is asked to:

- approve the recommended allocation of Second Homes Council Tax monies for 2006/07 as shown in the final columns of Table A and Table B respectively
- approve the recommendation that £16,000 of the £22,500 allocated to Regenerating the Mendip Economy priority in 2005/06 be used towards developing and managing a Business Investment Project
- agree that the BFSG meet again prior to the November MSP Board meeting to consider and make recommendations about how the remaining monies be allocated.

Contact: Sara Skirton 01749 341340
skirtons@mendip.gov.uk

Table A

Priority	Project	Amount Sought	BFSG recs
Tackling Climate Change Locally	Match funding the second year of the Invest to Save Budget "Mendip Partnership for Energy" project, carrying out joint energy auditing and raising awareness about energy efficiency.	£6,250	£6,250
	Support second phase of preparation of Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan for Mendip	£6,000	£6,000
Affordable Decent Housing for All	Developing a Multi Agency Web based Toolkit - to continue to fund the Project Worker for remainder of the programme.	£15,000	£12,000
Investing in Children and Young People	Mendip Participation Project (MPP). Phase 2.	V1 = £21,794 or V2 = £18,068	£18,068
Regenerating Mendip Economy	Business Investment Project Website maintenance and updating	£4,000	£4,000
	East Somerset Railway extension feasibility study	£5,000	£4,000
	Retail training for market town traders	£3,000	£3,000
Strengthening the Voluntary and Community Sector	a) Research the current quality standards achieved by the voluntary and community sector	£2,900	£2,900
	b) Upgrade the means of managing the VCS database	£4,400	£4,400
	c) Mendip Forum Conference / Workshops	£1,500	£1,500
Total BFSG Recommendations			£62,118

Table B

Partner	Project	Amount Sought	BFSG recommendation
Police	Police Community Support Officers in Glastonbury	Contribution towards deficit of £20,442.50	Contribution towards deficit of £20,442.50*
	Provision of Electric Bikes to Police Community Support Officers	£10,050	£2,010
Chair of Mendip Environment Forum	To set up a Community Interest Company	£22,000	£0
Mendip YMCA	Towards delivering the Routes Project in Frome	£7,500	£7,500
Total BFSG Recommendations			Up to a maximum of £29,952.50*

Total Fund	£102,938.00
Total BFSG recommendation	£92,070.508
Total remaining	£10,867.50

*the actual sum requested by the Police is likely to be considerably less than £20,442.50 – please refer to 3.5 and 3.6.



**Budget and Finance Sub Group
of the Mendip Strategic Partnership
Notes of the Meeting Held 21 August 2006, 9.30 am
at Mendip District Council**

Present from MSP: Ron Ballantine (Chair), Richard Dixon, Michelle Hawkes, Michael Hammond, Roger Kershaw, Paul Richards

Present from MDC: Sarah Guscott, Jo Milling, Richard Roberts, Sara Skirton

Apologies: Trevor Ashford, Ian Bennett, Nick Cottle, Andy Marsh, Tony Shepherd

1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions The Chair opened the meeting and round table introductions were made.</p>	
2.	<p>Minutes from BFSG Meeting 4 May 2006 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as being a true record of those proceedings. There were no matters arising.</p>	
3.	<p>Funds Available to MSP in 2006/2007 A summary of funds available to the MSP as at 10th August 2006 had previously been circulated.</p> <p>Having been updated, it was agreed that further discussion surrounding amended use of funding by the Regenerating the Mendip Economy and Affordable Decent Housing priorities would take place at the appropriate stage of the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair reminded the Group of the MSP Board's decision that, of the total amount of £102,938 to be allocated in 2006/07, a detailed sum of £60,000 will be set aside at this stage for the five priority groups to bid against. The remaining amount of £42,938 will be available to fund other projects or topping up which may arise.</p> <p>All recommendations for funding will be subject to ratification by the MSP Board.</p>	
4.	<p>Funding Proposals From the Five Priority Sub Groups The BFSG reviewed a report previously circulated and considered each request for funding in turn. The total maximum value of the bids received is £69,844.</p>	

	<p>a) <u>Regenerating the Mendip Economy</u></p> <p>Firstly, Sara Skirton reported that the priority is seeking permission from the Group to realign some of its previous 2005/06 allocation of funds (£22,500). This is due to the fact that the Economic Strategy has been produced in-house instead of using the services of external consultants as originally envisaged. The priority lead now predicts expenditure of £22,016, utilising some of the funds thus freed up to fund the development of a Business Investment website by December 2006, together with a management fee to MACOC for the remainder of the financial year 2006/07.</p> <p>The Group agreed to this revision of expenditure subject to the priority lead submitting a more detailed report on its activities to the next meeting of the Monitoring Group in September.</p> <p>Turning to the bid for 2006/2007, the priority is seeking funds totalling £12,000. After discussion, the Group agreed to expenditure of £4,000 for the updating and maintenance of the Business Investment website, £4,000 for a feasibility study into an extension of the East Somerset Railway and £3,000 to be spent on retail training for market town traders.</p> <p>b) <u>Investing in Children and Young People</u></p> <p>Michael Hammond added more background detail to this priority's bid for funding for Phase 2 of the Mendip Participation Project. Version 1's request for funding of £21,794 would fund a Project Worker for 2½ days per week or, alternatively, £18,068 for 2 days per week.</p> <p>It was agreed that, initially, a sum of £18,068 would be allocated to this priority to fund 2 days per week. However, this funding would be reviewed in December and may be increased to allow the Project Worker to spend 2½ days per week on the Participation Project, subject to the practicalities of such a decision.</p> <p>c) <u>Affordable Decent Housing for All</u></p> <p>Michelle Hawkes spoke in support of this priority's bid for £15,000 Year 2 funding for a Project Worker to research and develop a multi-agency web based toolkit. This will take the form of an easily accessible 'encyclopaedia' of multi agency work paths, projects and resources which are available across Mendip. Mendip Housing Ltd has agreed to become the host for this post. Bearing in mind there is a predicted underspend of £3,233 from the 2005/2006 allocation of £15,000, the Group recommended approval of funding of £12,000 to bring the project to a successful conclusion.</p>	<p>CA/ RR</p>
--	--	-------------------

	<p>d) <u>Tackling Climate Change Locally</u></p> <p>It was noted that at the previous meeting, the Group had agreed to look favourably on any request for match funding the second year of the Invest to Save Budget “Mendip Partnership for Energy” project. Jo Milling updated the Group on progress made by the Centre for Sustainable Energy on its joint energy auditing exercise and energy efficiency awareness raising campaign. The amount sought for this is £6,250.</p> <p>Baker Associates have been engaged to develop a locally relevant climate change strategy, and a bid of £6,000 has been submitted to cover the cost of this. Jo reported that an interim report will be presented to the MSP Board at its next meeting on 26 September but final conclusions of the project will not be available until the end of December.</p> <p>It was recommended that total funding of £12,250 be approved.</p> <p>e) <u>Strengthening the Voluntary and Community Sector</u></p> <p>Unfortunately, Tony Shepherd was unavailable to add any supporting information to his previously circulated report. Sara Skirton was able to update the Board on a meeting attended by herself, Tony and Sarah Guscott about setting quality standards to be achieved by the voluntary and community sector. Total funding of £8,800 is being sought, which comprises £2,900 for this project, upgrading and managing the VCS database at £4,400 and holding further Mendip Forum Conferences and Workshops at £1,500.</p> <p>It was agreed to recommend an allocation of £8,800.</p> <p>This brings the total amount of funding recommended for approval to £62,118.</p>	
5.	<p>Additional Bids for Funding</p> <p>Sara Skirton drew the Group’s attention to the fact that additional requests had been received for non-priority funding. It was noted that a problem could arise on this due to some MSP partners being aware that funds were available, while others were unaware. By not advertising the availability of funds throughout the community, criticism could be levelled at the MSP of non-inclusivity. Discussion followed on the difficulty in defining ‘partner organisation’ and the criteria for considering applications outside the priorities. The Group is mindful of the need to be seen to be fair in any invitation to organisations to submit bids.</p>	

As mentioned previously, £42,938 of second homes monies can be allocated in 2006/07; however, the maximum value of bids received is £59,992.

a) Avon and Somerset Constabulary

Inspector Paul Richards spoke in support of funding for a Police Community Support Officer in Glastonbury and outlined the reasons why Glastonbury appeared to be an 'exceptional case'. Although the Treasury is expected to release funds earlier than expected with a view to all PCSOs being in place by 31st March 2007, there is currently an estimated deficit of £20,442.50 in funding for the PCSO post in Glastonbury for 2006/07.

Subject to further clarification by the Council's External Funding Officer on the amount and timing of the SRB funding stream and police second homes monies, it was agreed to recommend funding the actual deficit.

b) Avon and Somerset Constabulary

The bid for 15 electric bicycles at a cost of £10,050 was considered, and discussion took place on the importance of both high police visibility within Mendip communities and the potential for reduction in carbon emissions.

It was agreed to recommend an allocation of £2,010 to cover the cost of the purchase of three bicycles. This would allow trials in each of the three PCSO areas and it was hoped that funding could be sought elsewhere from business and the community.

c) Mendip Environment Community Interest Company

Richard Dixon and Jo Milling spoke in support of a request for funding the formation of a CIC, with the assistance of a project worker for the first year. Funding of £22,000 to resource this scheme is being sought because the Environment Forum has neither the executive power nor indeed any remit to raise and disburse funds. The CIC would provide a focus for community action as well as specialist expertise, co-ordination and advice to voluntary organisations and individuals on sustainability and climate change issues. Opinions were expressed that these tasks might be more appropriately handled by other national, regional or local non-governmental organisations and that the structure of the existing environment groups should be reviewed before adding a new organisation. For this reason, the request for funding was refused at this time but the Group would consider a revised and more robust proposal at a future date.

d) Mendip YMCA – Routes Project in Frome

The YMCA has requested funding of £7,500 as a contribution towards the running costs of delivering the Routes Project in Frome. This venture provides advice, guidance and information

	<p>for young people, together with access and referral to appropriate support agencies. The Group felt that this cross-cutting project chimed well with a number of MSP priorities and for this reason, the Group recommended that funding of £7,500 be made available.</p> <p>This brings the total recommendation for allocation of funding to £29,952.50, which would allow £2,118 to be used to fulfil all the bids submitted by the five priority leads. Therefore, subject to ratification of these recommendations by the MSP Board, at least £10,800 (depending on level of funding awarded for the PCSO post) remains available for re-allocation at the end of December, to be committed by April 2007 and spent by April 2008.</p>	
6.	<p>AOB</p> <p>It was noted that, at some time in the future, the MSP Board may wish to undertake a project such as a consultation exercise. Roger Kershaw foresaw no problem in using MSP funds for this purpose.</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting was closed at 11.40 am.</p>	