

**Notes of the Wealden Local Strategic Partnership  
Meeting held on 9 July 2003**

**Present:**

Aprile Biggs – Environment Agency  
Councillor Norman Buck – Wealden District Council  
Ian Chisnall – Churches Together in Sussex  
Mary Coburn – New Downland Housing Association  
Fiona Henniker – Sussex Downs & Weald  
John Kelly – Wealden Federation of Voluntary Organisations  
Dr Iheadi Onwukwe – Eastbourne Downs Primary Care Trust  
Councillor Tony Reid – East Sussex County Council  
Mike Rogers – East Sussex Fire Brigade HQ  
Councillor Tim Sparrow – Sussex Association of Local Councils  
Chief Inspector Grenville Wilson – Sussex Police  
Charmian Allcock – Wealden District Council  
Mary Clare Deane - Wealden District Council  
Diana Francombe - Wealden District Council  
Alison Horan – East Sussex County Council  
Alison Jeffery - East Sussex County Council  
Sean Nolan - East Sussex County Council  
Nigel Pargiter - East Sussex County Council

**Apologies:**

Councillor Nigel Coltman - Wealden District Council  
Melanie Hunt – Sussex Learning & Skills Council  
Charles Lant - Wealden District Council  
Jeremy Leggett – Action in Rural Sussex  
Peter Midgley – Environment Agency  
Chief Superintendent Paul Pearce -  
Ken Stevens – Federation of Small Businesses

**1. Area Investment Frameworks**

The Partnership received a presentation by Nigel Pargiter, Economic Development Manager for East Sussex County Council.

Nigel explained that Area Investment Frameworks (AIFs) were intended as tools to enable the delivery of economic development objectives. East Sussex would have two AIFs, one that covered the Hastings and Bexhill Task Force Area and one for the rest of the county.

The development of the East Sussex AIF was being led by the East Sussex Economic Partnership (ESEP) and the process would be:

**Step 1:** To agree a limited set of economic development priorities for the AIF area as a whole.

- An initial analysis of existing strategies had shown that all organisations were broadly in agreement about the important issues, even though emphasis varied slightly.

- The ESEP wanted to involve all the LSPs in the county. It was hosting a conference/workshop on 14 July 2003 to agree the county's common economic development priorities and representatives from each LSP had been invited to attend.

**Steps 2 & 3:** To determine which organisations were providing what funding in which areas and then to identify gaps and duplication in funding provision

- Consultants would be employed to undertake the next stages in the process as a means to determining how the priorities identified in Step 1 could be delivered. They would be tasked to work directly with LSPs (approx 5 days per LSP).
- A website was being set up so progress could be followed. The ESEP would also keep in regular contact with LSP Chairs and link officers.

**Step 4:** By December 2003 to produce a framework for focussed delivery on a 3 year rolling programme

- Once the framework was produced, the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA) would use it as the basis for distributing funding from its Single Pot. The exercise was, however, not just about distributing SEEDA monies, but was intended to be used to align all agencies' funding.

In answer to questions, it was explained:

- The SEEDA funding was not "new" money but the process was intended to be a way to make most effective use of existing budgets by enabling delivery on a common set of priorities throughout East Sussex.
- As part of their role, LSPs had determined local priorities, which included economic development priorities. It would be the consultants' job to look at that work and draw out those economic development priorities which were common to the whole area.
- It would be part of the role of the consultants, when they identified gaps in provision, to determine whether those gaps occurred because they were not priorities or because they had been missed in existing strategies. The ESEP would be asked to consider and endorse those findings.
- The AIF would not be just another strategy – rather it would produce a 3 year delivery programme to help meet objectives in existing strategies.
- AIFs were being drawn up because it was considered that the existing system of delivery was fragmented and consequently unnecessary money was being spent on co-ordination and administration. AIFs should streamline funding across the area. They also represented a move from competitive bidding within an area to allocations which

should better facilitate working partnerships.

- The actual funding mechanism had not yet been agreed – it was thought appropriate to wait until priorities and programmes were known before trying to determine the best methods of delivery.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>To be noted by:</b>
The partners welcomed the opportunity to be involved and agreed that the Prosperity Theme Champion and related partners should take the lead on behalf of the LSP for this area of work	Ken Stevens

## **2. Children and Young Persons Strategy 2003-05**

The Partnership received a presentation by Alison Jeffrey, Assistant Director, Children and Young People (Planning and Commissioning), for East Sussex County Council.

Alison explained that the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership (CYPSP) had been established in 2002 to oversee and direct the strategic development of children's services in East Sussex. Those services included education, social services and health, together with voluntary services and initiatives. All LSPs in East Sussex were represented on the CYPSP; in the case of Wealden by John Kelly.

The draft Children and Young Persons (CYP) plan, distributed with the agenda, reported on progress with CYP services in 2002/03 and then set out four strands of work for 2003-2005. Those covered:

- Key strategic developments affecting all areas and services
- Priority areas for service development
- Extending consultation with young people
- Improving communications across services and with users/potential users

Key areas of work specifically affecting Wealden included:

- The piloting of Identification, Referral and Tracking in the area covered by the Eastbourne Downs PCT (which covers Hailsham).
- Investigating options for sustaining Childrens Fund and SureStart services in target areas within the District (such as Hailsham East).
- Review of funding policies for children and young people's activities.
- Making links between local "Communities Against Drugs" projects.
- Consulting with young people.

The LSP had also received a copy of the consultation document on the East Sussex Preventative Strategy which could be seen as a "sub set" of the wider CYP plan. All upper tier authorities were required to draw up preventative

strategies and the consultation document summarised what was already being done in relation to prevention and set out some further proposals for consultation such as increasing support for the development of parenting skills and further expansion of leisure opportunities and facilities.

The Strategy was warmly welcomed and the partners concurred that there was considerable cross-over with most, if not all, of the Theme Action Plans. The Partnership was aware that because certain issues may have been missed by the initial Community Strategy consultation in 2002 there was an ongoing need to evolve the Community Strategy, not only by encouraging the development of Parish Plans, but by taking account of issues raised in other organisations' consultation exercises and strategies.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>To be noted by:</b>
A response was required on two levels:	All partners
1) Partners were invited to pass their individual organisations' comments to Alison Jeffery by the following dates:	
CYP Strategy – end August 2003	
Preventative Strategy – 25 July 2003	
2) The Theme Champions were asked to consider their Action Plans to see where actions could be added or evolved in the future to better serve the needs of children and young people in the District	Theme Champions
In addition Alison Jeffery was asked to consider including a section for Wealden separately in the document.	Alison Jeffery

### 3. Matters Arising

#### (a) Community Strategy Website

Diana Francombe advised the Partners that the Community Strategy Website had been published in mid-June and had been registered with several of the major search engines. It was intended to undertake some publicity for the site during August 2003.

#### (b) District Council Member and Director Links

Councillor Norman Buck explained that each of the members of the District Council's Cabinet had taken responsibility for linking with one of the Community Strategy Themes. Most had now made contact with their counterpart Theme Champions and looked forward to developing constructive relationships in the future.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>To be noted by:</b>
A list of the District Council's links with each of the Themes be distributed to the partners	Secretariat

#### (c) Parish Plan Conference

Councillor Tim Sparrow reminded the Partnership that it had undertaken to use the £10,000 National Grid award to provide grants to assist Parishes to produce Parish Plans.

The grant scheme had been launched on 26 June at a half-day conference to which more than half the Parishes in Wealden sent representatives. About 80% of Parishes now had nominated contacts for community planning matters and every Parish Clerk had been sent a copy of the grants criteria and an application form.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>To be noted by:</b>
That a sub-group comprising Fiona Henniker and Tim Sparrow consider the applications for the Parish Plans grant and notify the decisions to the LSP at its meeting in December 2003.	Fiona Henniker, Tim Sparrow, secretariat

#### **(d) Theme Action Plans**

**Leisure:** The cultural partnership had met several times and had taken ownership of the Leisure Action Plan. Several new ideas had been generated and the action plan was nearing completion.

**Housing:** The Wealden Housing Partnership had discussed the action plan at its last meeting and had made some minor changes to ensure it reflected all the partnership involvement, the review processes and the current targets.

**Transport:** Work on the action plan was ongoing. It was evolving in light of a growing public demand for traffic speed reduction and the Visibly Better Roads initiative.

**Safety:** The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership had confirmed at its recent meeting that it would take responsibility for the action plan, although it was not technically within the statutory remit of the group. The action plan itself had now been finalised.

**Environment:** The Sussex Environmental Reference Group (previously the Pan-Sussex Group) had declined to be the delivery group for the environment action plan, although it was available to advise on any existing or proposed actions. The action plan was currently being co-ordinated between the Environment Agency and Wealden District Council and consideration was being given to how delivery would be handled in the long-term.

**Health and Social Care:** The action plan was almost finalised. The Healthy Wealden Partnership had agreed to undertake the delivery role and had expanded its membership to encompass all the actions.

**Prosperity:** The Revitalisation Forum had been approached at its last meeting to undertake the delivery of the action plan. The members were happy in principle to undertake this role but had asked for a presentation at the next meeting to explain the context of the plan and how far they could go in taking ownership.

It was pointed out that prosperity was one of the themes which did not have a neat delivery vehicle because its remit was so wide. It was considered important that other partners be involved in delivery and monitoring alongside the Revitalisation Forum.

**Learning:** Unfortunately no-one was in attendance to update on the Learning Action Plan.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>To be noted by:</b>
That the finalised action plans be emailed to the secretariat by 23 July 2003	Theme Champions

#### **(e) Plenary Session**

A date was suggested for early 2004 to update the wider partners on action to date and to consider how the Community Strategy could be taken forward for the following year. Attention was drawn to the National Evaluation of LSPs which was being undertaken over 5 years by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

It was suggested that the Community Strategy Action Plans needed to concentrate less on activities that were already taking place and to consider what new activities could be generated to meet the objectives. It was pointed out that there were four basic models of LSPs – advisory, commissioning, laboratory and community engagers. The Wealden LSP had been set up as an advisory group, assisting existing bodies and partnerships to better work together by defining common goals. However, it was acknowledged that there might be benefit in exploring different ways of working in the future and a visioning exercise was suggested for the latter part of 2003.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>To be noted by:</b>
That the Chairman and secretariat consider the proposal to hold a visioning exercise in late 2003, the outcome of which will inform a plenary session to be held in early 2004	Fiona Henniker Secretariat

#### **4. Connecting Communities Bid**

Diana Francombe explained that Sompriti had now submitted the bid to the Home Office. The outcome would be known in September and would be reported to a future meeting.

#### **5. UK Transplant**

Fiona Henniker explained that UK Transplant ([www.uktransplant.org.uk](http://www.uktransplant.org.uk)) was the national co-ordinating body for organ donation. The larger the pool of donors, the better the likelihood of being able to find matches for patients who might otherwise die.

It was acknowledged that the LSP had undertaken not to promote any scheme which fell wholly within the remit of only one of the represented sectors. However, Wealden District Council undertook to consider whether details of the scheme could be circulated with another mail-out such as electoral registration forms. It was also suggested that as many of the partners were large employers, the UK Transplant scheme could be promoted internally to staff.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>To be noted by:</b>
That Wealden District Council consider distributing details of the scheme with a future mail-out to residents	Charmian Allcock
That the Partners consider promoting the UK Transplant Scheme internally within their organisations.	all Partners

## **6. South-East Regional Housing Strategy**

Mary Coburn explained that the Strategy represented a shift of resources and, from the document, it was still unclear whether Wealden District would lose or gain. The definitions of key workers and the types of provision proposed was also unclear. There were already some problems with revenue funding for Supported Housing and the Strategy did not seem to address this.

It was agreed that housing was needed in the District but it was extremely important to develop the infrastructure alongside the housing. There was concern that, due to lack of infrastructure and resistance to new housing developments, much affordable housing could end up in large-scale developments outside of the areas where it was really needed. However, there was a growing recognition in some parishes that without developments of smaller and affordable housing, young people and families, as well as older people, might be driven away to other communities.

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>To be noted by:</b>
Councillor Buck was asked to feed back to the East Sussex Strategic Partnership so that the views of the Wealden LSP could be taken into account in that body's response to the consultation.	Councillor Norman Buck

## **7. Any Other Business**

### **(a) Fire Service Integrated Risk Management Plan**

Mike Rogers explained that the Government was now requiring the Fire Service to develop Integrated Risk Management Plans and he would be seeking to consult the members of the LSP in due course.

### **(b) Strategies**

The Partnership was asked to consider whether it wished to set any criteria for the consultations and strategies it receives in future. While it was important that the Partnership had an opportunity to comment on forthcoming strategies, usually partner organisations were also consulted separately and

there was a danger that future agendas could become flooded with such items. It was agreed that this item would be considered at the next meeting.

The meeting ended at 6.45pm