

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Manchester Partnership (LSP) Board
Held on 17 May 2005**

Present:	Councillor Richard Leese	MCC (In the Chair)
	Davy Iredale	CN4M
	Ed Cox	CN4M
	Briony Simister	Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce
	Michael Eakin	North West Arts Council
	Bill Marks	Job Centre Plus
	Justine Curran	GM Police
	Keith Howcroft	GMPTE
	Adrian Mercer	South Manchester PCT
	Steve Mycio	Deputy Chief Executive Performance

Also Present	Brian Holmes	GONW
	Geoff Little	Head of Corporate Performance
	Kath Smythe	Manchester Partnership Team Leader
	Ingrid Daly	Ward Co-ordinator
	Katy Carmichael	Ward Co-ordinator
	Maria Price	Area Co-ordination Team
	Charles Jarvis	Market Renewal
	Richard Elliott	Transport Policy Unit
	Chris Barber	Engineering
	Eamonn Boylan	Deputy Chief Executive (Regeneration)
	Mark Duncan	Regeneration Programmes Group
	Peter Jones	MPSL

Apologies: John Korzeniewski (GM LSC) and Chris Mulligan (GMPTE),

1. Neighbourhood Focus

Ed Cox summarised the presentation on Neighbourhood Focus that had been given to the April meeting of the Board. He emphasised the key issues for the Board: a shared vision to improve the quality of life at neighbourhood level; links between Neighbourhood Focus and mainstream budgets and delivery; information gathering at neighbourhood level; sharing good practice; and area-focused working integral to all staff. As an example of ward level analysis, Katy Carmichael gave a brief outline of the key issues in the Old Moat ward that centred on low educational attainment at secondary level and a lack of community cohesion, exemplified by an increase in anti-social behaviour in the last two years, especially amongst very young children.

Charles Jarvis gave a presentation on the Tracking Neighbourhood Change (TNC) project. This was a GIS-based system developed for Housing Market Renewal that tracked activity to a very local level. He demonstrated a number of activities in the Harpurhey area, including links between expenditure on alley-gating and a reduction in burglaries. Further development was taking place with Salford City Council which would involve an integrated early warning system and thereafter a web-based system for introduction across the two authorities with links to the Council's Corporate GIS project.

In discussion, a number of issues were raised, including

(a) the need to balance local and national priorities: agencies prioritised national targets and issues because these were what they were held to account for delivering but that could impact negatively on local issues. For example, youth nuisance did not feature at the top of any agency's list of priorities. However, it did have a real impact on neighbourhoods. There were a lot of agencies contributing to addressing the problem but no single agency taking the lead.

(b) this imbalance in priorities could result in gaps in the strategic allocation of resources to meet clearly identified community needs. The Board requested that the Management Group be tasked with identifying where those gaps were.

(c) staff were integral to a neighbourhood approach; this needed to start at appointment and induction and followed through by staff appraisal and development and working with other agencies where appropriate; the Board requested that the Management group undertake a piece of work to look at staff development and training in relation to an area focus across agencies.

(d) resources were also needed at a neighbourhood level if ward co-ordinators were to play a leadership role and carry out their work effectively; Management Group were tasked with addressing how to ensure that ward co-ordination be adequately resourced.

(e) the question was asked whether the Board was clear, individually and jointly, about its responsibility to neighbourhoods, its accountability and how these were then resourced. There was also the issue of how regional agencies responded at a neighbourhood level. It was agreed that there should be accountable, neighbourhood targets. Management Group were asked to develop a clear schedule of performance indicators for sustainable neighbourhoods as part of the development of a truly shared vision. This would form part of the community strategy review.

(f) All partners within the Partnership were asked what they were doing at a neighbourhood level and what they would do to improve their neighbourhood focus.

(g) As part of (f) above, partners should identify what information they collected that could inform the development of additional fields within the TNC fields.

(h) partner organisations that operated at a very local level, such as community organisations, were asked to consider how they contributed to the bigger picture objectives.

(i) Thematic Partnerships would be required to break down their targets to a neighbourhood level in next year's action plans.

(j) In order for TNC to help Thematic Partnerships target their actions, a presentation on TNC would be given to all Thematic Partnerships.

(k) The Board would return to the TNC system at a future meeting to consider the full range of information available from it.

(l) There should be a progress report to the Board at the October meeting.

Resolved/-

(i) that the report on neighbourhood focus be noted.

(ii) that Charles Jarvis be thanked for his presentation on Tracking Neighbourhood Change.

(iii) that the Management Group identify gaps in the strategic allocation of resources to meet clearly identified community needs.

(iv) that the Management Group undertake a piece of work to look at staff development and training in relation to an area focus across agencies.

(v) that the Management Group consider ways of ensuring that ward co-ordination was adequately resourced.

(vi) that the Management group develop a clear schedule of performance indicators for sustainable neighbourhoods as part of the development of a truly shared vision.

(vii) that all partners within the Partnership consider what they were doing at a neighbourhood level and what they would do to improve their neighbourhood focus.

(viii) that all partners identify what information they collected that could inform the development of additional fields within the TNC fields.

(ix) that partner organisations that operated at a very local level consider how they contributed to the bigger picture objectives.

(x) that Thematic Partnerships break down their targets to a neighbourhood level in next year's action plans.

(xi) a presentation on TNC be made to all Thematic Partnerships.

(xii) that the Board look again at the TNC a system at a future meeting.

(xiii) that there should be a progress report to the October meeting of the Board.

2. Minutes of the meeting of the Manchester Partnership Board held on 12 April 2005 and Action Note

The Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 15 March 2005 and Action Note were presented for consideration.

Resolved/-

That the Minutes and Action Note be received.

3. Matters Arising

(a) LSP Self Assessment (minute 4)

It was noted that further information had been circulated concerning the traffic light performance scores and reports to the Board.

4. Transport Thematic Partnership - Annual Performance Results

Richard Elliott, Convenor of the Transport Thematic Partnership, gave a presentation on the annual performance of the Transport Thematic Partnership over a range of themes: Road Safety, Safety and Security on public transport, Modal Shift for work journeys into the city centre, Increasing local public transport patronage, Improving Air Quality, Improving Employment and Health.

In discussion, a number of issues were raised concerning specific targets and projects:

(a) Road Safety

Richard and Chris Barber, Head of Engineering Services, said that the Road Safety LPSA target of reducing the number of people Killed or Seriously Injured (KSIs) in road accidents to less than 230 in a year showed a reduction since 2004 but the target was unlikely to be met. The figure for Greater Manchester over the last twenty years was downward, with a decrease in children's casualties, but did show a flattening in recent years. In the coming year, the partnership was to focus on more educational work aimed at the general public and engineering work in and around schools such as the creation of 20 mph zones.

(b) Safety and Security

There were some positive signs in the Reducing Crime and Fear of Crime target, with an 8% reduction on the number of incidents of anti-social behaviour on and around local bus services. The Safety and Security Sub-Group of the partnership was looking at ways of tackling localised "hot spots".

(c) Modal Shift

There had been some progress between 1997 and 2002 in increasing the number of journeys crossing the cordon inside the Inner Relief Route between 7.30am and 9.30am made by means other than private car from 51% to 59%. The Local PSA2 target was likely to be an increase to 62.6% by 2008, once methodology and baseline had been agreed with the Department for Transport.

(d) Local Public Transport Patronage

There had been an increase in recent years in bus patronage, particularly along some radial routes and quality bus corridors, although the number of journeys had decreased in 2004-2005. More retired or near retirement people had access to cars and therefore concessionary travel had declined. Amongst current projects were the development of community transport plans in each ward to identify local problems and take action to improve safety and connections to the public transport network and improving the patronage growth on quality bus corridors through continued partnership with bus operators.

(e) Air Quality

The figures for the four pollutants identified by the government were fairly stable. There had been some reduction in vehicle emissions, partly caused by the introduction of new buses.

It was noted that Piccadilly Gardens was not necessarily a typical site for monitoring road traffic and consideration should be given to monitoring other sites at neighbourhood level.

(f) Partnership Projects

There were a number of current projects that focused on Road Safety and Modal Shift. These included Travel Advisors in job centres to provide customised journey plans and advice to clients taking up job interviews; Community Transport in New East Manchester to set up a community transport organisation to provide group transport in the New East Manchester area; and several projects by the Travel Change Team that focused on sustainable travel for school journeys. Further work was required on assessing interventions and evaluating outcomes. These could be difficult with campaigns but easier where physical changes had been made. Modal shift was in itself difficult to assess.

Ethnic issues were being taken into account through neighbourhood road safety initiatives and more work would be done on producing written material in a variety of languages. On a more strategic level, Social Inclusion, Economic Competitiveness and Modal Shift were key issues for the Transport Thematic Partnership. Projects for these needed to focus on linking people to places and employment. The current view on congestion charging was that improvements to public transport would need to take place before congestion charging could be considered in Manchester.

Resolved/-

(i) that the report be noted.

(ii) that the Transport Partnership consider further the location of sites used to measure air pollution and sources of the pollution

5. NRF/ERDF

Eamonn Boylan introduced a report on the out-turn expenditure for NRF in 2004-2005, the use of resources in 2005-2006 that were unused in 2004-2005 and proposals for the improved management of NRF resources in 2005-2006. The final out-turn expenditure showed that 96% of resources had been invested, thus meeting the target of 95% set by ODPM. The amount of resources available for carry forward into 2005-2006 was £1,065,372. Of that figure, £754,372 related to four areas of the LSP who had requested a carry forward for the reasons set out in detail in the report. Consideration had to be given to the unallocated balance and criteria for its allocation. The report also set out a number of proposals to monitor expenditure more closely in 2005-2006, including stricter monitoring processes against quarterly spend profiles with financial penalties for those failing to manage adequately their budget allocation.

Resolved/-

(a) that the out-turn figures for 2004-2005 be noted.

(b) that the carry forward requests into 2005-2006 be approved as follows:

Economic and Local Employment Partnership - £410,000

Sustainable Neighbourhoods Partnership - £50,000

Area Regeneration Teams - £191,631

Strategy Development, Monitoring and Evaluation - £102,741.

(c) that the unallocated sum of £311,407 be distributed amongst the new Innovation Improvement Fund to support the four Board priority areas, the Community Network for Manchester and the 2006 Manchester Conference.

(d) that the request from the Area Regeneration Team for increased resources and staffing not be supported, as that would represent recurrent expenditure.

(e) that the Management Group consider the detail of the distribution set out at (c) above and report to the June meeting of the Board.

(f) that the proposals for managing NRF resources in 2005-2006 set out in section 3 of the report be approved.

6. LAA/SSCF

Kath Smythe introduced a report on the current negotiations concerning the Stronger and Safer Communities Fund (SSCF) Agreement and the development of a full Local Area Agreement (LAA). The SSCF Agreement for Manchester had now been submitted to Government Office. For 2005-2006, much of the funding was already allocated. The key issue was agreeing a challenging Agreement for 2006-2007. There was also an opportunity for Manchester to submit a proposal to become an LAA pilot. In an LAA, all partners would sign up to a mutually agreed set of high level targets for the four blocks comprising an LAA: Children and young people, Safer and stronger communities, Healthier communities and older people and Economic development. Through the LAA, partners would jointly agree actions to meet these targets and the resourcing of such actions. Manchester already has an agreed set of targets in its LPSA. The focus of the LAA, therefore, would be on local benefits for the City. The LAA would represent the next level of development for the Manchester Partnership and would provide an opportunity to increase the pace of change. A proposal had been drafted, annexed to the report, and needed to be submitted to GONW by 20 May 2005. Steve Mycio supported the draft proposal and added that if successful it would enable more decisions to be made at a Partnership level. The Chair supported the proposal, subject to some adjustment concerning the references to the Children's Board on page 7 and to deprived communities on page 10.

Resolved/-

(i) that the report be noted.

(ii) that the Board endorse the submission of the draft proposal to GONW, subject to the suggested amendments concerning the Children's Board and deprived communities.

7. Places/LPSA Update

Geoff Little gave a progress report on the current negotiations for the second generation local public service agreement (LPSA2) for the City. There were a number of delays in key areas, including targets involving residents in receipt of out-of-work benefits, 16-18 year old NEETs, vacant property, cleaner environment and ASBOs.

As part of these negotiations, the City was looking to achieve Explorer Partnership status to build on the relationships developed with government departments through the City's involvement with the Places Project. The NRU had suggested that this could be taken forward through a series of task groups linked to the Priority Places Steering Group. There were some concerns, however, on the need to identify the correct person to provide external challenge and advice from outside the City and the setting up of a group that was not integrated into existing mechanisms.

A number of issues were raised in discussion, including

(a) the exclusion of Community Engagement from the process was noted; for progress to be made on this issue, individual government departments and civil servants had to be approached systematically over time and informed about local priorities; the Board could assist this process by briefing the new Minister for Communities and Local Government David Miliband, with a copy of the letter being sent to Joe Montgomery, Head of NRU.

(b) the NRU needed to be informed of the current position concerning the negotiations, especially on concerns about targets; there would be an opportunity to do this at the meeting in Manchester of the Priority Places group on 17 June 2005.

Resolved/-

(i) the current position concerning the negotiations be noted.

(ii) that the Chair of the Partnership write to the Minister for Communities and Local Government to set out the Partnership's concerns concerning local priorities and any other related issues.

(iii) that the NRU be informed of the current position concerning the negotiations at the Priority Places group meeting on 17 June 2005 and elsewhere as appropriate.

8. Quarterly Performance Report

The Quarterly Performance Report, Final Quarter 2004-2005, was submitted for consideration. The Chair requested that future reports have a consistent set of figures for Employment and Economic Inactivity, as these seemed to vary, depending on their source. He also asked that an analysis be carried of any distortion to the figures caused by high levels of student populations in some areas, such as Hulme and Ardwick.

Resolved/-

(i) that the Quarterly Performance Report be noted.

(ii) that further analysis be carried out to produce a consistent set of figures for Employment and Economic Inactivity and to take into account any distortion to the statistics caused by high student populations.

9. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

10. Schedule of Board Business

A schedule of business to be considered by the Board at their meetings in June, July and September was noted as follows:

21 June

Report back from RG/BM on Economic Inactivity Action Plan
Focus on - Culture - annual performance results inc. QoL and Residents Survey information
Local Area Agreement/Stronger and Safer Communities Fund Agreement
MCC Corporate Improvement Programme

26 July

Report back on thematic activity re: Alcohol Strategy
Focus on - CDRP annual performance results (TBC)

6 September

Report back on Youth Nuisance
Quarterly Performance report
Focus on - Housing Market Renewal
 - Community Engagement
NRF

11. Next meeting

The following was noted as the date for next meeting: 21 June 2005 8.00am to 10.00am.

MEETING OF MANCHESTER PARTNERSHIP BOARD HELD ON 17 MAY 2005

ACTION NOTE

1. Neighbourhood Focus

Action

A. Management Group identify gaps in the strategic allocation of resources to meet identified community needs; look at staff development and training in relation to an area focus across agencies; consider ways of ensuring that ward co-ordination was adequately resourced; and develop a schedule of performance indicators for sustainable neighbourhoods. (**Management Group**)

B. Partners analyse activities at ward level and how they could improve their neighbourhood focus. (**All Partners**)

C. Partners identify what information they collected that could inform the development of additional fields within the TNC fields. (**All Partners**)

D. Partner organisations operating at a very local level consider how they contributed to the bigger picture objectives. (**CN4M etc.**)

E. Thematic Partners break down their targets to neighbourhood level in next year's action plans. (**All Thematic Partners**)

F. Presentation of TNC project be made to all thematic partners. (**Thematic Partnership Convenors/Charles Jarvis**)

G. Board reconsider TNC a future meeting (**Board**)

H. Progress report to October meeting of Board (**All Partners**)

2. Minutes of meeting held on 12 April 2005

Noted.

3. Transport Thematic Partnership - Annual Performance Results

Action

A. Transport Thematic Partnership consider further location of sites to measure air pollution and the sources of pollution. (**Transport Thematic Partnership**).

4. NRF/ERDF

Action

A. Management Group consider further detail of distribution of unallocated sum and report to June meeting of Board. (**Management Group**).

5. LAA/SSCF

Action

A. Draft proposal be submitted to GONW, subject to amendment re Children's Board and deprived communities (**Kath Smythe**)

6. Places/LPSA Update

Action

A. Chair of Partnership write to Minister for Communities etc to set out concerns re local priorities and related issues. (**Chair**)

B. NRU be informed of current position concerning LPSA negotiations at Priority Places meeting on 17 June 2005 (**Steve Mycio/Geoff Little**)

7. Quarterly Performance Report

Action

A. Further analysis be carried out to produce a consistent set of figures for Employment and Economic Inactivity and to take into account student numbers in areas of the City. (**CPRIT**)

8. Next meeting

21 June 2005 8.00am to 10.00am in Room 301.