

## Wiltshire Coordinating Group

17 September 2008  
Board Room, Community First, Devizes  
2pm – 4pm

### AGENDA

1	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies</b></p>																							
2	<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting</b></p> <p>To agree the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2008 as an accurate record</p>																							
3	<p><b>Supporting the Assembly</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiltshire Assembly Conference: Friday 3 October 2008 To receive an oral update on progress from Niki Lewis</li> <li>• Sustainable Community Strategy To discuss a draft report from David Maynard setting out an approach to revising the Strategy (attached)</li> </ul>																							
4	<p><b>Update from Partnerships – Plans, Priorities, Opportunities and any Blockages</b></p> <p>Existing and prospective partnership members to report</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Children &amp; Young People’s Trust Board</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Peter Fanshawe/Jim Smith</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Community Safety Partnership</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Julian Kirby/Sue Redmond</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Environment Alliance</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Gary Mantle/Alan Feist</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">GOSW</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Stella Milsom</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Health &amp; Well-being Partnership Board</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Maggie Rae(interim)/Sue Redmond (interim)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Housing Partnership</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Graham Hogg/Andrew Reynolds</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Infrastructure Consortium</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Philippa Read (interim)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Stronger, Resilient Communities</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Margaret West (interim)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Transport Partnership</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Alan Feist (interim)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">WFCAP</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Steve Lawton/Len Turner</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">WSEP</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Caroline Lewis</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Chairman will advise the meeting concerning WCC involvement in partnership activity</p>	Children & Young People’s Trust Board	Peter Fanshawe/Jim Smith	Community Safety Partnership	Julian Kirby/Sue Redmond	Environment Alliance	Gary Mantle/Alan Feist	GOSW	Stella Milsom	Health & Well-being Partnership Board	Maggie Rae(interim)/Sue Redmond (interim)	Housing Partnership	Graham Hogg/Andrew Reynolds	Infrastructure Consortium	Philippa Read (interim)	Stronger, Resilient Communities	Margaret West (interim)	Transport Partnership	Alan Feist (interim)	WFCAP	Steve Lawton/Len Turner	WSEP	Caroline Lewis	
Children & Young People’s Trust Board	Peter Fanshawe/Jim Smith																							
Community Safety Partnership	Julian Kirby/Sue Redmond																							
Environment Alliance	Gary Mantle/Alan Feist																							
GOSW	Stella Milsom																							
Health & Well-being Partnership Board	Maggie Rae(interim)/Sue Redmond (interim)																							
Housing Partnership	Graham Hogg/Andrew Reynolds																							
Infrastructure Consortium	Philippa Read (interim)																							
Stronger, Resilient Communities	Margaret West (interim)																							
Transport Partnership	Alan Feist (interim)																							
WFCAP	Steve Lawton/Len Turner																							
WSEP	Caroline Lewis																							
5	<p><b>Community Area Partnerships</b></p> <p>To receive an oral report by Len Turner, WFCAP</p>																							

6	<p><b>Research and Evidence</b></p> <p>To receive an overview to inform thinking of partnerships, from Laurie Bell, Service Director for Policy, Research and Communications in the new Wiltshire Council.</p>	
7	<p><b>Application to the Regional Improvement &amp; Efficiency Partnership (RIEP) - development funding for the Accountable Bodies Group</b></p> <p>The Accountable Bodies Group (ABG) is the Wiltshire equivalent of a 'Local Strategic Partnership'. A draft application for regional funding to develop the ABG is attached. The views of the Co-ordinating Group on the potential use of this funding if the application is successful will be fed in to the next meeting of the ABG.</p>	
8	<p><b>Communications and Hot Topics</b></p> <p>To consider whether partnerships and partners could be working more effectively to tackle priorities</p>	
9	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>The next meeting of the WCG will be held from 10am – 12 noon on Tuesday 28 October. Offers to host this meeting would be appreciated.</p>	

### **Advice on Revising the Sustainable Community Strategy**

#### **Background**

The Co-ordinating Group commissioned a report for the Wiltshire Assembly which would set out advice on revising the Sustainable Community Strategy, so that the Strategy set out the compelling story for Wiltshire.

#### **The Context**

The current Wiltshire Strategy was agreed in September 2007, but the Government, due to local government restructuring in Wiltshire, is expecting that a revised single strategy for the County will be produced and agreed by the end of March 2011.

#### **The Process**

It is still too early to agree a definitive process for arriving at the new Strategy, as many of the key staff who will need to be involved in shaping that process are not in post, or have not been in post long enough to have given detailed consideration to this issue.

It is clear that one of the central challenges will be to integrate the debate over the revised Strategy with similar debates around the progress and integration of the four District Local Development Frameworks, and their integration of the forthcoming revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West.

Similarly, pilot state of the area debates are being planned for this autumn in selected areas. These debates are being informed by local household surveys, and by statistical profiles. Next year the lessons learned from this process will be rolled out to all areas. The results of this county-wide process will be a central resource for revising the Sustainable Community Strategy.

#### **A Broad Proposal**

It is suggested that the overall vision of strong and sustainable communities in the September 2007 Strategy, and in its somewhat abbreviated form in the LAA, is a very good start in defining what we mean by 'strong and resilient communities' but that it is not rigorous enough to inform comprehensive assessments of the County. Nor has there be widespread debate about the content of the area profiles being used in the state of the area pilot debates. Furthermore the Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) has commissioned the research section to come up with a way of comparing the comparative strength and resilience of Wiltshire's community areas. All this can only be

achieved if we can gain a shared and detailed definition of the sorts of communities we are aiming to create. This definition needs to be precise enough and constant enough, to allow us to measure progress over a number of years. This means that this definition needs to be *separate* to the measures which are used to measure progress on implementing the LAA, as the latter will change as projects change.

The attached paper aims to further this debate, and the Co-ordinating Group is asked to enter this debate. The Wiltshire Assembly Conference on 3 October will also discuss the same theme, and the messages of this conference will need to be captured and used to refine our definition.

### **Achieving Clarity on the Roles of the LSP Groups**

The most effective distribution of roles between the various elements of the new LSP structure will emerge over time. Clearly, the Assembly needs to maintain a sufficient independence to fulfil its role as an inclusive body which devises the vision for Wiltshire, and which identifies the challenges facing the County. Nevertheless, the Co-ordinating Group needs to have a major role in advising the Assembly, bringing together and integrating the various policy debates within specialist partnerships, and also responding to drafts from the Assembly.

The Accountable Bodies Group (ABG) will need to ensure that the Sustainable Community Strategy, whilst retaining its independence and challenge, does not move too far from what funders consider to be good and effective uses of public money. The Sustainable Community Strategy cannot fulfil its role if it is not broadly supported by the major funding bodies. It also needs to have political support, and the ABG is able to assist in building this political, and public sector consensus.

### **Recommendations**

The Co-ordinating Group is asked to:

1. Agree that the first stage in revising the Strategy needs to be the clarification of the basic definition of 'strong and resilient' so that it is sufficiently clear, comprehensive and understood to provide a way of assessing the County, and of measuring progress, both at the County, and the Community Area levels.
2. That the Co-ordinating Group should receive a further report on this definition with accompanying measures/indicators at a future meeting in spring 2009
3. That a more detailed report on the process and timetable for revising the Strategy up to March 2011 is produced once the new Wiltshire Council is up and running.

---

Report writer: David Maynard

## Draft paper for Wiltshire Assembly

### How do we form a single vision for Strong and Resilient Communities from the differing and often competing concepts of Quality of Life, Life Satisfaction/Happiness/Well-being, Sustainability, Cohesion, Social Inclusion, and Equalities?

#### Introduction

The debate about what sort of a society, economy, and environment we want draws on a number of often competing concepts including quality of life, life satisfaction/happiness/well-being, sustainability, cohesion, social inclusion and equalities. In seeking to define what 'strong and resilient communities' might look like in Wiltshire we need to understand and integrate these concepts.

#### What factors do these concepts share in common?

An analysis of the factors which are associated with each concept has been undertaken. This analysis cannot be definitive as each of these concepts is dynamic, and measures and indicators are being continually added and modified as research and debate continue. Nevertheless, the following factors can be seen as a '**common core**' uniting all of these concepts.

#### Economic

1. **employment** is key. The damaging and wide-ranging effects of unemployment underline this. (The concept of cohesion does not so obviously highlight the importance of employment, but does underline that disadvantage is often associated with a drop in cohesion).
2. **an adequate income**. The damaging effects of poverty underline the importance of this. Marked income inequality is also associated with a wide range of negative personal and societal impacts.

#### Education and Skills

3. **improving skill levels**. In particular the achievement of a **degree** is mentioned in Life Satisfaction measures, where it is its association with higher incomes and wider social networks which are thought to contribute to personal happiness, rather than the education per se. It is also cited in Cohesion studies, where people with degrees (and higher professional and managerial occupational status) often have a more positive view of cohesion in their area, than people with lower attainment levels (and more routine or low skilled employment).
4. **school absences and exclusions, educational underachievement, NEET's (young people not in education, employment or training), and having poor adult skills levels** are regularly seen to be

damaging, especially within Quality of Life, and Social Inclusion analyses.

### **Crime and Community Safety**

- 5. high crime levels, and feeling unsafe (especially after dark)**

### **Housing and the Built Environment**

- 6. clean and green public spaces** are commonly cited as of importance, as are the negative impacts of litter and detritus, including dog mess, and building dereliction or poor maintenance
- 7. the availability of affordable, decent housing, that is well-designed and locally distinctive**

### **Culture and Sport**

- 8. reasonable access to a range of affordable sport and leisure facilities and activities**
- 9. undertaking regular and varied physical activity.** This seems to be key for all concepts except Cohesion.

### **Transport**

- 10. good access for all to essential public (eg. schools, hospitals, housing, GP surgeries) and private (eg. food shopping, utilities) goods and services.** This involves such things as location of these services, availability of public transport, safe and pleasant walking and cycling routes, affordability of services, access to private transport, etc.

### **Health and Social Care**

- 11. having a limiting long-term illness, and having a disability** have negative impacts under each of these concepts
- 12. mental health.** Poor mental health has negative impacts across several of these concepts. It is not explicitly mentioned under quality of life, or cohesion, but may be picked up as a limiting long-term illness, which is mentioned.
- 13. high life expectancy.** Life expectancy is reduced if the positive features associated with these concepts are not present. Older people in general tend to be happier, and see their communities as being more cohesive.

### **Governance**

- 14. direct democracy.** The ability to influence local decisions. This sense of empowerment seems to have general applicability to a variety of circumstances, eg the family, the workplace, local governance, etc. where being listened to, having ones opinion respected, and feeling that you have made a difference contribute to a sense of belonging, and of control over the circumstances in which we lead our lives.
- 15. trust in local institutions,** that they are open and fair

**16. good quality, and well-administered services, which people are satisfied with**

**Society/Community**

**17. strong, stable and positive family relationships**

**18. formal volunteering, and level of membership of voluntary and community groups and associations**

**19. level of trust in others**

As can be seen, even from this list of features, there are complex relationships of cause and effect between many of them. Also, it needs to be noted that each concept frames itself in different terms, and uses a somewhat different vocabulary. This makes the strict comparison of these concepts a less than exact science.

**What can be said about the differences between these concepts?**

**Sustainability** (as reflected in the SW Sustainability Framework and the UK sustainable development framework indicators). This concept is the most comprehensive of all the concepts under discussion. The SW Sustainability Framework continues the emphasis of Agenda 21, and emphasises promoting social justice, tackling inequality/social exclusion, promoting physical and mental health, fostering local distinctiveness and diversity, and encouraging open and inclusive public decision-making.

The definition of matters which contribute to creating sustainable communities, as set out in the Schedule to the Sustainable Communities Act 2007, particularly emphasises local solutions, eg. goods and services produced within 30 miles (or some lesser distance) of the local authority boundary. This emphasis is fine as a rule of thumb, but must not be accepted uncritically, as for instance, tomatoes grown under glass in this country during our winter months create more CO<sub>2</sub> than tomatoes grown outdoors in warmer parts of the world and then transported here.

What the SW Framework does add to the general summary of common features above, is an emphasis on promoting low carbon solutions (to transport, to the development of local economies eg. buy local, develop environmental technologies, etc.), and more generally be resource efficient in terms of use of energy, water, and minimisation of waste ie. living within environmental limits. There is a bigger awareness that we need to live locally in a way that avoids disadvantaging not only future generations, but also others living elsewhere in the world today, for instance by purchasing ethically produced goods. The Framework is a prompt to action, and does not concern itself overly with issues of measurement and monitoring. This is tackled by the SW Observatory's environmental module, but the links between this and the SW Framework are not that explicit.

The UK sustainable development framework indicators from 'Securing the Future' (2005) are most closely associated with the Audit Commission's Area Profiles **Local Quality of Life Indicators** by the inclusion of such *specific*

factors as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), educational attainment (19 year olds with level 2 qualifications), life expectancy, pensioner poverty, crime rates, and importantly environmental measures, and so on. As a thumbnail sketch of some key aspects of local life, many of which demonstrably relate to local public concerns, the Audit Commission's set of local indicators has many strengths, and should be built on through the addition of factors from some of the other concepts. For instance, there are no measures relating to the stability of marriages and families, or of the level of involvement of people in local community and voluntary organisations eg. through volunteering, or of the mental health of the population, or even with people's satisfaction with their employment.

The problem with sustainability as a concept is that it is really an amalgam of several more specific concepts like social inclusion, and resource efficiency, but the full integration of these concepts is unclear and incomplete. For instance, the SW Framework does not offer a radical vision of a comprehensive sustainable economy; rather it is particularly concerned with progressively introducing resource efficiency and low carbon thinking (ie. environmental limits) into the way that more and more businesses work and plan.

It is probably fair to say that 'environmental sustainability' is the most developed facet of this concept, partly because it lends itself to quantification and scientific enquiry. 'Social sustainability' has a long history of debate and theorising, but because it has to deal with such contentious issues as the distribution of power, social justice, and the extent to which inequality is the product of structural or personal factors, there is less consensus. As for 'economic sustainability', this is almost a contradiction in terms, as even experts are regularly taken by surprise, and fail to predict major events. The concept of 'environmental limits' to economic activity is intelligible, but in practice hard to enforce either nationally (as each firm will make its own decisions about suppliers and sourcing of materials) or globally, as the example of China's unstoppable acquisition of resources around the world shows.

Nevertheless, the *comprehensiveness* of the concept is its strength, and any concept which does not include promoting the health of the biosphere as an integral part of its vision is fundamentally flawed. No other concept has the potential and range of 'sustainability'.

### **Life Satisfaction**

The concept of life satisfaction or happiness offers the best opportunity to integrate subjective and objective factors that promote personal well-being. Many of the factors which are identified in the literature make good intuitive sense, for instance the centrality of the quality of our personal relationships with our partners, our families, and our circle of friends in influencing how happy we are, and the importance of making time to enjoy such relationships. The fundamental importance of forming secure attachments in infancy is underlined. Interestingly, the only other concept which looks at such issues as

the stability (or lack of it) of families, and the strength and range of social networks, is social inclusion, and even then there is not the emphasis on such things as maintaining stable marriages, which is a key finding of the happiness literature.

Life Satisfaction as a concept has the capacity to include an eclectic mix of factors, ranging from the importance of sunlight and the beneficial effects of being able to see trees and green space from offices, hospitals and private homes, to more internal factors like the need to regularly experiencing absorption in activities or 'flow'. The concept emphasises the human need to be outward focussed, to care for and about others (but full time caring, interestingly, damages happiness), to contribute to society by becoming involved in aims that are wider than yourself eg. through volunteering, through participating in local decision-making, and by going to church regularly.

There are also some fairly non-contentious claims that to be happy one needs to cultivate gratitude and thankfulness, to live in and savour the present, to be optimistic and future focussed, to set goals which are challenging but achievable, to ensure that one has a degree of autonomy and scope for creativity at work, to avoid over thinking and social comparison, to develop coping strategies for emotional hurts and stressful situations, to put things in a wider context to gain perspective, to cultivate humour and playfulness, to free oneself from excessive materialism, and even to smile and laugh a lot.

As can be seen from some of these factors such as volunteering, cultivating wide circles of friends and social contacts, participating in local decision-making, the positive effects of church attendance, etc. the concept of Life Satisfaction has some overlap with the notion of *social capital*.

Of all the concepts under discussion, this gives the richest account of what it feels like to live a full and satisfying life. It also provides a challenge to some more limited concepts of economic progress, where growth in GDP is considered as a goal in itself, regardless of its impact on personal relationships and family life. It is noteworthy that Life Satisfaction does not make any profound connection with the concept of environmental sustainability, beyond such factors as the need for clean and green surroundings. It may also be considered by some to be politically regressive as it claims that only 40% of our happiness is within our power to do something about. It also promotes a philosophy a major strand of which is about adopting a more positive attitude towards our present circumstances, rather than changing those circumstances. Nevertheless, there is also the strand which emphasises the need to help others, and get involved in wider goals.

Life Satisfaction or happiness appears to offer a more inclusive and experientially-based concept of social sustainability than either social inclusion or cohesion alone, and perhaps these latter two concepts should over time be incorporated into a more robust Life Satisfaction concept.

## **Cohesion**

This concept is continually developing as the nature of the associated issue changes. At one time the issue was of how to assimilate new ethnic minority migrants into settled UK communities. This changed into a vision of how these settled and new migrant communities can adapt to each other in a positive way. There is now a move to see cohesion as involving the whole community and its various groups (of which ethnic minority communities are only one part) and how well they get along together. The DCLG study 'Predictors of Community Cohesion: multi-level modelling of the 2005 Citizenship Survey' (Feb 2008) provides a fascinating insight into the factors which correlate with community cohesion. Many of the factors that predict cohesion would also predict life satisfaction, for example, increasing income, a degree, higher level professional and managerial employment, older ages, formal volunteering, perceptions on the willingness of people to help their neighbours, extent to which people would pull together to improve their neighbourhood, increasing trust in local people, having friends from different ethnic backgrounds, and feeling able to influence local decisions. The negative factors associated with a lowering of the perception of cohesion include high crime, feeling unsafe (especially after dark), limiting long-term illness or disability, and living in a deprived area. Many of these are similar or the same as the factors associated with social inclusion and life satisfaction, suggesting that the issue of ethnic minority migration is often powerfully overlaid over the issues to do with *already* deprived areas.

There were, as one would expect, some distinctive findings related with ethnic minority communities. It was found that the mix of communities into which new migrants came was a critical factor in how well the communities got on. Some very diverse areas accepted new migrants positively, others did not. Much depended on local history and circumstances. Unsurprisingly, areas that had not seen many migrants before, often had difficulty adjusting, and community cohesion dropped as a result. Again, unsurprisingly, where people feared racist attacks, there was less cohesion. Another finding related to fair treatment by local services. Cohesion was lowered for ethnic minority communities if they felt they would be treated unfairly because of their race in gaining access to services, eg. housing. There is also evidence to show that cohesion can be damaged if people within the settled community perceive that new migrants are getting preferential, as opposed to equal treatment with respect to access to local services.

Cohesion as a concept appears to be an answer to a particular issue. As this issue becomes defined more broadly as "how do all communities get on positively together", then it moves to being something of a subset of the Life Satisfaction/Social Capital, and the Social Inclusion concepts.

## **Social Inclusion**

The concept of social inclusion occupied a central place in the Labour Government's thinking following the 1997 election. It catalogues a wide range of factors which stand in the way of certain people's capacity to fully

participate in mainstream society. Low incomes and poverty are key underlying factors, as is the related state of, particularly long-term, unemployment. Other factors include truancy and school exclusion, NEET's, educational underachievement and poor levels of adult skills, drug and alcohol abuse, homelessness and sleeping rough, poor and overcrowded housing, lack of access to affordable public transport and to good quality public and private services, poor leisure facilities, teenage pregnancy, poor health, looked after children, disabled people, lone parents, poor social networks beyond the immediate family, rising inequality and falling social mobility, poor maintenance of the built environment and public spaces, etc.

As can be seen from this long list of factors which disadvantage people's life chances there is a lack of underlying theory to identify what is cause and what is effect, what is a risk factor and what is an outcome. The paper produced by Bristol University 'A Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Social Exclusion' (January 2007) attempted to express the causal relationships and the direction of causation in a diagram on page 119.

Capitalism creates inequality, as by definition, not all can succeed. The concept of social inclusion holds within it many tensions. For instance, how much of this inequality is due to structural factors, and how much down to lack of personal effort and commitment. Is it a question of giving equal opportunity to all, but then what do you do with those who do not take that opportunity but are still clearly in need? The answer to this question is highly political, and is linked with attitudes of government towards redistribution, and welfare. There are also strong generational patterns which make initiatives to tackle social exclusion very challenging.

## **Equalities**

There has been a shift in recent years away from the narrower concept of equalities as involving the combating of prejudice and discrimination through the creation of legal rights and protection. This approach has progressively been seen as an important part of the wider project of creating an equal society. In the final report of the Equalities Review 'Fairness and Freedom' (Feb 2007) the following broader definition is offered: 'An equal society protects and promotes equal, real freedom and substantive opportunity to live in the ways people value and would choose, so that everyone can flourish. An equal society recognises people's different needs, situations and goals, and removes the barriers that limit what people can do and be'.

The review produced a suggested Equalities Scorecard to measure progress on achieving equality. The Scorecard is based on 10 freedoms (or "capabilities") which were derived from international human rights legislation, and from consultation with the general public, including groups at high risk of disadvantage. The high level Scorecard is given below, but the full list is included at **Appendix 1** to this report. As can be seen from the fuller definition in the Appendix, a number of concepts have informed this definition, but that 'social inclusion' and 'well-being/happiness' have been particularly influential.

The 10 dimensions of equality	
Longevity	including avoiding premature mortality
Physical security	including freedom from violence and physical and sexual abuse
Health	including both well-being and access to high quality healthcare
Education	including both being able to be creative, to acquire skills and qualifications and having access to training and life-long learning
Standard of living	including being able to live with independence and security; and covering nutrition, clothing, housing, warmth, utilities, social services and transport
Productive and valued activities	such as access to employment, a positive experience in the workplace, work/life balance, and being able to care for others
Individual, family and social life	including self-development, having independence and equality in relationships and marriage
Participation, influence and voice	including participation in decision-making and democratic life
Identity, expression and self-respect	including freedom of belief and religion
Legal security	including equality and non-discrimination before the law and equal treatment within the criminal justice system

As the report pointed out 'critically, these ten dimensions are not just about individual wealth, access, or achievement. They recognise that we do not live in isolation from families, neighbourhoods or communities. Equalities between men and women in relation to work-life balance, or of ethnic minority communities' participation in democratic life, are not just purely functions of individual will or skill. They depend on the degree to which the whole society prioritises family relations and makes them possible, or provides flexible working, or opens the political process for everyone. This is what we mean by equality in the round' p21

This broader definition of equality is clearly a higher level concept than all the other concepts examined in this paper, with the exception of 'sustainability', and possibly, 'quality of life'. It holds out the prospect that it can become the key overarching approach to what can be called 'social sustainability' as it encompasses social inclusion, social cohesion, and also 'social capital'. There is also a strong research and analytical basis to the concept provided by such books as Richard G. Wilkinson's 'Unhealthy Societies – the afflictions of inequality' in which he demonstrates the positive effects of greater equality, and the pervasive negative impacts of inequality on such aspects as health, crime levels, social and family relationships, and longevity.

The relationship with 'well-being/happiness' is more complex. For instance, if we take a hypothetical example of a situation where 75% of the working age population are in employment, but where there is one particular section of the population that is only 50% employed. Equalities thinking may say that we should look at the barriers to employment that the 50% employed group face, and set about removing them, so that eventually they can achieve 75% employment. Well-being thinking may be more inclined to say that "yes", employment is an important factor in promoting well-being, but that there are advantages to family life, caring, volunteering, health, etc. of not promoting full employment. It is possible that the concept of well-being could provide a challenge and a stimulus to equalities thinking to be more explicit about the trade-off between different aspects of equalities.

It must also be remembered that the Equalities Scorecard is intended as a generic list of capabilities which are related to a range of societal, economic, and cultural conditions and factors which go much wider than indicators which focus on particular service impacts. For this reason it is hard to compare the equalities list with more specific indicators, eg. local Quality of Life indicators. This issue should begin to resolve itself once specific bundles of indicators are identified for each of these equalities capabilities.

### **The Way Ahead**

This review of concepts has begun to indicate a way forward. It is recommended that the overarching concept of 'sustainability' is adopted as the main framework. Within this concept the concept of 'environmental sustainability' is well understood, and in most cases lends itself to scientific and quantifiable study.

The notion of 'economic sustainability' is less clear. Economies are by their very nature unpredictable, and changeable, despite the best efforts of Governments and others to create stable conditions for long-term investment (eg. low and stable inflation, and interest rates). There is also no consensus as yet about whether such events as climate change merely 'set limits' to economic growth, or require a more fundamental reshaping of our economy and its aims and products. In this 'well-being' evidence provides another dimension suggesting that an economy must begin to think not just able generating sufficient jobs, but jobs which are satisfying and fulfilling, which allow creativity and some degree of personal autonomy and control, which allow a healthy work-life balance, etc.

The concept of 'social sustainability' is the most complex of the three. It is suggested that in order to begin to make sense of this concept that the concept of equality (as expressed in the Equalities scorecard) is taken as the overarching concept. It is informed and challenged by the next most comprehensive concept, namely 'well-being/happiness'.

Other concepts appear to become more specific and limited in their scope, as one moves from 'social inclusion' to 'community cohesion' to 'social capital'. This suggested hierarchy of concepts hopefully begins to show the way by

which these concepts can be in future integrated into a single concept of 'social sustainability'.

### Some Tentative Conclusions

- that there needs to be more work done to integrate the various concepts under discussion in this paper
- that more work needs to be done to sort out the causal interrelationships between factors, so it becomes clearer what is cause and what is effect, what is a risk factor and what is an outcome, etc.
- that there are certain features of each concept that might be the basis for unifying these concepts eg. the fundamental importance of *supportive personal relationships*; the notion that people want to have some *control and autonomy* over their work, their immediate environment, their place in their families, local decisions, etc; that people need projects which *contribute to wider aims* not just forward their personal needs; that employment and an adequate income are basic to nearly all other aims, etc.
- a final observation which is not so far demonstrated in this paper, is that the definition of 'sustainable communities' agreed as part of the EU Bristol Accord (see **Appendix 2**) does capture surprisingly well the range of factors cited by the various concepts that have been reviewed in this paper, and could provide a focus for further integrating these concepts.

DM  
15<sup>th</sup> September 08

# Appendix 1

## Extract from the Equalities Review report – Fairness and Freedom (Feb 2007)

### What does the framework measure?

The first step in building the framework is to identify the various substantive freedoms, activities and aspects of well-being that our society considers important for everyone. The Review accepts CASE's recommendation that assessment of inequality in our society today should be based on the following list of central and valuable freedoms (or 'capabilities'). These are the things members of our society feel it is most important they are *enabled* to do.

### List of central and valuable capabilities for adults

#### The capability to be alive

including, for example, being able to:

- avoid premature mortality through disease, neglect, injury or suicide
- be protected from arbitrary denial of life

#### The capability to live in physical security

including, for example, being able to:

- be free from violence including sexual, domestic and identity-based violence
- be free from cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
- be protected from physical or sexual abuse
- go out, and to use public spaces safely and securely, without fear

#### The capability to be healthy

including, for example, being able to:

- attain the highest possible standard of physical and mental health, including sexual and reproductive health
- access timely and impartial information about health and healthcare options
- access healthcare, including non-discrimination in access to healthcare
- be treated medically, or subject to experiment, only with informed consent
- maintain a healthy lifestyle including exercise and nutrition
- live in a healthy and safe environment including clean air, clean water, and freedom from pollution and other hazards

#### The capability to be knowledgeable, to understand and reason, and to have the skills to participate in society

including, for example, being able to:

- attain the highest possible standard of knowledge, understanding and reasoning

- be creative
- be fulfilled intellectually
- develop the skills for participation in productive and valued activities, including parenting
- learn about a range of cultures and beliefs and acquire the skills to participate in a multicultural society
- access education, training and lifelong learning that meets individual needs
- access information and technology necessary to participate in society

**The capability to enjoy a comfortable standard of living, with independence and security**

including, for example, being able to:

- enjoy an adequate and secure standard of living including nutrition, clothing, housing, warmth, social security, social services and utilities
- have personal mobility, and access to transport and public places
- live with independence, dignity and self-respect
- have choice and control over where and how you live
- enjoy your home in peace and security
- access green spaces and the natural world
- share in the benefits of scientific progress including information and technology

**The capability to engage in productive and valued activities**

including, for example, being able to:

- undertake paid work
- care for others
- have rest, leisure and respite, including holidays
- choose a balance between paid work, care and leisure on an equal basis with others
- work in just and favourable conditions, including health and safety, fair treatment during pregnancy and maternity, and fair remuneration
- not be forced to work in a particular occupation or without pay
- not be prevented from working in a particular occupation without good reason

**The capability to enjoy individual, family and social life**

including, for example, being able to:

- develop as a person
- develop your moral outlook and other beliefs
- formulate and pursue goals and objectives for yourself
- hope for the future
- develop and maintain self-respect, self-esteem and self-confidence
- have a private life, including protection of personal data
- access emotional support
- form intimate relationships, friendships and a family
- celebrate on special occasions
- be confident that your primary relationships will be treated with dignity and respect
- spend time with, and care for, others

- enjoy independence and equality in primary relationships including marriage
- be free in matters of reproduction
- enjoy special support during pregnancy and maternity, and during childhood

**The capability to participate in decision-making, have a voice and influence**

including, for example, being able to:

- participate in decision-making
- participate in the formulation of government policy, locally and nationally
- participate in non-governmental organisations concerned with public and political life
- participate in democratic free and fair elections
- assemble peacefully with others
- participate in the local community
- form and join civil organisations and solidarity groups, including trade unions

**The capability of being and expressing yourself, and having self-respect**

including, for example, being able to:

- have freedom of conscience, belief and religion
- have freedom of cultural identity
- have freedom of expression (so long as it doesn't cause significant harm to others)
- communicate, including using ICT, and use your own language
- engage in cultural practices, in community with other members of your chosen group or groups (so long as it doesn't cause significant harm to others)
- have self-respect
- live without fear of humiliation, harassment, or identity-based abuse
- be confident that you will be treated with dignity and respect
- access and use public spaces freely

**The capability of knowing you will be protected and treated fairly by the law**

including, for example, being able to:

- know you will be treated with equality and non-discrimination before the law
- be secure that the law will protect you from intolerant behaviour
- be free from arbitrary arrest and detention
- have fair conditions of detention
- have the right to a fair trial
- access information and advocacy as necessary
- have freedom of movement, and be free to choose where you live
- have the right to name and nationality
- own property and financial products including insurance, social security, and pensions in your own right
- know your privacy will be respected and personal data protected

- This list has been developed in two steps:
- first, a core list was derived from the international human rights framework, and
- second, the list was refined and supplemented through consultation with the general public and individuals and groups at high risk of disadvantage.

The Review accepts that the list should be open to revision through a range of methodologies. In particular, we recommend that Government, together with the CEHR, regularly reviews and updates the list. Public consultation will remain essential to the updating of the list, so that it reflects society's changing concerns. It may be appropriate to review the core list, as well as the other elements.

The Review also accepts CASE's recommendation that a different list of freedoms for children be adopted. However, we believe that more extensive consultation with children needs to be carried out before a final list is proposed. Consideration also needs to be given to how this relates to existing frameworks, including the Every Child Matters framework.

## Appendix 2

### THE “BRISTOL ACCORD”, DECEMBER 2005

#### Part I: Characteristics of a Sustainable Community

**Definition:** Sustainable communities are places where people want to live and work, now and in the future. They meet the diverse needs of existing and future residents, are sensitive to their environment, and contribute to a high quality of life. They are safe and inclusive, well planned, built and run, and offer equality of opportunity and good services for all. There are a number of key pre-requisites for the aim of creating genuinely sustainable communities across Europe. These are:

- i. **Economic growth** is of central importance. Without economic growth, EU Member States are unable to invest in the creation and maintenance of sustainable communities.
- ii. The integrated Sustainable Communities approach grows directly out of Europe's unique tradition of **social inclusion and social justice**.
- iii. The **role of cities** is key to success. Successful cities with strong cultural identities deliver sustainable communities beyond their limits – regionally, nationally and even internationally. And achieving the goals of Lisbon will require Europe's cities to be places of international excellence that allow the knowledge economy to thrive.
- iv. Sustainable communities are ones that **respond to the challenge of social segregation** at all levels, including neighbourhoods.
- v. Sustainable communities also embody the principles of **sustainable development**. They balance and integrate the social, economic and environmental challenges and meet the needs of existing and future generations.
- vi. Recognition that sustainable communities can exist at **different spatial levels**: neighbourhood, local, city, regional.

**Sustainable communities are diverse, reflecting their local circumstances. There is no standard template to fit them all. But they should be:**

- (1) **ACTIVE, INCLUSIVE AND SAFE** – Fair, tolerant and cohesive with a strong local culture and other shared community activities
- (2) **WELL RUN** – with effective and inclusive participation, representation and Leadership
- (3) **WELL CONNECTED** – with good transport services and communication linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services
- (4) **WELL SERVED** – with public, private, community and voluntary services that are appropriate to people's needs and accessible to all
- (5) **ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE** – providing places for people to live that are considerate of the environment

(6) **THRIVING** – with a flourishing, diverse and innovative local economy

(7) **WELL DESIGNED AND BUILT** – featuring quality built and natural environment

(8) **FAIR FOR EVERYONE** – including those in other communities, now and in the Future

## Annex 1

### Eight Characteristics of a Sustainable Community

#### **(1) ACTIVE, INCLUSIVE AND SAFE – FAIR, TOLERANT AND COHESIVE WITH A STRONG LOCAL CULTURE AND OTHER SHARED COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES**

Sustainable communities offer:

- a sense of community and cultural identity, and belonging
- tolerance, respect and engagement with people from different cultures, background and beliefs
- friendly, co-operative and helpful behaviour in neighbourhoods
- opportunities for cultural, leisure, community, sport and other activities, including for children and young people
- low levels of crime, drugs and antisocial behaviour with visible, effective and community-friendly policing
- social inclusion, equality of opportunity and good life chances for all

#### **(2) WELL RUN – WITH EFFECTIVE AND INCLUSIVE PARTICIPATION, REPRESENTATION AND LEADERSHIP**

Sustainable communities enjoy:

- representative, accountable governance systems which both facilitate strategic, visionary leadership and enable inclusive, active and effective participation by individuals and organisations
- effective engagement with the community at neighbourhood level, including capacity building to develop the community's skills, knowledge and confidence
- strong, informed and effective partnerships that lead by example (e.g. government, business, community)
- strong, inclusive, community and voluntary sector
- sense of civic values, responsibility and pride

#### **(3) WELL CONNECTED – WITH GOOD TRANSPORT SERVICES AND COMMUNICATION LINKING PEOPLE TO JOBS, SCHOOLS, HEALTH AND OTHER SERVICES**

Sustainable communities offer:

- transport facilities, including public transport, that help people travel within and between communities and reduce dependence on cars
- facilities to encourage safe local walking and cycling
- an appropriate level of local parking facilities in line with local plans to

manage road traffic demand

- widely available and effective telecommunications and Internet access
- good access to regional, national and international communications networks

#### **(4) WELL SERVED – WITH PUBLIC, PRIVATE, COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY SERVICES THAT ARE APPROPRIATE TO PEOPLE’S NEEDS AND ACCESSIBLE TO ALL**

Sustainable communities have:

- well-performing local schools, further and higher education institutions, and other opportunities for lifelong learning
- high quality local health care and social services, integrated where possible with other services
- high quality services for families and children (including early year’s child care)
- good range of affordable public, community, voluntary and private services (e.g. retail, fresh food, commercial, utilities, information and advice) which are accessible to the whole community
- service providers who think and act long-term and beyond their own immediate geographical and interest boundaries, and who involve users and local residents in shaping their policy and practice

#### **(5) ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE – PROVIDING PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO LIVE THAT ARE CONSIDERATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT**

Sustainable communities:

- provide places for people to live that respect the environment and use resources efficiently
- actively seek to minimise climate change, including through energy efficiency and the use of renewables
- protect the environment, by minimising pollution on land, in water and in the air
- minimise waste and dispose of it in accordance with current good practice
- make efficient use of natural resources, encouraging sustainable production and consumption
- protect and improve bio-diversity (e.g. wildlife habitats)
- enable a lifestyle that minimises negative environmental impact and enhances positive impacts (e.g. by creating opportunities for walking and cycling, and reducing noise pollution and dependence on cars)
- create cleaner, safer and greener neighbourhoods (e.g. by reducing litter and graffiti, and maintaining pleasant public spaces)

#### **(6) THRIVING – WITH A FLOURISHING, DIVERSE AND INNOVATIVE LOCAL ECONOMY**

Sustainable communities feature:

- a wide range of good quality jobs and training opportunities
- sufficient suitable land and buildings to support economic prosperity and change

- dynamic job and business creation, with benefits for the local community
- a strong business community with links into the wider economy
- economically viable and attractive town centres

## **(7) WELL DESIGNED AND BUILT – FEATURING QUALITY BUILT AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

Sustainable communities offer:

- sense of place – a place with a positive ‘feeling’ for people and local distinctiveness
- user-friendly public and green spaces with facilities for everyone including children and older people
- sufficient range, diversity, affordability and accessibility of housing within a balanced housing market
- appropriate size, scale, density, design and layout, including mixed-use development, that complement the distinctive local character of the community
- high quality, mixed-use, durable, flexible and adaptable buildings, using materials which minimise negative environmental impacts
- buildings and public spaces which promote health and are designed to reduce crime and make people feel safe
- buildings, facilities and services that mean they are well prepared against disasters – both natural and man-made
- accessibility of jobs, key services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling

## **(8) FAIR FOR EVERYONE – INCLUDING THOSE IN OTHER COMMUNITIES, NOW AND IN THE FUTURE**

Sustainable communities:

- recognise individuals’ rights and responsibilities
- respect the rights and aspirations of others (both neighbouring communities, and across the wider world) also to be sustainable
- have due regard for the needs of future generations in current decisions and actions.

UK Presidency: EU Ministerial Informal on Sustainable Communities: Policy Papers

### **Community Area Partnerships**

To summarize where we currently stand:

1. Earlier this year, Jim Lynch an independent consultant, conducted a review of each of the existing CAPs in Wiltshire, and his findings are currently being considered by the individual CAPs.
2. CAPs have until the end of this month to submit any responses they may wish to make. All responses will be considered by the WFCAP Steering Group at its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October.
3. During the Autumn Jim Lynch will be available to CAPs to help plan their development.
4. Work is also to commence in the next few weeks on the development of a set of minimum operating standards for CAPs. A draft proposal will be circulated to CAPs before the end of November.
5. It is intended that the minimum operating standard will be adopted at the WFCAP AGM scheduled for January/February 2009.
6. Following the resignation of Nicki Coyne WFCAP's Development Officer, we are currently in the process of recruiting a WFCAP Manager (part-time) and a Partnership Development Officer (part-time).
7. WFCAP is now working more closely with Community First to co-ordinate the limited resources available to support CAPs, to avoid duplication and help ensure that efforts are directed to meeting the greatest need.
8. WFCAP is attempting to provide support for the establishment of CAPs in those areas where previously they have not existed.
9. WFCAP is supporting the setting-up of Area Boards and will work to help achieve effective co-operation between Boards and Partnerships across the County.
10. WFCAP is playing a full part in the newly-formed South West Market & Coastal Towns Network (MCTN). MCTN is funded by SWERDA for three years and is the umbrella organisation jointly-operated by the 6 countywide fora of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Gloucestershire, Somerset and Wiltshire.

**Len Turner**  
**Economic Partnership Manager**  
**West Wiltshire Economic Partnership**  
**Tel: 01225 355553**  
**email: len@wessexchambers.org.uk**



---

## LSP Stock-Take v1.0

### August 2008

---

#### Purpose

The purpose of this self-assessed stock-take is

- to enable each LSP to identify its own areas for improvement
- to allow the SW RIEP to get a region-wide view of the LSPs' strengths and areas for improvement so as to identify the most appropriate regional support programmes.
- To validate the distribution of £20k grant to each LSP.

#### Method

- The stock-take is conducted via a self-assessment template and questionnaire (below).
  - Responses will be collated by the SW RIEP. Individual responses and scores will be seen by GOSW and RIEP officers running the SW RIEP's *Support to LAAs and MAAs* workstream, but will not be published, nor shared with other LSPs without permission.
  - Please return completed self-assessments **by 30-Sep-08** to **Ann Penwell** at the SW RIEP [a.penwell@dorsetcc.gov.uk](mailto:a.penwell@dorsetcc.gov.uk), cc-ing **Jayne Erskine** at GOSW [jayne.erskine@gosw.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:jayne.erskine@gosw.gsi.gov.uk)
- 

## SECTION A: Introductory statement

### The LSP's keys strengths and areas for development

*It is suggested that you write this after you have completed the rest of the stock-take*

## SECTION B: Assessment Tool

The questionnaire below is largely based on CLG's *Partnership Assessment Tool*\* with some questions removed and additional questions drawn from Gloucestershire's draft *CAA Stock-take Tool* and GOWM's *LAA Performance Management Assessment Tool*.

- It is important that a representation of responses from across each partnership is obtained (as opposed to one individual responding on behalf of the partnership).
- This can be achieved either through a workshop session at which partnership reps agree moderated scores, or by issuing the questionnaire to partnership representatives for completion and return to a partnership coordinator who collates average scores.
- The moderated or average scores for each LSP are returned to the SW RIEP in the boxes below
- *It may be that, for the purposes of meeting the SW RIEP's 30-Sep-08 deadline, only one individual will respond, but you are urged to deploy the Section B questionnaire more widely when you can.*

\* Assessing Strategic Partnership: The Partnership Assessment Tool, ODPM. Crown copyright 2003

**Please score all statements as follows:  
4=Strongly Agree; 3=Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree**

### 1. Understand Local Needs

		Score
1a	There is a joined-up approach to developing and using local intelligence at a strategic level to derive a shared evidence base to support targets and delivery	3
1b	The partnership has a sound understanding of the present and future needs of its communities	3
1c	The needs of hard-to-reach groups are recognised and understood	2

**Comment:**

### 2. Develop Clarity & Realism of Purpose

2a	The partnership successfully reconciles and arbitrates between competing priorities	3
2b	The SCS expresses a clear vision, shared values, and agreed outcomes beyond the immediate LAA [ <a href="#">the Local Agreement for Wiltshire does this</a> ]	4
2c	There is clear alignment between the SCS aims and meaningful LAA targets whose achievement will contribute to the delivery those aims	3
2d	The reason why each partner is engaged in the partnership is understood and accepted	3
2e	There is a clear 'golden thread' linking the disparate strategies, agreements and plans	3

**Comment:** The Local Agreement for Wiltshire supports the SCS, and provides clear ambitions and action, linking to Thematic Delivery Partnerships and partners.

### 3. Ensure commitment and ownership

3a	There is clear commitment to partnership working from most senior levels of each partnership organisation	4
3b	Commitment to partnership working is sufficiently robust to withstand most threats to its working	3
3c	There is evidence of individual partners committing / re-assigning resources to deliver partnership outcomes	4
3d	Partnership outcomes are embedded in individual partners' service plans	3
3e	Partners accept shared accountability for success or failure	3
3f	There is clarity about the roles and responsibilities of Duty to Cooperate 'named partners'	2

**Comment:** The difference that will be made by duty to cooperate partners not yet actively involved is unclear.

### 4. Develop and maintain trust

4a	Levels of trust within the partnership are high enough to encourage delegation between partners	3
4b	Commitment to partnership working is sufficiently robust to withstand most threats to its working	3
4c	Partners support and challenge each other	3
4d	The partnership has a track record of joint activity, and/or joint strategic commissioning, successfully delivering improvement outcomes and/or efficiencies	3

**Comment:** The new family of partnerships has just been formed – the answer to 4b is based on working between many of the partners, eg on LPSA and the first LAA. 4b repeats 3b.

### 5. Create clear and robust partnership arrangements

5a	It is clear what financial resources each partner brings to the partnership	2
5b	The non-financial resources that each partner brings to the partnership are understood and appreciated	3
5c	Lines of accountability and responsibility for the partnership are clear and understood	3
5d	Partnership arrangements distinguish between 'strategic planning' and 'delivery' roles.	4
5e	Operational partnership arrangement are simple, time-limited and task-orientated	3
5f	The partnership's principal focus is on delivering outcomes for its communities.	3
5g	Thematic partnerships underpin and support the executive board of the LSP, with clear lines of accountability.	4
5h	The partnership effectively identifies, manages and tracks risks and issues (e.g.,	3

	resource failure, an under-performing partner, etc.)	
5i	The local Third Sector are appropriately represented in the governance arrangements	<b>3</b>
5j	The local private business sector are appropriately represented in the governance arrangements	<b>2</b>

**Comment:**

5a & b A greater understanding of the roles, responsibilities and resources (not just financial) of the main public sector bodies is being established through the Accountable Bodies Group. The main focus has been on securing commitment to deliver agreed action – from across the sectors – this means that individual partners commit to carrying out (and resourcing) action required to deliver the Local Agreement for Wiltshire. How each partner secures the necessary resources has been left to each partner to determine.

5c Some Thematic Delivery Partnerships are being formed – in the meantime the clear lines are to lead organisations and individual partners.

5e Operational responsibility rests with Thematic Delivery Partnerships (which have an ongoing role) and individual partners.

General – the family of partnerships is newly formed (first meetings July 2008) so where appropriate answers are based on how the new arrangements are expected to work.

**6. Monitor, measure and learn**

6a	The partnership has clear success criteria for its SCS.	<b>4</b>
6b	The partnership has effective arrangements for monitoring and reviewing how successfully its aims and objectives are being met	<b>3</b>
6c	The monitoring arrangements use segmentation of data to ensure that the impacts on hard-to-reach groups are picked up	<b>2</b>
6d	The partnership also monitors its own performance as a partnership, and acts to resolve shortcomings	<b>3</b>
6e	There is a shared commitment to and ownership of the partnership's performance management framework	<b>3</b>
6f	There is a visible 'public friendly' version of performance reporting	<b>2</b>
6g	There are arrangements in place to engage with and respond to community concerns	<b>3</b>

**Comment:**

General – the family of partnerships is newly formed (first meetings July 2008) so where appropriate answers are based on how the new arrangements are expected to work.

6a this is in the Local Agreement for Wiltshire (LAW)

6c the LAW identifies people and places to be targeted by action, but we do not generally segment reporting data to identify particular hard to reach groups

6d the new family of partnership arrangements are the result of such a review

6e there is shared commitment to the new arrangements, and these will be improved as we learn from practice and to take advantage of the benefits from the introduction of the new unitary council.

6f, g summary information and newsletters are published, but are not widely known; the SCS and LAW reflect community concerns and characteristics. The new family of partnerships and unitary council arrangements should make this stronger - through the Assembly, stronger links with communities, and area boards.

**7. Resolve performance issues**

---

5a	There is an agreed 'ladder of intervention' between partners to deal with underperformance	<b>3</b>
5b	There is evidence that underperformance has been / is being effectively resolved through a joint response	<b>3</b>
5c	There is clear senior involvement (including senior political involvement where appropriate) where necessary to resolve performance issues	<b>4</b>

**Comment:**

draft

## SECTION C – Support offered / sought

To enable the SW RIEP to target training and workshop support appropriately, and to network LSPs with each other for mutual support, please list the particular outcomes / targets in your LAA which you consider to be areas that you can offer support with, or that you seek support with.

NI	Outcome / target	Support offered (e.g. peer advice, speak at SW RIEP event, etc.)	Support sought (e.g. from peers, from a SW RIEP event, etc.)

*Add extra rows as required.*

## SECTION D – Proposed usage of £20k grant from SW RIEP

Please describe how your LSP intends to use the £20k grant from the SW RIEP:

Activity / output / deliverable	Outcome	£ Amount*
To help implement and embed the new 'family of partnership' arrangements for Wiltshire:	* The amounts below are indicative and may vary between the activities	
<b>Accountable Bodies Group</b> (Wiltshire's first Public Sector Board): A structured programme to help the ABG develop how it can work together in a very different way. This includes an awayday, as well as preparatory work bringing together information about key partners, governance and performance.	The Accountable Bodies Group could make a real difference to the way the public sector is managed in Wiltshire - eg by shifting from reactive to early intervention; supporting communities to help themselves; achieving high public satisfaction and more local decision making; and reducing overheads by sharing common facilities. This work will help it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a deeper, shared understanding of the issues to be addressed</li> <li>• Better integrate plans and budget to achieve shared ambitions, including the LAA</li> <li>• Have a clearer understanding of how best to work with communities and so called hard to reach groups</li> <li>• Identify capacity and skills for effective partnership working</li> </ul>	£5,000
Support the development of and working across Thematic Delivery Partnerships (TDPs) (new partnerships are: Resilient Communities, Housing, Health & Wellbeing, Environment and Transport)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong governance arrangements to deliver LAW/LAA outcomes</li> <li>• Greater understanding of the roles of TDPs and the issues faced</li> <li>• Joining up strategy across the Thematic Delivery Partnerships to support the SCS and LAW</li> </ul>	£5,000
Investigate and develop joined up facilities where appropriate (eg research and intelligence, communication (including internet), shared services etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient and effective operations</li> <li>• Improved understanding and better use of intelligence</li> <li>• Improved communication, between partners and with the wider community and the public</li> </ul>	£10,000
		<b>TOTAL £ 20,000</b>

*Add/delete rows as required*

**END**

## **TRANSPORT ALLIANCE/PARTNERSHIP**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- To hold the lead strategic role for transport in Wiltshire.
- To support and advise the Wiltshire Assembly on all transport related matters.
- To identify transport needs and issues in Wiltshire, and agree objectives and priorities within the framework of the Wiltshire Sustainable Community Strategy, the Wiltshire Local Development Framework and the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan.
- To seek delivery of agreed transport objectives and priorities through the commitment, activities and resources of members in the Wiltshire 'family of partnerships', seeking approval where necessary.
- To support the involvement of Community Boards and Community Area Partnerships in all transport-related issues.
- To act as the principal consultation forum and endorsing body for transport initiatives.
- To monitor and review the implementation of transport-related actions in the Local Agreement for Wiltshire.
- To raise awareness of transport issues and develop appropriate linkages with the other Thematic Delivery Partnerships within the Wiltshire 'family of partnerships'.
- To nominate a suitable representative to sit on meetings of the Coordinating Group.
- To set-up and periodically review sub-transport partnerships and working groups.
- To provide a 'meeting place' where transport issues and concerns can be raised by all members in an open, transparent and inclusive way.
- To review its membership and terms of reference annually.

### **MEMBERSHIP**

#### Members

While it is acknowledged that the 'cross-cutting' nature of transport is very important, it is considered that 'wider issues' (e.g. health, climate change, social exclusion) are best addressed through the Coordinating Group and its role in coordinating the work of all the Thematic Delivery Partnerships. Moreover, seeking to address these 'wider issues' through the Transport Partnership would result in its membership becoming large, diverse and as a result unwieldy.

Given the above, the membership is made up of those organisations with a direct and strategic involvement in transport in Wiltshire:

- Wiltshire Council
- Government Office for the South West
- SWRA/SWRDA
- Highways Agency
- Wiltshire Constabulary
- Network Rail
- Wilts & Dorset Bus Company
- First Group (Rail & Bus)
- Freight Transport Association

- Primary Care Trust
- WSEP
- Community First
- Campaign for Better Transport
- Sustrans
- Passenger Focus

To ensure that organisations with responsibility and/or involvement in 'wider issues' are kept informed of the work of the Transport Partnership, a wider reference group will be set-up which would receive the agenda papers and notes of meetings, and be invited to attend an annual forum.

### **CRITERIA AND COMMITMENT OF MEMBERS**

- Members should have a broad and deep knowledge of their sector, and have the capacity to think strategically.
- Members should be of a sufficient level to make decisions on behalf of the organisations they represent.
- Members should communicate information and decisions made by the Partnership to others in their organisation and sector.

### **OPERATION**

- The Partnership will meet quarterly.
- The Partnership will elect an independent Chair and will review this post annually.
- The Partnership will elect a Vice-Chair from participating members who will deputise for the Chair in his/her absence.
- The Partnership is to operate on a consensual basis.
- Secretarial support will be provided by the Service Director, Sustainable Transport, Wiltshire Council.
- The Partnership can agree, establish and review sub-groups as required which will meet separately and report back to the Partnership at each meeting.
- Agenda papers and notes of the meeting are to be distributed electronically to Partnership members, the wider reference group and posted on the Wiltshire Council website.
- Meetings to be held in closed session with the facility to move to open session if required.

### **SUB-GROUPS**

- Wiltshire and Swindon Road Safety Partnership
- Freight Quality Partnership for Wiltshire
- Bus Punctuality Improvement Partnership
- Delivering Accessibility and Rural Transport Partnership (to be reconvened)
- Wiltshire Parking Partnership (to be set-up)
- Wiltshire Health Access Partnership (to be set up)

## WILTSHIRE CO-ORDINATING GROUP (WCG)

### Minutes of a Meeting held at Community First, Devizes on Wednesday 17 September 2008

#### 1. Attendance:

Keith Robinson (Chairman)	Kathy Green (Housing Partnership)
Peter Fanshawe (C&YP Trust Board)	Philippa Read (Infrastructure Consortium)
Jim Smith (C&YP Trust Board)	Margaret West (Stronger, Resilient Communities)
Sue Redmond (Community Safety Partnership)	Sharon Britton (WCC)
Tim Mason (Community Safety Partnership)	Niki Lewis (WCC)
Gary Mantle (Environment Alliance)	Laurie Bell WCC)
Stella Milsom (GOSW)	Annie Child (WCC)
Nicola Cretney (Health & Well-being PB)	Karen Spence (WCC)
Sarah Fussell (Health & Well-being PB)	Caroline Lewis (WSEP)

Linda Watts (WCC) was present to take a note of the meeting.

Apologies were received from Julian Kirby (Community Safety Partnership), Alan Feist (Transport Partnership), Maggie Rae (Health & Well-being Partnership Board), Graham Hogg (Housing Partnership), Len Turner (WFCAP), John Wraw (Chairman of the Wiltshire Assembly)

#### **ACTION**

#### 2 Minutes of the last meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2008 were agreed.

#### **Matters Arising**

Keith Robinson gave an introduction to the meeting emphasising the key co-ordinating role of the WCG, and to the role of the WCG in supporting the Wiltshire Assembly.

Sharon Britton and Karen Spence have drafted a document that maps partnerships in Wiltshire. They will circulate the document in a draft form so that it can be adjusted, based on information from WCG Members.

**Sharon  
Britton**

A potential website is to be established to include information about the WCG. In the meantime Members are asked to send any issues that they wish to share on a "networking" basis to Linda Watts at [lindawatts@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:lindawatts@wiltshire.gov.uk).

#### 3 Supporting the Assembly

##### Wiltshire Assembly Conference: Friday 3 October 2008 – progress update

- Niki Lewis circulated a copy of the invitation to the Official Launch of the Wiltshire Assembly to be held at Center Parcs, Longleat
- The invitation list has been informed by suggestions from the Voluntary Sector and it includes partnerships' representatives.
- John Wraw, Archdeacon of Wilts, will Chair the Assembly meeting.
- There has been a preliminary discussion with the keynote speaker, Matthew Taylor, Chief Executive of the Royal Society of Arts.
- The key theme for this meeting is "building stronger and more resilient

## ACTION

communities”.

- A DVD is being made especially for this meeting.

Keith Robinson observed that it is important to involve people with local connections, in order to support progress on the Local Agreement for Wiltshire (LAW).

WCG members expressed interest as to how Wiltshire compares with other Authorities in terms of “local intelligence” returns. Niki Lewis advised that the Place Survey will take place for the first time this autumn. The results will then be published and made widely available.

Niki Lewis

Gary Mantle suggested that a structured approach to aspects of sustainability is taken, with annual reports to the Wiltshire Assembly. Niki Lewis confirmed that it is intended to take an annual report to the meeting of the Wiltshire Assembly on 3 October.

Niki Lewis

### Sustainable Community Strategy

After discussion of the paper setting out an approach to revising the sustainable community strategy, the recommendations were agreed with the proviso that the timescale for recommendation 2 is brought forward. This will be incorporated in the output from the Wiltshire Assembly meeting on 3 October. This work will also need to be integrated with the Districts’ ongoing work on the Local Development Framework (LDF).

David  
Maynard

### Draft paper for the Wiltshire Assembly

After discussion, it was agreed that environmental sustainability requires more elaboration, and the section on culture and sport requires a Wiltshire focus. David Maynard is to carry out further work on the paper.

David  
Maynard

## 4. **Update from Partnerships – Plans, Priorities, Opportunities and any Blockages**

### Children & Young People’s Trust Board

Peter Fanshawe and Jim Smith advised that the Children and Young People’s Plan Summary is available in an accessible form. There is also a public friendly version of Every Child Matters. During discussion the following suggestions were requested:

- How to obtain employers views on the employability of young people in Wiltshire. It was suggested that a first contact for this purpose would be the Wessex Chambers of Commerce as they conduct a 6-monthly survey of their Members. Caroline Lewis will also raise the issue with the Economic Partnership.
- Wiltshire College is also to be approached for ideas on this issue.
- Stella Milsom is to provide information for the WCG on a relevant University survey.

Caroline  
Lewis

Stella Milsom

**Community Safety Partnership**

Tim Mason and Sue Redmond reported that:

- Four District partnerships are being restructured into one partnership. Support for this single partnership is yet to be resourced and established.
- Obtaining data is very complex and GOSW was requested to assist.
- The Community Safety Partnership will be interested in participating in “public confidence” surveys but it would be more effective that these surveys are carried out involving other partners.
- The development of governance and partnership working are being supported by a development day which is to be funded by GOSW.
- The links with stronger communities will be developed further.
- The potential benefits arising from International comparisons were discussed. Niki Lewis advised that ground work has been done on matching Local Area Agreement (LAA) streams with European funding streams – this is currently being dealt with by the new LAA Ambitions Leads Group, and information will be brought to WCG when it is timely. It was agreed that some WCG Members will become involved in taking this area work forward.

**Stella Milsom**

**Niki  
Lewis/Sharon  
Britton**

**Environment Alliance**

Gary Mantle reported that:

- Guidance was awaited before the final shape of the Alliance was defined and the Terms of Reference were completed.
- Four thematic groups have been established within the Alliance.
- Regarding the outcome of the consultation on representation within the Alliance, nominations from thematic groups will now be sought.
- It was clarified that it has not been agreed that there should be a common Terms of Reference for all partnerships.
- Sharon Britton will assist thinking about shaping the Alliance and the Terms of Reference by sending Gary an updating email.

**Sharon  
Britton**

**Health and Well-being Partnership Board**

Sarah Fussell reported that:

- The Healthier Wiltshire project is being concluded.
- Membership and Terms of Reference of the Health and Well-being Partnership Board will be considered during the autumn.
- LPSA - The results analysis of the recent survey, carried out to follow up the 2005 survey, will be used to focus work in schools and elsewhere.
- The first Bid for LPSA reward grant is currently being put together. A report on this will be available early in October.
- Work is taking place on refreshing the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA).

Housing

Kathy Green reported that:

- Housing teams at District level are involved in an integration process. This is taking into account best practice.
- The current thinking is that the three housing market areas will be retained as there are funding benefits from this configuration.
- Risks that are foreseen include capacity and deliverability.
- Following a brief discussion on the economic situation and its impact on housing, the following points were made:
  - Keith Robinson observed that a “conversation” is needed at the Wiltshire Assembly about the current economic situation.
  - In particular it is important that partners reflect on whether there is any purposeful activity that should be co-ordinated across relevant partnerships.
- The underlying causes of housing need are to be further examined.
- Further information on the impact of the economic situation in Wiltshire is desirable. Anecdotal information from sources such as the Citizen’s Advice Bureaux indicates that debt is increasing but substantive data is not yet available.
- The views of WCG are to be reflected as appropriate in the next version of the draft Sustainable Community Strategy.
- Co-ordination of housing groups is needed to establish common boundaries.

**Niki Lewis**

**David Maynard**

It was agreed that WCG discuss housing further relatively early in the Groups programme – it is to be an item at the next WCG meeting.

**Linda Watts**

Transport Alliance

- Terms of Reference were circulated.

Wiltshire Strategic Economic Partnership

Caroline Lewis reported that:

- The Countryside & Land-based Group is being wound up and absorbed into the main partnership.
- WSEP has made links with the Children & Young People’s Trust Board with regard to NEETs (young people who are **not** in education, employment or training).
- Gary Mantle and Caroline Lewis are to have a separate discussion about links between WSEP and the Environment Alliance.

Stronger, Resilient Communities

Margaret West reported that:

- A draft job description is being produced by Niki Lewis, for a full-time worker to support the partnership. The job description has been agreed.

Infrastructure Consortium

Philippa Read reported that:

- A first meeting of the Voluntary Sector Assembly has taken place.
- The Infrastructure Consortium is being restructured to ensure that sectoral interests are represented.
- The Infrastructure Consortium is working with Sue Redmond and her colleagues on the outcome of the Voluntary Sector Review. Feedback will be provided to the sector in November.

5. **Community Area Partnerships**

A note from Len Turner was circulated. It was agreed that Len will be asked at the next meeting of WCG to discuss the inter-relationships between the Community Area Partnerships and the Thematic Partnerships.

**Linda Watts**

6. **Research and Evidence**

This item was deferred to the next meeting of WCG.

**Linda Watts**

7. **Application to the Regional Improvement & Efficiency Partnership (RIEP) – development funding for the Accountable Bodies Group**

Sharon Britton introduced this discussion.

- Sharon referred to Sections C and D in the application and indicated that she would appreciate comments on those sections.
- There is a need to highlight aspects of good practice that we are willing to share with others.
- There is a deadline for the application. Sharon needs to finalise the application at the end September.

It was agreed that WCG members are to consider the application and provide comments to Sharon Britton. Sharon's email address is: [sharonbritton@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:sharonbritton@wiltshire.gov.uk).

8. **Date of next meeting**

10am – 12 noon on Tuesday 28 October in The Board Room at Community First offices, Devizes

**ALL**