

# Highland Community Planning Partnership

## Community Planning Board

Minutes of Meeting of the Community Planning Board held in the Board Room, Assynt House, Beechwood Park, Inverness on Wednesday 3 June 2015 at 10.00 am.

### Present:

#### **Representing the Cairngorms National Park Authority (CNPA):**

Mr D Bryden

#### **Representing the Highland Council (HC):**

Dr D Alston

Ms M Smith

Mr S Barron

Ms M Morris

Mr B Alexander

Ms C McDiarmid

Mr P Mascarenhas

#### **Representing Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE):**

Ms C Wright

#### **Representing the Highland Third Sector Interface (HTSI):**

Ms I Grigor

Ms M Wylie

#### **Representing High Life Highland (HLH):**

Mr D Graham

Mr I Murray

#### **Representing NHS Highland (NHS):**

Mr G Coutts

Ms E Mead

Mrs J Baird

Ms C Steer

Mr K Oliver

#### **Representing Police Scotland (PS):**

Ch Supt J Innes

#### **Representing the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS):**

Dr M Foxley

Mr S Hay

#### **Representing the Scottish Government (SG):**

Mr J Pryce

#### **Representing Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH):**

Mr G Hogg

#### **Representing the Scottish Police Authority (SPA):**

Mr I Ross

#### **Representing the University of the Highlands and Islands (UHI):**

Ms F Larg

### In attendance:

Ms J Bromham, Highland Biodiversity Officer, Development and Infrastructure Service

Ms H Ross, Senior Ward Manager, Chief Executive's Office

Miss M Murray, Committee Administrator, Corporate Development Service

Mr P Green, Group Manager, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service

### Also in attendance:

Dr O Escobar, Lecturer in Public Policy, Edinburgh University

Ms F Garven, Chief Executive, Scottish Community Development Centre

## Dr D Alston in the Chair

### Business

#### Preliminaries

Prior to the commencement of formal business, Dr D Alston referred to the recent meeting of the Convention of the Highlands and Islands and reiterated the view of the Deputy First Minister, John Swinney, that, to work towards fairer distribution of wealth in society, the economy and economic development should be at the heart of every community planning agenda.

#### 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr G Moir (Cairngorms National Park Authority); Mr J Gray, Mrs M Davidson, Mr S Black, Ms E Johnston and Mr S Finlayson (Highland Council); Mr M Johnson (Highland and Island Enterprise); Mr J Wilson (Highland Third Sector Interface); Mr D McLachlan (High Life Highland); Dr H van Woerden (NHS Highland); Mr R Iffla (Scottish Fire and Rescue Service); and Professor C Mulholland (University of the Highlands and Islands).

#### 2. Minutes of Meeting

##### i. Community Planning Board

There had been circulated, and were **APPROVED**, Minutes of the Community Planning Board held on 4 March 2015.

In relation to Item 4a – Delivering Partnership Outcomes: Economic Growth and Regeneration – the Chairman sought confirmation that all public sector workers in Highland were in receipt of the Living Wage.

In response, it was explained that some of the college sector were not yet paying the Living Wage. However, West Highland College would be doing so as of summer 2015 and Sabhal Mòr Ostaig would be phasing it in over the next academic year. It was emphasised that the Community Planning Partnership did not represent all public sector employers and that it was not only about direct employees but contractors, partners etc. In addition, although it was a Community Planning Partner, the Highland Third Sector Interface was a representative organisation rather than a public sector agency.

Thereafter, having recognised that care was needed in terms of the language used, it was **AGREED** that updates continue to be provided until such time as it could be confirmed that all public sector agencies in the Highland CPP paid the Living Wage.

##### ii. Chief Officers' Group

There had been circulated, and were **NOTED**, Notes of Meetings of the Chief Officers' Group held on 23 February 2015 and 26 March 2015.

### **3. Local Democratic Experiments and Community Empowerment**

#### **i. Participatory Democracy and Community Empowerment**

As background information, there had been circulated Report No CPB/06/15 by the Head of Policy and Reform, Highland Council which summarised the key findings from the Strengthening Local Democracy Commission and the other drivers for supporting participatory democracy and community empowerment within the Highland CPP. The links between democracy and inequalities were highlighted and the findings were relevant for all public bodies in the partnership as well as the third sector.

There had also been circulated an Executive Summary in relation to Citizens' Juries on wind farm development in Scotland.

Dr O Escobar, Lecturer in Public Policy, Edinburgh University, undertook a presentation during which detailed information was provided on participatory and deliberative democracy; the evolving role of citizens in liberal democracies; the key challenges in organising engagement processes; and myths about citizen engagement. Democratic innovation was a growing field and examples of mini-publics and participatory budgeting exercises were provided. It was explained that CPPs required both participatory and deliberative democracy and it was necessary to understand how they coalesced with representative democracy and combine international evidence with local knowledge to develop a home-grown approach. In terms of funding, it was resource intensive but, in conclusion, Members were asked to consider how much they would be willing to pay for effective democracy/decision-making.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- information was sought on the outcomes of participative exercises;
- the Isle of Eigg and parts of the Western Isles had been completely transformed as a result of community ownership and were exemplars of participatory democracy;
- there appeared to be more community activity in remote rural areas and information was sought on whether there were any differences between urban and rural areas in terms of approach;
- in relation to building legitimacy and trust in public institutions, choosing high stakes issues felt counterintuitive and further information was requested in that regard;
- there were significant numbers of people who, for generations, had not been active participants in their communities and might be affected by layers of barriers. If the systems with which they engaged were based on some perception of disadvantage, this potentially reinforced their sense of self as being passive;
- the manner in which care was delivered impacted on how people saw themselves and how they participated;
- in relation to mini-publics such as Citizens' Juries, concern was expressed that responsibility for what was considered to be a bad decision would simply transfer from one group of decision-makers to another and information was sought on what evidence existed that their decisions were accepted by the wider community; and

- Members questioned whether an evaluation had been carried out of a good participative model in comparison with a good representative model and whether there was value in trying to strengthen and reinvigorate the representative system.

In response to issues raised, Dr Escobar explained that:-

- in relation to outcomes, there was no evidence base in Scotland yet although there was elsewhere in the world. However, it was difficult to compare with previous programmes as participatory and deliberative democracy were new ways of working and there were no clear baselines;
- whilst there were good examples of participatory democracy locally, the institutional system had not evolved to accommodate that level of civic engagement;
- in Scotland, rural areas were often at the forefront in terms of community participation. However, many issues that affected rural communities, such as employment and the economy, could not be addressed locally. It was therefore necessary for rural areas to have an input in to the central institutions that made decisions on such matters;
- if people considered a process to be fair, transparent and based on the best available evidence and reasons, they would trust it. To demonstrate the point, an example was provided of a Citizens' Jury on windfarm development, at the conclusion of which 97% of participants had said that, if they were assured that the same process was being used to make a decision, they would respect the decision even if it was contrary to what they believed. Divisive issues demonstrated the power of engagement and, the more such exercises took place, the more trust and confidence people would have in them;
- to lower barriers to participation, it was necessary to think about those who never engaged with the system and put in place the necessary resources and mechanisms. Participants in Citizens' Juries had been paid and, whilst some had initially taken part for that reason, they left wanting to make a difference in their communities. The payment element was important as it allowed, for example, a full-time carer to obtain cover and someone with a disability to pay for transport. 55% of jurors had never engaged before but, by the end of the process, their sense of self-efficacy had increased notably and they all said they would engage again;
- community acceptance of the decisions of Citizens' Juries was a matter of political leaders and the media conveying the message that it was a participatory process. However, there were also ways of involving the community in the process – for example, jurors holding public forums and gathering the views of local people; and
- participative and deliberative democracy could not work without representative democracy. The argument was that they could help representative democracy to overcome some of the challenges it had faced over the past few years.

Ms F Garven, Chief Executive, Scottish Community Development Centre (SCDC), then undertook a presentation during which it was explained that SCDC had been involved in a piece of research, commissioned by the National Community Planning Group, which had examined the extent to which current procurement practices between statutory bodies involved in community planning and third sector providers were appropriate when considering the

objectives community planning sought to achieve; the extent to which community engagement was actually influencing activity planning and outcomes within the community planning process; and the extent to which the most local and often least organisationally developed community activity could be better supported in ways which would lead to that activity being capable of playing a full part in service planning and the development of better outcomes for local communities.

Detailed information was provided on the methods used and the overall findings, including current activity, key failings and future direction. Points to consider included identifying what was procured and why; developing better information and intelligence; developing a strategic approach to community engagement; creating mechanisms for dialogue, deliberation and learning between agencies and communities about what worked and why; sustaining a workforce remitted to supporting community effort and making links with agency work; equipping the wider workforce to understand their roles in relation to positive outcomes for local people; and investing in strong community-led organisations to undertake an independent community development role.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- further information was sought regarding community anchor organisations;
- one of the frustrations for third sector organisations was that it was difficult to be a contributing and equal partner as discussions invariably centred around funding. Longer term funding, say for three or five years, would allow funding to be discussed in year one with subsequent years spent talking about how organisations could work together innovatively; and
- in relation to the provision of health and social care services, Highland had led a strategic commissioning approach that was very much about partnership working and building communities. Linked to that was an understanding that there would be longer term funding and more security for the third sector.

In response to issues raised, Ms Garven explained that:-

- development trusts were a good example of a community anchor organisation and were often established as a vehicle to take forward a specific local issue such as an asset becoming available or a windfarm opportunity. They were in a pivotal position to take forward robust local action that directly responded to local need. However, they might not have the capacity to involve wider community interests;
- it was recognised that there was a power imbalance and third sector organisations' ability to act as a strategic partner was inhibited. Some community organisations had as many as 48 funding streams and it took a huge amount of work to keep them afloat. Discussions had taken place regarding the need to invest rather than grant fund so that there was a long term approach; and
- the best examples of strategic commissioning and moving towards a more co-productive model were in health and social care services. It was a matter of putting the necessary systems in place for public agencies to meet with local providers and co-design what a service should look like then consider the best way to deliver it in partnership.

Thereafter, the Chairman having thanked Dr Escobar and Ms Garven, the Board **NOTED** the issues raised in the report and presentations.

**ii. Progress with Local Discussions on Reviewing Local Community Planning Arrangements and Council Area Committees**

There had been circulated Report No CPB/07/15 by the Head of Policy and Reform, Highland Council which provided an update on progress being made with reviewing Local Community Planning arrangements and Area Committees. Initial discussions had been underway in the last round of District Partnership meetings and, at the time of the Board meeting, discussions had taken place in 12 Wards with Elected Members.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- reference was made to the former Sutherland Partnership and, whilst the time had not been right in terms of policy and policy development, the potential of such a forum was recognised;
- reconciling area decision-making with strategic committees and party politics would be challenging;
- interest was expressed in the concept of deliberative democracy, as discussed during the previous item;
- better links between the Community Planning Board and local community planning forums were essential and it was suggested that consideration be given to inviting District Partnership Chairs to attend future meetings of the Board;
- local forums could be dominated by individuals with knowledge, experience and time and there was an issue to be addressed in terms of developing the capacity for participation. District Partnerships had originally been established to consider matters relating to the integration of health and social care and taking on a wider range of issues would dilute their ability to examine issues in detail. In addition, the amount of expertise needed to participate would increase and the imbalance in favour of those with knowledge and experience would become greater;
- it was necessary to consider how to make the transition from community groups coming together for specific projects to keeping people engaged in local community planning in the long-term;
- administrative boundaries did not always correspond with what local people considered to be their area;
- loss of power could be a concern for public bodies and it was necessary to address this and allow decisions to be made at a local level;
- control over assets empowered communities and the Community Empowerment Bill would bring that into focus;
- local communities wanted a say in a wide range of issues and public bodies would have to respond accordingly;
- information was sought on how to get focused local groups to think about the greater good. In response, it was explained that the key to deliberative democracy was to ask people to give public reasons for their decisions rather than private reasons, and examples of each were provided;
- clarification was required as to who would be held accountable if local initiatives were not successful. In response, it was explained that accountability was a key issue and, if decision-making was going to be more

localised, it was necessary to work in partnership to create a sophisticated governance structure that clearly set out roles and responsibilities;

- in relation to asset transfers, there was a natural ebb and flow within communities and it was necessary to consider what would happen if, after a number of years, a group failed. However, it was highlighted that this was the sort of issue that communities needed to tackle;
- whilst welcoming the momentum in Highland, partners shared concerns regarding the extent and timescale of the decisions to be made. However, it was recognised that imposing top-down solutions would be a mistake and, instead, it was necessary to facilitate a direction of travel underpinned by values and principles, learn from the local experiments taking place and build a framework over time;
- local community planning arrangements had to be systemic, strategic and sustainable. In addition, there had to be a fit between Council decisions and the Council structure and partnership decisions and partnership structures;
- whilst the CPP had committed to experimentation and variation, establishing a decision-making process that officers could not support was not viable and it was necessary to devise a fit, not only between administrative boundaries and local communities but with services and managers;
- there was a skill set to community development and it was necessary to cultivate it across all partner agencies;
- community development approaches were extremely powerful but were not an easy option; and
- particularly in light of the aging population, it was necessary to encourage communities to think about what sort of society they wanted to see in the future and the services they might need. In addition, it was necessary to address issues collectively rather than looking at them in isolation.

Dr Escobar explained that What Works Scotland was there to support CPPs to address issues such as those raised during discussion and to make the connection between research, policy and practice.

The Chairman welcomed the stimulating discussion and emphasised the importance of continued communication as matters progressed. He invited partners to feed back any further comments on the ideas emerging to the Council's Head of Policy and Reform and Community and Democratic Engagement Manager.

Thereafter, the Board:-

- i. **NOTED** the progress being made in early conversations through District Partnerships and among local Elected Members;
- ii. **NOTED** that no agreement was sought at this time to change arrangements locally but, with further work and conversations to take place over the summer, a further report would be provided to the Board in September 2015. This provided three months to develop acceptable proposals for local experiments in some areas to improve community planning. Proper regard would be given to each partner's governance arrangements before any changes could take place; and
- iii. **AGREED** that any further comments on the ideas emerging be fed back to the Council's Head of Policy and Reform and Community and Democratic Engagement Manager.

#### **4. Presentation: Highland Biodiversity Action Plan (2015-2020)**

There had been circulated Report No CPB/08/15 by the Highland Biodiversity Officer, Highland Council, which explained that the Highland Environment Forum had reviewed and updated the Highland Biodiversity Action Plan (HBAP) and it would be launched in late June 2015. The report provided an update on progress made by the partners to deliver the HBAP (2010-2013) and a summary of the new HBAP (2015-2020).

Ms J Bromham, Highland Biodiversity Officer, undertook a presentation in amplification of the report during which detailed information was provided on progress with the HBAP 2010-2013, including invasive non-native species work and the Highland Seashore Project. She also summarised the HBAP review process, the HBAP 2015-2020 objectives and priorities for future work which included the promotion of land management for wildlife, improved ecological input to the local planning process, supporting local biodiversity projects, the Marine Heritage Project, the Highland Rhododendron Projects and the Highland Biological Database Project.

It was emphasised that the new HBAP was a genuine product of community planning and had been strongly influenced by the outcomes identified by the CPP. In terms of economic growth and regeneration, it was key to supporting the natural assets upon which most of the economic activity in Highland was based. In relation to employability, volunteering projects developed skills in people seeking employment or internships. With regard to early years, there were eco-schools projects and initiatives such as the Highland Seashore Project engaged youngsters. In relation to safer and stronger communities, there was a focus on community led projects and it was highlighted that the type of groups that became important within communities often came from an environmental or biodiversity background. In terms of health inequalities, there was an increasing body of evidence regarding the importance of the environment for people's physical and mental health. With regard to older people, there was a specific project which aimed to engage older people and encourage them to share their knowledge and experience with other community members. In relation to community learning and development, community-based volunteer projects developed generic skills that could be applied to other projects. In conclusion, all partners were invited to consider how they could play a part in supporting the HBAP.

Thereafter, the Board, having recognised both the intrinsic and economic value of the HBAP, **NOTED** the report and accompanying presentation.

#### **5. Presentation: Developing the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service Strategic Plan 2016/19**

Mr S Hay, Area Manager – Service Delivery, undertook a presentation on the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) Strategic Plan 2016/19 during which detailed information was provided on the background to the SFRS, the operating context, the requirement for a three year strategic plan, key timelines, the emerging direction of travel and key transformation projects.

It was explained that this was an opportunity to influence the draft Plan prior to approval by the SFRS Board and the formal consultation period. To aid discussion, the Board was invited to consider the following questions:-

- i. What are the key strengths of the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service?



- ii. As a local partner, what are our shared challenges and opportunities?
- iii. What do you think the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service can do to help improve matters at local partnership level or nationally?
- iv. What really matters to our local communities?

Dr M Foxley added that the traditional role of firefighters was diminishing as prevention improved and, to retain Retained Duty System stations as budgets reduced, it was necessary to utilise firefighters in different ways. In addition to the falls prevention work already taking place, the SFRS Board had discussed out of hospital cardiac arrest; rural health issues emergency response; closer links with the Royal National Lifeboat Institution and Mountain Rescue teams; firefighting at sea and emergency towing vessels; remote and rural integration opportunities for improving community safety; integration opportunities for emergency planning; and options for a new externally recognised people safety practitioner modular course. The Strategic Plan would be submitted for ministerial approval in less than a year and it would be helpful to obtain partners' views so that they could be fed in.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- if there were ideas within the SFRS in terms of the type of integrated model envisaged, it would be helpful if they could be presented to partners for consideration;
- retained firefighters were the greatest strength of the SFRS. However, they were also the greatest weakness due to the difficulties with recruitment and it was suggested that partners, as employers, should do more to promote the retained firefighter service;
- 800 staff throughout Highland was significant and it was suggested that there might be merit in carrying out an exercise to evaluate the economic impact of the SFRS in Highland;
- in relation to the SFRS broadening its remit to include activities currently undertaken by other agencies, information was sought on whether consideration had been given to whether there were any activities currently undertaken by the SFRS that might be better suited to another organisation. In response, it was confirmed that discussions were underway but they were at a very early stage and suggestions from partners were invited;
- climate change had resulted in an increasing number of floods, wildfires and storms etc. With regard to wildfires in particular, they were often set by land managers and a means of recharging them when fires got out of control was required as well as closer examination of the standards they were required to meet; and
- in relation to the four questions posed, given the length of the agenda it was suggested that partners respond directly to the Area Manager – Service Delivery following the meeting.

Thereafter, the Board:-

- i. **NOTED** the presentation;
- ii. **AGREED**, in relation to the four questions posed, that partners respond directly to the Area Manager – Service Delivery following the meeting;
- iii. **AGREED** that consideration be given to how to promote the retained firefighter service within CPP agencies; and
- iv. **AGREED** that the possibility of carrying out an exercise to evaluate the economic impact of the SFRS in Highland be explored.

## 6. Delivering Partnership Outcomes

The following updates had been provided by Responsible Officers on the current delivery plans for the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA), the partnership's agreed strategic priorities and developing partnership working:-

### i. Economic Growth and Regeneration

The circulated report by HIE, as lead partner on this theme, explained that the Scottish economy had shown continuous growth in every quarter since late 2012 and business confidence continued to increase. An overview of key indicators was provided which showed that Highland continued to enjoy higher rates of economic activity and lower rates of employment and youth unemployment than the rest of Scotland. The number of business start-ups had decreased but, overall, entrepreneurial activity was still high in Highland in comparison with the Scottish average. Commentary was provided on wages and housing and it was highlighted that, despite high employment levels, wages remained stubbornly low. The Scottish Business Pledge had been published and HIE would seek to support employers who wanted to move towards paying the Living Wage. In relation to digital economy research, it was explained that, in spite of significant investment in next generation broadband roll-out, there were still challenges for businesses in terms of connectivity and digital skills. Finally, the report provided a summary of HIE approvals during Quarter 4 of 2014/15 which amounted to £1,493,676 towards over £10m of investment. The full HIE performance outturn for 2014/15 would be presented to the HIE Board at the end of the June 2015 and it was suggested it be circulated to the CPP Board for information.

During discussion, it was suggested that the Chief Officers' Group be asked to consider how to strengthen future agendas in terms of economic priorities.

Thereafter, the Board:-

- i. **NOTED** the update;
- ii. **AGREED** that the Chief Officers' Group consider how to strengthen future agendas in terms of economic priorities, with a discussion led by HIE at the next meeting; and
- iii. **AGREED** that the HIE performance outturn for 2014/15 be circulated to Members for information when it was available.

### ii. Employability

The circulated report by the Council, as lead partner on this theme, provided a brief overview of key indicators and progress in response to emerging priorities which were shaping delivery in 2015. The Employability strand of the SOA had two long term outcomes, namely, to widen participation in the labour market across all client groups and across all Highland geographies; and to enable the region's young people to have the opportunity to flourish and to contribute to the sustainable economic growth of the Highland economy. In terms of statistics, the headline unemployment rate had dropped from 2.6% in April 2013 to 1.6% in April 2015. Youth unemployment had also fallen from 800 in April 2013 to 620 in April 2015. However, it was highlighted that the figures might include some young people who were in work but receiving Universal Credit and that

changes in statistical collection allied to the introduction of Universal Credit made analysis of progress towards long-term outcomes difficult. The report went on to detail activity in relation to the ESF Programme 2014-20, Scotland's Youth Employment Strategy and the Skills Investment Plan.

The Board **NOTED** progress and activity underway in response to the ESF Programme 2014-20, Scotland's Youth Employment Strategy and the Skills Investment Plan, which together would inform a revised SOA Action Plan 2015.

### iii. **Early Years/Children**

The circulated report by the Council, as lead partner on this theme, explained that the Council and NHS Highland had agreed a performance framework for children's services, as outlined in For Highland's Children 4, and provided details of the current situation in relation to those measures relating specifically to early years. Although significant progress had been made, a number of baselines and targets were still to be established. In addition, some processes required to be put in place for collecting data for new outcome targets. Work within the Early Years Collaborative continued to develop a method and culture for delivering improvement and frontline staff and managers across a range of services were using the Model for Improvement to accelerate change. The report also provided details of the number of improvement projects taking place in respect of each National Key Change Theme.

In addition to the report, the Director of Care and Learning explained that the level of infrastructure to support early years services had become increasingly unfit for purpose and the Council had now agreed to enhance it. In relation to the provision of 600 hours of free early learning and childcare, the Council continued to consult with local communities regarding achieving enhanced flexibility and, as part of that, local Childcare and Family Resource Partnerships would be engaging with all local partners in terms of local needs in each of the current districts. Finally, it was explained that the Scottish Government had commissioned a report on the early years workforce and this was now available on the Scottish Government's website.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

### iv. **Safer and Stronger Communities**

Chief Superintendent J Innes explained that Highland had become a safer place over the last financial year. Less people had been killed or seriously injured on the roads, antisocial behaviour and vandalism had reduced and fewer homes had been broken into. Going forward, there would be a greater focus on sexual offences and hate crimes which, it was hoped, would lead to an increased level of reporting of such incidents.

In addition, information was provided on the Safer Highland Rock Challenge and Junior Rock Challenge events that had taken place at Eden Court in April 2015. A number of partners had attended the events, at which approximately 700 school children had taken part in activities relating to alcohol and drug misuse as well as friendship, bullying and citizenship. Highland would be represented at the national event in Dundee in June 2015. Initial feedback was that children were drinking and smoking less, going to school more and feeling

better about themselves and the event was a tremendous success in terms of how, collectively, the Safer Highland Partnership was making the area stronger.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

**v. Health Inequalities and Physical Inactivity**

The circulated report by NHS Highland, as lead partner on this theme, explained that, since the last meeting, the Group had progressed work to develop a partnership understanding of deprivation and inequalities in rural areas; and produced and disseminated the report from the health, housing and homelessness event that took place in February 2015 and progressed the recommendation to move from having two groups with a focus on homelessness to one partnership group. Emerging themes for further action included the development of a partnership approach to ESF funding; organisation of an anti-poverty event; consideration of the use of “community mapping”; and completion of self-assessment. The report also provided an update on physical activity.

The Board **NOTED**:-

- i. progress in developing a joint understanding of deprivation and inequalities in rural areas of Highland; and
- ii. action on the specific priorities of health, housing and homelessness; developing a joint approach to ESF funding; physical activity; self-assessment; and organising an anti-poverty event.

**vi. Outcomes for Older People**

The circulated report by NHS Highland, as lead partner on this theme, provided updates on a number of areas of activity including Technology Enabled Care; Older People’s Inspection; Quality in Care Homes and Care at Home; Carers; “I’m not a Complainer” Report; Strategic Plan; Operational Units; and Volunteering.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

**vii. Environmental Outcomes**

The circulated report by SNH, as lead partner on this theme, detailed a number of areas of activity including the establishment of a partnership against wildlife crime; the preparation of a Highland Land Use Strategy; the review of the Highland Biodiversity Action Plan; a proposed Biosphere Reserve in Wester Ross; the review of planning guidance for onshore wind energy; and the Carbon CLEVER declaration and Community Grant Fund. In particular, it was highlighted that the Home Energy Efficiency Programme in Highland had been nominated for “Project of the Year” in the Green Deal ECO Awards. This was in recognition of the delivery of a £12m project offering free external wall insulation to over 1000 properties in Highland, which was beneficial in terms of both carbon management and health inequalities.

In addition to the report, details were provided on a number of major local projects including the Flow to the Future project in Caithness and Sutherland, the Nevis Landscape Partnership project and the Coigach-Assynt Living

Landscape Project. It was also highlighted that the Cairngorm Nature Festival had recently taken place. This was an annual event that raised the profile of the value of nature to the National Park and its environmental, social and economic objectives.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

#### **viii. Community Learning and Development**

The circulated report by the Council, as lead partner on this theme, summarised the background to the formation of the Community Learning and Development (CLD) Strategic Partnership. The Partnership had continued to meet regularly and had focused increasingly on the timetable for the preparation of the statutory CLD Plan by September 2015. An outline structure had been drafted and the aim was to submit the final Plan to the Education, Children and Adult Services Committee on 27 August 2015 for approval. In relation to District Partnerships, progress had been made in identifying lead officers. There were early indications of which agency would lead which district and it was intended to finalise this in the near future. The report also provided an update on the new CLD inspection regime.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

#### **ix. SOA Development Plan**

The circulated report by the Council provided an update on progress in relation to the SOA Development Plan 2014 to 2018. In particular, it was highlighted that partnership discussions had taken place at officer level regarding the empowering impact of participation in arts and culture. Discussions had also take place regarding working together as a partnership to support the new rights that community bodies would have to participate in improving outcomes. Other issues to report to the next meeting of the Board included the new requirements for CPP performance reporting arising from the community empowerment legislation and an update on the partnership approach to prevention in Merkinch, Inverness.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

### **7. Highland Local Policing Plan**

Chief Superintendent J Innes explained that, over the past six months, there had been considerable engagement regarding the Highland Local Policing Plan for the next three years. It was emphasised that the priorities in the Plan reflected what local people wanted local policing to concentrate on, namely:-

1. Road Safety
2. Alcohol and Drug Misuse
3. Antisocial Behaviour/Disorder
4. Crimes of Dishonesty
5. Protecting People

In addition, it was highlighted that Police Scotland and the Scottish Police Authority (SPA) had signed a protocol agreement regarding communication and engagement, particularly in relation to policy development. There was a commitment to engage at

both national and local level, particularly with the SPA but also with local scrutiny bodies, including the CPP, on any policy changes so that comments could be made in advance. This was a very positive step.

The Board **NOTED** the update.

## 8. Deprivation and Inequalities – Rural Analysis

There had been circulated Report No CPB/09/15 by the Head of Policy and Reform, Highland Council, and the Head of Health Improvement, NHS Highland, which provided an update on the work of the Health Inequalities Group to develop a joint understanding of deprivation and inequalities in rural Highland.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- information was provided on the work being undertaken by the Further Education Regional Board in relation to the Scottish Funding Council funding streams for both rurality and rural deprivation. To maximise the impact, it was vital to collectively feed the information gathered in to the government system and Dr M Foxley undertook to liaise with the Head of Health Improvement in that regard;
- in identifying rural areas for the CPP to focus efforts to reduce inequalities, it was necessary to be clear about what it was intended to achieve as a partnership as well as individual agencies;
- HIE's geographical area was wider than Highland and there were implications for areas outwith Highland that were equally or perhaps more disadvantaged in terms of rurality. From an HIE perspective, it was important to understand what the proposed list of small rural towns might mean in terms of how resources were prioritised;
- an assurance was sought that sufficient resources were available to make a difference in the communities and small towns identified. If that was not the case, it was suggested that the lists be narrowed down further;
- the Chief Officers' Group had welcomed the fact that there was a rich mix between HIE's fragile areas approach and the small towns were it was recognised that there was significant inequality;
- the communities and small towns identified represented approximately five percent of the Highland population and this was an appropriate group to begin to target;
- there was a long history of debate regarding the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation versus other methods of identifying inequalities and the work undertaken would enable more evidence to be drawn out that could be fed in nationally and potentially bring more funding to Highland; and
- targeting resources to address inequalities in rural areas had to be evidence based and the report was a major step forward and provided greater focus. It was suggested that it be remitted to the Chief Officers' Group to undertake further detailed work and consider how best to proceed.

Thereafter, the Board:-

- i. **NOTED** the progress made by the Health Inequalities Group and the analytical work produced in Annex 2 of the report;
- ii. **AGREED** that there was sufficient analysis at this time from the three indices in use to identify rural areas for the CPP to focus efforts to reduce inequalities;

- iii. **AGREED** that the 16 rural communities listed in Table 4 and the small rural towns listed in Table 3 be the focus for CPP collaboration to reduce inequalities. This complemented the work underway in the four areas of urban deprivation; and
- iv. **AGREED** that it be remitted to the COG to undertake further detailed work and consider how best to proceed.

## 9. Redesign of Community Justice

There had been circulated Report No CPB/10/15 by the Director of Care and Learning, Highland Council, which set out the requirement for new governance and planning arrangements for Community Justice Services. Options for local arrangements were outlined and it was recommended that these be considered by the Community Planning Partnership Board. The Council's Education, Children and Adult Services (ECAS) Committee and the CPP Chief Officers' Group had agreed that the proposal outlined in paragraph 3.2 of the report, whereby the ECAS Committee would continue to act as the strategic committee with decision-making authority delegated to an enhanced and extended Criminal Justice Sub-Committee, would meet the governance requirements for Community Justice in Highland.

The Board:-

- i. **NOTED** the planned change in governance arrangements for Community Justice; and
- ii. **AGREED** to the option outlined in paragraph 3.2 of the report for the future model of planning Community Justice Services.

## 10. Locating Public Access Defibrillators in Highland

At its meeting on 4 March 2015, the Board agreed that a mapping exercise be carried out in relation to the provision of defibrillators in local communities. In that regard, there had circulated Report No CPB/11/15 by the Director of Adult Care and the Director of Public Health, NHS Highland which provided an update on progress.

The Board **AGREED**:-

- i. that the information gathered by the CPP to date be shared to inform the national work but that further locally targeted work would be of no added benefit at this stage; and
- ii. to inform the national work of the Lucky2bhere initiative and the considerable impact it had had on local communities across Highland, not only by supporting the purchase of defibrillators but by providing vital training.

## 11. Breakthrough Achievement for the Highland CPP 2015/16 – Employment of Care Leavers

The Director of Care and Learning, Highland Council, explained that, at its meeting on 26 March 2015, the Chief Officers' Group had undertaken to collaborate on a breakthrough achievement that not only marked the effectiveness of the CPP but had tangible outcomes. Officers had been keen that it addressed inequalities, as well as having links to the economy and employability. Having considered a number of options, partners had agreed to focus on offering employment to care leavers, either within their own organisations or through their networks. At the Chief Officers' Group on 27 May 2015, officers had considered the size of the challenge and recommitted

to it. There were approximately 25 care leavers per year in Highland. At present, the Council was in touch with 67 previous care leavers, only 6 of which were in full-time employment, and this summed up how delivering on the challenge would be a breakthrough achievement. Partners had agreed to identify lead officers and the Council had committed to developing an infrastructure to support the initiative.

Having welcomed the proposed breakthrough achievement, the Board **NOTED** the update.

## **12. Date of Next Meeting**

The Board **NOTED** that the next meeting would be held on Friday 11 September 2015 in the Council Chamber, Highland Council Headquarters, Inverness.

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm.