

Highland Community Planning Partnership

Community Planning Board

Minutes of Meeting of the Community Planning Board held in the Council Chamber, Council Headquarters, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness on Wednesday 28 June 2017 at 10.00 am.

Present:

Representing the Highland Council (HC):

Mrs M Davidson
Mr A Christie
Mr B Lobban
Mr S Barron
Ms M Morris
Ms A Clark
Mr P Mascarenhas
Ms E Johnston
Mr C Maclennan

Representing Police Scotland (PS):

Ch Supt G Macdonald

Representing the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS):

Mr J MacDonald

Representing Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH):

Mr G Hogg

Representing Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE):

Mr R Kirk (also representing Caithness Community Partnership)

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

Ms D Rawlinson

Representing the Highland Third Sector Interface (HTSI):

Mr I Donald (Substitute)

Community Partnership Chairs:

Mr R Kirk, Caithness (also representing HIE)
Ch Insp I Maclelland, Sutherland
Mr F Nixon, Badenoch and Strathspey
Mr G Ross, Inverness

Representing High Life Highland (HLH):

Mr I Ross (Substitute)
Mr I Murray

Representing NHS Highland (NHS):

Dr D Alston
Ms E Mead
Mrs J Baird
Ms C Steer

In attendance:

Mr I Kyle, Children's Planning Manager, Highland Council
Mr D Wilby, Head of Performance, High Life Highland
Ms C McDiarmid, Head of Policy and Reform, Highland Council
Mr C Simpson, Principal Tourism and Film Officer, Highland Council
Mrs R Daly, Board Secretary, NHS Highland
Miss M Murray, Committee Administrator, Highland Council
Miss J Green, Administrative Assistant, Highland Council

Also in attendance:

Mr J Beaton, Highlands Policy and Engagement Officer, Inclusion Scotland

Dr D Alston in the Chair

Business

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr G Moir, Ms M Smith, Mr B Alexander, Mr S Black, Mr D Oxley, Mr J Gibbs, Ms I Grigor, Ms M Wylie, Mr D McLachlan, Ms D Mackinnon, Mr M Loynd, Ms A Clark, Mr R Muir and Ch Insp B Mackay.

2. Minutes of Meetings

The Board:

- i. **NOTED** the draft Minutes of the Community Justice Partnership – 22 February 2017; and
- ii. **APPROVED** the Minutes of the Community Planning Board – 15 March 2017.

3. Community Partnerships Update

The following verbal updates were provided on the current status of Community Partnerships:-

Caithness

Mr R Kirk explained that 14 members of the public had attended the recent meeting in Dunbeath. There was a feeling of unity and participation within the Partnership but there were still some resourcing issues to be addressed in terms of people and time in order to bring forward the various Plans by October 2017.

Sutherland

Ch Insp I Maclelland outlined the progress being made with the Locality Plan for Golspie including conducting a survey, arranging a series of workshops to review feedback with the help of a local university student, and populating the driver diagrams. It was emphasised that there was a need for training on driver diagrams as soon as possible. An update was also provided on the work of two subgroups relating to transport and employability, and it was confirmed that work was ongoing to submit a request for two additional localities. Lastly, it was confirmed that an annual review of the Partnership would take place on 7 July 2017 and an invitation to the event would be extended to the Acting Head of Policy, Highland Council, or another representative of the CPP.

Nairn

Ch Insp I Maclelland, on behalf of Ch Insp B Mackay, outlined the progress being made in relation to the establishment of an employability group and the draft Children's Plan. It was confirmed that additional Partnership representation had been sought from Nairn Youth Forum. Information was provided on further engagement work taking place before the survey closed, as well as the work being undertaken in terms of utilising local events to raise the profile of the Partnership. The next meeting would take place on 15 July 2017 in Nairn Community Centre.

Easter Ross

Mr F Nixon, on behalf of Mr M Loynd, confirmed that the location of meetings was being rotated around the area with the last meeting having been held in Alness. It was explained that partners had attended joint training with the Mid Ross Partnership on the VOiCE tool, and that the results of the survey were being assessed in comparison with the "Having Your Say" survey which had been carried out in 2015. Clarity was sought on the formal process for dividing a locality to create a separate locality for Balintore, and the Chair would follow this up by email. The next meeting would take place on 29 June 2017.

Mid Ross

Mrs J Baird, on behalf of Ms A Clark who had recently taken over as Chair, explained that the Chair was undertaking a series of one to one meetings with partners to get feedback on progress to date and their individual priorities and contribution. She had also attended the Local Outcome Improvement Plan consultation event in Dingwall and a Ross-shire Youth Forum meeting. The first formal Partnership meeting in public had taken place on 8 May 2017 and had covered issues including the various plans to be produced, local outcomes, the review of the Active Highland Strategy, and the quality of support for families affected by substance misuse. It had been agreed to produce Locality Plans for Dingwall and Conon and the first consultation event was scheduled to take place in Conon on 10 July 2017. The work being undertaken by the Communication and Engagement Subgroup, which included promoting the event in Conon, was outlined, and it was confirmed that a number of partners had attended training on the VOiCE tool.

Badenoch and Strathspey

Mr F Nixon confirmed that the last meeting took place on 10 May 2017, which coincided with the first Ward Business Meeting for newly elected Members. The Adult and Children's Plan Subgroups were well advanced and a meeting of the Children's Plan Subgroup would be held on 4 July 2017 to review the first draft and associated driver diagram. The Engagement Subgroup continued to meet and the Sutherland Partnership survey was being used to gather evidence to inform priorities. Partners were developing good relationships in terms of problem-solving and identifying the resources and skills available. The work being undertaken to engage young people was outlined and it was confirmed that the next meeting of the Partnership would take place on 16 August 2017. The positive atmosphere of the Partnership was emphasised. However, there were challenges to be addressed in terms of public attendance.

Inverness

Mr G Ross advised that he was the newly appointed Chair of the Inverness Partnership, which would meet in public for the first time that afternoon. Key items of business included a communication plan and updates on Children's and Adult Plans as well as the Locality Plan for Merkinch. The review of welfare projects was also a vital piece of work. There had been positive engagement and people had been encouraged to continue to meet throughout the summer to meet the targets set for October 2017.

Updates were not available in respect of Lochaber and Skye, Lochalsh and Wester Ross Partnerships.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:-

- partners commended the work by Police Scotland and all those involved in the

Sutherland Partnership, particularly in terms of its social media presence;

- community planning theme groups had gone through a self-assessment process so there were some tools available and lessons that could be shared with Community Partnerships;
- in relation to the decision at the previous meeting to amend the boundaries of the Nairn Partnership, which had been well received, it would be useful to gather information on the pros and cons of any potential future changes to inform decision-making;
- it had previously been recognised that some acceleration was required in relation to Skye, Lochalsh and Wester Ross Partnership and, given that the Chair was not in attendance, the Chair of the Board undertook to contact him to seek an update; and
- the spirit of collaboration and sharing learning/best practice amongst Community Partnerships was very helpful.

The Board **NOTED** the updates and **AGREED** that, if Community Partnership boundary issues arose in the future, information on the pros and cons of any potential change be presented to the Board to allow an informed decision to be made

4. Developing Community Partnerships – Update

There had been circulated Report No CPB/07/17 by the Acting Head of Policy, Highland Council, and the Head of Health Improvement, NHS Highland, on behalf of the Community Partnerships Subgroup.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- the Chair of Caithness Community Partnership highlighted that discussion had taken place regarding developing an economic plan, building on the work of the Caithness and North Sutherland Regeneration Partnership, to address issues that would not be included in the health and social care plan. Partners expressed support in that regard and it was confirmed that the economy and job creation would be central to the Programme for the Council. However, it was important not to lose the focus on addressing inequalities;
- information having been sought on whether requests for new localities would be retrospective, it was explained that the Chief Officers' Group had oversight of the process in that regard;
- it was important that the Highland Outcome Improvement Plan reflected the various Partnerships' Locality Plans;
- it was suggested that it be remitted to the Chief Officers' Group to consider and recommend accountability routes and processes for approving each of the plans developed by Community Partnerships; and
- the Council's Youth Convener highlighted that, during his last six weeks in post, he planned to visit each of the nine Community Partnership areas to meet with the Chair or attend a Partnership meeting with two other young people from the area to share their views on the issues in their communities.

The Board:

- i. **AGREED** that, where necessary, Community Partnerships could develop a general plan for their area to cover issues that might not be captured in the children's, adult health and social care or locality plans;
- ii. **AGREED** that the strategic Community Learning and Development Plan be reviewed and updated;
- iii. **AGREED** that the partnership Equalities Working Group develop a partnership approach to 'inequalities proof' local plans;

- iv. **APPROVED** the template at Appendix 1 of the report for Community Partnerships to use to seek agreement from the Chief Officers' Group to add or change the localities they wished to focus on in terms of developing locality plans;
- v. **NOTED** that the CPP Board and Chief Officers' Group would need to ensure that the appropriate linkages were made between the Local Outcome Improvement Plan and Locality planning process through regular review;
- vi. **AGREED** that it be remitted to the Chief Officers' Group to consider and recommend accountability routes and processes for approving each of the plans developed by Community Partnerships; and
- vii. **NOTED** that a process for escalating issues and concerns within the CPP structures needed to be developed by the Chief Officers' Group.

5. Presentation by John Beaton, Inclusion Scotland

John Beaton, Highlands Policy and Engagement Officer, Inclusion Scotland, gave a presentation on the work of Inclusion Scotland, a national disabled persons' organisation made up of people with a disability and their organisations, and the Scottish Government's key disability stakeholder. He began by outlining a number of disabling barriers in terms of both the medical and social models. He then provided an overview of the Highland Pilot Project which was funded by the Scottish Government to identify regional barriers and provide solutions to increase civic participation of Highland disabled people. In terms of achieving this, Inclusion Scotland had identified that an expert by experience was the missing link between disabled people, their organisations and public bodies. Three ideas were therefore proposed, namely, the establishment of a single disabled representative on each of the nine Community Partnerships; support for a pan-impairment, pan-Highland disabled persons' organisation; and the opportunity to work in a co-operative way with the Highland Community Planning Partnership.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- it was recognised that people with a disability were experts by experience. However, people with different disabilities experienced different issues and it was important to ensure that all issues were captured;
- transportation was a key issue and it would be helpful to bring together a group of people with a disability to inform the CPP on accessibility issues;
- it was important that disabled representatives on Community Partnerships were not seen as tokenistic and ways in which this could be avoided were sought and received;
- it was suggested that Community Partnership Chairs be asked to consider the most effective way of implementing Inclusion Scotland's idea to establish a single disabled representative on each Community Partnership;
- further information was sought on the purpose of the pan-impairment, pan-Highland disabled persons' organisation and how it would operate to ensure that existing disabled organisations did not feel displaced and understood how to be involved;
- HTSI had a close relationship with Inclusion Scotland and was based in the premises so was well-placed to take forward the suggestion of a pan-impairment, pan-Highland disabled persons' organisation. In doing so, it was suggested that the views of the Council's Equalities Officer, Elected Members and other partners be sought, and that a report be presented to the next meeting of the Board;
- progress in terms of the establishment of disabled representatives and a disabled persons' organisation should be reviewed in a year's time;
- the CPP was involved in a number of different initiatives – eg the Green Health Partnership – and steps could be taken to ensure that disabled persons' interests were represented; and
- people who developed impairments should be looked upon as a resource to provide

experience rather than a problem.

The Highlands Policy and Engagement Officer having responded to the issues raised, the Board **NOTED** the presentation and **AGREED** that:

- i. it be remitted to Community Partnership Chairs to consider the most effective way of implementing Inclusion Scotland's suggestion that there be a disabled representative on each Community Partnership;
- ii. the Highland Third Sector Interface engage widely and explore how best to take forward the suggestion of a pan-impairment, pan-Highland disabled persons' organisation, and report back to the next meeting; and
- iii. progress in terms of i. and ii. above be reviewed in a year's time.

6. Delivering Partnership Outcomes

There had been circulated the following reports by Responsible Officers on the current delivery plans for the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA), the partnership's agreed strategic priorities, developing partnership working, and views on future roles for the groups:

i. Economic Growth and Regeneration (HIE)

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the report.

ii. Employability (Highland Council)

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the report.

iii. Early Years/Children (Highland Council)

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the report.

iv. Safer and Stronger Communities (Police Scotland)

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the report.

v. Health Inequalities and Physical Activity (NHS Highland)

Further to the report, the Head of Health Improvement provided an update on the meeting held on 26 June 2017 to develop proposals for taking forward a Green Health Partnership in Highland.

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the report.

vi. Outcomes for Older People (NHS Highland)

During discussion, more detail was sought in relation to adult services in line with the information provided in the report on early years/children.

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the report.

vii. Environmental Outcomes (SNH)

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the report.

viii. Community Learning and Development (Highland Council)

The Board **NOTED** that the CLD update had been incorporated within item 7 on the agenda.

ix. SOA Development Plan (Highland Council)

The Board scrutinised and **NOTED** the update.

7. Community Learning and Development (CLD)

There had been circulated Report No CPB/08/17 by the Director of Care and Learning, Highland Council.

Further to the discussions under item 3, it was highlighted that the CLD Support Officer was organising driver diagram training for CLD leads, which would be open to other partners.

The Board:

- i. **NOTED** the progress being made towards the development of Locality Plans as contained in Appendix A of the report;
- ii. **NOTED** the appointment of the CLD support officer to support the work of the CLD Strategic Group and the nine Community Partnerships and their CLD leads;
- iii. **NOTED** that a framework for monitoring CLD provision through Locality Plans would be considered by the CLD Strategic Group to support monitoring by Community Partnerships/CLD leads once the CPP had considered the datasets and performance indicators that it would use to monitor progress for its overall planning;
- iv. **AGREED** the revisions to the CLD Plan 2015-18 in Appendix B of the report as proposed by the CLD Strategic Group to take account of the way in which the CPP had developed the planning and service delivery arrangements;
- v. **NOTED** that the updated CLD Plan would be considered by the Council's People Committee should recommendation iv. above be agreed;
- vi. **AGREED** the revised CLD Strategic Group remit in Appendix C of the report which clarified its role in the light of the new community planning/locality planning arrangements; and
- vii. **NOTED** that the CLD Strategic Group had started to consider the new 2018-2021 CLD Plan.

8. Supporting more community action and community-run services: acting on feedback

There had been circulated Report No CPB/09/17 by the Head of Policy and Reform, Highland Council, on behalf of the Community Gateway Subgroup.

The Head of Policy and Reform, Highland Council, gave a presentation in amplification of the report, during which detailed information was provided on the outcome of discussions at the CPP Chief Officers' Group; the Council's redesign process; the community groups that had been consulted and their feedback/ideas for support; the findings of the "Redesigning for Community Action" event in November 2016; the features of the most popular idea of a "Community Gateway"; and providers' feedback. There were three

possible courses of action for the CPP in developing the “Gateway” idea and these were described in detail in the report for the Board’s consideration.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- in the interest of transparency, Mr I Ross explained that he Chaired a Council for Voluntary Services. Mr A Christie highlighted that he was a Director of HTSI and Highland Citizens Advice Bureau Ltd;
- it would be helpful to feed in to the work being undertaken by the Commission on Highland Democracy, given the overlap with some of the themes highlighted in the report/presentation;
- it was necessary to communicate the proposed “Gateway” effectively and offer reassurance to regional and local bodies;
- it was important to recognise the geography of Highland and the associated challenges;
- if the Board agreed to proceed with the “Gateway”, there should be a period of review after 12 months;
- whilst recognising the need for grant funding, it was necessary to exercise caution in terms of increasing dependency, and to encourage Development Trusts and other community groups to generate income;
- the importance of listening to community feedback was emphasised and concern was expressed that the recommendations had drifted too far from what communities wanted, which was a simple single point of access;
- third sector organisations needed to come together and discuss how to achieve greater consistency, simplify what they did and make themselves more useful to communities;
- a national review of Third Sector Interfaces was currently underway and it was therefore an opportune time to develop the proposed “Gateway”, which would help to improve efficiency and quality control;
- change should be driven through improvement rather than a top-down approach;
- the term “Community Gateway” was too inward-facing;
- there appeared to be some confusion in terms of the organisations seen as having a role in supporting community action and the features of a “Community Gateway”;
- it was necessary to achieve best value, minimise duplication and meet the needs and demands of community organisations, and it was suggested that, prior to progressing development work, a mapping exercise/best value review of existing provision be carried out;
- whilst it was a good idea in principle, concern was expressed that the proposed “Gateway” would only meet a few of the needs it was intended to, and it was suggested that consideration be given to how to manage advice and information provision at a local level;
- it was not clear whether the proposed “Gateway” was virtual or physical; and
- a webpage might be helpful but most people wanted to speak to someone and it was suggested that there was a need for a small pool of people with the expertise to help community bodies navigate their way through the maze they encountered when beginning a new project.

In response to the issues raised, it was explained that, whilst there was duplication, the significant amount of time and resources required to carry out a mapping exercise was prohibitive. Another issue was that, whilst there might be a desire to have one identified person as a point of contact within an area, not all provision was controlled by the CPP. In terms of community bodies wishing to speak to somebody, the “Gateway” was not intended to replace the skills and advice provided by delivery partners and there would still be referrals.

Following further discussion, it was suggested that the Board was not in a position to proceed with the proposed “Gateway” on the basis of the information available and that further work be undertaken by the Subgroup to clarify what it would look like and how community groups would access it. It was important to be confident that a web-based “Gateway” was what communities wanted and, as a first step, it was suggested that the original group of 14 community bodies be consulted on the proposal and whether it was sufficient or the right start in meeting their expectations/requirements.

In addition, on the point being raised, the Chief Executive, NHS Highland, confirmed that the scope for a Rapid Process Improvement Workshop (RPIW) could be explored. It was explained that RPIWs brought together people with different agendas or understandings to try and eliminate the waste from a particular process. However, it was necessary to be clear about the process to be mapped and identify a start and end point.

In relation to recommendation iv, the Chair emphasised the need to make it clear to those involved to date that their input was being taken seriously and that the CPP was exploring ways to make its action more effective.

Thereafter, the Board:

- i. **NOTED** the engagement events to date and the role the Highland Third Sector Interface had had in organising and facilitating them;
- ii. **NOTED** the feedback and ideas from community bodies, and that the idea of a Community Gateway was the most favoured; that a sub group of the Chief Officers’ Group had worked to develop this idea and engaged with providers as well; and that there appeared to be considerable overlap and duplication across providers of the services sought of a Gateway;
- iii. **AGREED** that, before progressing development work, the original group of 14 community bodies be consulted on the proposal for a web-based “Gateway” and whether it was sufficient or the right start in meeting their expectations/requirements;
- iv. **AGREED** that the scope for a Rapid Process Improvement Workshop be explored;
- v. **AGREED** that more detailed proposals on what the “Gateway” would look like and how community groups would access it be presented to the Board when the action at iii. above had concluded; and
- vi. **AGREED** that not responding to the feedback created risks for the CPP strategically and locally and that it be made clear to those involved to date that their input was being taken seriously and that the CPP was exploring ways to make its action more effective.

9. Draft Highland Outcome Improvement Plan (HOIP)

There had been circulated Report No CPB/10/17 on behalf of the HOIP Subgroup.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- thanks were expressed to the Subgroup for their efforts in progressing the HOIP. In particular, partners commended the Chief Officer, HTSI, who had been the driving force behind the community engagement work;
- the departure from the bureaucracy of the SOA was welcomed;
- the HOIP was a ten-year plan and there should be clear opportunities for Community Partnerships to feed in to the ongoing process;
- mobile inclusion should be added to the proposed Infrastructure priorities;
- affordable housing was a barrier to employment and was a key priority. However, it

was suggested it might sit better under Infrastructure than Poverty Reduction;

- the cross-cutting impact themes were important. However, it was not yet clear how they would interact in terms of activity;
- in relation to the Mental Health and Wellbeing outcome, it was necessary to make it clear that the term “wellbeing” was being used in the context of mental health rather than in a wider sense;
- the Plan focussed on how to address problems rather than take opportunities, and there were economic and environmental opportunities that had not been included; and
- whilst welcoming the focussed document, concern was expressed that there was no mention of the environment or sustainability.

Further discussion took place on the issues raised, during which it was emphasised that the Plan was not intended to be all-encompassing but was about reducing inequalities by addressing, as a partnership, the issues that were important to communities in Highland. However, it was recognised that there was a need for more of an asset-based approach and to better communicate the purpose of the Plan.

As a first step, it was suggested that the title of the Plan be amended to “The Highland Outcome Improvement Plan – Reducing Inequalities in Highland”. In addition, it was proposed that a narrative be included to better explain the purpose of the Plan, present it in a more positive way and provide further context, particularly in terms of the links between the various outcomes and themes, and the opportunities that existed.

The Chair added that the CPP had the power to do other things as a partnership and suggested that consideration be given to the wider vision for Highland over the next ten years.

Thereafter, the Board:

- NOTED** the engagement process and feedback received;
- AGREED** the content and structure of the draft Highland Outcome Improvement Plan subject to the title being amended to “The Highland Outcome Improvement Plan – Reducing Inequalities in Highland” and the inclusion of narrative to better explain the purpose of the Plan, present it in a more positive way and provide further context, particularly in terms of the links between the various outcomes and themes, and the opportunities that existed to deliver:
 - the 5 key outcomes outlined in section 3.3 of the report
 - the 4 impact themes outlined in section 3.4 of the report
 - the priorities identified within each outcome which could be found on pages 4-8 of the draft Highland Outcome Improvement Plan
- AGREED** the next steps for consulting on the draft Highland Outcome Improvement Plan;
- AGREED** that partners consider the community engagement feedback and work on developing supporting actions for a 1 year Delivery Plan that would be considered by the Board in October 2017; and
- AGREED** that consideration be given to the Community Planning Partnership’s wider vision for Highland over the next ten years.

10. Active Highland Strategy – Community Engagement

There had been circulated Report No CPB/11/17 by the Chair of the Health Inequalities and Physical Activity Theme Group on behalf of the Active Highland Group.

The Board **NOTED** the feedback from the community engagement work.

11. Potential impacts of the vote to leave the European Union and any contingency plans partners may have in response

There had been circulated Report No CPB/12/17 by the Director of Development and Infrastructure, Highland Council, with input from the Chief Officers' Group.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- NHS Highland had significant concerns regarding the potential impact on staffing levels;
- the term “migrant workers” did not capture the labour market issues which related not only to people who perceived themselves as being migrants, and who might be temporary/seasonal workers, but to the choices people made about where they wanted their lives and careers to be;
- some companies were already taking action, including reinforcing existing links with, or diversification into, the UK market;
- there was already evidence of a downturn in labour supply in some sectors – eg harvesting of agricultural products; and
- in terms of where to present the information gathered, partners were reminded that the Scottish Government Location Director for Highland had indicated, at the previous meeting, that she would seek to present evidence to the UK Government.

Thereafter, the Board **NOTED** the content of the report and **AGREED** that the Scottish Government Location Director for Highland seek to present the information gathered to the UK Government.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Board **NOTED** that the next meeting would take place at 10.00 am on Wednesday 4 October 2017 in the Police Board Room, Divisional Headquarters, Old Perth Road, Inverness, IV2 3SY.

The Board also **AGREED** that consideration be given, at the next meeting, to whether or not meetings of the Community Planning Board should be held in public.

The meeting ended at 12.40 pm.