

## Highland Community Planning Partnership

### Community Planning Board

Minutes of Meeting of the Community Planning Board held in the Main Conference Room, Police Scotland, Divisional Headquarters, Old Perth Road, Inverness on Wednesday 4 October 2017 at 10.00 am.

#### Present:

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

Mr A Christie  
Mr B Lobban  
Mr S Barron  
Ms A Clark  
Mr I Kyle (Substitute)  
Mr A McCann (Substitute)

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

Mr J Gibbs

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

Ms I Grigor  
Ms M Wylie

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

Mr I Ross (Substitute)  
Mr I Murray

##### Representing NHS Highland (NHSH):

Dr D Alston  
Mrs J Baird  
Dr H van Woerden  
Ms C Steer

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

Ch Supt G Macdonald

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

Mr M Loynd (Substitute) (also representing East Ross Community Partnership)

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

Ms D Mackinnon

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

Mr G Hogg

##### Community Partnership Chairs:

Ch Insp I Maclelland, Sutherland  
Mr M Loynd, East Ross (also representing SFRS)  
Ms A Clark, Mid Ross  
Mr S MacPherson, Skye, Lochalsh and West Ross (Interim Chair)  
Ch Insp B Mackay, Nairn  
Mr G Ross, Inverness

#### In attendance:

Miss M Murray, Committee Administrator, Highland Council  
Miss J Green, Administrative Assistant, Highland Council

**Dr D Alston in the Chair**

#### Business

##### 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were intimated on behalf of Mr G Moir, Mrs M Davidson, Mr A Mackinnon, Ms M Smith, Mr B Alexander, Mr S Black, Mr P Mascarenhas, Ms E Johnston, Mr D Oxley, Mr D McLachlan, Ms E Mead, Dr M Foxley, Mr R Iffla, Mr J MacDonald, Ms D Rawlinson, Mr R Kirk and Mr F Nixon.

## 2. Minutes of Meetings

The Board:

- i. **NOTED** the Minutes of the Community Justice Partnership – 22 June 2017;
- ii. **APPROVED** the Minutes of the Community Planning Board – 28 June 2017; and
- iii. **NOTED** the draft Note of the Chief Officers' Group (COG) – 22 September 2017.

On the point being raised, it was further **AGREED** that clarification be provided, for the next meeting, regarding the lines of accountability and governance in respect of the Highland Community Justice Partnership and the Highland Child Protection Committee.

## 3. Highland Outcome Improvement Plan (HOIP)

**Dr D Alston declared an interest in this item as his partner was employed to service the Highland Environment Forum (HEF).**

There had been circulated Report No CPB/13/17 by the HOIP Subgroup.

The Unit Manager – South Highland, SNH, drew attention to paragraph 3.1 of the report which, as requested by him at the COG, asked the Board to consider adopting the environment as a cross-cutting theme. He explained that he had originally been content that some of the actions in the Action Plan, which would deliver the outcomes, would relate to the environment. However, given that a third of the responses to the written consultation referred to the omission of the environment and that it had been raised at the HEF, he suggested that the matter merited reconsideration. He highlighted the opportunities that existed, in terms of attracting visitors and businesses, as a result of the quality of the environment and scenery in Highland. From a social perspective, the Government was raising issues around environmental inequalities – eg equality of access to green space. With regard to the actions that would deliver the HOIP, there was a strong recognition of the importance of the environment in terms of physical and mental health, and particular reference was made to the development of a Green Health Partnership. In relation to climate change, there were inequality issues in terms of physical connectivity, flooding and other extreme weather events. In conclusion, he emphasised the importance of listening to communities and that protecting the environment was critical to addressing inequalities in Highland, whether at an economic, social or environmental level.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- it was emphasised that the HOIP was not intended to cover every aspect of every need. It had a defined purpose in terms of tackling inequalities and, if the Board wished to add the environment as a cross-cutting theme, it was necessary to be clear about the reasons;
- partners having been asked to consider the nature of the existing cross-cutting themes, it was suggested that the environment was not viable as it did not contribute to every outcome and its inclusion would diminish the focus of the HOIP, which was key to its success;
- partners having questioned whether there was a way to increase recognition of the environment without making it a cross-cutting theme, it was suggested that there might be an opportunity for a separate environmental strategy that could potentially be linked to inequalities in the future;
- whilst it was recognised that climate change was a significant issue, it was not something that had been raised at the community roadshows;

- the environment featured highly within the Place Standard tool being used by Community Partnerships;
- climate change was being addressed by other groups – eg the Local Resilience Partnership, which was sighted on issues such as flooding, both in terms of prevention and response;
- it having been suggested that examining the consultation responses and SNH data might help to identify the key environmental inequalities in Highland and some actions that would contribute to the outcomes, it was explained that the actions had come from a clear pathway of workshops and consultation and concern was expressed that taking one aspect and informing it with data collected by partners would undermine the process;
- concern was expressed regarding whether the CPP had the resources to deliver what was already a very detailed plan, and how it would be evaluated;
- there was a need for a mechanism that recognised the need for the HOIP to be focussed and put it in context but made some wider connections and recognised the importance of the environment as a resource; and
- it was suggested that the Board approve the HOIP as circulated but feature the environment heavily in the annual review. If, at that time, it not being a cross-cutting theme was perceived to be an issue, it could be addressed.

Following consideration of the differing views expressed, the Board **AGREED**:

- i. the proposed amendments to the HOIP;
- ii. the proposed Action Plan; and
- iii. that it be remitted to the Chief Officers' Group to consider the issue of the environment, whether at the Annual Review of the HOIP or an earlier date, taking into account the feedback from the consultation and the points raised during discussion, and come back to the Board with proposals as to how to address it.

#### **4. Delivering Partnership Outcomes**

##### **i. Community Partnerships – Updates from Chairs**

Verbal updates were provided on behalf of the nine Community Partnerships, covering issues such as frequency of meetings, public attendance, establishment of subgroups, local workstreams, community engagement, and the status of children's, adult and locality plans.

In particular, the following issues were raised:

- a local organisation had been granted a significant amount of funding to support Sutherland Community Partnership with its community engagement work;
- public attendance at meetings had been variable;
- in addition to children's, adult and locality plans, Caithness Community Partnership had developed an economic plan;
- resources continued to be a limiting factor in terms of both the pace and scope of activity;
- in relation to East Ross Community Partnership localities, the COG had approved the request to separate Balintore from Milton and Kildary;
- partners were working well together and the information-sharing taking place was helpful, both to Community Partnerships and individual organisations;
- the opportunity to share experiences with other Community Partnerships at the forthcoming Development Day was welcomed;

- some Partnerships had seen increasing engagement by young people and thanks were expressed to the Community Learning and Development Support Officer and Youth Development Officers for their support in that regard;
- Mid Ross Community Partnership had agreed, in principle, to pilot having a disability-experienced representative, as discussed at the previous meeting of the Board;
- in relation to Skye, Lochalsh and West Ross Community Partnership, Mr S MacPherson, Head of Strengthening Communities, HIE, had assumed responsibility for chairing the Partnership on an interim basis. It was recognised that there was some ground to make up in terms of public consultation and engagement but confidence was expressed that this would take place as quickly as possible;
- over 20 organisations had participated in a development session in Lochaber, the aim of which was to increase engagement with third sector and community groups, and it was intended to hold another similar session; and
- Inverness Community Partnership was looking at the use of social media to engage with young people more effectively.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- it was encouraging to hear about the stage of the various plans and the significant amount of work involved was acknowledged. Going forward, the challenge was implementing the plans and the Board and COG had an important role in terms of supporting Community Partnerships and ensuring that there were some quick wins. It was recognised that this would impact on partners' resources and difficult decisions might have to be made;
- in relation to adult plans, it was highlighted that there would be a network event on 23 October 2017 to bring together the NHS Highland leads for sharing and learning, to review the plans, and to ascertain whether there were any common themes that work could commence on;
- the Director of Public Health and Health Policy, as Executive Lead for Children and Young People within NHS Highland, having commented that he would be keen to work with the Council's Director of Care and Learning and Children's Planning Manager to reflect on children's plans, it was explained that it had been agreed to review children's plans at the For Highland's Children 4 Leadership Group, which included NHS representatives;
- on the point being raised, it was suggested that the Community Partnership Chairs' meeting was the most appropriate forum to discuss draft locality plans. There would also be an opportunity at the forthcoming Development Day, although there was not a specific slot on the agenda. In addition, the Chief Officer, HTSI, explained that, if Chairs sent draft plans to her, they could be made available on the members' section of the CPP website, which was accessible by login only. It was requested that details of how to login be circulated to partners;
- information was provided on the review of the HTSI which, it was anticipated, would lead to more effective participation by third sector organisations at Community Partnership level. Whilst it was recognised that there was active participation in some areas, there was always room for improvement and it was necessary to ensure that there was an understanding of the importance of strategic locality planning and that the third sector contributed to that equally throughout Highland. A structure was anticipated whereby, at the core, local services would be commissioned and they would be held accountable for speaking downwards to their communities and upwards through the HTSI so there was a shared understanding through the spine of the organisation, largely as already existed in public sector organisations; and

- Community Partnerships differed in terms of how they reacted to offers of third sector participation and it was necessary to get better at supporting such offers.

Thereafter, the Board:-

- i. **NOTED** the updates; and
- ii. **AGREED** that information on how to access the Members' section of the Community Planning Partnership website be circulated to partners.

## ii. **Update from COG on developing Community Partnerships**

The Acting Head of Policy, Highland Council, gave a verbal update on behalf of the Community Partnerships Subgroup, during which information was provided on a further development session that had taken place with Community Partnership Chairs. The issue of capacity, which had been raised by Chairs, had been discussed at the COG where the importance of each organisation prioritising and committing to Community Partnerships had been emphasised. Training had taken place on driver diagrams and the Place Standard, and a community impact assessment checklist and conflict resolution approach had been agreed by the COG. The issue of accountability, which had also been remitted to the COG, was challenging and a final position had not yet been reached. It was important to achieve a balance between ownership of the plans at local level and oversight at CPP level. In addition, it was necessary to consider whether there should be different approaches for locality plans and children's and adult plans. The Community Partnership Subgroup had been tasked with exploring the issues in more detail and would report back to the next COG and Board.

The Chair of the COG sought the views of the Board on the extent to which accountability was delegated to Community Partnerships or whether the Board had some accountability for the quality of outputs of the Partnerships. Discussion ensued, during which the following main issues were raised:

- the plans were owned by Community Partnerships and it was not for the Board to impose a standard format. However, there was a need for a degree of consistency in terms of quality assurance and it was important that the outcomes could be evidenced;
- there was potential for unrealistic objectives to be included in locality plans and there was a need for governance in that regard. Considerable discussion took place on the issue of managing expectations, during which it was commented that representatives participating in Community Partnerships should have an understanding of what their organisations would regard as unachievable and Chairs needed to be able to rely on them to interject when expectations were getting too high. It was explained that senior officers in the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service and Police Scotland were sense-checking locality plans on behalf of local officers to ensure that the commitments and aspirations were reasonable and achievable. It was suggested that a similar approach be adopted by other partner organisations and that this be captured in a simple set of principles that all partners could sign up to;
- having sought input from Scottish Government community planning leads, the Scottish Government Location Director explained that there was no specific requirement on Boards. The duties were placed on CPPs as entities and it was therefore up to them to set themselves up in a way they considered suitable to discharge the duties. In terms of locality planning, every public sector body with statutory community planning duties should agree the content of the locality plan

unless the CPP agreed that certain partners need not do so. Locality plans needed to be agreed by representatives who had the authority to both sign off a plan and commit their organisation to supporting and resourcing delivery of it. In practice, that was most likely to be representatives on the CPP Board but the CPP could delegate authority to Community Partnerships. The CPP could also choose to include other bodies as signatories;

- whilst the need for assurance was recognised, it was hoped that this would be sought in a positive and encouraging manner;
- it might be that the Board had a role, not so much in terms of quality assurance but in managing deficits and assisting partnerships who were having difficulty in achieving outcomes;
- in terms of the statutory guidance, accountability to communities was key and it was suggested that consideration be given to whether the role of the Board was not about holding Community Partnerships to account in terms of actions but having a robust process in place to ensure that communities participated;
- in addition to the conflict resolution process for partners, it was suggested that consideration be given to a process whereby communities could escalate issues in terms of Community Partnership performance; and
- the Chair highlighted that the remit of the Board was to provide strategic political leadership and expertise to drive and enable public sector reform. As part of that leadership, the Board had chosen to set up particular mechanisms and it had a responsibility to make sure those mechanisms were working. However, it was not necessary to sign off the details of every plan. In terms of locality plans, the key issue was making sure the processes were working. With regard to adult and children's plans, the accountability arrangements might need to be different to take account of relevant partners' statutory obligations.

Thereafter, the Board:

- i. **NOTED** the position; and
- ii. **AGREED** that the Community Partnership Subgroup and Chief Officers' Group take into account the points raised during discussion, particularly in relation to governance and escalation routes, when considering the issue of accountability.

### iii. **Annual Performance Reports 2016/17**

There had been circulated the following reports by Responsible Officers:

- i. Economic Growth and Regeneration
- ii. Employability
- iii. Early Years/Children
- iv. Safer and Stronger Communities
- v. Health Inequalities and Physical Activity
- vi. Outcomes for Older People
- vii. Environmental Outcomes
- viii. SOA Development Plan

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

At this stage, reference was made to the earlier discussions regarding governance and the Board was asked to reflect on whether it was assured and felt it had achieved what it had set out to.

## 5. Presentation: Scottish Fire and Rescue Service Transformation

Mr M Loynd, on behalf of the Area Manager and Local Senior Officer, SFRS, gave a presentation on SFRS transformation during which he outlined the need to adapt to meet new risks; the transformation strategy covering the service's values, vision, method and outcomes; the wider role and responsibilities of firefighters in future; the risks of failing to transform; and proposals for consultation and partnership working.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- the issues highlighted in the presentation were vitally important from a health and social care perspective and it was confirmed that the SFRS recognised that the footprint of fire stations across Highland was a great asset in terms of supporting other agencies, from both a prevention and response perspective;
- flexibility and maintaining the ability for the same people to be retained fire fighters, first responders and support workers, for example, was a key point of interest in terms of creating jobs within rural communities whilst providing a full range of services;
- in recognising the differences in demographics, types of housing, road traffic accidents etc across Scotland, it was queried how much local influence there would be, from the CPP for example, on the priorities;
- it was not intended to reduce the Service at an operational level but to try and maintain it by changing how it was delivered which, in a Highland context, would involve consideration of the retained environment including introducing new vehicles, utilising new technology and increasing the number of full-time staff in rural areas;
- it having been suggested that there was a need for the SFRS, Scottish Ambulance Service, NHS and Police Scotland to discuss collective resources, it was confirmed that this was taking place at a national level. Given that other public agencies were undertaking similar efficiency/savings projects, it was suggested that it would also be useful to have a conversation at CPP level. In this regard, it was confirmed that the SFRS would engage further with partner organisations, including the Scottish Ambulance Service which was not a member of the CPP, and were currently undertaking projects to support other frontline services in remote and rural communities; and
- the difficulty of changing people's expectations of the role of the fire service or ambulance service was recognised.

The Board otherwise **NOTED** the presentation.

## 6. Active Highland Strategy and Action Plan

There had been circulated Report No CPB/14/17 by the Head of Health Improvement, NHS Highland, on behalf of the Active Highland Strategy Group.

On the point being raised, it was confirmed that the timeline for implementation of the action plan was 12 to 18 months. There was a lead agency for each of the eight priorities and a good understanding of how the actions would be taken forward by partners. The inclusion of natural heritage as a theme was welcomed and congratulations were expressed to the Head of Health Improvement and her colleagues for the Strategy which, as a result of community planning processes, was an improvement on previous activity strategies.

The Board **APPROVED** the Active Highland Action Plan.

## 7. The impact of the Fort William smelter development on the locality and the issues to be addressed at CPP level

There had been circulated Report No CPB/15/17 by the Director of Business and Sector Development, HIE.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- an update was provided with respect to community ownership of land during which it was explained that Liberty had made an undertaking to the government that they would significantly involve the community in land transfer. The East Lochaber and Laggan Community Trust had been formed and initial engagement with Mr Duncan Matheson, who had recently been appointed by Liberty and had responsibility for the overall estate, had been positive;
- whilst the paper rightly focussed on industrial and infrastructure issues, it was important to recognise that there were wider issues of significance for communities in terms of the development of Lochaber as the Outdoor Capital and how Glen Nevis and Ben Nevis were managed;
- the CPP had a key role in ensuring that the impact of the development was positive and sustainable, and particular reference was made to education, health care and transport services;
- on the point being raised, it was confirmed that the initial estimate, based on the size of the factory, was that 345 jobs would be created during the first phase of the development;
- concern was expressed regarding the impact on the roads network, particularly the A82, and partners were encouraged to use whatever leverage they might have to persuade Transport Scotland to bring forward investment in the area and find solutions to the challenges. In this regard, it was explained that Transport Scotland had undertaken some survey work and further work would be undertaken during October 2017, the scope of which had been extended to Corpach and Torlundy. Shift patterns would be designed to limit the impact on congestion, further details of which would be provided in the planning application; and
- designing a new hospital for the 21<sup>st</sup> century was key and considerable engagement would be required in that regard.

The Board otherwise **NOTED** the impacts for the CPP as set out in the report.

## 8. Date of Next Meeting

The Board **NOTED** that the next meeting was scheduled to take place at 10.30 am on Tuesday 19 December 2017 in the St Kilda Room, SNH Headquarters, Great Glen House, Leachkin Road, Inverness.

In concluding the business, it was confirmed that NHS Highland would chair the next two meetings, during which time it was necessary to redefine the Board's role and responsibilities and clarify lines of accountability and escalation, as discussed during previous items.

The meeting ended at 12.35 pm.