



**Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk,
NR33 0EQ**

Scrutiny Committee

Members:

Councillor Stuart Bird (Chairman)
Councillor Mike Deacon (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Edward Back
Councillor David Beavan
Councillor Judy Cloke
Councillor Linda Coulam
Councillor Andree Gee
Councillor Louise Gooch
Councillor Tracey Green
Councillor Colin Hedgley
Councillor Geoff Lynch
Councillor Keith Robinson
Councillor Caroline Topping

Members are invited to a **Meeting of the Scrutiny Committee**
to be held in the Conference Room, Riverside, Lowestoft
on **Thursday 20 May 2021 at 6:30 pm**

This Meeting is being held in person in order to comply with the Local Government Act 1972. In order to comply with Covid regulations and guidance, the number of people at this Meeting will have to be restricted to only those whose attendance is reasonably necessary.

Ordinarily, East Suffolk Council encourages members of the public to attend its Meetings but on this occasion would encourage the public to watch the livestream, via the East Suffolk Council YouTube channel instead at <https://youtu.be/70AGy4RgHzw>.

If you do believe it is necessary for you to be in attendance we encourage you to notify Democratic Services, by email to democraticservices@eastsuffolk.gov.uk, of your intention to do so no later than 12 noon on the working day before the

meeting so that the Meeting can be managed in a Covid secure way and the Team can endeavour to accommodate you and advise of the necessary health and safety precautions.

However, we are not able to guarantee you a space/seat and you are advised that it may be that, regrettably, we are not able to admit you to the conference room.

An Agenda is set out below.

Part One – Open to the Public

Pages

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions.

2 Declarations of Interest

Members and Officers are invited to make any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary or Local Non-Pecuniary Interests that they may have in relation to items on the Agenda and are also reminded to make any declarations at any stage during the Meeting if it becomes apparent that this may be required when a particular item or issue is considered.

3 Review of the Community Partnerships

Report of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Communities, Leisure and Tourism

Review of Community Partnerships

1 - 29

4 Cabinet Member's update

To receive an update from Councillor Smith, the Cabinet Member for Communities, Leisure and Tourism, on her portfolio and strategic priorities.

5 Appointments to Outside Bodies (scrutiny functions)

Report of the Leader of the Council

Appointments to Outside Bodies 2021-22 (Scrutiny functions)

30 - 35

6 Scrutiny Committee's Forward Work Programme

To consider the Committee's Forward Work Programme

Part Two – Exempt/Confidential

Pages

No Exempt/Confidential

There are no Exempt or Confidential items for this Agenda.

Close



Stephen Baker, Chief Executive

Filming, Videoing, Photography and Audio Recording at Council Meetings

The Council, members of the public and press may record / film / photograph or broadcast this meeting when the public and press are not lawfully excluded. Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Committee Clerk (in advance), who will instruct that they are not included in any filming.

If you require this document in large print, audio or Braille or in a different language, please contact the Democratic Services Team on 01502 523521 or email:

democraticservices@eastsuffolk.gov.uk



The national Charter and Charter Plus Awards for Elected Member Development
East Suffolk Council is committed to achieving excellence in elected member development
www.local.gov.uk/Community-Leadership



SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 20 May 2021

Subject	Review of Community Partnerships
Report by	Councillor Letitia Smith, Cabinet Member for Communities, Tourism and Leisure
Supporting Officer	Nicole Rickard Head of Communities Nicole.rickard@eastsuffolk.gov.uk 07766 998074 Luke Bennett Partnerships Manager Luke.Bennett@eastsuffolk.gov.uk

Is the report Open or Exempt?	OPEN
-------------------------------	------

	Click or tap here to enter text.
Wards Affected:	All Wards

[Officer guidance for completion of report template](#)

Purpose and high-level overview

Purpose of Report:

To update on progress in relation to the eight East Suffolk Community Partnerships since their formation in November/December 2019.

Options:

The progress and effectiveness of the Community Partnerships has been reviewed against the criteria identified in the scoping document provided, namely:

- Achievement of priorities
- Monitoring the impact of funding
- Effectiveness of partnership membership
- Approach to allocating grant funding between the Community Partnerships
- Data about the Community Partnership areas

Recommendations:

There are no recommendations within this report. The Scrutiny Committee, having received this report, questioned, and debated its contents at the meeting on 20 May 2021, will decide if it wishes to make recommendation for consideration by Cabinet, or not.

Corporate Impact Assessment

Governance:

Oversight of Communities Partnerships is through the Community Partnership Chairs Group, the Community Partnership Board, the Communities Strategic Plan Delivery Group and the Strategic Plan Delivery Board

ESC policies and strategies that directly apply to the proposal:

‘We are East Suffolk’ Strategic Plan – ‘Enabling Our Communities’ priority.

Environmental:

Several Community Partnerships have identified the environment as one of their three priorities. The Greenprint forum is represented on the Community Partnership Board.

Equalities and Diversity:

The aim of the Community Partnerships is to enable greater involvement from all sections of the East Suffolk community in decision making and co-production of solutions to local needs. Links have been developed between the Partnerships / Board and Protected Characteristic groups such as Youth Voice and the Disability Forums.

Financial:

A total of more than half a million pounds is directly invested in Community Partnerships each year through the New Homes Bonus. Over the lifetime of this Council, each individual Community Partnership will have received £85,000 (a total investment of £680,000) and the Board will have received £1,050,000. Additional resources have been invested in maximising links with Town and Parish Councils, via Suffolk Association of

Local Councils, and Voluntary and Community Sector organisations, through Community Action Suffolk and in supporting the work of the Community Partnerships and Board.

Human Resources:

The resource to deliver the Community Partnerships programme sits in various teams in the Council, including the Communities Team (specifically the Partnerships Manager and eight Communities Officers), Democratic Services Team and the Funding Team.

ICT:

All Community Partnership meetings have been held via Zoom since the Covid-9 pandemic began in March 2020.

Legal:

The Legal and Democratic Services Teams have been involved in developing the Terms of Reference for the Community Partnerships.

Risk:

Risk assessments are undertaken in relation to individual projects as relevant.

External Consultees:	No external consultees in relation to the development of this report. However, a wide range of partners are actively involved in the eight Community Partnerships and the Community Partnership Board.
-----------------------------	--

Strategic Plan Priorities

Select the priorities of the Strategic Plan which are supported by this proposal: (Select only one primary and as many secondary as appropriate)		Primary priority	Secondary priorities
T01	Growing our Economy		
P01	Build the right environment for East Suffolk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P02	Attract and stimulate inward investment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P03	Maximise and grow the unique selling points of East Suffolk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P04	Business partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P05	Support and deliver infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T02	Enabling our Communities		
P06	Community Partnerships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P07	Taking positive action on what matters most	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P08	Maximising health, well-being and safety in our District	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P09	Community Pride	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
T03	Maintaining Financial Sustainability		
P10	Organisational design and streamlining services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P11	Making best use of and investing in our assets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P12	Being commercially astute	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P13	Optimising our financial investments and grant opportunities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P14	Review service delivery with partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T04	Delivering Digital Transformation		

P15	Digital by default	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P16	Lean and efficient streamlined services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P17	Effective use of data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P18	Skills and training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P19	District-wide digital infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T05	Caring for our Environment		
P20	Lead by example	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P21	Minimise waste, reuse materials, increase recycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P22	Renewable energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P23	Protection, education and influence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XXX	Governance		
XXX	How ESC governs itself as an authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

How does this proposal support the priorities selected?

The Community Partnerships are themselves a priority – P06 – in the ‘We are East Suffolk’ Strategic Plan. Through the projects supported by the Community Partnership Board and the eight individual partnerships (set out in detail below), impact has been and will be achieved against a number of the other priorities in the Strategic Plan, for example digital skills and training, building the right environment for East Suffolk, taking positive action on what matters most, health wellbeing and safety, community pride and community assets.

Background and Justification for Recommendation

1 Background facts	
1.1	During the public consultation on forming the new East Suffolk Council, one of the main concerns expressed by consultees was in relation to the 55 councillors covering larger geographical areas, more town and parish councils, more people and therefore potentially becoming disconnected from residents.
1.2	In response to these concerns, it was decided to form eight Community Partnerships, using the new East Suffolk wards as the ‘building blocks’ for each Community Partnership area to maintain and enhance existing connections. It was agreed that a Community Partnership Board would sit above the individual partnerships to take a strategic overview of the issues being considered and ensure that work was not being undertaken in silos. All eight Community Partnership Chairs sit on the Board, alongside a range of key partners including Suffolk Police, Clinical Commissioning Groups, Suffolk County Council, Community Action Suffolk, Suffolk Association of Local Councils, EDF Energy, BT, Britten Pear Arts, Suffolk Community Foundation and the Greenprint Forum.
1.3	The aim was that Community Partnerships would bring together partners and community representatives to jointly problem solve key issues identified through a combination of data and local insight.
1.4	The eight Community Partnerships are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aldeburgh, Leiston, Saxmundham and villages • Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and villages • Carlton Colville, Kessingland, Southwold and villages • Felixstowe Peninsular • Framlingham, Wickham Market and villages

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley • Lowestoft and northern parishes • Melton, Woodbridge and Deben Peninsular
1.5	<p>Our ambitions for 2020/21 were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed Community Partnerships as the place to do place-based collaborative problem solving • Invest Community Partnership and Board funding to address the (data-led and local insight-led) priorities identified at individual CP and East Suffolk level • Hold a successful Forum to share good practice and lessons learned

2 Current position

2.1	<p>Community Partnership Launch Workshops</p> <p>The eight Community Partnerships were launched with a workshop in a community venue in each area in November or December 2019. Following presentation of a bespoke data pack with key facts and figures about the CP area, attendees were asked to consider any issues that they felt to be missing that were important to local residents. A list of priorities was generated based on both the headlines in the data pack and conversations in the room, and the final stage of each workshop was a vote, where each attendee was given the opportunity to identify their top three priorities. The voting outcomes were then reviewed and used to generate a list of priorities for each of the Community Partnerships (and for East Suffolk overall).</p>
2.2	<p>Community Partnership Data Packs</p> <p>Each of the eight Community Partnership workshops focussed on a data pack which was produced for the Council by the Suffolk Office of Data Analytics (SODA). Each pack is available at https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/community/community-partnerships/. A pack was also produced for the whole East Suffolk area which covered the same issues as the individual packs but highlighted which Community Partnership areas were doing better or worse in relation to each theme. This data pack was used as the basis for a workshop at the 2019 Community Partnership Forum. The data packs have not been updated although the Board and individual partnerships have been briefed on a range of challenges posed by Covid-19 – see: Document.ashx (cmis.uk.com)</p>
2.2	<p>Priorities</p> <p>The priorities identified through the workshops for each CP area are as follows:</p> <p>Aldeburgh, Leiston, Saxmundham and villages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education, Opportunities and Aspirations • Reduce social isolation and loneliness – particularly carers, older people, and men 40+ • Encourage and enable everyone to be more physically active and healthy <p>N.B. Priorities were revised in light of the pandemic and were originally Transport and Access to Services, Economic Regeneration and Housing that meets local needs</p> <p>Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active and sustainable transport solutions / community transport • Reduce social isolation and loneliness

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve wellbeing and enable people to live healthy lives <p>Carlton Colville, Kessingland, Southwold and villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active and sustainable transport provision, particularly rural • Reduce social isolation and loneliness • Facilities, activities, and employment for young people <p>Felixstowe Peninsular</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tackle social isolation and loneliness • Improve physical and mental health and wellbeing • Education – aspirations, ambitions, and standards <p>N.B. Priorities were revised in light of the pandemic and originally included Community Spaces and Physical Enhancements</p> <p>Framlingham, Wickham Market and villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing opportunities for young people • Reduce social isolation and loneliness • Alternative, active, and sustainable transport provision <p>Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce social isolation & loneliness • Environmental care and sustainable transport • Support people to age well • Traffic and road safety <p>Lowestoft and northern parishes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve mental health and wellbeing • Tackle childhood obesity • Reduce social isolation – all ages <p>Melton, Woodbridge and Deben Peninsular</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active and sustainable transport provision (put on hold for 2020/21 due to the pandemic) • Village Hub – bringing services to people • Youth Engagement, opportunities, and services <p>The votes for these were aggregated to generate to top three priorities for the Community Partnership Board – Social Isolation and Loneliness (201 votes), Sustainable Transport (190 votes) and Mental Health and Wellbeing (150 votes).</p>
2.3	<p>Community Partnership meetings</p> <p>Each Community Partnership (CP) met at least once physically between January and March 2020 to agree their Terms of Reference and Membership. They also began to generate ideas for projects to tackle the priorities identified for their area and to spend the £10,000 allocated per CP area for the 2019/20 financial year. However, in March 2020 the Covid-19 pandemic struck, which meant that several of the CP's were unable to hold their final meeting of the year and therefore some of the funding was unallocated and rolled forward to 2020/21.</p>
2.4	

	<p>All CPs were back in operation by June/July 2020, meeting virtually by Zoom. Although this has had an impact in terms of the level of interactivity of meetings, CP members have adapted well. Several of the Community Partnerships reviewed and revised their priorities in light of the pandemic as it was felt that it would be difficult for them to deliver against their original priorities given the restrictions that were in place. The Board formed a Covid Impacts Task and Finish Group (which several CP Chairs sit on) to understand the challenges for East Suffolk – and a proportion of the 2020/21 strategic budget was dedicated to enabling the Covid response and recovery. The Home but Not Alone Covid response, led by the Communities Team, has helped us to reach into communities and build new partnerships and this insight has, in turn, influenced the work of the eight partnerships and the Board.</p>
2.5	<p>Funding</p> <p>Funding was allocated equally across the eight Community Partnership areas as it was felt that, whilst some had larger populations, others had high numbers of rural communities and larger geographical areas. There are also complexities associated with having multiple centres of population/focal points in one Community Partnership area (e.g. Beccles, Bungay and Halesworth - plus the rural areas) compared to having one focal point plus rural areas (e.g. Lowestoft). This model also recognises that the larger Community Partnership areas have greater access to alternative sources of funding (particularly the Felixstowe and Lowestoft areas) whilst those focussed on more rural areas may not. All Community Partnerships are now meeting regularly, and all have allocated the total funding of £35,000 that was available to them for 2019/20 (£10,000) and 2020/21 (£25,000). Many have formed Task and Finish Groups to progress projects more quickly in between partnership meetings.</p>
2.6	<p>Membership</p> <p>The core membership of each Community Partnership is the District and County Councillors for the area, a selection of Town and Parish Councils (identified through a nomination process prior to the first meeting and supported by Suffolk Association of Local Councils), VCSE representation (identified and support by Community Action Suffolk). In addition, partners including Suffolk Police, the relevant Clinical Commissioning Group and business representatives are invited to attend and are core partners in some Community Partnerships depending on their priorities.</p>
2.7	<p>Other Resources</p> <p>In addition to the financial resources for the Community Partnerships and Board outlined above, each partnership is supported by a Communities Officer who works closely with the Chair and supports project activity, including through Task and Finish Groups. Each Community Partnership Chair is an East Suffolk Councillor and Vice Chairs are now in place, many from external organisations. The Democratic Services Team provide invaluable support for all meetings (and for the Chairs and other Councillors between meetings). An additional 0.5FTE post has been made available in the Funding Team to support Community Partnership funding processes, including the small grant schemes. A small amount of funding (up to £10,000 each per annum) has been made available to SALC and CAS to support their role in Community Partnerships in enabling the engagement of Town and Parish Councils and VCSE organisations respectively.</p>

3 How to address current situation

3.1 Progress Against Priorities

Good progress has been made by all Community Partnerships, notwithstanding the hiatus initially caused by the Covid-19 pandemic – although in many ways having the network of Community Partnerships in place has provided the foundation of the community-led response to Covid-19 and demonstrated the strength of community in East Suffolk. Spend is excellent against available budgets and funding has been directly allocated against the priorities identified. It is important to note that whilst good progress has been made, the complex issues that have been identified as priorities are such that a single Community Partnership would not be in a position to say after one year (or even the lifetime of the Community Partnership) that this priority had been ‘solved’, for example Transport, Loneliness and Mental Health and Wellbeing. Indeed, the pandemic has exacerbated many of these issues. However, the projects selected for support and funding have clearly had a positive impact on the local area in a short space of time. Many of the projects funded have directly or indirectly supported the Covid-19 response or recovery.

3.2 Community Feeds

The Chairs and Support Officers are now considering how to increase the ‘community feed’ of issues into Community Partnerships as it was always intended that the Partnerships would be a forum for joint problem solving of issues emerging during the year as well as the data-led priorities that had already been set. From Summer 2021 reports will be fed into the Community Partnerships on priorities identified by Youth Voice (one of the Council’s mechanisms for engaging with young people) and we are looking for ways in which to feed in other voices.

3.3 Funding – Community Partnership Board spend

Whilst the Community Partnership Board was deemed to be out of scope for this review, it is intrinsically linked to the work of the individual partnerships as it has additional resources to allocate against the two priorities that came out top for East Suffolk - Isolation and Loneliness and Sustainable Transport, which are priorities for seven and five of our Community Partnerships respectively. The Board funding of a total of £450,000 across the two financial years has been used as follows:

- Covid 19 Community Fund - £20,000
- Hidden Needs Grants - £90,000 total across two Financial Years
- CAS Rural Proofing - £15,000
- Grandpads (simplified tablets for older residents) - £36,500
- Bounce Back Voluntary Sector Grants - £122,050
- CAS Volunteering Project - £5,853
- KATCH EV Bus - £40,000
- Community Transport - £80,000
- East Bags - £20,000
- CAS Covid-19 Buddy Up Scheme - £10,369
- Core Costs - £10,404

Total project costs for projects funded through the Board amount to £1,284,228.46, which represents a multiplier of 1.92 (i.e. for every pound that ESC has invested through the Board a further £1.92 has been contributed).

3.4	<p>Community Partnership Membership</p> <p>All Community Partnerships have reviewed their membership in advance of the 2021/22 financial year. Gaps in membership are currently felt to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Smaller Parish Councils - but SALC have made good progress since January 2021 in helping us to address this• Health input into partnerships where the priorities have a clear health dimension - although their absence in the last year is understandable given the pivotal role of the CCGs in tackling the pandemic• Rural voice - the Strategic Board has funded a specific project through Community Action Suffolk which is around 'rural proofing' Board and Community Partnership programmes and the new CP terms of reference reflects the need to 'think rural'• We are also keen to feed in views from communities of interest, for example Protected Characteristic groups such as people with disabilities through the two Disability Forums.																																	
3.5	<p>Funding – Overview of individual Community Partnership funding</p> <p>As outlined above, there has been good spend to date against the individual Community Partnership priorities. £280,000 has been committed to projects / small grant schemes across all eight CP's. 44 unique projects are planned, completed or underway across all eight CP's in 2020/21. Total project costs across all CP's is £707,701.14, which represents a multiplier of 1.53 on CP budgets (i.e. for every pound that ESC has invested through the CPs a further £1.53 has been contributed). This demonstrates the value that is added by working in partnership to bring budgets and funding streams together around shared priorities. This approach has enabled communities to identify specific issues and concerns within the framework provided by the CP priorities and giving them the tools to deal with their identified problems and concerns - a good example of local involvement and decisions going up rather than being enforced from above.</p>																																	
3.6	<p>Funding – Individual Community Partnership spend</p> <p>The funding provided to the Community Partnerships has been used to support a wide range of projects (in addition to the small grants for each CP area which are outlined in 3.6 below):</p> <p>Aldeburgh, Leiston, Saxmundham and villages</p> <table><tr><th>Amount</th><th>Project</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>£3,024</td><td>Economic Regeneration of Saxmundham High Street</td><td>Economic Regeneration</td></tr><tr><td>£9,350</td><td>Community Art Project</td><td>Reduce Social Isolation</td></tr><tr><td>£5,400</td><td>Dementia Project</td><td>Reduce Social Isolation</td></tr><tr><td>£7,500</td><td>Young People Project</td><td>Education, Opportunities and Aspirations</td></tr><tr><td>£4,726</td><td>Small Grants Fund</td><td>All 3 priorities</td></tr></table> <p>Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and villages</p> <table><tr><th>Amount</th><th>Project</th><th>Priority</th></tr><tr><td>£3,250</td><td>Reclaiming Bungay's Old Cemetery</td><td>Improve wellbeing and enable people to live healthy lives</td></tr><tr><td>£3,250</td><td>Beccles community growing space</td><td>Improve wellbeing and enable people to live healthy lives</td></tr><tr><td>£1,500</td><td>Free school summer holiday activities for 9–16-year-olds</td><td>Reduce social isolation and loneliness</td></tr><tr><td>£15,000</td><td>Mental Health Friendly Towns</td><td></td></tr></table>	Amount	Project	Priority	£3,024	Economic Regeneration of Saxmundham High Street	Economic Regeneration	£9,350	Community Art Project	Reduce Social Isolation	£5,400	Dementia Project	Reduce Social Isolation	£7,500	Young People Project	Education, Opportunities and Aspirations	£4,726	Small Grants Fund	All 3 priorities	Amount	Project	Priority	£3,250	Reclaiming Bungay's Old Cemetery	Improve wellbeing and enable people to live healthy lives	£3,250	Beccles community growing space	Improve wellbeing and enable people to live healthy lives	£1,500	Free school summer holiday activities for 9–16-year-olds	Reduce social isolation and loneliness	£15,000	Mental Health Friendly Towns	
Amount	Project	Priority																																
£3,024	Economic Regeneration of Saxmundham High Street	Economic Regeneration																																
£9,350	Community Art Project	Reduce Social Isolation																																
£5,400	Dementia Project	Reduce Social Isolation																																
£7,500	Young People Project	Education, Opportunities and Aspirations																																
£4,726	Small Grants Fund	All 3 priorities																																
Amount	Project	Priority																																
£3,250	Reclaiming Bungay's Old Cemetery	Improve wellbeing and enable people to live healthy lives																																
£3,250	Beccles community growing space	Improve wellbeing and enable people to live healthy lives																																
£1,500	Free school summer holiday activities for 9–16-year-olds	Reduce social isolation and loneliness																																
£15,000	Mental Health Friendly Towns																																	

		Improve wellbeing and enable people to live healthy lives
£2,000	Halesworth Wellbeing Bench	Reduce social isolation and loneliness
£10,000	Small Grants Fund	All 3 priorities
Carlton Colville, Kessingland, Southwold and Villages		
Amount	Project	Priority
£2,000	Community café at Carlton Colville Hub.	Reduce social isolation and loneliness
£2,000	Detached Youth work (with Carlton Colville Parish Council)	Facilities, activities, and employment for young people
£1,750	The Loft Youth Centre (Southwold)	Facilities, activities, and employment for young people
£2,000	Kessingland Parish Council new youth café	Facilities, activities, and employment for young people
£2,250	Research into provision for young people across the patch	Facilities, activities, and employment for young people
£800	Sloppy Slippers project	Reduce social isolation and loneliness
£5,000	Talking Benches	Reduce social isolation and loneliness
£2,325	Voice of a Friend (building on the Lowestoft project)	Reduce social isolation and loneliness
£1,875	Virtual Mile Project	Reduce social isolation and loneliness
£15,000	Small Grants Fund	Social Isolation and Young People
Felixstowe Peninsular		
Amount	Project	Priority
£5,000	Basics Foodbank	Covid-19 response
£2,000	FACTS Community Transport	Covid-19 response
£1,000	Adult & Community Services Fuel Vouchers	Covid-19 response
£5,000	Felixstowe Academy Library Project	Education – aspirations, ambitions, and standards
£5,000	Friends of Felixstowe Library Project	Education – aspirations, ambitions, and standards
£2,000	Community Directory	Tackle social isolation and loneliness
£1,500	Digital Inclusion Fund	Tackle social isolation and loneliness
£2,000	Langer School Half Term Activities	Education – aspirations, ambitions, and standards
£10,000	Small Grants Fund	Isolation and Loneliness, Mental Health and Emotional Wellbeing, Physical Health, Financial Hardship and Educational attainment
Framlingham, Wickham Market and Villages		
Amount	Project	Priority
£2,800	Youth Outreach in Wickham Market	Developing opportunities for young people
£3,840	Youth Outreach in Framlingham	Developing opportunities for young people
£5,050	Extended youth services - Pageant Field/Con Club/FAYAP building/Thomas Mills	Developing opportunities for young people
£1,000	Student Life research on youth provision/needs	Developing opportunities for young people
£3,000	East Coast EV Taxi bus Pilot	

		Alternative, active, and sustainable transport provision												
£15,000	Hour Community EV Wheelchair Accessible Vehicle	Alternative, active, and sustainable transport provision												
£800	Talking Bench project	Reduce social isolation and loneliness												
£3,510	Small Grants Fund	Developing opportunities for young people and reducing social isolation and loneliness												
Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley														
Amount	Project	Priority												
£9,040	Chinwag Kesgrave	Support people to age well												
£1,000	Meet up Mondays	Reduce social isolation & loneliness												
£5,708	Mental Health First Aid	Reduce social isolation & loneliness												
£5,040	Wellbeing programmes for 65+	Support people to age well												
£2,894	Talking benches	Reduce social isolation & loneliness												
£500	Great Bealings speed reduction project	Traffic and road safety												
£10,818	Small Grants Fund	Environment												
Lowestoft and Northern Parishes														
Amount	Project	Priority												
£9,935	Voice of a friend	Reduce social isolation – all ages												
£8,500	Young people obesity project	Tackle childhood obesity												
£5,760	‘Lowestoft Mile’ project	Reduce social isolation/Tackle childhood obesity/Mental Health and Wellbeing												
£10,805	Small Grants Fund	All 3 priorities												
Woodbridge, Melton and Deben Peninsular														
Amount	Project	Priority												
£10,000	Hollesley Village Hall Project	Village Hub – bringing services to people												
£10,000	Small Grants Fund	Village Hubs												
£15,000	Small Grants Fund	Youth Engagement Projects												
3.6	<p>Funding – Small Grant Schemes</p> <p>All eight Community Partnerships have established small grant schemes and worked with a sub-group of CP Members to set criteria and assess applications against these criteria. Each of the small grant schemes is themed around one or more of the three priorities agreed for that Community Partnership. Any small grant scheme underspends will be carried forward to run future small grants schemes during 2021/22.</p> <p>Aldeburgh, Leiston, Saxmundham and villages - £5,000 All 3 priorities</p> <table> <tr> <td>Leiston & District Swimming Club</td> <td>£</td> <td>760.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Friends of Aldeburgh Library</td> <td>£</td> <td>890.00</td> </tr> </table> <p>Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and villages - £10,000 All 3 priorities</p> <table> <tr> <td>Brampton and Stoven Village Hall</td> <td>£</td> <td>819.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fisher Theatre, Bungay</td> <td>£</td> <td>985.00</td> </tr> </table>		Leiston & District Swimming Club	£	760.80	Friends of Aldeburgh Library	£	890.00	Brampton and Stoven Village Hall	£	819.00	Fisher Theatre, Bungay	£	985.00
Leiston & District Swimming Club	£	760.80												
Friends of Aldeburgh Library	£	890.00												
Brampton and Stoven Village Hall	£	819.00												
Fisher Theatre, Bungay	£	985.00												

BACT Community Transport	£ 1,000.00
Falcon Meadow Community Trust	£ 500.00
Lowestoft & Waveney Breastfeeding Support	£ 970.00
Suffolk Family Carers	£ 1,000.00
Waveney & Blyth Arts	£ 1,000.00
Carlton Colville, Kessingland, Southwold and villages - £15,000	
Social Isolation and Young People	
Southwold Common Trust / Water Copse	£ 600.00
Sole Bay Arts CIO / Southwold Arts Café	£ 1,500.00
Carlton Colville Town Council Allotments / Generator	£ 330.00
Disability Advice North East Suffolk (DANES)	£ 1,500.00
Felixstowe Peninsular - £10,000	
Isolation and Loneliness, Mental Health and Emotional Wellbeing, Physical Health, Financial Hardship and Educational attainment	
Grange Community Primary School	£ 1,580.00
Bucklesham Community Council	£ 1,650.00
Felixstowe Cricket Club	£ 1,000.00
The Federation of Fairfield and Colneis	£ 1,000.00
Framlingham, Wickham Market and villages - £3,510	
Young People and Isolation/Loneliness	
N/A – yet to award	
Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley - £10,000	
Environment	
Play2day Nursery	£ 400.00
Friends of Grundisburgh Primary School	£ 1,500.00
Bredfield Community Environmental Project	£ 1,500.00
Oak Tree Replacement	£ 100.00
Gorseland Primary School/Biodiversity/Recycling	£ 1,451.24
Cedarwood Peace Garden	£ 1,000.00
Kesgrave Town Council/Pergola Conservation	£ 1,200.00
Martlesham Practical Conservation	£ 775.00
Portal Woodlands Bush/Hedge Cutting	£ 1,407.08
Heath Primary/Wildlife Habitats Project	£ 1,485.00
Lowestoft and northern parishes - £10,805	
All 3 priorities	
YMCA/Lowestoft School Workers	£ 1,665.00
Lound/Well-Being Presentation board	£ 1,990.00
RUFC/Community Mini-Bus	£ 2,000.00
Oulton Broad PC /Get Out There Get Fit	£ 2,000.00
Corton Playing/Field Outdoor Fitness Equipment	£ 1,650.00
BACT - A Meet, Greet and a Treat	£ 1,500.00

	Melton, Woodbridge and Deben Peninsular - £25,000 1. Village Hubs Eyke Village Hall £ 2,500.00 Campsea Ashe Village Hall £ 2,500.00 2. Youth Projects Woodbridge Town Council £ 2,500.00 Woodbridge Rugby Club £ 2,000.00 Blaxhall Parish Council £ 2,500.00 5th Woodbridge Sea Cadets £ 4,893.00 Just 42 £ 2,500.00 Shottisham Parish Council £ 1,163.40
3.7	Small Grants – Monitoring Each of these projects will be monitored and expected to feed back on their impact in the same way as the recipients of all other Council grants. Their impact, outputs and outcomes achieved will be checked against the anticipated outcomes identified in their application forms.

4 Reason for recommendations	
4.1	This section is part of the report template for all formal reports to all Committees. However, as stated above, the Scrutiny Committee having received this report, raised further questions at the meeting itself and debated both the report's contents and the response to its questions, the Scrutiny Committee will decide if it wishes to make recommendations, or not.

Appendices

Appendices:	
Appendix A	Written questions submitted in advance by the members of the Scrutiny Committee and the written responses
Appendix B	Responses by four of the CP Chairs to an invitation to complete a brief informal questionnaire by the Scrutiny Committee

Background reference papers:		
Date	Type	Available From
	None	

A review of Community Partnerships – May 2021

Cllr David Beavan

Q1: Why are ward members not informed of grant applications in their ward? (paragraph 2.5)

A1: All Ward Members are part of their Community Partnership and therefore have the opportunity to attend/actively participate in CP meetings, including those where funding decisions are made. The exception to this is the small grants schemes where the process is usually that volunteers from the CP (effectively a subgroup) form a Grants Panel that makes decisions on the CP's behalf, and a number of Councillors have been part of their CP Small Grants Panel. The decisions/outcomes of each Grants Panel are communicated to the full membership of the CP concerned at the next meeting and/or via email.

Q2: Will rural transport be restored to its prime position as we move out of the pandemic? (paragraph 3.1)

A2: Yes, the focus on sustainable transport (including rural transport) is being renewed in 2021/22 as we move through the different stages of the roadmap out of Covid. The work overseen by the multi-agency East Suffolk Transport and Travel Programme Group, supported by the Transport Project Officer (Jack Raven, second from EDF on a part time basis) is providing a foundation for this in the form of a scoping report with recommendations for action based on conversations with the eight Community Partnership Chairs and key partners such as Suffolk County Council and community transport providers. The Community Partnership Board agreed a funding pot of £80,000 in 2020/21 which will enable us to pilot innovative transport projects in the individual Community Partnership areas.

Q3: It seems to me that “pet” schemes are being passed down to communities rather than communities’ own proposals being prioritised. Can we have more bottom up and less top-down policies, please? (paragraph 3.2)

A3: Each Community Partnership has set its priorities and decided how it wishes to start to address these priorities. There have been suggestions from Communities Officers and other ESC staff about project ideas emerging from conversations with Town/Parish Councils, community groups and voluntary sector organisations but hopefully the range of projects funded across the eight areas and the lack of the same projects appearing in the list in 3.6 demonstrate that the process is bottom up and not top down. Apart from small grants schemes, there are very few projects (talking benches and the ‘virtual mile’ project being the two exceptions) that appear in the list for more than one CP area that share the same priorities. The only bottom-up projects that have not progressed either a) needed more development or b) did not address at least one of the CP priorities. As we continue to develop our eight CP's we will strongly encourage them to continue to use task and finish groups to develop projects from the ground up as this is an effective way

to ensure wider, grassroots engagement.
<p>Q4: (a) Have we any monitoring results yet? Can we ensure that we publish these within a year of a grant? (paragraph 3.7)</p> <p>(b) Can we measure lasting benefits and seek to make our efforts sustainable by encouraging social enterprise?</p>
<p>A4: (a) Not yet, but we will collect the Monitoring Information through the new Community Partnerships Funding Officer Kevin Wegg and make it available for dissemination and reporting at the end of each project, including on the CP website. Ongoing, informal monitoring is also recommended to each CP for each of their funded projects e.g. updates at CP meetings.</p> <p>(b) Absolutely. The organisations funded through the CP Board, the individual Community Partnerships and the small grants come in a range of forms including social enterprises. All grant applications forms include questions about sustainability to ensure that applicants have considered next steps once their grant funding has been spent. We have also commissioned CAS to deliver bespoke business planning support for VCSE organisations in East Suffolk aimed at supporting growth in voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations as well as increasing their sustainability.</p>
<p><i>Cllr Louise Gooch</i></p> <p><i>Please may I make it clear that my questions are not to be read as criticism of the very good work undertaken so far.</i></p> <p>Q5: Is the general funding model of £10,000 /£25,000 per Community Partnership regardless of the population base adequate and fit for purpose, or is a review of the funding model necessary?</p>
<p>A5: It is felt that the current model works, although this could be reviewed in the future if a clear case is made to do so. Each Community Partnership has its own unique challenges including higher levels of deprivation, large number of rural settlements, multiple town centres and greater or lesser access to external funding. It is important to note that ESC also funds Place Based Initiatives in three of the most deprived communities – namely Lowestoft Rising, Leiston Together and Felixstowe Forward. The Council’s approach to place-based working is currently being reviewed and a report will be considered by Cabinet in June 2021.</p>
<p>Q6: What analysis is being undertaken to gauge how the benefits of the projects map out onto those communities identified as having higher than average levels of deprivation?</p>
<p>A6: Over the coming year we intend to map more of our activity to ensure that there is a clear view of where funding is being allocated. It is important to remember however that allocating funding is only one element/tool in terms of the joint problem solving that the CPs were set up in order to do. In some cases it may be that other funding can be identified which is more appropriate to support a particular project, enabling the CP funding to be allocated to other projects. The Hidden Needs mapping which was updated</p>

in 2020 identifies target areas in terms of isolation and loneliness and the spread of grants across these areas has been mapped.
Q7: In terms of the gaps identified in expertise or focus in panel membership (3.4) what is being done to address this?
A7: As outlined in the report, we are working with Suffolk Association of Local Councils and Community Action Suffolk to boost Town and Parish Council and Voluntary and Community Sector membership respectively. The Rural Proofing recommendations have been incorporated into the revised Terms of Reference for 2021/22 and aim to ensure that the needs of rural communities are given robust consideration. Our focus over the next 12 months will be on engaging with protected characteristics groups at the most appropriate level – which could be inviting them to attend the CP itself or a Task and Finish Group or indeed it may be more effective for the Communities Officer and Chair to attend one of their meetings to seek members views on CP activity.
Q8: What wider research is being undertaken to glean lessons in good practice in other authorities?
A8: A peer review of our work around Community Partnerships is being undertaken through the Local Government Association in Autumn 2021. One of the aims is to obtain an external view of our Community Partnership programme to date and to feed in best practice from elsewhere through our peer reviewers. Before setting up the Community Partnerships the Council did extensive research (with support from the LGA and MHCLG) into other similar initiatives around the country and we spoke to representatives of a number of these in shaping our ideas.
Q9: What analysis is undertaken to look at the cross-community partnerships and how projects or funding might be shared?
A9: The Partnerships Manager and Funding Support Officer maintain oversight of the activity of all eight CPs and provide a simple monthly summary of that activity to the CP Chairs. Several projects that have emerged in one CP area have either been extended across more than one CP area (e.g. Voice of a Friend) or subsequently been taken up by others, for example the Lowestoft Mile and Talking Benches. In addition, projects from individual CPs, including the Mental Health First Aid for Communities project that started in the Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley have been picked up at a Community Partnership Board level. This is something that could be built upon through the Chairs meetings where best practice and innovative ways of working are shared.
Q10: Are we reviewing whether the boundaries of the CPBs best reflect the communities served? (For example, Carlton Colville is detached from Lowestoft; do we think this is wise?)

A10: Significant discussion took place before the Community Partnership areas were set, not least to try to ensure that the Lowestoft Community Partnership, which is almost twice the size of the next largest, was manageable without splitting it using an arbitrary north south divide. Adding Carlton Colville into the Lowestoft CP area would potentially make that one unmanageable in terms of size and make the Carlton Colville, Kessingland and Southwold CP too small and unviable. This will be reviewed at some point though.

Cllr Caroline Topping

Q:11 Equalities and Diversity: The aim of the Community Partnerships is to enable greater involvement from all sections of the East Suffolk community in decision making and co-production of solutions to local needs. Links have been developed between the Partnerships / Board and Protected Characteristic groups such as Youth Voice and the Disability Forums.'

- (a) Who else is included in this greater involvement please? I see Youth Voice and Disability Forums and I know you can't list everybody, but I am looking at specifically BAME groups for other ethnic and cultural input please.
- (b) "2.7 Each Community Partnership Chair is an East Suffolk Councillor." I believe all the Chairs are from the administration. Does it say anywhere that the Chairs have to be from the administration?

A11:

(a) We are looking at engagement with additional sections of the community over the coming months on an individual CP level given the differences in the demographics of each CP area. We are keen to do more to provide opportunities to engage with different communities of interest over the coming 12 months although this is as likely to be us going out to groups, as per the conversations that we have been leading with members of the BAME community, as them attending regular CP meetings

(b) The Terms of Reference state that 'Each CP will be Chaired by an ES Councillor for the CP area, appointed by the Leader of East Suffolk Council'

Questions to be circulated to the eight Chairs of the eight Community Partnerships on behalf of Scrutiny Committee
<p>Q1. In your opinion, have we the correct representation on each Partnership? Are there other agencies/partners we should consider?</p>
<p>My Ward and CP area are very rural and some of the villages are quite small. Some don't even have a Parish Council, just a Parish Meeting and many of the PC members feel the CP is 'not for us'. I think they are put off by the Town & District Councillors, whom some see as more powerful. We have had support from SALC to engage these Parishes and I have tried in my own Ward, asking other DCs to do so in theirs, but this has met with a mixed response . I feel we are in danger of the grant funding all going to the towns or the projects in which Town and District councillors are involved/ have encouraged to apply, which probably amounts to the same thing</p>
<p>Q2. How proactive are Councillors in identifying ideas to spend the funding on within their communities? Are all members of the Partnership bringing ideas to the meetings and/or to the Chair?</p>
<p>Very</p>
<p>Q3. How do we currently share best practice with other Community Partnerships – when, for example, two have similar ideas?</p>
<p>I'm not sure I have, directly, though our clerk, Sarah Carter clerks more than one CP and does offer hints on what others are doing. I also read minutes and details from the other CPs. Each is different though and you cannot have a one size fits all.</p>
<p>Q4. How well is your Community Partnership informing local organisations that funding is available?</p>

Very well, I send all information to parishes in my Ward and ask other DCs to do the same. I don't check they have done it
Q5. With reference to the Council's Strategic Objectives and the Community Partnership Board, how well do you think this matches your own Partnership's objectives? Do you have different priorities?
No
Q6. With reference to the Funding Model, is the general funding model of £10,000 /£25,000 per Community Partnership, regardless of the population base, adequate and fit for purpose in your opinion, or do you think a review of the funding model might be necessary?
I think a review should happen. With a wide area to cover, it is difficult to offer all communities a sufficient amount of money to encourage them to come forward.
About
I am beginning to think the best way to engage parishes is for DCs and the Communities Officer to make a presentation ton each Parish Council in a last ditch attempt to get them involved, but perhaps this is not an appropriate use of time or resource – and of course would not apply to all PCs

Appendix B – Reply 1

--

On behalf of the Scrutiny Committee, thank you.

<p>Questions to be circulated to the eight Chairs of the eight Community Partnerships on behalf of Scrutiny Committee</p>
<p>Q1. In your opinion, have we the correct representation on each Partnership? Are there other agencies/partners we should consider?</p>
<p>As we develop the partnerships we will hopefully identify more relevant partners that operate in the community that can help in identifying and contributing to projects that benefit a wider representation of the community. Currently it feels that we have too many Councillors on them so can become more like a Committee than a community focussed partnership.</p>
<p>Q2. How proactive are Councillors in identifying ideas to spend the funding on within their communities? Are all members of the Partnership bringing ideas to the meetings and/or to the Chair?</p>
<p>At the FPCP very few projects have been suggested by councillors. The majority of the projects have been through the Chair and the Communities Officer. We have started to recruit more community representatives which I anticipate will lead to better projects</p>
<p>Q3. How do we currently share best practice with other Community Partnerships – when, for example, two have similar ideas?</p>
<p>This is an area that needs developing, at the moment we are reliant on the Communities Officer or at the Chairs meeting albeit we are reliant on what information a Chair may chose to impart. A section on the internal web page could be an option so people other than Chairs or the panel can keep themselves up to date.</p>
<p>Q4. How well is your Community Partnership informing local organisations that funding is available?</p>

Very well, we have good contacts with local community magazines and radio stations so new projects receive good coverage.
Q5. With reference to the Council's Strategic Objectives and the Community Partnership Board, how well do you think this matches your own Partnership's objectives? Do you have different priorities?
I believe the FPCP are in accord with the Strategic Board
Q6. With reference to the Funding Model, is the general funding model of £10,000 /£25,000 per Community Partnership, regardless of the population base, adequate and fit for purpose in your opinion, or do you think a review of the funding model might be necessary?
As the Partnerships develop there may be a need to add addition funds, it will depend how proactive they are and that they are delivering value for money. The FPCP (and others I believe) have introduced Small Grant Funds which seem to be well received by the community and are likely to become more popular as community groups re-launch themselves following the lockdowns.
Q7. Are there any other additional comments you would like to add? <i>Maximum 200 words, please</i>
<p>A review of the core members of each Partnership trying to reduce the number of Councillors and encouraging community representatives may attract more people with the right skills to participate. It is disappointing as outlined above the low number of projects that are referred to by Councillors.</p> <p>It would be good if it appeared easier to receive financial support from the Strategic Board to local projects that could be developed, at the moment the strategic board has their agreed projects which are by nature strategic and that means there is limited funding to develop local projects.</p>

Appendix B – Reply 2



On behalf of the Scrutiny Committee, thank you.

Questions to be circulated to the eight Chairs of the eight Community Partnerships on behalf of Scrutiny Committee
<p>Q1. In your opinion, have we the correct representation on each Partnership? Are there other agencies/partners we should consider?</p>
<p>Except for the fact that Campsea Ashe has been put in another Community Partnership area when it should be within Framlingham/Wickham Market the representation seems to be correct and working well .Agencies/partners should be considered only if they really make a positive contribution to our objectives.</p>
<p>Q2. How proactive are Councillors in identifying ideas to spend the funding on within their communities? Are all members of the Partnership bringing ideas to the meetings and/or to the Chair?</p>
<p>Councillors are very proactive. As with all groups members of the Partnership do not contribute equally but the outcome of meetings is always positive.</p>
<p>Q3. How do we currently share best practice with other Community Partnerships – when, for example, two have similar ideas?</p>
<p>The Council Officers share best practice of other Community Partnerships with us</p>
<p>Q4. How well is your Community Partnership informing local organisations that funding is available?</p>

In my opinion both Councillors and our Community Partnership Officer deal with this very effectively. For example, our Community Partnership Officer Nicola Jenner has visited most of the Parish Councils in her patch.

Q5. With reference to the Council's Strategic Objectives and the Community Partnership Board, how well do you think this matches your own Partnership's objectives? Do you have different priorities?

The objectives and priorities are the same.

Q6. With reference to the Funding Model, is the general funding model of £10,000 /£25,000 per Community Partnership, regardless of the population base, adequate and fit for purpose in your opinion, or do you think a review of the funding model might be necessary?

Yes, it is fit for purpose and no funding model review is needed. In my opinion, applying different criteria may be challenging in several ways. The current model is perceived as equitable despite not taking into consideration socio-economic differences within the District Council area.

Q7. Are there any other additional comments you would like to add? *Maximum 200 words, please*

Going forward we should focus on investing more in our parishes and rural communities and less in our towns which have other readily available funds at their disposal.

Appendix B – Reply 3

--

On behalf of the Scrutiny Committee, thank you.

Questions to be circulated to the eight Chairs of the eight Community Partnerships on behalf of Scrutiny Committee
Q1. In your opinion, have we the correct representation on each Partnership? Are there other agencies/partners we should consider?
<p>Cannot speak for other partnerships, but we do have a good variation of services attending our meetings, if any special issues come up we would request support from the agency.</p>
Q2. How proactive are Councillors in identifying ideas to spend the funding on within their communities? Are all members of the Partnership bringing ideas to the meetings and/or to the Chair?
<p>As Chair I try to ensure all Parishes in my ward are aware of funding available, both by word of mouth and emails. Further try to make sure it is not just the Towns that carry out recommendations but also the smaller Parishes. I fully encourage all to bring forward ideas however small they may seem.</p>
Q3. How do we currently share best practice with other Community Partnerships – when, for example, two have similar ideas?
<p>At present we only meet up and chairs and board meetings, I am in the process of contacting CP's attached to my ward to start discussions as to similar ideas we may all have and take forward a joint research and working partnership.</p>

Q4. How well is your Community Partnership informing local organisations that funding is available?

Via all members of the CP, emails to all Town and Parish Clerks, word of mouth and looking at local news letters to see if we have missed any local organisations out.

Q5. With reference to the Council's Strategic Objectives and the Community Partnership Board, how well do you think this matches your own Partnership's objectives? Do you have different priorities?

We adjusted our priorities last year as the size of some of the issues (Transport being one) was being undertaken by other sections of the council. Our three issues now are Isolation and Loneliness, Encourage and enable everyone to be more physically active and healthy and Education opportunities and aspirations.

We are well supported in all three of our priorities. Our Isolation and Loneliness task group have been extremely busy over this COVID-19 period and will continue to do so.

Q6. With reference to the Funding Model, is the general funding model of £10,000 /£25,000 per Community Partnership, regardless of the population base, adequate and fit for purpose in your opinion, or do you think a review of the funding model might be necessary?

My personal opinion is that it is better to have a joint set figure, to do it on number of residents would limit to amount available to the smaller towns and parishes, but their demands may be far greater due to geographical isolation etc. Maybe there could be a "schedule" of all the priorities being undertaken by all the CP and maybe support funding could be offered between themselves if it was joint working on a priority.

Unsure how this would work.

Q7. Are there any other additional comments you would like to add? *Maximum 200 words, please*

How do we as Community Partnerships make sure there are no exclusions especially but not exclusively from the perspective of the community and voluntary sectors?

The involvement of residents and unknown excluded groups at different stages and on different issues within communities?

How do we involve communities and voluntary organisations to highlight their contribution and assets they can bring to implementing solutions to community issues?

Bit Jibberish but I am sure if we look deep enough within all our Towns and Parishes there are missed opportunities of good work being undertaken?

On behalf of the Scrutiny Committee, thank you.



SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 20 May 2021

Subject	Appointments to Outside Bodies for 2021/22 (scrutiny functions)
Report by	The Leader of the Council
Supporting Officer	Katherine Abbott Democratic Services Officer katherine.abbott@eastsuffolk.gov.uk 01394 444320

Is the report Open or Exempt?	OPEN
-------------------------------	------

Category of Exempt Information and reason why it is NOT in the public interest to disclose the exempt information.	Not applicable
Wards Affected:	All Wards

Purpose and high-level overview

Purpose of Report:

The Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider its Appointments to Outside Bodies (scrutiny functions) for the 2021/22 Municipal Year, as outlined at Appendix A of this report.

Options:

The Council needs and wishes to engage and work with external organisations, including the Outside Bodies listed in Appendix A, to continue to deliver the priorities identified in the East Suffolk Strategic Plan.

Recommendations:

1. That Councillors be appointed to those Outside Bodies listed in Appendix A for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.
2. That designated substitutes also be appointed to attend the Outside Bodies listed at Appendix A for the 2021/22 Municipal Year in the event the primary appointee is unavailable.
3. That the Leader of the Council be authorised to fill any outstanding vacancies left unfilled by the Scrutiny Committee.
4. That the Leader be granted delegated authority to make any necessary changes to the membership of the Outside Bodies for the remainder of the 2021/22 Municipal Year, in consultation with the other Group Leaders.

Corporate Impact Assessment

Governance:

Appointments to Outside Bodies may be made under the general power in Section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 – to do anything which is likely to promote the economic, social, or environmental wellbeing of the area, unless specifically prohibited.

The process of the Scrutiny Committee collectively approving appointments to Outside Bodies, where the role relates to a scrutiny function of the Council, in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution, was delegated to the Committee by the Leader at the meeting of Full Council held on 22 May 2019

Details of the representation on Outside Bodies are included on the Council's website.

Members appointed to Outside Bodies will be asked to present a short, written report to Full Council, at least once per year, on the work of the Outside Body.

ESC policies and strategies that directly apply to the proposal:

None.
Environmental:
None.
Equalities and Diversity:
None.
Financial:
Those Councillors formally appointed to external organisations as the Council's representative can claim travel expenses in accordance with the Members' Allowance Scheme. These costs can be met from existing resources.
Human Resources:
None.
ICT:
None.
Legal:
None.
Risk:
Members must consider the implications and responsibilities of being involved with Outside Bodies as they must continue to comply with the District Council's Code of Conduct when acting as the appointed representative of the Council; comply with the Code of Conduct of the Outside Body they are appointed to, if one exists; and, declare a personal interest in any business of the District Council as necessary.

External Consultees:	None.
-----------------------------	-------

Strategic Plan Priorities

Select the priorities of the Strategic Plan which are supported by this proposal: (Select only one primary and as many secondary as appropriate)		Primary priority	Secondary priorities
T01	Growing our Economy		
P01	Build the right environment for East Suffolk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P02	Attract and stimulate inward investment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P03	Maximise and grow the unique selling points of East Suffolk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P04	Business partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P05	Support and deliver infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T02	Enabling our Communities		
P06	Community Partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P07	Taking positive action on what matters most	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P08	Maximising health, well-being and safety in our District	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P09	Community Pride	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

T03	Maintaining Financial Sustainability		
P10	Organisational design and streamlining services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P11	Making best use of and investing in our assets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P12	Being commercially astute	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P13	Optimising our financial investments and grant opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P14	Review service delivery with partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T04	Delivering Digital Transformation		
P15	Digital by default	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P16	Lean and efficient streamlined services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P17	Effective use of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P18	Skills and training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P19	District-wide digital infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T05	Caring for our Environment		
P20	Lead by example	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P21	Minimise waste, reuse materials, increase recycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P22	Renewable energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P23	Protection, education and influence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XXX	Governance		
XXX	How ESC governs itself as an authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
How does this proposal support the priorities selected? Councillors appointed to Outside Bodies work to help address local issues and to achieve sustainable solutions. This will help to both deliver a strong and sustainable local economy and to improve the quality of life for everyone living and working in the District.			

Background and Justification for Recommendation

1	Background facts		
1.1	The Scrutiny Committee collectively appoints annually to two Outside Bodies where the role relates specifically to a scrutiny function of the local authority. It was agreed by Full Council at its meeting on 22 May 2019 that these appointments would be delegated to the Scrutiny Committee.		
1.2	Some appointments to Outside Bodies are made because of a statutory requirement to appoint one or more members to them. Most appointments to Outside Bodies are discretionary taking into consideration how representation on them adds value.		
1.3	Appointment of members to Outside Bodies provides support to the organisation concerned and enables members to fulfil their community leadership roles and, in the case of scrutiny-specific bodies, their role as a member of the Scrutiny Committee.		
1.4	Members appointed to Outside Bodies can work with and alongside these so helping to empower them in terms of addressing local issues and delivering sustainable solutions.		

2 Current position	
2.1	Members were last appointed to Outside Bodies (scrutiny functions) 2020/21 by the Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in September 2020.

3 How to address current situation	
3.1	<p>Outside Bodies can gain several benefits from having a representative of the Council on them, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To represent the interests of the Council and to promote the strategic aims of its Strategic Plan; • To provide knowledge, skills and expertise which may not otherwise be available; • To provide local accountability or democratic legitimacy through the appointment of an elected representative; • To ensure that good relationships can be maintained with the body; • To deliver a partnership project that requires the input of other organisations or community groups; • To protect the Council's investments or assets i.e., if the Council has provided grant funding or provides funding for service delivery; • To lever in external funding which is not available to the Council on its own.
3.2	Taking account of all information provided within the report, the Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the content of Appendix A.

4 Reason for recommendations	
4.1	To ensure that members are appointed to Outside Bodies (scrutiny functions) for 2021/22.

Appendices

Appendices:	
Appendix A	Proposed list of appointments to Outside Bodies (scrutiny functions) for 2021/22.

Background reference papers:	
Review of the Outside Bodies and their membership Available from democratic.services@eastsoffolk.gov.uk	

APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES 2021/22 (SCRUTINY FUNCTIONS)

OUTSIDE BODY	NUMBER OF MEETINGS PER YEAR	NUMBER OF MEMBERS TO BE APPOINTED	MEMBER APPOINTED (Designated Substitute to also be indicated)	ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION including usual meeting venue, where known
Suffolk Flood Risk Management Scrutiny Panel	2 per annum (subject to review at SCC Full Council on 27 May 2021)	1	Cllr Keith Patience <i>Substitute: Vacant</i>	Endeavour House, Russell Road, Ipswich Responsible for reviewing and influencing decision-making in relation to the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy
Suffolk County Council Health Scrutiny Committee	4 per annum (subject to review at SCC Full Council on 27 May 2021)	1	VACANCY <i>Substitute: Cllr Tony Cooper</i>	Endeavour House, Russell Road, Ipswich Responsible for scrutinising well-being and health services across the county.