

**Unconfirmed**



**EASTSUFFOLK**  
COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the **Community Partnership Board** held via Zoom  
on Monday, 7 June 2021 at 6.00pm

Chris Abraham (Chief Executive of Community Action Suffolk (CAS))  
Chris Blundell (Chairman of the Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley Community Partnership)  
Judy Cloke (Chairman of the Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and Villages Community Partnership)  
Tony Cooper (Chairman of the Aldeburgh, Leiston, Saxmundham and Villages Community Partnership)  
Louise Hardwick (NHS Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group)  
Mark Jepson (Chairman of the Felixstowe Peninsula Community Partnership)  
James Mallinder (Chairman of the Melton, Woodbridge and Deben Peninsula Community Partnership)  
Lisa Perkins (Realisation Director for British Telecom)  
Carol Poulter (Chairman of the Framlingham, Wickham Market and Villages Community Partnership)  
Russ Rainger (Suffolk Association of Local Councils (SALC))  
Jane Topping (Southern Area Superintendent)  
Stephen Singleton (Suffolk Community Foundation)  
Letitia Smith (East Suffolk Council Cabinet Member for Communities, Leisure and Tourism)  
Danny Steel (Vice-Chairman of the Lowestoft and Northern Parishes Community Partnership)  
Roger Wright (Britten Pears Arts – Snape Maltings)

**Others present:**

Sarah Carter & Sarah Davis (Democratic Services Officers)  
Nick Khan (Strategic Director, East Suffolk Council)  
Sally Longmate (SALC)  
Alexander Nicholl (Deputy Cabinet Member for Transport, Suffolk County Council)  
Ben Porter (Funding Manager, East Suffolk Council)  
Nicole Rickard (Head of Communities, East Suffolk Council and NHS Norfolk & Waveney / Ipswich & East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Groups)

---

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Paul Ashdown, Norman Brooks, Jenny Ceresa, Susan Harvey, Steve Gallant, Michael Ladd, Tom McGarry, Tim Passmore and Paul Sharp.

**2. Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

Sarah Davis, Democratic Services Officer, welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that the Vice-Chairman was appointed each year and she requested nominations for the position. A nomination was received and seconded to re-appoint Lisa Perkins as Vice-Chairman.

## **RESOLVED**

That Lisa Perkins be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the Board for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

**In the absence of the Chairman, Steve Gallant, the Vice-Chairman then assumed the Chair.**

### **3. Community Partnership Board - Update Report**

The Board was informed that the formal notes of the last meeting held on 1 March 2021 had not been produced in time for the agenda and would, therefore, be considered at the next meeting. In the meantime, however, the Partnership was asked to note the update report of the Board's discussions on 1 March 2021 which had subsequently been presented to each Community Partnership for their information.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Update Report in relation to the last Board meeting be noted.

### **4. Terms of Reference**

The Board received the updated Terms of Reference which incorporated amendments resulting from the recent Rural Proofing work, specific reference to using other sources of community intelligence eg Youth Voice to inform the work of the CPB, reviewing priorities on an annual basis, as well as various governance changes such as continuing with virtual meetings if preferred and, if so, voting verbally to ensure that YouTube viewers could see who and how people were voting. It was noted that all the changes were consistent with the updated generic Terms of Reference which had recently been adopted by each of the Community Partnerships.

## **RESOLVED**

That the updated Board's Terms of Reference be noted.

### **5. Covid Impacts Task and Finish Group Report**

The Board received the Task and Finish Group's report on their activities since the last meeting. It was noted that the Group had focussed on two specific areas, namely activity around employment support and skills development, and the funding request from Student Life. Following publication of the agenda, CAS had asked that the Board note the Minding the Gap Project which offered targeted support for young people to help them move towards the labour market had received further funding for that programme until 2023.

## **ACTION**

Nicole Rickard to add the information from CAS relating to the Minding the Gap Project and reissue the document with the minutes.

The Board received details of three Outcome Proposals that required funding:

(a) **East Suffolk Energise Employment Support Outcome Proposal - £18K**

It was noted that £12K had already been secured from East Suffolk Council. In addition to the £18K being requested from the Board, approval was being requested to reallocating £20K from the original ESP Funds to this project.

(b) **Volunteering Pathways Outcome Proposal - £30,827K**

This project looked at opportunities for volunteering as a way to progress into a career and would link into the Buddy Up Project.

(c) **Ambitions to Employ Outcome Proposal - £25K**

This project would support emerging start ups and small businesses to develop and provide help with the legal and financial aspects of employing staff. The project would provide 30 hours of learning over six modules. Clarification was sought as to whether there had been any input from the DWP because they wanted to get people in employment. Nicole Rickard stated that she would check with the Economic Development Team who worked closely with the DWP to see if they had been contacted.

In addition to the above projects, the Board considered the Student Life Peer to Peer Health Ambassador Outcome Proposal which involved training and supporting students to engage with other young people and to identify potential signs of a decline in emotional wellbeing and to work with pastoral staff to identify appropriate support. The proposal was to run an extended pilot in six East Suffolk schools in a mixture of locations to enable proof of concept of the Student Life model. The cost of the pilot was £3,500 per school and Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG would fund 50% of the pilot in the former Suffolk Coastal area (£5,250) and, therefore, the outcome proposal requested £15,750 for the remaining sites. A condition attached to the funding would be to ensure that the students and pastoral staff were aware of other related initiatives eg Kooth, Youth Voice and Young Health Watch as well as current offers from other statutory services. It was suggested that another funding requirement should be to provide a quarterly update to track the sustainability and roll out of the project. Louise supported the idea and stated that it was key to know what other programmes had been commissioned so that students were not confused with all the different offers.

## **RESOLVED**

That the requests for funding, totalling £89,500, as detailed above be approved.

## **6. Vulnerability in East Suffolk Post Covid**

Nicole Rickard provided details of the key themes which had come out of the Home But Not Alone Scheme and the Clinically Extremely Vulnerable calls made to residents from December 2020 to

March 2021. She then asked key Board partners to identify their top three priorities to enable the Board to understand their position post Covid.

Stephen Singleton, Suffolk Community Foundation, stated that the main issues were isolation and loneliness, declining mental health and changed financial circumstances. He referred to SCF's Surviving Winter Campaign to raise money for the elderly living in fuel poverty and stated that, whilst 1500 homes had been heated across the County, they had found this year that the number of people stating they felt isolated and lonely had doubled due to covid and obviously this combined with fuel poverty had severely impacted on their mental health.

Chris Abraham, Community Action Suffolk, agreed that isolation and loneliness was a priority particularly given most grass roots activities had stopped due to covid and buildings were closed. CAS had surveyed community groups and 40 out of 80 responses had said they had reopened, of those that had not yet opened, 26 would reopen, 5 were unsure and 9 were definitely not reopening. Chris explained that one of the main issues was about getting volunteers back to help run the activities and, therefore, CAS would be undertaking a campaign about the benefits of volunteering and getting communities reinvigorated. The second priority was young people and the concerns about the lack of youth clubs etc which impacted on feelings of isolation, the impact covid had on education, and opportunities for youth volunteering as a pathway into a career. CAS had also appointed a new Youth Development Officer to help those that wanted to bring together support for those wanting to start groups and help with training to set up Youth Groups. The third priority was the resilience of the VCSE as there was concern about the support the sector needed to keep providing people with the support they needed and the availability of volunteers. Another challenge was whether the sector should remain providing online support services or return to face to face given many residents did not have access to digital technology.

Louise Hardwick, Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG, stated that all the issues identified by the previous partners and Covid itself had a major impact on the health system to deliver essential services so the CCG's first priority was to deal with the backlog of care which was worse than expected, especially wait lists for surgery which had previously been 18 weeks but was now 18 months. This had resulted in more patients having their care "managed" to support patients through the long waiting times. In addition, there were already pressures on the resources available and this was now compounded by the impact the pandemic had on the staff themselves. The aim was to look clinically and holistically at providing support through the community. The next priority was children and young people's education and how their physical and emotional wellbeing could be supported. The third priority was to increase the vaccine take-up particularly in the harder to reach communities.

Russ Rainger stated that SALC had undertaken a needs analysis from local councils to assess the issues they were facing and had found that parishes felt isolated in the same way individuals had which was then reflected in their work with the communities, particularly around communication. The first priority was, therefore, delivering specialist support on communications. SALC was developing a portal for SALC members, providing training, services etc and this would increase capacity and improve resilience. Specialist workshops had been undertaken eg a speeding workshop, webinars had been held and virtual systems were being embraced eg events and e-newsletters. The second priority was about engaging parishes across sectors and encouraging them to work together to support each other and provide challenge on what was important to them eg responding to consultations on NSIPs. The last priority was about improvement and development for councils themselves eg the clerks and councillors, about their standards, improving skills and development, providing team building and collaborating across areas.

Jane Topping, Suffolk Police, stated that the first priority was Domestic Violence as the number of reports had increased, particularly coming out of lockdown. The main issue was the impact it had on children and it was important to ensure that referrals were notified to the school of the child the next day to enable them to spot any changes in behaviour. The next priority was mental health and it was noted that the number of calls received regarding missing persons and suicide, as well as Anti-Social Behaviour had increased significantly. It was felt that all these linked to mental health. The third priority was about regular partnership liaison as partnership working had improved over covid eg having quick Teams meetings rather than face to face especially for tackling emerging vulnerability issues eg domestic abuse, mental health and child exploitation. The Police also wanted to work with CSPs to identify areas where vulnerability was a key issue so that officers and Police could visit those areas together.

Andy Cuthbertson explained that the first Suffolk County Council priority related to isolated and vulnerable individuals as part of the Community Recovery project working with CAS, Districts and Boroughs so all aspects of the community could re-open and provide services. The second priority was about addressing health inequalities which had worsened due to the pandemic. The last priority was about enabling the VCSE to play an equal and active part in the Suffolk system as they played a very important role in community recovery. Another issue was about data sharing and encouraging organisations to sign up to Suffolk Information Partnership to support vulnerable people in a data secure way.

Nicole Rickard reported that the Norfolk and Waveney CCG had identified vaccine inequality, particularly uptake in deprived, high risk and harder to reach communities. Their second priority was helping people to remain well in the community whilst waiting for operations and to remain healthy once discharged. Thirdly, they had identified addressing health inequalities particularly inactivity and long-term conditions.

In light of the discussions, Nicole referred to a list of projects that had already been agreed as well as several new proposed projects focussing on Mental Health, Physical Health and Wellbeing, Financial Inclusion, Supporting Vulnerable Families and Digital Exclusion. She also drew attention back to the list of key priorities from partners, highlighting the common themes such as isolation and loneliness, and mental health and asked if there were any gaps.

Chris Blundell acknowledged the good work that was taking place but expressed concern as a Community Partnership Chairman that he was not aware of what was happening in his area and if he could get involved. The Chairman suggested that Nicole discuss Chris Blundell's concerns offline. She added that she felt this had been a really useful exercise and was a temperature check but queried if there were any gaps and, if not, then what were the priorities. She added that mental health and wellbeing awareness appeared to be key. Nicole confirmed that it was hoped to bring some proposals on mental health to the next meeting if the Task and Finish Group could review what they had heard to date and put forward a plan for the next meeting.

James Mallinder queried how people who did not want help could be reached and if there was a disconnect between what was put forward based on information from several people and if that was then actually reflected in the take up. The Chairman asked if he was querying the validation of the data capture that was driving the Board's actions and he confirmed this. Nicole explained that this was why pilots were held and the Board then received statistics on the pilots before projects were rolled out. The Chairman added that this was also why the Task and Finish Group was being asked to look at the information collected and to test them before putting forward

recommendations and an action plan to the Board.

## **ACTION**

- (1) The Task and Finish Group to reconvene and put forward a report and action plan to the September meeting.
- (2) Nicole to discuss Chris Blundell's concerns with him outside of the meeting.

## **7. Transport Task and Finish Group**

Alexander Nicholl thanked colleagues on the Group for their hard work and in particular EDF for donating the time of Jack Raven who had helped drive forward data and research to enable the Group to generate ideas that were hopefully practical and deliverable. He explained that the Group had looked at existing models of transportation and the impact of the pandemic eg public confidence on the use of public transport and commuter/busy times had changed. Jack had met with officers, stakeholders and Partnership Chairman who had been asked about issues in their area and the responses identified had included issues due to rural isolation, connecting people and cleaner/greener transport. Alexander stated that the Group was now at the draft report stage and he requested that the Board discuss the report in a holistic way in September eg looking at transport to medical centres and other points of need thereby ensuring there was joined up thinking. He explained that the Group would meet twice more in the next few weeks to score the projects on a traffic light process. He added that they would not exclude projects just because of cost and, in light of the comments by James earlier in the meeting, he stressed that local need had to be demonstrated before a project was agreed. He added that integration was a priority so that people could move about using different methods without having a complicated fare structure.

James Mallinder stated that people might say they wanted services but would they use them. He added that a local transport scheme to Woodbridge had turned into a group social event and it might be that having bus ambassadors in the community could have several benefits. The Chairman acknowledged his point and agreed that having a dual approach was beneficial.

## **RESOLVED**

That the verbal update on the Transport and Travel Programme be noted and it was agreed that a deep dive would take place on the Group's report at the next meeting in September.

## **8. Community Partnership Updates**

Letitia Smith reported that the Community Partnerships were doing a fantastic job and were growing in their skills and knowledge, looking at their priorities and reviewing their objectives. Their Terms of Reference had been renewed. Most had set up Task and Finish Groups looking at projects and several had set up small grants schemes. Some were also looking forward to returning to face to face meetings. With the Chairman's agreement, Letitia invited Partnership Chairmen or Vice-Chairmen to highlight 1 or 2 projects.

**Lowestoft and Northern Parishes Community Partnership** – The Small Grants Scheme had approved five projects totalling £7,610 for an over 80's Group, a vegetable patch in a rural school and transport for isolated communities through the rugby club. Refused or deferred projects were

being supported to find funding elsewhere. Danny thanked all the officers for their continued support. He also gave an update on the four Lowestoft Mile Walks and the number of views each had received, which totalled 4015 views. He added that funding was now available for a fifth walk and a shortlist of possible areas was currently being voted on and perhaps surprisingly it was likely to be a “walk” on Oulton Broad waterways.

**Framlingham, Wickham Market and Villages Community Partnership** – £15k had been given for a wheelchair accessible vehicle which was used at least four times per week even during the pandemic. Partnership funding had been used to purchase talking benches and for the trial of KATCH bus, as well as replacing goalposts and helping the football club in Wickham Market and a red telephone box “kiosk on the hill” to advertise community events/projects.

**Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and Villages Community Partnership** - The second small grants scheme had just been launched and the Partnership had engaged Access Community Trust to lead a project around mental health awareness in each of the three market towns.

**Melton, Woodbridge and Deben Peninsula Community Partnership** – The main concern was the age and condition of village halls/hubs and the Partnership was focussing on getting funding to refurbish the fabric of the buildings. A pilot project that had also been funded was to provide cookery lessons for elderly residents.

**Felixstowe Peninsula Community Partnership** – The Partnership was working with the Integrated Neighbourhood Team (INT) and as part of that had supplied 35 blood pressure machines for surgeries. Another project was a local equivalent of the Lowestoft Mile but this would be done in conjunction with the Felixstowe School who would do the research, film and publish the walks. In addition, villages were being encouraged to take part in the Small Grants Scheme.

## **9. Any other Business**

There were no other items of business.

## **10. Date of Next Meeting**

It was confirmed that the next meeting would take place on 6 September 2021 at 6pm remotely via Zoom.

The meeting concluded at 8.15pm

.....  
Chairman