



**Minutes of a meeting of the Neighbourhood Management Board
Held on 22nd March 2007 at 2.00pm in the
NORA office, South Lynn, Kings Lynn**

Present:

John Dobson (Chair)	-	Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk
Irene Gammon (Vice chair)	-	Hillington Square Residents' Association
Paul Lusher	-	South Lynn Forum
John Burns	-	Fairstead Area Neighbourhood Group
Walter Glynn	-	Fairstead Area Neighbourhood Group
Vicky Etheridge	-	Neighbourhood Manager
Stuart Gunn	-	Norfolk Constabulary
Charles Joyce	-	Norfolk County Council
Stephanie Bilham	-	Gaywood Park Action Group
Nigel Yates	-	Gaywood Park Action Group
Daisy Line	-	Diversity Representative
Malcolm Summerfield	-	Hillington Square Residents Association
Sylvia Pomeroy	-	Disability Representative
Michelle Parker	-	Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk
Chris Bamfield	-	Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk
Sue Lowe	-	Age Concern
Jackie Nurse	-	Linking Together
Helen Mace	-	North Lynn Community Centre
John Rees	-	Norfolk Primary Care Trust
Eddie West-Burnham	-	West Norfolk MIND
Christopher Smith	-	Freebridge Community Housing
Sarah Reed	-	Job Centre Plus
Pat Brodowski	-	Job Centre Plus
Sharon Ludford	-	Community Development Officer
Sue Payne	-	Community Development Officer
Richard Rockcliffe	-	Norfolk County Council

By Invitation:

Nicky Stevenson	-	The Guild
Jeremy Hawkins	-	Local Government East Midlands
Saffron James	-	Young Foundation
Diana Esguerra	-	Young Foundation
Katerina Pateraki	-	Go East
Nicolas de Jong	-	Go East

Apologies

David Lennard Jones	-	Childrens Services
John Eastgate	-	Norfolk County Council
Councillor Geoff Daniel	-	Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk
Ashley Yallop	-	Discovery Centre
Charles Hare-Winton	-	Childrens Services

Supported By:

Sarah Dennis	-	Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk
--------------	---	--

		Action
1	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes from the Last Board Meeting of 18th January 2007</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and extended a special welcome to Sue Lowe – the Older Peoples representative on the Board.</p> <p>Apologies were as noted above.</p> <p>The minutes from the meeting of 18th January 2007 were agreed as a true record.</p>	
3	<p>Update from Neighbourhood Manager</p> <p>Vicky Etheridge had circulated a paper outlining the achievements to date. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing sessions had taken place for the Board shadowing scheme • Interviews were to take place for the Administrative post • Neighbourhood Clean up teams were in post • Preparatory work on the Fairstead pub was underway • New fencing and gates had been installed on the College field • Project Manager for the alley gating scheme had been appointed • An audit was to be undertaken of the open spaces <p>Vicky also explained that there would be a de brief for the work shadowing scheme on 25th April 2007 at the Town Hall. The Community Sports Initiative would have two main elements; these would be football development and set up of teams. These activities would be led by Kings Lynn Football Club in the Easter holidays.</p> <p>Vicky Etheridge outlined the role of a Project Officer to take forward some of the capital and revenue schemes. Vicky anticipated the salary would be in the</p>	

	<p>region of £30-£40,000 per annum. She explained that the project skills could be shared with the NORA project. She did not anticipate that the Project Officer for Safer and Stronger to last the full term of the Safer Stronger funding. The Chair asked the Board if there was consensus to approve the posts of Administrative Officer and Project Officer.</p> <p>Charles Joyce expressed concern around the salary bandwidth for the Project Officer and their term of employment. Chris Bamfield noted that there were insufficient resources to complete projects and there was sufficient funding to employ a post. He recognised people’s concerns regarding the cost but acknowledged that the salary needed to be competitive and included ‘on costs’ which are an additional 20-25% on top of an actual salary.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>1) Vicky Etheridge to draft a job specification for the post of Project Officer and circulate to Board members on her return from annual leave</p> <p>2) The post to be agreed and funds allocated unless the Neighbourhood Manager receives notification from at least two members that they disagree and this will constitute a block and will not be taken forward.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Vicky for her report.</p>	<p>VE</p> <p>ALL</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Better Understanding of How Services Are Delivered</p> <p>Vicky Etheridge introduced this item and explained that in order to show progress towards the SSCFs mandatory outcomes and indicators, baseline information had to be gathered in relation to current patterns of service delivery and service provider engagement with residents. She explained the exercise would focus on one estate to make it manageable but that the lessons learnt would be very transferable to the other SSCF neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Saffron James introduced herself to the Board.</p> <p>Jeremy Hawkins gave a presentation on network analysis and the need for this study to be undertaken and the benefits of understanding how agencies and organisations communicated with each other.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Jeremy for his presentation. Paul Lusher questioned what the end product would be and whether this was something agencies or the Community Development Officers should be doing. In response to a question from Paul, Vicky explained that the cost of the network analysis would be approximately £20,000. The Chair explained that the focus of the analysis would be to ensure that service providers and agencies worked more effectively. He explained that this was not the responsibility of the Community Development Officers as they were employees of the Borough Council, and the Borough Council was not ‘in charge’ of the Partnership.</p> <p>There was discussion around the network analysis and the fact that several surveys had already been completed. The view was that residents would not</p>	

	<p>complete another survey when they had not seen the results of previous ones. Chris Bamfield explained this was not a survey and there would be opportunities created by learning about networks. This view was re-iterated by Jeremy Hawkins who explained that it would show how well 600 people in one area carried out their services and how effective this collective effort was.</p> <p>In response to a question from Sue Lowe, Vicky explained that the network analysis had been agreed by the Board in the Cleaner, Safer Greener Action Plan.</p> <p>Charles Joyce highlighted other issues where funding may be needed, such as victims of domestic violence and also commented that he felt asylum seekers were 'getting everything on a plate'. This latter view was strongly opposed by Daisy Line.</p> <p>The Chair drew Board members attention to the set of minutes whereby the Cleaner Safer Greener Action Plan had been agreed, which stated that network analysis would be undertaken.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>The network analysis pilot goes ahead with a full report to be brought back to the Board at a later date.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Budget Update</p> <p>Vicky Etheridge explained that the capital budget was potentially over allocated by £30,027, if all schemes went ahead as planned. There were some capital and revenue projects that were in the Borough Council's budgets, but would be paid for by Safer Stronger funding, and then a contribution would be received back from the Borough Council in the 2007/08 financial year. Chris Bamfield suggested that four year projections be provided at a future Board meeting.</p> <p>It was AGREED that;</p> <p>1) The report be noted</p> <p>2) The Neighbourhood Manager to bring four year revenue and capital budget projections to a future meeting of the Board.</p>	<p>VE</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>MUGA Update and Costings</p> <p>A paper had been circulated outlining the costs of the MUGAs, and potential locations. Suggested locations were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kingsway or Lynnsport • Parkway • Hockham Street • William Booth Road • The Walks 	

	<p>Where there was sufficient space on the site, costings had been provided for two MUGAs. This applied to Kingsway and Parkway. The total cost of all the MUGAs (including two where space allowed) would be £529,933, or where only one was provided in each location the cost would be £441,882. Sport England would contribute one third of the cost. The cost to SSCF would either be £273,129 if one MUGA was placed in each location or £325,960 if two were put where space allowed.</p> <p>In response to a question from John Burns regarding the siting of the MUGA in Kingsway, Vicky Etheridge explained that the location would be for the residents to decide. She explained that the consultant had met with key individuals in each of the neighbourhoods to discuss the locations. John Burns explained that they had only met with the consultant once and their opinion had not been sought for the siting of the MUGA.</p> <p>Nigel Yates commented that the costs were in excess of the costings Gaywood Park Action Group had acquired for the MUGA organised by the Pro Teens Group. Chris Bamfield explained that the costings in the paper were of a high specification, particularly with regard to items such as fencing. The paper outlined the revenue implications associated with the ongoing maintenance of the MUGAs, and Chris explained that a high specification from the outset would be particularly important, in order to keep ongoing maintenance costs to a minimum.</p> <p>In response to a question from the Chair regarding revenue costs, Vicky Etheridge confirmed that the revenue budgets did not include provision for ongoing maintenance costs. The Chair explained that all SSCF projects were expected to be mainstreamed at the end of the SSCF programme.</p> <p>There was general discussion concerning the revenue implications of ongoing maintenance and whether the Borough Council would be able to budget for these costs. Chris Bamfield suggested that the Board seek reassurance from the Borough Council that the Council would maintain the sites, prior to giving final approval to the schemes.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The MUGA consultant to contact the residents in each neighbourhood and to hold further consultation regarding the siting of all MUGAs. 2) Once this consultation had taken place, a further report to be submitted to the Neighbourhood Management Board outlining detailed proposals. 3) The costs of £529,933 (for two MUGAs where possible) and £441,882 for one MUGA on each site, where accepted as reasonable costings by the Board. 	
<p>7</p>	<p>The Scrap Store Project</p> <p>Eddie West –Burnham circulated a paper outlining a proposal for a scrap store in Kings Lynn. He thanked Sue Payne for her work on the proposal.</p>	

The proposal was to incorporate a large furniture store and warehouse with a re-paint scheme for the community sector as well as a scrap store.

In response to a question from Daisy Line regarding management and funding of the project, Eddie West-Burnham confirmed that he would be seeking funding to ensure sustainability of the project. He also explained that 80% of the work would take place within the 5 SSCF areas. The £10,000 requested was for a feasibility study into identifying businesses, community and voluntary organisations that would make use of the service.

Sue Payne explained that the project would need to be a partnership and that no one organisation should be in control. The partnership could be made up of representatives from MIND, Forward and Futures and FANG for example.

Sylvia Pomeroy questioned whether the project would receive Lottery funding, and highlighted a project in her village that had received Lottery funding for a feasibility study. She preferred to see SSCF funding allocated to something more tangible than a feasibility study.

Chris Bamfield indicated that the Borough Council's refuse and recycling service were interested in supporting the project, although he had some concerns over the accessibility of the current site. He questioned whether a more suitable site may be available. Eddie West-Burnham noted that he expected a feasibility study would show whether the existing site used by MIND was suitable and what type of premises were required.

Vicky Etheridge explained that this project would help achieve several SSCF outcomes.

Helen Mace and Jackie Nurse left the meeting at 4.40pm.

Charles Joyce explained that the project would have implications under the Waste Framework Directive. There was discussion around the project including the need to be aware of the Waste Framework Directive and to work with the County Council to receive recycling credits.

The Chair asked if there was consensus to approve the project. Malcolm Summerfield requested clarification concerning some of the figures in the report. A senior researcher at £340 per day for five days had been costed at £2,380, although a feasibility study at £340 per day for five days had been costed at £1,700.

It was **AGREED** that:

1) Eddie West-Burnham to clarify costings and report back to the Board

EWB

2) Alternative sites to be considered as part of the feasibility study

EWB

3) Specialist officers, to include the Environment Agency, to be consulted as part of the feasibility study.

EWB

	Daisy Line, Pat Brodowski, Sarah Reed and Eddie West-Burnham left the meeting at 4.45pm.	
8	<p>Town Team</p> <p>Vicky Etheridge had circulated a paper outlining two options for the future of the Town Team. The first option would be to revise the Town Team membership and remit and the second option would be to disband the Town Team completely and hold an annual meeting of the Neighbourhood Management Board instead, which would be open to all community and voluntary groups, service providers and interested residents in the five neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Charles Joyce explained that he felt the Town Team should continue. He noted that members may have valid view points that they wished to communicate. Vicky Etheridge explained that members of the Neighbourhood Management Board had a responsibility to report back to their neighbourhoods.</p> <p>In response to a question from the Chair regarding members who may be missed if the Town Team were disbanded, Vicky explained that there were only two members on the Town Team not represented on the Neighbourhood Management Board. Chris Bamfield agreed with the disbanding of the Town Team and supported the idea of holding an annual event.</p> <p>There was discussion around the representation on the Town Team and the benefit of an annual event as opposed to twice yearly Town Team meetings.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>Option two of the proposal – to disband the Town Team and hold an annual event in its place, be accepted by the Board.</p> <p>Charles Joyce requested it be noted that he did not agree with the proposal of disbanding the Town Team.</p>	
9	<p>Installation of CCTV cameras on Gaywood Park Estate</p> <p>Vicky Etheridge had prepared a paper outlining a proposal for extra CCTV cameras on the Gaywood Park Estate. This would contribute to some of the SSCF mandatory outcomes. Vicky explained that the Borough Council would not take on the maintenance or surveillance of the cameras, instead Freebridge were proposing to take on these costs.</p> <p>Charles Joyce had raised several questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence was there to prove that CCTV reduced crime? • Had there been consultation with the Police Architect Liaison Officer or the Crime Prevention Officer? • Was there any long term commitment to fund the monitoring and maintenance of the cameras? 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the funding from Freebridge the best use of this resource? <p>Christopher Smith explained that CCTV cameras were part of a strategy for reducing crime and the fear of crime and not the only solution. He also explained that there had been lots of consultation with the residents on the estate and they were in favour of the new cameras. He explained that Freebridge had extended their funding of the monitoring and surveillance and the cost to Freebridge was in the region of £170,256, and not £11,750 per annum for three years. Although the presence of cameras may not eradicate crime, crime could possibly be worse if the cameras were not in place. In 2006/07 12 out of 21 of the cameras had shown a decrease in crime over 2005/06.</p> <p>Sylvia Pomeroy reported that Freebridge tenants would effectively have met the costs of CCTV both through their rent and the council tax. She explained that other housing associations should contribute to the costs and not simply Freebridge.</p> <p>Nigel Yates explained that the estate needed CCTV cameras and that there should not be a delay. John Burns noted that three cameras would be preferable to two, as one camera to cover the whole of Bagge Road was insufficient.</p> <p>In response to a question from Wally Glynn regarding the use of redundant cameras from Hardwick Estate, Christopher Smith confirmed that these cameras would be used.</p> <p>Chris Bamfield explained that the "ball" type cameras would be preferable as it would not be obvious as to which way the camera would be pointing at any one time. Christopher Smith explained that on other estates CCTV footage had proved invaluable as evidence, and Gaywood Park estate did not have this option, which was unfortunate. Nigel Yates explained that Gaywood Park Action Group had planning permission for a CCTV mast, so that if further funding was available in the future, this mast could be used for an additional camera.</p> <p>Christopher Smith re-iterated that CCTV was not a solution in itself, but was part of a solution. The residents were very keen to have the cameras installed.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>The proposal to install two cameras on the Gaywood Park estate be approved.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>Funding Agreement With Norfolk Constabulary</p> <p>This item was taken after item 11.</p> <p>The Chair asked if there was consensus to sign the funding agreement between the Partnership and Norfolk Constabulary. Charles Joyce voiced concerns over the abstraction of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) from one neighbourhood to another in times of need. Stuart Gunn explained</p>	

	<p>that 80% of the PCSOs time should be spent in their neighbourhood, as stated on the agreement. The target would actually be 90% if possible.</p> <p>Charles Joyce expressed concerns regarding cover if a PCSO was on sick leave or annual leave. Stuart Gunn explained that in certain circumstances it would be necessary to take PCSOs from one neighbourhood into another and this could not be avoided. Charles Joyce also highlighted the need to provide welfare facilities in each neighbourhood.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>1) The agreement be signed subject to the following amendments; i) the Agreed Service Level will be 100% in each neighbourhood ii) The Service Level to be reviewed on a quarterly basis iii) Any aspect of the agreement to be reviewed and amended at any time, providing there is the agreement of both parties. iv) Each neighbourhood to provide welfare facilities for the PCSOs in their neighbourhood.</p>	VE
11	<p>Setting Up Community Action Groups</p> <p>This item was taken after item 6.</p> <p>Stuart Gunn gave a presentation outlining some of the recent crime statistics. He explained that vehicle crime had decreased from 3072 vehicles in 2001/02 to 1322 in 2006/07. Similarly, burglary from dwellings had decreased from 939 in 2001/02 to 304 in 2006/07. He explained that most of the public rated the fear of crime quite highly, and would consider crime rates when purchasing property. He explained that neighbourhood policing had been brought in to help reduce crime rates, and that one in three crimes were detected in the western area. It was the intention to have a police presence in each neighbourhood by 1st April 2007. There were four neighbourhoods within Kings Lynn and 52 in the whole of Norfolk.</p> <p>Stuart Gunn explained the concept of Community Action Groups whereby groups would meet every 8 weeks in each neighbourhood and discuss any issues relevant to their area. Priorities would be identified and then groups would work with other agencies to help take these priorities forward. Stuart explained that he would like to link this work into existing community groups, as opposed to setting up completely new groups. He also explained that these meetings would be open to all members of the public, which had not always happened in the past. Stuart requested members of the Board to nominate their groups to be part of the Community Action Groups.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>1) The South Lynn Forum and Gaywood Park Action Group to be nominated as Community Action Groups</p> <p>2) Stuart Gunn to contact John Burns regarding the set up of a separate group to cover the Fairstead Estate.</p>	PL/NY /SB SG/JB

<p>12</p>	<p>An Identity for SSCF in Kings Lynn</p> <p>The Communications Officer at the Borough Council had designed two logos for the SSCF which were circulated.</p> <p>It was AGREED that;</p> <p>Chris Bamfield, Wally Glynn and Christopher Smith to further consider identifying a logo for the SSCF.</p>	<p>CB/CS /WG</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>Board Members Expenses</p> <p>Vicky Etheridge had circulated a paper outlining a proposal to reimburse Board members for any expenses incurred in the course of their Board duties. This would only apply to those members in the voluntary or community sector as it was expected that statutory agency members would be reimbursed by their organisations in the usual way.</p> <p>In response to a question from Paul Lusher regarding claiming for telephone calls, Vicky Etheridge explained that a simple claim form could be used to log all calls made in connection with Board business.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>The proposal to reimburse Board members for their expenses, as outlined in the report be approved.</p>	
<p>14</p>	<p>Freebridge Community Caretaker Scheme</p> <p>Christopher Smith reported that an estate office had been opened in North Lynn with a Housing Officer based there. From the 1st April 2007 the role of the Community Caretakers would include other duties and the role would be more of a Community Warden. They would patrol the area and intervene in any incidents of anti social behaviour. This would be piloted in North Lynn and, if successful, trialled on Fairstead Estate, Hillington Square and Gaywood Park estate. Once the trial was completed a report would be presented to the Neighbourhood Management Board.</p> <p>Paul Lusher noted that there did not appear to be any initiatives taking place in South Lynn. Christopher Smith explained that South Lynn would not be included in the pilot. It would be assessed however for the provision of an estate office.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The verbal report be noted 2) A report to be brought back to the Board once the trial period of the 	<p>CS</p>

	Caretaker Scheme was complete.	
15	<p>Board Job Shadowing Update</p> <p>Nicky Stevenson from The Guild gave an update on the Job Shadowing Scheme. She explained she had held one briefing session for the residents and a separate session for the service providers. Some of the residents and service providers had started their shadowing. Nicky would also be meeting with the communities of interest and the elected members. These had proved more difficult to set up.</p> <p>There would be a job shadowing debrief on 25th April 2007, and the shadowing needed to be completed by that date. Nicky explained that she would be looking at the set up of a knowledge audit in order to discuss any particular areas that may need to be examined.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Nicky for her update.</p>	
16	<p>Consumption of Alcohol in Public Places</p> <p>A paper had been circulated outlining the proposed area for the control over consumption of alcohol in public places. The proposal was now out for consultation with licensees and interested parties in Kings Lynn. The Board were asked to consider the area proposed under the control of consumption.</p> <p>Sylvia Pomeroy explained that she had spoken with the Principal Officer in Environmental Health and Housing responsible for the consultation and explained there were issues at Highgate in Kings Lynn. In response to a question from Paul Lusher regarding the potential roll out over the whole of Kings Lynn, Chris Bamfield explained that there needed to be proof of anti social behaviour related incidents relating to alcohol.</p> <p>In response to a question from Charles Joyce regarding Hillington Square, Vicky Etheridge explained that this was not included in the proposed area.</p> <p>Paul Lusher explained that he would be happy to see the whole of Kings Lynn covered by the control, although Chris Bamfield explained that there needed to be clear demonstration of the risks of anti social behaviour related to alcohol. In response to a question from the Chair regarding incidents in South Lynn, Paul Lusher responded by explaining that there were incidents of drinking on the streets in South Lynn.</p> <p>It was AGREED that:</p> <p>The proposal be supported with the provision that the following areas be considered for the proposal: Hillington Square, Gaywood, South Lynn, Highgate and North End.</p>	

17	<p>National Neighbourhood Management Network Spring Conference</p> <p>Details of a conference planned for 26th April had been circulated. There were four places available. In response to a question from Charles Joyce regarding cost, Vicky Etheridge explained each place would cost £100. Sharon Ludford explained that she was named to attend, but if there were other Board members wishing to attend she would step down.</p> <p>It was AGREED that;</p> <p>1) There would be four representatives from the Board attend</p> <p>2) SSCF would cover the cost of all four places.</p>	
	<p>Date and Time of Next Meeting</p> <p>The next meeting would be on Thursday 24th May 2007 at 5.00pm. There would be a buffet tea at 7.00pm. The focus of the meeting would be to further develop the action plan and budget proposals.</p>	
	<p>The Chair thanked everyone for attending.</p> <p>The meeting finished at 5.47pm</p>	