

**MINUTES of  
LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP STEERING GROUP  
Special Meeting – 23 JUNE 2010**

---

**PRESENT**

Cllr Penny Channer	Chairman of Maldon District LSP and Leader Of Maldon District Council
Hazel Berrett (HB)	Director of Community Services, Maldon District Council
Paul Murphy (PM)	Maldon and District CVS (Chairman of Health Housing and Wellbeing Partnership)
Carl Pullen (CP)	Essex Fire and Rescue (Chairman of Community Safety Partnership/Solution Group)
Councillor L Schnurr (LS)	Heybridge Parish Council (EALC representative)
David Stevenson (Ds)	Chairman of Local Delivery Group Plus (Head Teacher, The Plume School)
Fiona Marshall	Chief Executive, Maldon District Council
John Zammit	Partnership project Officer, Essex County Council
Superintendent Steve Johnson	Essex Police

**In attendance**

Tara Bird (Minute clerk)	Committee Services Officer, Maldon District Council
Lynn Marston (LM)	LSP Development Officer, Maldon District Council

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

- 1.1 Cllr Channer gave a brief introduction to the background to the meeting.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from: Dale Robinson, Peter Woollard, Michelle Dunn and John Moulson.

**3. THE PERFORMANCE REWARD GRANT POSITION (SEE APPENDIX 1)**

- 3.1 The position as outlined in Appendix 1 and the implications for the LSP of the proposed cuts as outlined in Appendix 2 were noted by the group.

#### **4. CURRENT LSP BUDGET POSITION (APPENDIX 3)**

- 4.1 LM reported that the appendix detailed the amounts spent and committed for the forthcoming year. She advised that details of the contracts were also provided.
- 4.2 LM advised that the monies for the Older Persons Exercise Classes had been allocated but not paid.
- 4.3 The PCT Grant was not expected to be available in 2010 / 11. In response to a question, it was noted that it was not known as yet if any cuts for this year would be made. LM explained that the PCT would be happy if the LSP was to use the current unallocated monies for a health and wellbeing project but that it would be more difficult to allocate the money to support the LSP itself.
- 4.4 It was commented that partnership contributions also needed to be discussed and noted that they were servicing a number of LSPs across the area. PC declared an interest as the member who represents the Essex Fire and Rescue Services
- 4.5 £10,000 of the Essex County Council (ECC) National Indicator 4 monies had been allocated, although only £2,425 had been spent. It was suggested that spend of the remaining monies be put on hold. HB suggested that the LSP needed to find out what the impact on meeting targets if the monies were not available.
- 4.6 LM explained that £10,000 had been paid for the first year of the Hospital Link Worker due to match funding. This year (year 2) £20,000 had been allocated as match funding was no longer available – this was paid monthly. To stop this service would result in closure costs of around £7,000. PM suggested that if this was able to continue until the end of the financial year this would allow time to obtain alternative funding.
- 4.7 It was reported that if the IT for older person's project was stopped there would be some abortive costs but it was thought that around £5,000 – 10,000 could be recouped. If this and any of the other PRG projects were ended any match funding would be lost.
- 4.8 LM reported that she was awaiting further information from ECC regarding the Maritime Centre project and that she had been advised that it would be difficult to break the Mediation for Young People contract.

#### **5. QUESTIONS FOR THE LSP (APPENDIX 4)**

- 5.1 LM drew the Groups attention to the letter from Cllr Peter Martin, Essex Management Board (Appendix 1) which stated that "...partners are reminded not to commit to any new activity funded by PRG." This relates in particular to the first section of appendix 4.

## PRG Projects:

- 1 Should the LSP continue to pass money to the hospital link worker project which receives monthly payments until a firm decision is made as to regarding the funding for the project?**

The group discussed this and FM suggested that perhaps notice should be given to staff, there would still be associated costs but would provide some clarity. This was discussed and felt to be a sensible option as to defer any decision would see the LSP as incurring further costs.

LM advised that the June payment could be made but she was unable to advise regarding payments after 5 July as these depended on Essex County Council.

It was agreed that all Year 2 PRG projects should be prioritised.

- 2 Should the LSP confirm the advice given to the mediation for neighbourhood disputes project that there will be an immediate cessation of funding and that no further mediation cases can be taken on until further notice?**

This was agreed.

- 3 Should the LSP confirm that the IT for Older people project should receive no further payments until the funding position is clear and that the financial costs of withdrawing from contracts should be explored?**

This was agreed.

- 4 Should the LSP confirm that the LSP will pay the outstanding expenses for the Voluntary sector building but that no further payments will be made after that?**

This was agreed.

- 5 The LSP should find out more as regards the £75,000 transferred to ECC for the marine apprenticeship scheme?**

In response to a question regarding support for LM from ECC, JZ advised that if the LSP was having problems with regards to this to let him know.

The above was agreed.

- 6 Should the LSP confirm that no further payments will be made to the mediation for vulnerable young people (at risk of homelessness) project until the funding position is clearer and that the financial costs of withdrawing from the contract should be explored?**

This was agreed.

**7 Should the LSP draw up a priority list of the remaining PRG projects i.e. which ones to protect first?**

The Steering Group were happy for LM to draw up a priority list based on comments this morning.

The group discussed the need for sustainability and how the criteria should be applied.

Support for the LSP

**8 How should the LSP continue to be supported (budget and paid Officer) in the short-term while the Sustainable Community Strategy is being renewed?**

**9 How should the LSP continue to be supported in the longer term?**

**10 Is this partnership worth saving?**

**11 Could partnership work be encouraged and supported in the District in other ways?**

In response to a question regarding 5 July event, it was felt that the LSP may be criticised for putting on an event when others are having pay cuts etc. LM provided the group with further information on the event and the current attendees. FM suggested that rather than the even a questionnaire could be sent out to those attendees as an alternative data collection exercise.

LS suggested that the LSP should continue to be supported until at least the SCS was in place.

DS felt that to terminate the LSP at this point would be wrong until further information becomes apparent. But consideration was needed as he felt the LSP could not afford the services currently being used to support it.

It was agreed that the LSP would continue until at least September when it was felt that a clearer idea of funding etc. would be available.

Continued spending and future plans:

**12 Is the LSP happy for the Parish Plans event planned for 14 September to go ahead? Some costs would be incurred in cancelling the venue.**

**13 Should the LSP go ahead and book a venue for its October / November reporting back event?**

The LSP discussed the above and agreed that neither the Parish Plans or LSP reporting back events should go ahead.

Liability:

**14 Who pays any possible redundancy costs?**

LM reported that redundancy costs relating to projects would effectively come from project monies and others (i.e. The LSP Development Officer) would come from PRG monies.

**15 Who has the ultimate liability for any PRG to be paid back to ECC if the amount exceed the amount the LSP is able to raise?**

In response to a question regarding the scope to share some of these costs with partners, LM advised that she was currently awaiting further information which should be available by 14 July.

FM suggested that the LSP needed to confirm its legal liability.

DS suggested that a way forward would be for the different partners to bring resources, time, money etc. to the table. PC felt that changing the way the LSP operates, through pooling funds, making funds and efficiencies had to be investigated.

NHS Mid Essex Funding:

**16 Should the £5,000 which is unallocated be awarded to RUSTIC's Home from Hospital project (funding ends at the end of June 2010 but it is hoped that funding can be secured from January 2011 onwards. They have requested £10,000 to bridge their funding gap and keep the scheme going.)? Or to one of the PRG projects which is likely to suffer from the cuts?**

**17 Should the LSP formally seek the PCT's views on whether the £5,000 could be used to support the LSP rather than being directed into Health and Wellbeing?**

In response to a question LM confirmed that information provided was correct at time of dispatch. She advised that it was not clear whether RUSTIC had started to wind down the service.

The guidelines for these monies were that they had to be used Health and Wellbeing projects. LM advised that the monies needed to be allocated or at least spent by the end of the financial year. LM suggested a couple of options for use of the monies.

HB provided a brief outline of the Hospital projects for 2010 / 11. Following further discussions it was felt that further information on this project was required. DS suggested that a group be set up to further review this project and make a decision on behalf of the group. It was agreed that PAC, LM and PM would form this group.

## **6. MEETING OF THE STEERING GROUP W/C 12 JULY**

- 6.1 LM proposed that another special meeting of the Steering Group be organised for the week commencing 12 July 2010. This was agreed.

The meeting closed at 11:079pm.