



ENVIRONMENT AND HOUSING PARTNERSHIP

4 November 2008

Present

David Slater	- Executive Director of Environment and Regeneration (In the Chair)
Councillor Bill Shepherd	- Housing Theme Portfolio Holder
Councillor Wendy Taylor	- Environment Theme Portfolio Holder
Peter Stafford	- Voluntary Sector Representative
Rob Nichols	- Environment Theme Lead Officer
Lionel Hehir	- Voluntary Representative
Linda Seery	- PCT
John Telfer	- Community Voice
Nick Fray	- Community Voice
George Mansbridge	- Newcastle City Council, Strategic Housing (representing C Cunningham)

In Attendance:

Paul Gallagher	- LSP Team (PG)
Nick Stevens	- Newcastle City Council, Chief Executive's Office (NS)
Gary MacDonald	- Newcastle City Council, Transport Policy Manager (GM)
Anna Benbow	- Your Homes Newcastle (AB)
Phil Hunter	- Newcastle City Council, Corporate Policy Team (PH)
Elaine Campbell	- Newcastle City Council, Democratic Services (EC)
David Connor	- Newcastle Warm Zone (DC)
Cal Boal	- Community Empowerment Network (CB)
Satpal Parmar	- Community Empowerment Network (SP)

Report	Discussion/Decision	Action
1. Apologies for Absence	Christine Cunningham, Geoff Matthews, Les Clark,	EC
2. Summary of Meeting held on 22 September 2008	<p>AGREED</p> <p>Matters Arising:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alcohol Strategy Funding – Lynda Seery reported on the success of a series of funding bids to the sum of £542,000. Part of the funding would establish posts to support the delivery of the strategy, in particular the treatment element. 	

Report	Discussion/Decision	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In terms of housing, there was a strong evidence base for change as a result of the work undertaken for the Growth Point Programme of Development (POD). An outline timetable was given for the submission of the refresh with a view to sign off by the Secretary of State in early April 2009. <p>During the ensuing discussion, the following issues were highlighted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This Partnership clearly had a role to play in N1138, (Satisfaction of People over 65 with both home and neighbourhood), albeit it was led by the Wellbeing and Health Partnership – there were also a range of other cross cutting targets relating to for example the alcohol strategy and employment to which this Partnership would contribute. ▪ A query was raised regarding transport and it was noted that the annual target for the current year had been achieved. On that basis, it was not anticipated that there would be any significant change in the target over the next four years. If those targets were achieved, as was expected, this could result in additional resources of £4.5m. ▪ There was concern that the transport indicator (NI 167) had been allocated to this Partnership with no reference to members of the former Transport/Access Theme Group to inform them of this fact. It was explained that the more strategic elements of transport would be addressed through the multi-area agreement, responsibility for which would lie with the Newcastle Partnership Strategic Board. (As an example, the Nexus Bus Strategy would be considered by the Strategic Board at its December 2008 meeting). <p>However, it was considered that the more operational aspects would seem to logically link into issues around homes/neighbourhoods and quality of place which were all the responsibility of this Partnership. The Strategic Board had agreed that Nexus should have a link into the Partnership structure and considered that this Partnership would appear to be the most appropriate.</p>	<p>GMc</p>

Report	Discussion/Decision	Action
	<p>AGREED – That</p> <p>(i) the report be received;</p> <p>(ii) further detail on the transport target be submitted to the next meeting of the Partnership;</p> <p>(iii) it be noted that where appropriate, other transport issues of broader interest would also be considered by this Partnership;</p> <p>(iv) a précis and web link of the City Councils congestion plan be circulated to the Partnership.</p>	<p>All/PH</p> <p>GMc</p> <p>GMc</p> <p>GMc</p>
<p>4. Performance Monitoring Report</p>	<p>Nick Stevens, in presenting his report, highlighted four key issues for discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Delivery in general. ▪ The understanding of targets by theme leads/Partnership. ▪ The red traffic light target – action. ▪ Action planning. <p>During discussion of those four key items a number of issues were raised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Newcastle Partnership Delivery Board were anxious to ensure appropriate governance arrangements were in place and Delivery Partnerships had all the necessary support. On that basis, the Deputy Chief Executive/Partnership Director were to meet with the Partnership to discuss the delivery of targets (probably at the January 2009 meeting) with an initial discussion to take place between the Deputy Chief Executive and the Chair. ▪ The report itself provided a summary of targets/delivery plans and it was clear that progress was mixed. A major concern was that in some instances there seemed to be an inability to articulate what action might take place quickly to achieve targets within the time frame. This was crucial as the Comprehensive Area Assessment was primarily based upon Partnership working and achieving those targets. Further work was to be carried out with target leads over the next couple of months. 	<p>DCX/DS</p> <p>NS</p>

Report	Discussion/Decision	Action
	(iii) a detailed and focus debate on two/three of the targets to take place at the next meeting.	NS/RN/LC
5. Inclusion of Transport in the Delivery Partnership	Discussed earlier.	
6. Clean and Green Sub-Group	<p>Rob Nichols provided an update on the recently established Sub-Group.</p> <p>The Sub-Group would be focusing on NI195 (litter/graffiti etc) – a first meeting had been held recently with a second meeting scheduled for December 2009.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Whilst progress on NI195 was satisfactory, it was apparent that there was an inconsistent approach among local authorities as to the definition and that would need to be addressed. ▪ The Sub-Group would also look at other targets within the same “suite” including issues around anti-social behaviour and environmental crime. ▪ The Sub-Group was keen to widen participation including for example, the further education sector to address specific issues around students. ▪ There were significant differences in local environmental quality and the Sub-Group hoped to examine the reasons why this was the case and develop some early solutions which would contribute to the LAA targets. The first task would be to develop a simplistic tool kit to address these issues and which could be applied Citywide. ▪ An obvious driver for this work was the disproportionate level of resources spent on the “cleaning” agenda which could be used more effectively and efficiently elsewhere. <p>AGREED – That the report be received.</p>	<p>RN</p> <p>RN</p>
7. Warmzone Update	David Connor gave a presentation/update on the work of Warmzone (copy of the presentation to be circulated). Following the presentation, a number of comments were raised as follows:-	EC

Report	Discussion/Decision	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There were clearly links to the health agenda including long term conditions and excess winter deaths. ▪ The traditional approach must change and there was now the opportunity to engage with the employment/skills agenda. ▪ There was also an opportunity arising to secure substantial Government funding from the Community Energy Saving Programme to promote area based schemes and this would have great cross sectoral benefits – there was perhaps a role for this Partnership in lobbying Government. ▪ Whilst some progress had been made in encouraging GP referrals more work was required with colleagues at the PCT to address this. ▪ Tackling hard to heat homes was a major issue – not only in technical terms, but the major disruptions caused and the fact that the measures would physically reduce the size of the property. There was no easy solution and whilst one option was simply to increase the household income, this did nothing to contribute to the reduction in carbon emissions. ▪ There was a need to continue raising awareness and in response to a specific query around Housing Associations, it was noted that their response was generally good. A major area of ongoing concern, remained the private rented sector which generally suffered from both lower incomes and lower energy efficient properties. <p>AGREED – That</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the presentation be received and progress noted; (ii) the submission to the Governments Community Energy Saving programme be endorsed. 	<p style="text-align: center;">ALL</p> <p style="text-align: center;">DC/LC</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ALL</p>
8. Date and Time of Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The next meeting was scheduled for 26 January 2009. 	

Report	Discussion/Decision	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="432 282 1267 427">▪ A revised work programme be established taking into account the decision to consider in detail two/three targets at each meeting together with the underpinning action plans. 	<p data-bbox="1331 367 1442 400">RN/GM</p>