

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

Minutes of a joint meeting of the **Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Wednesday 20 November 2019** at **6pm** when there were present:

Ms S J Catchpole	Ms R M Grattan	Mrs S M Prutton
Mrs J K Copplestone	Mrs T M Mancini-Boyle	Mrs L A Starling
Mr A D Crotch	Mr M L Murrell	Mr D M Thomas

Also in attendance were the Director of People and Communities, Assistant Director of Individuals and Families; Healthy Living Manager (for Minute no: 3); Evaluation and Data Analyst (for Minute no: 4); Housing, Health and Partnership Officer (for Minute no: 5); Economic Development Officer (Health and Wellbeing) (for Minute no: 7) and the Senior Committee Officer.

Ben Stone and Damien Millmen of First Step attended for Minute no: 5.

1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

After calling for nominations, it was proposed and seconded that Mr Whymark be appointed Chairman.

RESOLVED:

to appoint Mr Whymark Chairman for this meeting.

Mr F Whymark in the Chair

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Beadle, Mr Bulman, Mr Foulger, Miss Lawn and Mr Shaw.

3 LEISURE PRINCIPLES

The Healthy Living Manager presented her report which was due to be considered by Cabinet on 14 January 2020, seeking the Panels' views on the leisure principles which would guide officers in identifying leisure opportunities and priorities.

In Broadland, 81% of residents' day to day activities were not limited by illness or disability yet over a quarter of 4-11 year olds and 61% of adults

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

were classified as overweight. The health costs of physical inactivity in Broadland for one year were estimated at £2,158,318 or £1,781,695 per 100,000 population. Broadland had a robust leisure offer which combined communities and physical activities for families, communities and individuals with a recognition that it needed to cater for all generations to target levels of activity and social cohesion. Examples included the Tots2Teens holiday activities; Broadly Active; Why Weight programme; Marriott's Way 10k race as well as supporting various Park Runs. It was well recognised that there were wider benefits of leisure services to the individual, community and public sector.

It was noted that a significant amount of leisure facilities and activities across Norfolk were privately owned and often out of reach of those people who might benefit the most. The Council's aim was to ensure that every resident had an opportunity to engage in physical activity in their community but not to the detriment of high quality and effective services.

Therefore, to build on the existing offer, officers had developed a set of proposed leisure principles (below) which would guide officer resource towards identifying opportunities to improve the health and wellbeing of residents in the community as well as offer a framework for how the Council might develop the offer to residents and the rationale for the programmes of work which were supported.

Community Offer

- (1) We will work with partners to aim to ensure that there is a Leisure offer appropriate and proportionate to communities across Broadland, to help as many of our population become active. In doing this, our order of priority of preference will be:
 - (a) Steer the community towards existing provisions and work with partners to make sure they are accessible.
 - (b) Develop capacity in the community sector to help establish self-sustaining leisure solutions.
 - (c) Where there is a gap in the market, look at options to provide.
- (2) We will work with partners to ensure that a leisure offer is a consideration of any major development or population growth in the district.

Health and Wellbeing

- (1) Given the developed national evidence on the telling contribution that activity can have on various longer-term conditions and social issues, we will utilise leisure assets and expertise to help work in the following areas in line with the shared health & wellbeing priorities. This is

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

building upon our successful Help Hub partnership and work to help develop community capacity.

- People who are likely to or have suffered a fall as a consequence of frailty.
 - Unhealthy and inactive lifestyles in adults and children/adult obesity.
 - Those experiencing long term worklessness and NEET (not in education, employment or training).
 - Those experiencing low level mental wellbeing issues such as early onset dementia and social isolation.
 - Those living with low level chronic health conditions where increased physical activity could be beneficial
- (2) Activity will be targeted to areas of the districts where we are aware of specific needs to ensure tailored provision to local communities, not universally.
- (3) Given the contribution to wider public-sector issues, we will seek to work in partnership and attract funding to help deliver in these areas, and to satisfy financial objectives for the service.

Financial

- (1) Any new or existing facility or activity should seek to be at least cost neutral.
- (2) In establishing or maintaining any facility or activity we should look to work with partners to help share the operational cost burden and risks.
- (3) Our leisure services should remain affordable to different members of our community, which means that some cohorts or products (see 'Health and Wellbeing') will generate less of a commercial operational yield than others.
- (4) In any investment we should look to better utilise existing community assets rather than develop from new.
- (5) Aside of investment to maintain our assets, any new non-essential (i.e. repair, replacement and maintenance) capital investment over the strategy period in leisure facilities will need to come from external sources unless there is a demonstrable ROI in excess of those typically expected via our treasury management investments (typically this is currently between 2 and 3%).

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

Members acknowledged that South Norfolk Council directly provided leisure facilities through its leisure centres whereas Broadland delivered a strong community leisure offer but the joint aim was to make facilities commercially viable and expand provision by working with partners. Everyone was to have access to high quality services, accessible to all, regardless of financial circumstances. The Councils would work in partnership with schools, parish councils etc to help them maximise use of their facilities and provide the most suitable activities for the community and its demography.

Members discussed the merits of the principles, noting that these did not commit the Council to any particular project but enabled collaboration with other council departments and public sector bodies to gain other, non-financial, benefits. An example of this was a resident of South Norfolk who had undergone a hip replacement – low level exercise reduced the need for physio appointments and the consequential financial burden on the NHS.

In conclusion, Members agreed that both officers and Members needed to be increasingly innovative and collaborative to deliver its ambitions and the proposed principles offered a constructive framework to achieve this. Accordingly, it was

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

to endorse the report and recommend Council to adopt the leisure principles.

4 JOINT INCLUSIVE GROWTH PROJECT PLAN

The Evaluation and Data Analyst presented his report outlining both current and proposed impacts of the Council's Inclusive Growth work which was due to be considered by Cabinet on 14 January 2020. The report provided an update on the Inclusive Growth agenda at county-wide level, a summary of the current work in this area undertaken by both South Norfolk and Broadland Councils and a proposed project plan to underline the Joint Inclusive Growth Strategy.

The Evaluation and Data Analyst reminded Members that the Strategy had been approved by both Councils in August / September 2019 which included approval of the framework and associated priority areas. However, Broadland's Cabinet had requested a more detailed action plan to accompany the Strategy, to form a workplan in relation to the Inclusive Growth Agenda. He emphasised that the list of projects was not exhaustive and there were still other areas to be considered, such as graduates returning to the area to seek employment.

The table of projects within the report was intended as a brief summary and identified how delivery could be substantially divergent for each council. In

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

these cases, officers were recommending that best practice was followed across the related projects or, where there was no overriding policy to do so, a single approach would be taken in order to allow the organisation to take advantage of the resources of the shared officer team. Furthermore, in a number of cases, funding; priority levels; policy and resourcing were different for the two councils and, where the policy steer from Members was substantially different, officers were proposing that the workstreams continued as previously.

Members noted the agreed priorities of the Joint Inclusive Growth Workshop of both authorities had been incorporated into the project plan and many of the projects had been the subject of discussions across the county via the Inclusive Growth Coalition.

Also included within the report was an overall timeline, designed to give an overview of timescales and key targets for each individual project as well as demonstrating the linkages between projects.

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development commented that economic development was a huge subject and the corporate approach had been for the Communities directorate to be the lead department, working with the Economic Development team. She did not want to see the work of the Economic Development team constrained and there were other factors to take into consideration, such as the Norfolk and Suffolk Economic Strategy and LEP Industrial Strategy. In her view, the projects outlined in the report should not be included within the Corporate Plan at this stage – work was still in progress plus the staff restructuring was still underway and people were not in their new posts. The Director of People and Communities responded that the plan was not about specific functionality of teams but cut across all remits. In addition, many of the projects were large scale and transcended over a bigger responsibility than district councils. Three assistant directors had been involved (Economic Growth; Planning and Individuals & Families) and all portfolios. The Director of Place, who had responsibility for economic development, endorsed the project plan. The Evaluation and Data Analyst added that he had worked with officers below assistant director level in a number of service team including economic development; planning; housing and partnerships.

The Director of People and Communities advised that the Corporate Plan was currently being written and this would include issues such as the skills gap but this would also appear in the Inclusive Growth Project Plan.

A Member concurred with the views of the Portfolio Holder that the projects needed to be developed further before they were included in the Corporate Plan. This view was shared by other Members and it was agreed that, whilst the Panels could endorse the Joint Inclusive Growth Project Plan they were unable to support inclusion of the projects in the forthcoming Corporate Plan at the current time.

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED:

to endorse the Joint Inclusive Growth Project Plan.

5 ROUGH SLEEPING PREVENTION – UPDATE

The Housing, Health and Partnership Officer introduced Ben Stone and Damien Millmen of the First Step project, advising that there was a collaborative approach to preventing rough sleeping across the two council districts, providing a rapid response to reports of cases of rough sleepers. Damien and Ben then provided Members with an outline of the project and the resources available to it, together with statistics on referrals and outcomes.

Scope of Project

- A collaborative approach across the Broadland and South Norfolk districts to provide support and advocacy to rough sleepers.
- To work closely with businesses, agencies and partner organisations to provide a streamlined service that addresses the needs of rough sleepers.
- To provide a rapid response to reports of rough sleepers.
- To connect with rough sleepers and to assess individual needs, support requirements and likely barriers to accommodation.
- To link in and work closely with the housing options team to explore accommodation options available through the council.
- To assist rough sleepers with no local connection to reconnect with family and/or other local authorities.

Resources

- 2 full time Rough Sleeper Coordinators with knowledge of homelessness legislation and experience of support provision.
- Somewhere Safe to Stay (Ssts) hub run in collaboration with Notting Hill Genesis provides 3 crash beds in a staffed supported accommodation scheme for up to 72 hours.
- Staging Post accommodation as a move on from Ssts. Consists of a 2 bed flat which accommodates up to 4 people for up to 8 weeks.

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

- Personal budget for spot purchasing accommodation and to provide essential assistance i.e. travel costs, clothing etc.

A total of 43 customers had been referred into service with 44 verification visits undertaken since August 2019.

Of the verified rough sleepers:

- 2 found own solution
- 9 accommodation provided First Step
- 5 assessed as priority need and linked into Housing Options
- 3 moved out of area
- 2 unable to accommodate due to risks
- 6 assisted by Housing Options
- 1 long term entrenched

Visits were carried out at 6am to connect with the rough sleepers twice a week. Six people who had been identified as a rough sleeper had actually got accommodation but were sleeping rough as a “one-off” due to family circumstances such as a disagreement. Some rough sleepers were migratory which meant that helpers were unable to make contact with them.

Damien provided details of two case studies which had both had a successful outcome, one involving a 67 year old man who had been homeless since 1998 following loss of employment which resulted in rent arrears and then loss of his social tenancy.

The Assistant Director of Individuals and Families advised Members that there were economies of scale and resilience with the two councils working together and positive feedback had been received from central government. It was hoped to roll out the project to other areas in due course. He commended the two representatives of First Step, adding that partner agencies were appreciative of the role they carried out, which included working at all hours of the day and night. Damien responded that they had been overwhelmed with the positive response and encouraged by the assistance by other organisations. For example, the Rotary Club provided care packages and Houdens provided kitchen facilities through its charity programme.

In response to a question on whether there had been any issues with crossing neighbouring councils' boundaries, the Housing, Health and Partnership Officer advised that Broadland had secured funding into a pathway service so the relationship with other councils was mutual not adversarial, to best meet the needs of the person across the district. Other

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

future initiatives included further funding via the Early Help Hub and housing-led properties for people with complex needs – these provided a maximum two year tenancy.

In terms of referrals from one rough sleeper about another, Ben responded that the project would accept referrals from anyone and these would be verified by a personal visit. The referrals were not limited to the Broadland / South Norfolk area.

In response to a question on the statistics, the Housing, Health & Partnership Officer advised that the first annual rough sleepers count had been a physical count across both districts. It had taken place between midnight and 2am looking at various areas when two or three potential rough sleepers had been identified. It was also possible to establish estimates for the number of other rough sleepers.

A Member expressed concern that a number of rough sleepers often had mental health problems and / or had been discharged from either hospital or the prison service without any planned accommodation. She questioned if this caused particular problems and whether rough sleepers chose rural areas believing they were safer than the city centre. The Housing, Health & Partnership Officer responded that a proportion would have mental health problems and was pleased to report that a protocol had been established with the prison service for a set process to be in place on discharge, supporting people on their release. A similar protocol was shortly to be signed off with the health service.

The Chairman thanked Ben and Damien for attending, commending the work undertaken by the project which would make a huge difference to people's lives and particularly welcomed the hospital discharge protocol.

6 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

to exclude the Press and public from the meeting for the remaining business because otherwise, information which was exempt information by virtue of Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, would be disclosed to them.

7 FUTURE OPTIONS FOR THE TOTS2TEENS PROGRAMME

The Economic Development Officer (Health and Wellbeing) presented his report, which was due to be considered by Cabinet on 14 January 2020, providing a summary valuation of the Tots2teens programme, options for any

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

future provision and seeking Members' views on elements of provision.

It was noted that the Tots2Teens programme had been running for 27 years and had evolved considerably over that time. It provided daily "experiences" to young people who lived or went to school in Broadland aged between 5 and 16 years, throughout every school holiday. Sessions were charged but with reductions available for those on certain benefits or referred through the Early Help Hub. The service was available to the full spectrum of families, being both inclusive and integrated. Officers had been considering the future provision of the Tots2Teens programme, its similarities and any potential relationship with South Norfolk Council's Kids Camp (a more traditional and sports based child care session provided over longer hours at the two council-run leisure centres). Attendance rates had averaged around 80% for the past few years and work had been ongoing to identify how this could be increased. The report provided information on other providers of school holiday activities, such as church or school groups through to national providers such as Premier Education, and how these compared to the Tots2Teens provision. Also included within the report were suggested short and longer term actions for developing the scheme in a cost effective manner and options for future charging including various percentage increases.

The Director of People & Communities advised that the purpose of the report was for Members to steer officers on future provision – by considering the objectives of the scheme, how it could be developed and the charging model. Currently, there was an inequality in the discount system and in addition, this had highlighted an issue with non-attendance, with places being booked at a significant discount which was not a sufficient incentive for actually turning up. This also had a negative impact in terms of the places not being used could have been taken up by another child. In addition, the eligibility factors for reduced rates needed to be tested to ensure they were still relevant.

A Member highlighted the overall financial cost to the Council of providing the Tots2Teen service but questioned if this actually resulted in financial and/or other savings further down the line. The Assistant Director of Individuals and Families responded that this had not been the focus of the evaluation until now but the intention was to approach the council's partner organisations such as Children's Services to look at the overall costs/benefits

Another Member expressed strong support for the scheme and suggested that the review should focus on what was the overall aim – if spread too thin, it could prove difficult to do well. The review should look at which facets added value, what other scheme were currently available and was the discounting scheme fair/equal. The Director of People & Communities advised that the report did provide some analysis of current market provision. He emphasised that commercial schemes did not always provide for children with challenging behaviour. The Tots2Teens scheme was based on "experience based" as opposed to sport based and the aim was to raise the aspirations of participants and providing different opportunities which was

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

different to the health and wellbeing agenda.

Another Member also expressed his strong support for the scheme, adding that sometimes the council had to accept having a loss leader when evaluated against the benefits. In his opinion, the financial cost to the council was far outweighed by the benefits to the children and mitigated against potential costs and risks if the scheme were not to be provided. The Director of People & Communities reminded Members that it was a discretionary service but acknowledged that there would be other types of savings outside of the district council. This view was supported by another Member who added that as the funding was not matching the costs of the experience, support should be sought from partners such as Children's Services. She emphasised that the Council couldn't run all services at a loss and the fee for Early Help Hub referrals certainly needed to be reviewed.

Members accepted that that as the Tots2Teens scheme provided for children with special needs, this involved an intensive amount of staff and therefore justified an increase in fees. Furthermore, the huge value of the scheme was acknowledged, together with the financial contribution made by the council and therefore options should be explored with other providers and partner organisations.

In conclusion, it was considered that Tots2Teens provided a useful service that promoted inclusive growth plus health and wellbeing for Broadland's young people including some of the most vulnerable residents of the district. Although the service was currently a loss making programme, there were elements that were unlikely to be replaced by commercial providers in the event it was removed. The programme operated good practice and met all legal requirements and was well thought of by residents with favourable feedback consistently garnered. It was noted that educational and social care professionals were supportive of the wider developmental work the programme offered to young people with additional needs which presented growth and funding opportunities. Providing this service was likely to offer savings elsewhere and in the future within public services and wider social care. Whilst the programme currently costed the Council money, it enhanced its reputation and delivered on many of the Council's key objectives. By adopting the short term recommendations proposed (raise income; review discounted schemes and open up the scheme to young people in South Norfolk), the Council could work to maintain a high standard offer at greatly reduced costs whilst also investigating the longer term recommendations to bring external investment to the scheme.

Accordingly, it was

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

Joint Meeting of Economic Success and Wellbeing Panels

- (1) that the Council continues to offer Tots2Teens as a discretionary holiday activity scheme and investigate extending the Kidscamp, recognising the current and potential contribution both made to inclusive growth and health and wellbeing outcomes;
- (2) to increase the charges for Tots2Teens fees by 15% for the next two years with a view to moving towards a cost neutral project;
- (3) the Council harmonises its discounted offer to be equitable, by charging 50% for all those on means-tested benefits (acknowledging that this could be reviewed in exceptional circumstances);
- (4) to endorse officers, working in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for both Economic Development and Housing & Wellbeing to explore the longer term recommendations contained in the report (para 5.5) with a view to enhancing the service and reducing / removing the financial burden of providing such a programme.

The meeting closed at 7.43pm