

HOWDENSHERE FORWARD

Notes of meeting held on Thursday 3 August at 7 pm in the LOIDB boardroom, Bridgegate, Howden.

Present: Christine Burton, Liz Charnock (Secretary), Kevin Crean, Jane Crossley (ERYC), Daphne D'Ark, Theresa Fearnley, Cora Heptonstall, James Little, Frances O'Riley, Tessa Kay, John Pole (Chair), Paul Robinson, Anne Shaw (MBED), Ros Taylor, Jonathan Taylor, Keith Tinkler, Lorraine Vant, Roger Watkins, Andrew Williams
Apologies: Mark Birtles, Helen Holloway, Liz Jordan (YF), Ingrid Ridley, Hugh Roberts

1. Notes of last meeting

The notes of the meeting of 4 July 2006 were agreed as a correct record, subject to amendment as follows:

- 1.1 Re note 2.2 – catchment area: to make clear that the area incorporates the parishes within the catchment area of Howden School.
- 1.2 Re note 2 – to record that during discussion of the partnership agreement some issues about the clarity of the terminology were raised and the Chair invited Paul Robinson to look more closely at the strategic objectives in the document and translate them into a more workable format, and that Paul agreed and asked Anne Shaw to assist.

2. Revised draft partnership agreement - feedback

The Chair reported that there was feedback from Jane Crossley in relation to membership of the partnership board, and from Paul Robinson and Anne Shaw relating to strategic objectives.

2.1 Membership of the board

Jane Crossley reported that ERYC were unhappy about the loose nature of the proposed first board, being made up largely of individuals. The partnership needed local organizations to be involved which could help deliver the strategy, and whose representatives would speak for and report back to those organizations; while it was accepted that it may be difficult to identify which organizations should be involved as board members, it was a question of public accountability. She pointed out that it was open to the partnership to co-opt individuals, and that there was more flexibility in the appointment of Chair if this was left as in the original draft.

It was noted that it would still be open to all interested parties to participate in the wider partnership and focus groups, whether or not they were from a particular organization. The purpose of the RMT programme was not to subsume all the activities of the catchment area but to define a strategy for future development.

After discussion it was agreed:

- 2.1.1 to retain the principle of an independent Chair, to be elected by the board but not necessarily a member of the board;
- 2.1.2 that the previous decision in relation to the election of the partnership board be confirmed (see note 2.6 of 4 July meeting). Jane advised that this might not be acceptable to ERYC.

2.2 Strategic objectives

Anne Shaw and Paul Robinson introduced their paper which had been previously circulated to members. They had looked at current documentation – the economic assessment, the strategic framework, the workshop outcomes and the partnership agreement, and had tried to create a useable document which could be implemented quite quickly. Part of the draft sought to address the aims and objectives, and priorities for action, and break them down into objectives, success criteria, actions, and critical success factors. They had thought it useful

to review the economic assessment and the strategy documentation, and felt a summary of the Genecon (consultants) report would be helpful to encourage more community involvement. The draft paper was broken down into four sections:

- a statement of vision and aims
- headline objective 1 – to develop an agreed long term strategy and priorities for action
- headline priority 2 – to develop an agreed communication strategy and annual plan
- headline priority 3 – to develop a performance management framework for delivery of the initial priorities for action

They felt that effective consultation and communication was critical to the success of the strategy and the encouragement of greater community involvement.

John Pole felt that Anne and Paul had exceeded their brief, which in his understanding was, following discussion at the last meeting, to suggest rewording to clarify the objectives of the partnership and to suggest a means by which their outcomes could be measured. This paper touched on wider issues of the overall vision and strategy for the partnership and proposed a further year of consultation, which he felt was neither practicable nor necessary, and could be counter-productive. Recent workshops, public consultation and surveys all raised the same issues as were highlighted in the present strategy document; he felt it was time to move forward to start to address these issues and that the third and fourth sections of Anne and Paul's paper, on communications strategy and performance management framework, were appropriate tools to begin with. Project priorities had been identified and it was important that these were progressed without further undue delay.

After lengthy discussion it was agreed:

- 2.2.1 that the partnership would not proceed to re-examine the basic strategy and business plan at this stage;
- 2.2.2 that section 2.2.1 of the partnership agreement (objectives) should remain as presently worded, recognizing that the proposed project areas fit the strategic parts of the overall objectives; and
- 2.2.3 to move forward on the basis of priorities 2 and 3 of the draft paper.

3. Working groups

John Pole spoke on his proposal to establish four working groups arising from priorities identified in the workshop sessions, as follows:

- Business, skill development and Local Development Framework;
- Arts, heritage and tourism (including Shire Hall and public realm);
- Transport;
- Youth (including youth sport).

The appointment of a 'champion' for each group was discussed. Paul Robinson volunteered to lead the Youth group for its first six months, and John Pole volunteered to lead the Business group. It was agreed to give further consideration to membership of the groups at the next meeting, noting that membership should be encouraged from outside the existing partnership as well as within.

Anne indicated that she would be able to find funding support for a special event to encourage young people to get involved.

Jane reported that ERYC would shortly be interviewing for five Renaissance Co-ordinator posts, one of whom would be based in Howden.

4. Communications strategy

Anne Shaw had prepared a paper on this which had been circulated prior to the meeting. Members thanked Anne for her work on this and agreed that it was important to raise public awareness of Howdenshire Forward and its strategy through as many means as possible, including forthcoming local events. This could also include taking advantage of expertise such as MBED and the ERYC marketing department, and local media including the Senior

School's website. It was also agreed to ask the school to organize a logo design for the partnership, and that a small working group should be set up to work with the new ERYC support officer when in post.

John Pole offered to work on a draft vision statement for use in promotional material.

5. Request from Howden Town Forum for financial support

A request by the Forum for financial support to complete the sculpture project, addressed to Yorkshire Forward, had been passed on by them to the partnership. Cora Heptonstall reported that £15,000 was needed, and that grants were being sought from other sources. Members discussed it but no decision was able to be reached as it was not yet clear whether the partnership was properly constituted, what funding might be available to the partnership in the short term and what criteria it would be likely to employ in determining funding support for local projects.

6. Date of next and future meetings

Thursdays at 7 pm in the LOIDB board room, as follows: 7 September, 5 October, 9 November, 7 December.

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm.