



**charnwoodtogether**  
making life better

**CHARNWOOD TOGETHER BOARD  
10TH FEBRUARY 2010**

**PRESENT:** Councillor M. Preston (Chair) – Charnwood Borough Council  
Tony Stott (Vice-chair) – Action for a Better Charnwood  
Hazel Fish – Rural Community Council  
Paul Fileman – Loughborough Chamber of Trade and Commerce  
Councillor T. Griffiths - Leicestershire & Rutland Association of Local  
Councils  
Mike Hannay – Astra Zeneca  
Neil Lambert – Voluntary Action Charnwood  
Chief Inspector N. Newell – Leicestershire Police  
Kevin Ryan – Charnwood Arts  
Councillor J. Vincent – Charnwood Borough Council  
Jon Walker – Loughborough University  
Councillor E. White – Leicestershire County Council

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

S. Boud – Leicestershire County Council  
S. McIntosh – Leicestershire County Council  
G. Parker – Charnwood Borough Council  
S. Phipps – Charnwood Borough Council

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor Shartt, R. Hulme, J. Mutton, D. Tilley and A. Williams

**1. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th December 2009 were confirmed as an accurate record.

**2. CHAIR'S REPORT**

The Chair stated that he had no items to report.

### 3. LEICESTERSHIRE CARES

At the invitation of the Partnership, a presentation to advise the Partnership of the work of Leicestershire Cares was given by Monica Kimche (copy filed with the agenda).

Particular attention was drawn to the following matters:

- Mock interview and feedback sessions would be held on 24th and 25th February 2010 at Burleigh Community College, to help students prepare for interviews. Members of the Board were invited to support the sessions by volunteering as an interviewer.
- It was of concern that people who found employment had their benefits stopped immediately, although there was a possibility that they would not receive any wages for up to a month following the commencement of work.
- As a charity, Leicestershire Cares was continually looking for additional funding. Any suggestions for available funding streams should be forwarded to M. Kimche.

In response to comments made and questions, M. Kimche stated:

- (a) Support for education programmes was received from Leicester City Council. It was unclear why Leicestershire County Council provided no such support.
- (b) £150,000 was received by Leicestershire Cares for the last financial year.
- (c) Over the previous ten years, it had been estimated that £4m worth of time had been received from volunteers working on projects for Leicestershire Cares.
- (d) In respect of placements, opportunities were being discussed with Charnwood Borough Council for placements in Services within the Authority, for example with the Street Wardens.
- (e) In respect of the 'Flying Fish' project, any local policing unit had a commitment to take placements.

S. Phipps stated that an article had been prepared to launch the scheme at Charnwood Borough Council and the Chair proposed that the scheme be publicised to a wider audience.

### **AGREED**

- I. that the presentation be noted;

2. that any member wishing to take part, or require further information, in respect of the interview sessions being held on 24th/25th February 2010 or with being involved in any of the projects, contact M. Kimche, [Monica@leicestershirecares.co.uk](mailto:Monica@leicestershirecares.co.uk).

#### 4. THE OLYMPICS 2012

A report considered by the Borough Council's Community and Partnerships Scrutiny Committee at its meeting held on 20th January 2010 in respect of the Olympics 2012 was submitted for the consideration of the Partnership, together with information in respect of the Loughborough Flames project, submitted by J. Mutton.

J. Hale, the Director of Loughborough Regeneration attended the meeting to assist with the consideration of the report. He stated that the report detailed preparations being made locally to take full advantage of the opportunities of the Olympics and that the recommendations made by the Committee would be submitted to the Borough Council's Cabinet at its meeting to be held on 18th February 2010.

Within the report reference was made to the presence of the University in Loughborough and it hosting of the Japanese team, the working groups and the strategies, the involvement of Prospect Leicestershire, the Cultural Olympiad and the longer term legacy following on from the Olympics. In respect to the Eastern Gateway project, Network Rail was looking to have improvements completed by March 2012, work had begun clearing that ground.

Reference had been made to the torch relay, which would be a major event in the build up to the Olympics. G. Parker reported that he had attended a regional event and the torch relay would be in the region for three days. Each Council would have to submit an application for the torch relay to visit its area and members could consider how such an event could be held in Loughborough, to assist with the submission of an application. Applications had to be submitted by 31st March 2010.

Reference was made to the Loughborough Flames information submitted with the agenda. Further information was available from Jim Mutton at [jim.mutton@lboro.ac.uk](mailto:jim.mutton@lboro.ac.uk)

The following issues were raised and comments made by members of the Board:

- (i) The use of the Olympics to advance the Eastern Gateway project was welcomed.
- (ii) The Leicestershire Steering Group was an important group and could focus on using existing structures as part of its plans.
- (iii) The long term legacy of the Olympics was reflected in the University strategy and its decision to host the Japanese team. The relationship with Japan was expected to continue after 2012, with links with academics and businesses already made.

- (iv) Japan Day had been recognised at the University in 2009 and in 2010 UKTI would be organising events on campus.
- (v) The University had the accommodation it required for 2012 and welcomed the joint working arrangements it had with the Borough Council Officers to further develop plans in the build up to the Olympics and beyond.
- (vi) It was proposed that a bill board be erected near the railway station to show the developments in the area.
- (vii) Publicity and events should focus on Charnwood and not just be Loughborough centric.
- (viii) The entourage for the torch relay was large. It would include 95 vehicles, which would need to be cleaned each evening and 250 people.
- (ix) It was suggested that the application for the torch relay could include a proposal for the first mile being run around the track at the University in under four minutes.
- (x) When preparing the torch relay application, consideration would need to be given to the logistics of having the relay in the area, including accommodation, torch carriers, traffic management, animation of the route and an evening event – possibly a ‘party in the park’.
- (xi) Any submission for the torch relay in Loughborough would be competing against the three cities, Lincoln and other areas of the region.
- (xii) Part of the bid for the torch relay could include accommodation being offered to participants and the entourage in private homes, as happened with long distance charity walks passing through Loughborough along the A6.

In respect to issues raised, comments made and questions, officers stated:

- (a) A theme group would be developed to produce an Action Plan for the involvement of children and young people at a sub-regional level. The Director of Leisure and Environment was on a local project team to develop local involvement.
- (b) There would be contact with local schools through the University.
- (c) In respect of the torch relay, no route had been agreed. The only definite would be that it would be in London on 12th July 2012, the preceding 60 days still had to be agreed.

The Chair requested that the Board receive frequent updates in respect of the development and build up to the events and local arrangements for the Olympics 2012.

## **AGREED**

1. that the information be welcomed;
2. that officers be requested to arrange for a bill board to be erected near to the railway station to show the developments in the area;
3. that J. Hale and J. Walker discuss outside the meeting the development of a sub-group, to consider the submission of an application for a leg of the torch relay to take place in Loughborough;
4. that the Board receive frequent update reports in respect of the preparations for the Olympics 2012 locally.

## 5. CHARNWOOD TOGETHER REVIEW

A report on the findings of the review of the working arrangements of Charnwood Together was submitted. The Board was asked to consider:

1. How the Board could better drive and influence improvement in the Borough – leading to real achievement by Charnwood Together?
2. The recommendations for changes to the structure set out in appendix A to the report.

S. Phipps proposed that the Board consider the matter, a structure be submitted to the Board's AGM in May 2010 and the Board consider the differences it makes at future meetings.

Reference was made to the Partnership Delivery-group and its successes in respect of the work it had undertaken with communications. However, the membership had been less enthusiastic when considering the background work, which it was considered was more appropriate for the Executive to undertake. In the future it was considered that Communications was a task for the whole Board. S. Phipps noted that the delivery-group had brought representatives from various organisations with specific skills to address issues. He suggested that the communications group continues, but reporting to the Executive.

Reference was made to agenda item 8, in respect of the Leicestershire Sustainable Communities Strategy review. Historically Charnwood had a Sustainable Communities Strategy in its own right (although it linked in to the Leicestershire SCS). An option to help Charnwood Together focus on a smaller range of key issues might be for there not to be a separate SCS for Charnwood. The SCS requirements might be met through a revised Leicestershire SCS with Charnwood Together then

owning the delivery of those aspects of that strategy best addressed at the Charnwood level.

The following issues were raised and comments made by members of the Board:

- (i) The Board did not monitor or receive regular updates on delivery.
- (ii) Delivery groups had struggled to have a focus because the Sustainable Community Strategy was so broad. A narrower frame could lead to a better focus and way forward.
- (iii) It was suggested that a representative from British Gypsum be invited to join the Board as a business representative from the South of the Borough.
- (iv) It was proposed that representatives from Charnwood Neighbourhood Housing and Charnwood Promotions be invited to join the Board.
- (v) It was suggested that with an enlarged Board membership there were fewer meetings of the Board, with the Executive meeting regularly and more activity take place within the Delivery groups.

In response to issues raised, comments made and questions, S. Phipps stated:

- (a) A similar template to that used by North West Leicestershire, included in the report, could be considered by the Executive and submitted to the next meeting of the Board.
- (b) It was an omission that a RCC representative had not been included in the proposed membership of the revised Board and that would be rectified.
- (c) A number of representatives from businesses in the South of the Borough had been invited to join the Board, but without success. The matter could be revisited.

The Chair stated that the revised strategy should be delivery orientated and include details of the roles of the Board, the Executive and the Delivery groups

**AGREED** that, taking account of the discussions at the meeting, a further report in respect of the Charnwood Together Review be submitted to the meeting of the Board, to be held on 12th May 2010.

## 6. REVIEW OF THE CHARNWOOD SECTION OF THE COUNTY SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

A review of the County Sustainable Communities Strategy was underway and as part of that Charnwood Together was invited to consider the current Charnwood section of that Strategy, in order that any comments could be fed into the County review process. The Charnwood Section of the current Leicestershire Together Strategy

was submitted, together with a copy of a draft Leicestershire County Council report, the purpose of which was to ask the Partnership to formally endorse and sign off the Places in Charnwood report.

The following issues were raised and comments made by members of the Board:

- (i) The review would be a useful focus for consideration at the Board's AGM in May 2010 to agree priorities moving forward.
- (ii) Each area referred to in the Places in Charnwood section referred to specific places. It would be beneficial to include something to pull the Borough together.
- (iii) There was the option for either the Board to consider the matter or submit individual areas to the appropriate Area Forum for comments.

In respect to issues raised, comments made and questions, officers stated:

- (a) It was anticipated that the Places refresh be completed by July 2010 and the process completed by September 2010.
- (b) From the County Council's point of view, there was no predetermined way to undertake the review. It was up to the Board to decide how the review was undertaken and by whom.
- (c) The details were not ambitious enough. When Leicestershire was considered, there were three distinct divisions, the city, market towns and rural areas. There was a difference between Loughborough and other local market towns, which should be identified with an additional tier thus, major city, significant strategic area, market towns and rural areas, with Loughborough identified as a significant strategic area. There were many drivers within Loughborough that were not dissimilar to the city.
- (d) Loughborough had an industrial base and a nationally recognised university.
- (e) Comments in (c) and (d) above, should be included within the 'vibrant urban community' section.
- (f) The achievements of the Board should also be included within the revised document.

## **AGREED**

- 1. that the information be noted;
- 2. that S. Phipps and S. McIntosh consider the comments made by the Board further outside the meeting and taking account of the discussion and decisions under minute 5 above;

3. that the matter be considered further by the Board at its AGM in May 2010.

## 7. BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE

Councillors Preston and White, N. Lambert, T. Stott and J. Walker declared an interest in the item.

A verbal update report in respect of Building Schools for the Future programme was given by S. McIntosh as follows:

### 'Readiness to Deliver' Document

The bid document had been submitted to Central Government and was being circulated to interested parties. Officers expected to be advised of the outcome of the bid and if they had been successful during March/April 2010.

### Consultation Process

The consultation process was underway. During that process a third option had been proposed and was being considered. Officers were unclear whether that option met the criteria, however, it would be submitted to LCC Cabinet for consideration with the other options, following completion of the consultation process on 2nd March 2010.

### Loughborough Learning Launch

The launch had taken place, with a key note speech being given by David Hemery to over one hundred guests.

The following issues were raised and comments made by members of the Board:

- (i) Reference was made to option C. There was a local groundswell of opinion in respect of the proposed closure of Limehurst High School. That matter should not be taken lightly and would require careful handling with the local community.
- (ii) Option C had been debated fully at a recent LCC Scrutiny Committee meeting. To retain a school on the Limehurst High School site there was a requirement of 900 places and associated playground facilities for that cohort. There was not the ground available for that to be considered. There was a requirement to fully explain the decision making around the proposed closure of that school. The matter had been fully debated, taking into account the advice of officers over fulfilling the BSF criteria set by central government.
- (iii) Many residents were passionate about the retention of Limehurst High School, arguing that it was not a failing school, rather it was a successful school that had received good Ofsted Inspection reports.

- (iv) It was of concern that a report in the Loughborough Echo had referred to the LCC Cabinet stating that Limehurst High School would close under those proposals.
- (v) Looking at demographics into the future, the number of school places required locally would fall and the BSF programme required that schools remove surplus places. The current round of BSF could be a final opportunity to apply for funding of that scale to improve schools in the Loughborough area.
- (vi) When a consultation process had taken place, it was important that the views received be considered and taken into account when decisions were made.
- (vii) The closure of Limehurst High School would have a huge impact on the culture of the local community. Parents had concerns in respect of 11 year olds travelling to schools further from their homes. Should the closure go ahead there would be a great deal of community cohesion work required in the area.
- (viii) Local residents required more than explanations for the decisions being taken, they needed reassurance to allay their concerns.
- (ix) The twelve months prior to the closure of a school would require careful management, to ensure the pupils at that school were not disadvantaged in any way. That had been successfully achieved in schools in a similar position in the past.
- (x) It was of concern that there was a danger that the level of controversy in respect of the proposals could result in the failure of the bid.
- (xi) Any conflict with local residents should be resolved with dignity and speed. There was a relationship between Limehurst High School, the local community, politics, culture and religion which would need to be addressed.
- (xii) In respect of the outcome of the Building Schools for the Future programme, local people would see local politicians as having made the decisions rather than national Government.
- (xiii) There were concerns in respect of the timescale of the proposals and the manner in which the changes were being proposed.
- (ivx) Without commenting on the merits of the different options put forward, the Board supported the BSF application as a welcome opportunity to increase investment in learning facilities in and around Loughborough. It was proposed that the Board submit its support for the Programme to the LCC Cabinet. The bid would be good for local business and improve education.

- (vx) Should the bid be successful, it would have an impact on the schools in the south of the Borough.
- (xvi) In respect of the Loughborough Learning launch, the event went well and had been received positively. Following on from the launch consideration should be given to taking the proposals forward and resourcing, which could be difficult to obtain.
- (xvii) Loughborough Learning had been viewed as a further positive to support the Building Schools for the Future Programme. The University had been invited to be part of its development, believing in the best education opportunities for all and if it could assist in its promotion would be happy to do so, but not to hold strong views as to how that should be achieved.

In response to issues raised and comments made, the Chair stated:

- (a) In order to receive the £80m funding, the rules set by the Government had to be met.
- (b) The Government had views in respect of the future of education and had given a prescriptive list of the process to follow to submit an application for funding.
- (c) The speed with which the bid was submitted was to meet the 31st January 2010 deadline.
- (d) A press release had been issued to encourage local residents to submit their views as part of the consultation process.

## **AGREED**

- 1. that the Board supports the principle of Building Schools for the Future funds being sought to enable reconfiguration of secondary education in Loughborough, Quorn and Barrow as an important, one off opportunity to transform a key aspect of community life;
- 2. that the key messages of the minute be extracted and submitted to the LCC Cabinet as the views of the Board.

## **8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

The item had been included on the agenda to allow Members to propose items for inclusion at future meetings of the Board.

At the request of Chief Superintendent D. Tilley, the item in respect of the New Police Force Structure, programmed for consideration at the meeting of the Board, had been postponed to a date to be agreed.

The following matters were proposed for consideration at future meetings of the Board:

The Annual Report;  
The SCS to include priorities and achievements.

**AGREED** that the following items be considered at future meetings of the Board, taking account of decisions taken earlier in the meeting:

- Charnwood Together Review – 12th May 2010;
- Review of the Charnwood section of the County Sustainable Communities Strategy SCS priorities and achievements – 12th May 2010;
- Annual Report – 12th May 2010;
- The new Police Force Structure – to a date to be agreed;
- Olympics 2012 – regular updates;

#### 9. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Dates and venues for future meetings of the Board had been agreed as follows:

12th May 2010 - AGM – Charnwood Borough Council

Proposed dates for the Council Year 2010/11 were as follows:

29th September 2010  
15th December 2010  
9th February 2011  
11th May 2011

Members were requested to agree the proposed dates and consider venues for those meetings.

#### **AGREED**

1. that the dates for meetings for the current Council year be noted;
2. that dates for the Council Year 2010/11 be agreed as follows:

29th September 2010  
15th December 2010  
9th February 2011  
11th May 2011

#### 10. OTHER BUSINESS

##### (i) Councillor Jill Vincent

Councillor Vincent stated that she would no longer be a member of the Board as she had been nominated Mayor Elect for the next Council year and

therefore would not be the Chair of the Charnwood Health and Well-being Partnership.

The Chair, on behalf of the Board, congratulated Councillor Vincent on her nomination, thanked her for the work she had undertaken as a member of the Board and wished her well for her year as Mayor.

(ii) Voluntary Action Charnwood

N. Lambert made reference to the two documents he had tabled at the meeting as follows:

- Voluntary Action Charnwood – Services 2009–10 Services operating from John Storer House and Shepshed Volunteer Centre
- Well-being Services – Voluntary Action Charnwood

**AGREED** that the documents be noted.

(iii) Rural Community Council

The Rural Community Council had employed a new Climate Change Officer who would be taking up their post in March 2010.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.

(iv) Transferring Learning BSF Project

S. McIntosh made reference to a document entitled ‘Transferring Learning BSF Project’. He had copies available for members of the Board at the meeting.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.

(v) Charnwood Partnership for Children and Families

S. Boud made reference to a leaflet detailing the work of Childrens’ Centres. He had copies available for members of the Board at the meeting.

**AGREED** that the information be noted.