



**Minutes of the Board Meeting**  
**11<sup>th</sup> November 2016**  
**10.30am – 12.30**  
**LH2.31 Loxley House**

**Present:**

Jane Todd – Chair of One Nottingham Board - **JT**  
 Prof Cecile Wright, Nottingham Equal VCS BME Advocate – **CW**  
 Nigel Cooke, Director, One Nottingham - **NC**  
 David Tilly, Geldards, Business Representative – **DT**  
 Candida Brudenell – Assistant Chief Executive, Nottingham City Council - **CB**  
 Sajid Mohammed, Karimia Institute, VCS Faith Advocate – **SM**  
 Audra Wynter, Wyntax, Business Representative – **AW**  
 Mike Khouri-Bent, Business Representative - **MKB**  
 Dr Hugh Porter, Clinical Commissioning Group, Nottingham - **HP**

**In attendance:**

Lorel Manders – One Nottingham  
 Dean Goodburn - Policy NCC  
 Kerry Ferguson – Policy NCC  
 Nick Murphy – Chief Executive, NCH

**Apologies received:**

Ian Curryer, Chief Executive, Nottingham City Council - **IC**  
 Andrew Redfern, Framework HA, VCS Advocate - **AR**  
 Cllr Jon Collins, Leader of the Council - **JC**  
 Sue Fish, Chief Constable, Nottinghamshire Police - **SF**  
 Cllr David Mellen, Portfolio Holder for Early Intervention and Early Years, Nottm City Council - **DM**

Item	Agenda Item	Action
1.	<p><b>Welcome and apologies for absence</b></p> <p>JT welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies were noted from IC, JC, AR, SF, and DM.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Minutes and Matters arising from the Board meeting 9 September</b></p> <p>JT thanked CW for chairing the last meeting, and the minutes were accepted as accurate.</p> <p>Matters Arising:</p> <p><u>Black Lives Matter</u></p> <p>NC updated that briefings for Board Members are being produced and will be circulated prior to the January meeting, and a meeting with NCC is due to take place next week. The invitation to the January meeting has been</p>	

	<p>accepted.</p> <p>CW confirmed that following the demonstration, the individuals involved were charged and found guilty (fined and given a 3 year conditional discharge). Due to the level of feeling involved, there is a need for sensitivity about the issue.</p> <p>Reports due to be circulated by SM on behalf of Nottingham Citizens have been delayed, pending more research.</p> <p><u>One Nottingham Review – Governance</u></p> <p>LM advised that following the agreement of a couple of changes at the last meeting, the final version has been circulated and published on the website.</p> <p>Work to appoint the new board members is ongoing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Faith representative being discussed at the Bishop’s Faith Leaders group next week.</li> <li>- Paul Southby from Nottingham Means Business is liaising with Boots.</li> <li>- The universities are to be written to and meetings arranged.</li> <li>- Youth – putting forward nomination from Youth Council.</li> <li>- Further Education meeting to be arranged soon.</li> <li>- Cultural Strategic Partnership – nomination being discussed.</li> <li>- VCS representation to be reviewed following the outcome of the VCS report.</li> </ul> <p><u>Awards</u></p> <p>Board Members noted that both the Goose Fair Dinner and Nottingham Awards, and the Black Achievers Awards went very well.</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Housing Act 2016 – Update and Discussion</b></p> <p>NM introduced the paper that had been circulated on the impact of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and recent benefit reforms. He explained that meetings had been held by NCH with tenants and feedback provided, to influence the regulations which have yet to be produced. This is proving to be a difficult process, exacerbated by the backlog of secondary legislation. Key points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be an impact on the stability of communities and there may be an increase in RTB.</li> <li>• It will be up to local councils to apply local policies, and there are practical implications re assessing income and the costs associated.</li> <li>• Impact on waiting list.</li> <li>• Also impact of welfare reform, costs of processing and the cumulative impact on tenants of a number of measures.</li> </ul> <p>A discussion followed and a number of points were made:</p> <p>MB - commented there would be implications for housing providers and</p>	

	<p>there would be huge challenges for NCH, including how to maintain the quality of service, instability within communities and rent increases.</p> <p>AW – Housing Associations are impacted, and as private rented sector landlords are not always as accommodating, arrears, evictions and homelessness may increase. NM replied that the biggest cause of homelessness at the moment, is the ending of private tenancies.</p> <p>CB cautioned that there would be pressure on social providers, and asked of anything is being done in respect of private landlords? NM advised that regulations were being developed at a local level, including licencing and restrictions on HMOs. There is more of a focus on larger private landlords rather than smaller.</p> <p>HP advised that health concerns and pressures would come from the Act, including concerns about receiving universal credit and budgeting skills. There will be an impact on vulnerable people. CW added that there would also be an impact on children’s attainment and levels of abuse.</p> <p>NM advised Nottingham is doing a lot to respond to the challenges, and that NCH is setting up 2 subsidiaries: a registered provider arm and a trading arm, to operate as a private landlord. It is difficult as everyone is waiting for the regulations.</p> <p>MB added that it was important to make better links with other strategic work – e.g. place based. SM reported that in the recent Sanctuary Commission survey a third of respondents were living in unsatisfactory private rented accommodation. People are more vulnerable, so will move in even if conditions are poor. There needs to be more regulation and enforcement.</p> <p>It was agreed to include something on the impact of the Act on the Inclusive Growth Commission written submission statement and to consider the implications for cohesion further. NM would be invited to come back when the implications are clearer, after the regulations have been issued.</p>	<p>DG/KF</p> <p>NC</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Nottingham Plan – Performance Report 2015/16</b></p> <p>DG introduced the Nottingham Plan annual report and went through the presentation which will be circulated. The Board noted the performance in 2015/16 and highlighted a number of areas they were interested in:</p> <p>DT suggested he would be interested in understanding more about the proportion of high level skills in the city and getting more information on whether we are making the maximum use of opportunities. Is it possible to identify actions that have made a clear impact?</p> <p>CW added that it was important to continue to look at in work poverty and to understand the cycle of poverty. She queried whether Nottingham had received any Social Mobility Fund, as Derby received some funding? This focuses on early years and reducing the education gap.</p>	<p>DG</p> <p>DG</p> <p>DG</p>

	<p>AW pointed out that the top priorities don't reflect aspiring businesses and SME's and that the VAT measure is not really appropriate.</p> <p>HP advised that the impact on the Smoking Reduction target had not all been about funding but also the impact of consistent messaging, such as around smoke free places. There was a discussion about how far this could be applied and whether it should include NCH properties.</p> <p>SM noted that Robin Hood Energy was beginning to have a real impact and that other cities are now looking similar packages.</p>	
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Voluntary Sector Engagement Proposals</b></p> <p>MKB introduced the paper and presentation on the VCS strategic voice work which has been developed through a steering group of ON Board members. Although AR has given his apologies for today's meeting, he is supportive of the proposals as the VCS general representative on the board.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with NCVS about their involvement and support and the next steps, if agreed are to take the proposals through to implementation.</p> <p>CB commented that this work would enable the VCS to be better placed, providing an independent voice and enabling partners to tap into the VCS.</p> <p>CW added that it would be important for BME organisations to be represented.</p> <p>The Board the proposed model and gave it's support to the Steering Group to work with the One Nottingham team, to develop an action plan and implement this.</p>	MKB/JT/ NC/AR/LM
<b>6.a</b>	<p><b>One Nottingham Partnership Fund 2014-16</b></p> <p>LM introduced the first report 6a, giving an update on the use of the ONPF over the last 2 years, and to date this year. This is funded from income from business units, and in the past a contribution from the One Nottingham base budget. Priorities for funding have included the Nottingham Plan priorities, ON Board priorities, encouraging aspirations, celebrating achievements and diversity in the city.</p> <p>The Board noted the report and commented that a good range of partners and diverse work had been carried out from the ONPF.</p>	
<b>6b</b>	<p><b>One Nottingham Partnership Fund 2016-2019</b></p> <p>DT, MKB and NC declared a non-pecuniary interest in Young Creatives Nottingham, as trustees.</p> <p>NC introduced the report and outlined some of the pressures that NCC faces, that impact on the available budget for One Nottingham. He updated</p>	

	<p>the board on the current position regarding income from the business units and the forecast for the next 3 years. NC also went through the proposals for the ONPF from 2016-2019. This includes a number of 3 year allocations to provide security to key areas of ON interest, including Children’s Literacy, Cares for Kids, Young Creatives Nottingham and Nusic, plus a small amount to fund ongoing partnership activity, including One Nottingham running costs.</p> <p>A discussion took place and a number of points were made:</p> <p>Cares for Kids breakfast clubs, board members felt it was important to be mindful of links with commercial companies and ethical considerations around healthy eating.</p> <p>Cohesion and events such as the Carnival were important. With reduced funding available; there needs to be more focus on community cohesion and aspiration, and less on ‘celebration’. There need to be some criteria for funding, such as will the allocation bring in additional match funding?</p> <p>The proposals to support literacy were supported, and to use the funding to maximize impact around equalities, City of Literature and aspiration.</p> <p>CB outlined the state of the NCC budget and that there may be a need for further reductions in NCC support to ON. We would need to consider how to support ON staffing in the future, and will need a further discussion.</p> <p>A number of points were made about the difficulties in quantifying the monetary added value of One Nottingham and it’s work, and that what ON has brought in on grants more than outweighs costs, we need to look at costs versus investment.</p> <p>If fund raising will be required in the future we should look at this in a strategic way and do some planning, looking at the added value we can bring and potential models. It was important to capture the impact of what One Nottingham do, for when we need it.</p> <p>The Board agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The allocations outlined in 4.14, subject to appropriate approvals through Nottingham City Council Financial Regulations.</li> <li>ii. To receiving periodic performance reports on the projects’ progress.</li> <li>iii. The revised governance arrangements and delegation levels for the ONPF outlined in 5.1, from April 2017.</li> </ol>	LM/NC
7.	<p><b>Inclusive Growth Commission – Discussion and Feedback</b></p> <p>KF advised the Board that there was still an opportunity to make a written submission to the Commission and requested any further points, or case studies be sent though to her at NCC. She reported that some different points had come through in the Nottingham discussion and that the Commission had been struck by the focus on practical and place based solutions.</p>	All

	<p>AW requested that she be circulated further information, and it was agreed that NM be requested to provide a housing submission.</p> <p>CB added that she had found the discussion really interesting, and SM added that social and cultural capital were key and the need to celebrate cohesion.</p>	KF
8.	<p><b>Ongoing Update/Watching Brief Items:</b></p> <p><u>EU Exit</u> Nothing to update.</p> <p><u>Community Cohesion</u> NC updated that £60,000 had been allocated from Scape Group Ltd. for the Big Tent, which would focus on positive messages about cohesion, and a community cohesion manager is due to be appointed by NCC to develop a strategy.</p> <p>It is important to maintaining a balance in messages about ensuring community safety and positive cohesion. It was agreed to arrange a meeting with Toni Price for CW and SM, and to cover communications in more detail at the next meeting.</p>	NC
11.	<p><b>Forward Plan</b> This will be updated and circulated.</p>	LM