Strategic Policy and Resources Committee

Friday, 22nd April, 2016

MEETING OF STRATEGIC POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Members present: Councillor Boyle (Chairperson); the High Sheriff (Alderman Rodgers); Aldermen Convery and Kingston; Councillors Clarke, Haire, Hargey, Hutchinson, Jones, Kennedy, Long, McAllister, McCabe, McVeigh, Ó Donnghaile and Walsh.

Also attended: Councillor R. Browne.

In attendance: Mrs. S. Wylie, Chief Executive; Mr. R. Cregan, Director of Finance and Resources; Mr. N. Grimshaw, Director of City and Neighbourhood Services; Mr. G. Miller, Director of Property and Projects; Mrs. J. Minne, Director of Organisational Development; Mr. J. Walsh, Town Solicitor; Mr. S. McCrory, Democratic Services Manager; and Mr. J. Hanna, Senior Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies

Apologies for inability to attend were reported from Aldermen Browne and Stalford and Councillor Graham.

Minutes

The minutes of meetings of 4th and 22nd March were taken as read and signed as correct. It was reported that those minutes had been adopted by the Council at its meeting on 4th April.

Declarations of Interest

In response to a request from a Member, the Chief Executive undertook to submit a report on Declarations of Interest to the next meeting of the Committee.

Restricted Items

The information contained in the following three reports is restricted in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014
Leisure Estate Programme

The Committee considered a report which provided an update on the development and implementation of the £105 million leisure assets programme which outlined the key highlights since the last update in January.

The Committee agreed:

City wide strategy and the identification of USPs across the new facilities

(i) to endorse the citywide strategy and USPs for the agreed new centres under the Leisure Transformation Programme as outlined below. The Committee noted that these had been developed through consultation with the Area Working Groups, the outcomes of consultations to date with residents and local communities, the best practice site visits in liaison with the Council’s leisure operating partner GLL and other industry experts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRE</th>
<th>USP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>Sports Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersonstown</td>
<td>Family fun leisure water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook</td>
<td>Outdoor Centre of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Aquatic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoniel</td>
<td>Outdoor Centre of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templemore</td>
<td>Spa and heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) to the proposed facilities mixes for the Robinson, Andersonstown and Brook Centres as outlined at paragraph 3.3-3.7 of the report;

(iii) to the visions for both the Templemore (spa and heritage) and the Avoniel (Outdoor focused – proposed to become a dry facility) as outlined in paragraph 3.8-3.9;

(iv) to note that work was ongoing on Girdwood Phase II and that discussions were continuing with DSD/DCAL in relation to this facility and to agreeing its USP;

Other programme level issues

(v) Political Engagement - that a further set of site visits to leisure facilities be undertaken in order to inform the development of the next phase of the programme;

(vi) Communications – to note that ‘Coming Soon’ signage had been installed at Andersonstown, Brook and Avoniel, with signage to go up at the other sites within the coming months and that focused
communications strategies on leisure and other investments were being worked up

Next steps

(vii) to note the immediate next steps as set out in paragraph 3.13 of the report and the estimated timescales for the next stages as set out in paragraph 3.14; and

(viii) to note that the next steps/timescales were predicated on endorsement by the Committee this month on the city wide strategy, on the facilities mixes for Brook, Andersonstown and Robinson and the visions for Templemore and Avoniel and that any delays in sign-off on these would delay getting the projects on the ground.

Organisational Development Update – City and Neighbourhood Services

The Committee considered the contents of a report which provided an update in relation to the work undertaken to date to create the City and Neighbourhood Services Department and which sought agreement on the proposed functional model of the department.

After discussion, the Committee:

- noted the context and rationale for the departmental change programme and the work undertaken to date;
- agreed to create two functional strands and posts below director level;
- noted that the development of the new department was based on significant benchmarking of high performing, value for money integrated customer services and was aligned to other key priorities for the Council such as the efficiency programme and the employability and skills framework; and
- noted that work to create and implement the new department would be ongoing over the next year (at least) and staff and trade unions would be engaged throughout with regular and timely reports being presented to Members.

City Regional Devolution

The Chief executive submitted for the Committee’s consideration a report which provided an update on work in relation to developing a Belfast city-region ‘deal’ and which sought agreement on the next steps.
The Committee:

- agreed that it would like to see the ‘city as an economic engine’ for NI and this being recognised in the NI Executive’s Programme for Government and NI Investment Strategy;
- agreed that the ResPublica discussion paper could be used as a platform upon which to engage with key stakeholders and further develop a partnership to deliver a city-region devolution ‘deal’;
- agreed that the next phase of advocacy needed to be politically-led and that party group leaders or their nominee actively participate in a series of briefings, including briefings at Stormont and Westminster;
- authorised the payment of any appropriate travel and subsistence allowances incurred by elected Members during the advocacy phase;
- agreed to convene a workshop in late summer, with all Members of the Council invited, to interrogate the emerging proposals; and
- authorised the Chief Executive to commission ResPublica for the advocacy phase, with a detailed specification and agreed outputs.

**Belfast Agenda**

**Corporate Plan 2016/17**

The Committee considered a report in relation to the Council’s Corporate Plan 2016/17, a copy of which is set out below:

```
1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of Main Issues

1.1 To present Members with a copy of the draft Belfast City Council Corporate Plan 2016-17.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Members are asked to approve the council's Corporate Plan 2016/17.

3.0 Main Report

3.1 The Corporate Plan 2016-17

The corporate plan is a key governance document, cited in the council’s constitution as the means by which the Strategic Policy & Resources Committee sets the strategic direction of the council. It sets out what the council wants to achieve for the city and the key priority actions to make this happen.
```
3.2 As members will be aware, a significant amount of organisational planning has already taken place, underpinned by an extensive range of consultation and engagement activities, which has provided a strong foundation, upon which to finalise the Corporate Plan for 2016/17. This work has included:

- The on-going development of the Belfast Agenda, including the Belfast Conversation events - a series of workshops with communities which directly consulted all partners, including residents on their priorities for Belfast;
- A survey of 1,500 residents which asked them to consider their priorities for the city;
- A series of engagements exercises with government departments, statutory and other key agencies in the city and the private, community & voluntary sectors.
- The 2016/17 revenue estimating process and the departmental and service planning assumptions which underpin this;
- The development of committee plans for the City Growth & Regeneration Committee and the People & Communities Committee;
- The ‘Belfast Future City – Making it real’ local area events and subsequent engagement with local residents;
- Development and consultation on other key strategic documents such as the Organisation Development Programme, City Centre Regeneration & Investment Strategy, Capital Programme and many more.

3.3 The council's corporate priorities included within the draft corporate plan reflect the four pillars of the Belfast Agenda which set out the city’s draft medium term priorities. An additional internal element has been added to reflect the key strategic internal programmes, such as the Organisational Development programme, efficiency programme, financial planning processes, waste programme and so on.

3.4 Performance Improvement

Members will also be aware that the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 introduced a duty on council to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of [its] functions. The council therefore has a statutory obligation (at the beginning of every year) to publish an Improvement Plan setting out the Council’s Improvement Objectives. The Northern Ireland Audit Office will be
responsible for overseeing the implementation of this duty and will undertake an examination of the planning process the council uses to derive their improvement objectives.

The Corporate Plan also includes the council’s improvement objectives which are directly aligned to, and cascade from the council’s priorities as informed by the wide reaching consultation process and analysis of the issues impacting upon the city.

3.5 Planning Workshop

A planning workshop for the SP&R Committee, was held on Friday 8th April 2016. The workshop provided an opportunity for Members to discuss the city priorities, council priorities and priorities for the city-region. Before focusing on the corporate priorities and improvement objectives for the year ahead.

In particular Members discussed the following:

- The city’s approach to economic growth, including discussions about the role of the city as regional driver and the case for greater place-based devolution.
- The concern of Members to connect local people and communities to the benefits of growth.
- Member’s’ wish to influence the programme for government to reflect the role of Belfast as the driver of growth in the region.
- Improving the strategic effectiveness of the council, the sustainability of the city and the efficiency of the organisation.
- The importance of effective city planning, including transport planning and ensuring effective city connectivity.
- The need to support employability and access to opportunities.
- The importance of the city centre and wider city development, including neighbourhoods
- Investment to support business start ups and help local businesses to grow.
- Delivering the council’s programme of physical investment and ensuring this delivered improved outcomes for local communities;
- The need to integrate and improve services at a local level.
The importance of positioning and marketing the city effectively in order to make it competitive and attract investment, tourists and talent.

The Corporate Plan, which includes the council’s improvement objectives, reflects the discussion of Members at the workshop.

3.6 Implementation

Implementation of the corporate plan is supported by a suite of strategic and operational plans and programmes which include committee plans, strategic programme plans and plans at departmental and service level as appropriate. Implementation will be monitored and reported in accordance with the council’s performance management framework.

3.7 Financial & Resource Implications

Costs for the implementation of the council’s Corporate Plan 2016-17 have been factored into the budget estimates for 2016/17.

3.8 Equality or Good Relations Implications

As part of the Belfast Agenda and corporate planning process, residents and other stakeholders have been consulted through our residents’ survey and other stakeholder engagement events.

3.9 The Belfast Agenda and a new longer-term corporate plan will be developed for 2017 and will be subject to full consultation."

The Committee approved the Council’s draft Corporate Plan for 2016/17.

Governance for Belfast Agenda

The Chief Executive submitted for the Committee’s consideration the following report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

1.1 This report provides Members with an overview of the governance requirements needed to satisfy the legislation for community planning.

1.2 It specifically outlines considerations for a Community Planning Partnership Board model and the representation of Members."
2.0 **Recommendations**

2.1 The Committee is asked to:

- Consider the proposed governance model and structures and provide feedback and recommendations.
- Agree that the six Party Group Leaders represent the Council on the Belfast Community Planning Board.

3.0 **Main report**

**Background**

3.1 As Members will be aware the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014, Part 10, placed a statutory duty on councils in relation to community planning. The legislation states that as lead partner the council must initiate, maintain, facilitate and participate in community planning for its district. This includes putting in place appropriate governance and management structures.

3.2 In addition the Local Government (Community Planning Partners) Order 2016 was approved by the Assembly in March 2016 and identifies the statutory community planning partners who are required to participate in community planning.

3.3 The legislation states that a council must work with its community planning partners to identify and build consensus on: (1) long term objectives for improving the social, economic and environmental well-being of the district and (2) actions to be performed and functions to be exercised.

3.4 A council must publish a document, ‘a community plan’, after consensus has been reached with its community planning partners before 01 April 2017. As Members are aware the community plan for the city is being called the Belfast Agenda.

**Governance model for Belfast Agenda/Community Plan**

3.5 The community planning guidance states that it is for each council to decide upon an appropriate governance structure for its district. Neither the legislation nor the guidance stipulates a model of governance that must be adopted by council. However, the guidance does appear to assume a Community Planning Partnership of some sort will be established.
3.6 The following diagram was presented to Members at the SP&R planning workshop on Friday 08 April. It represents a possible conceptual framework of the Belfast Agenda and identifies four distinct ‘spaces’

The four spaces are:

- An authorising environment, the ‘community planning partnership’ or leadership board.
- Delivery partnerships/task groups, possibly building upon existing city partnerships and structures with a view to clustering, collapsing and editing these in the longer term.
- Creative space for city leaders to think and innovate and inform interventions;
- Area/neighbourhood based spaces to deal with local interventions, integrated service delivery and ensure effective local engagement.

Community Planning Partnership Board

As stated earlier the governance structure for community planning has not been prescribed, however there is an expectation that an overarching community planning partnership would be established, involving a broad range of representatives including those required by legislation and also other partners who will support the delivery of the community plan/Belfast Agenda.
A Belfast Community Planning Board could include:

- Council – officials & Members (required)
- Statutory Community Planning Partners (required x13)
- Support partners (optional) may include:
  - Assembly Departments (x9)
  - Business sector
  - Community & Voluntary sector
  - Existing citywide partnerships (eg BSP; PCSP; Shared City etc)
  - Others eg FE/HE; Environment Agency, PBNI etc

3.7 This would mean a Belfast Community Planning Board could have 30+ members.

3.8 This partnership will be expected to set the strategic direction of the community plan, agree the key priorities and provide strategic oversight. It would be expected to delegate authority to delivery structures for the implementation and detailed monitoring of plan. It is proposed this partnership meet six monthly.

3.9 Member representation on Community Planning Board

Members have a critical role on any Belfast Community Planning Board specifically in relation to demonstrating the civic leadership responsibility of council. In other jurisdictions of the UK, the council is generally represented on a strategic community planning partnership by the Leader of the Council, who is often the chair. Given the difference in council governance in Belfast it is recommended that the Party Group leaders (6 Members) sit on the Community Planning Board. This will allow for greater political representation but will significantly increases the size of the Community Planning Board (and in particular the council’s representation). However, this model is likely to be stable over the lifespan of the community plan/Belfast Agenda.(4 years)

3.10 Next steps

Initial views of Members are sought on a preferred option for Member representation so that this can be considered in line with the ongoing partner discussions.

3.11 It is proposed the 1st meeting of an interim Community Planning Board could be held in June 2016.
3.12 Discussions with key community planning partners will be continuing over the coming weeks to consider the community planning governance framework and identify additional support partners. Members previously agreed to the holding of a community & voluntary sector workshop and this is to be held on 10 May 2016 to consider the participation of the CVS in community planning.

3.16 Further work is required to fully develop options for the other aspects of the governance structures, such as the delivery and creative/innovation spaces. Details of this work will be brought to Members as they develop.

3.17 Financial & Resource Implications

This next programme phase of the Belfast Agenda is included within current Council resources. Given the significant workload associated with supporting delivery of the Belfast Agenda consideration is being given, as part of the ongoing organisational development programme to the necessary alignment and organisation of staff to ensure effective delivery.

3.18 Equality or Good Relations Implications

Equality and good relations implications, in relation to this policy, are still under consideration. Further updates will be sent to the Equality and Diversity Officer in due course. However, it is likely an EQIA will be carried out as part of the formal consultation process on the Belfast Agenda.”

The Committee agreed the proposed governance model and structures and that the six Party Group Leaders represent the Council on the Belfast Community Planning Board.

PEACE IV

The Committee considered the following report in relation to potential funding for projects under PEACE IV:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

1.1 Members will recall that the SP&R Committee last month considered a report on Peace IV (copy attached at Appendix 1) and were asked to decide which projects, if any, the Council would support, and/or lead. After discussion the Committee agreed to:
- look at the possibility of a combined project involving the North Belfast Cultural Corridor, the Cultural Hub – Belfast Story and the Ulster University and BCC Civic and Educational Outreach Initiative; and
- act as lead partner for both the Shankill Women’s Centre and the Black Mountain Shared Space projects

This decision was ratified by Council at its meeting on 4th April.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Subsequent to this ratification a Party Group has requested that this decision is reconsidered by Committee to allow for the addition of the Colin Glen Trust as a fourth project to be supported by the Council for potential funding under Peace IV. Members are asked to consider if they wish to agree this request and add the Colin Glen Trust as an additional project for support under PEACE IV.

2.2 Members are asked to note that the final decision about which projects to fund will rest with SEUPB and that there is only a limited amount of capital funding available under this theme. SEUPB have previously indicated that it is likely that only one or two projects will be funded in Belfast.

3.0 Main report

3.1 In keeping with previous PEACE programmes, there will be a separate call for capital projects under the Shared Space and Services strand. This will open in September 2016. The budget for the capital call is €45m and the N+3 rule applies to PEACE IV, allowing spend up to 2023. Projects supported under the Shared Spaces theme must support the creation of shared spaces or the re-use of existing public spaces, with an emphasis on areas where sections of the community would feel excluded, including interfaces and areas which are subject to sectarian and anti social behaviour.

3.2 Members will be aware that the Council's previously agreed capital project, (agreed at the SP&R Committee in June 2013) was the North Belfast Cultural Corridor. Since this time, a number of other projects have been put forward by Councillors, or Officers have been made aware of projects being progressed by other groups/partners in the city. The SP&R Committee last month considered a report on Peace IV which detailed all the emerging projects that officers are aware of across the city and were asked to decide which projects, if
any, the Council would support, and/or lead. After discussion
the Committee agreed to:

- look at the possibility of a combined project involving
  the North Belfast Cultural Corridor, the Cultural Hub –
  Belfast Story and the Ulster University and BCC Civic
  and Educational Outreach Initiative as a combined
  project; and
- Acting as lead partner for both the Shankill Women’s
  Centre (SWC) and the Black Mountain Shared Space
  Projects.

3.3 The decision was ratified by Council at its meeting on
4th April. Following this a Party Group has requested that this
decision is reconsidered by Committee to allow for the
addition of the Colin Glen Trust as a fourth project to be
supported by the Council for potential funding under Peace IV.
This project was included as a potential project for
consideration in the resort that was submitted to Committee
last month. Members are asked to consider if they wish to
agree this request and add the Colin Glen Trust as an
additional project for support under Peace IV.

3.4 In considering this request, Members are asked to note that
guidance from SEUPB in relation to the capital call under the
Shared Space and Services theme has highlighted that
‘experience gained from the previous Programme highlights
that each capital project requires a significant investment,
(estimated average costs €6m)’ and that ‘A minimum of
8 projects are required to ensure reasonable spatial
distribution across the eligible region’. Given this, and the fact
that the budget for the call is €45m it is likely that only one
project (or a maximum of two smaller projects) in Belfast will
receive funding as the guidance appears to be pointing to a
minimum of 8 projects at a value of approx 6m (the more
projects funded the less value they will have).

3.5 Financial & Resource Implications

The full resource implications will be quantified once the
capital project/projects have been agreed by Members.

3.6 Equality or Good Relations Implications

This will be assessed as part of the PEACE IV capital
application process.”

The Committee agreed to add the Colin Glen Trust as an additional project for
support under PEACE IV.
Physical Programme and Asset Management

Capital Programme

The Committee considered the undernoted report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

1.1 The Council’s Capital Programme is a rolling programme of investment which either improves existing Council facilities or provides new facilities. This report outlines –

- highlights of current status of projects under the Programme
- projects recommended to be moved – Leisure Transformation – Andersonstown, Robinson and Brook to be moved to Stage 3 – Committed
- a proposal to carry out a comprehensive review of the Council’s estate and assets

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Members are asked to –

General

- note the update in relation to the Capital Programme as outlined in 3.1 and that the Property & Projects Department is happy to arrange site visits for Members/ Party Groups to any capital project. Photos of projects are attached at Appendix 1.

Proposed movements on the Capital Programme

- agree that the following projects are moved to Stage 3- Committed – Tier 1 – Schemes at Tender Preparation Stage on the Capital Programme - Leisure Transformation Programme - Andersonstown, Robinson and Brook. Budgets for these projects have been agreed under the LTP and the Director of Finance & Resources has confirmed that they are within the affordability limits of the Council.
Review of the Council’s assets and estate

- grant approval for a study to undertake a comprehensive review of the Council’s estates and assets to be carried out to help inform future decision making and prioritisation for Members in terms of the ongoing physical programme – both new builds and maintenance

3.0 Main report

Key Issues

3.1 The Council’s rolling Capital Programme is a significant programme with over £185m of projects recently completed or currently underway. Members are asked to note the updates under the Capital Programme since the last update report in January.

Projects recently completed/in final stages of completion

- The £9.1m Innovation Factory at Forthriver which was handed over this week
- Pitches projects - A range of pitch projects have recently been completed under the Council’s £15million Pitches Strategy –
  - the new £1.7m 3G pitch at Cliftonville as part of the overall £4million Bunscoil Bheann Mhadagáin development
  - the new 3G pitch at Woodlands
  - new 3G pitch at Ormeau
  - in addition the new £1.1million 3G pitch at Sally Gardens was officially opened last month
- Completion of the parallel works at the Waterfront in time for the opening and the first major conference in May.

Projects currently on the ground

- new pitch and pavilion Musgrave and new pavilions at Victoria and Ballysillan (due for completion in June) under the Pitches Strategy
- the infrastructure at the North Foreshore
- Phase 2 of the £40million Connswater Community Greenway
• the new £21.7m leisure facility at Olympia which is due for completion in Autumn
• the £3.7million upgrade of the Tropical Ravine – it is anticipated that works will be completed early in 2017
• new Council accommodation in Adelaide Street which will be complete in early 2017
• a new MUGA at Springfield Avenue and Phase 1 of the Whiterock Community Corridor which commenced this month

Projects at tender preparation stage

• Preparatory work is continuing on a wide range of projects including the remaining sites under the pitches strategy (Cherryvale and Falls), the statue of the boxer John Caldwell in Dunville Park which will be unveiled in May and the boxer sculpture in Woodvale Park which will be unveiled in the Autumn time

Proposed movements on/additions to the Capital Programme

3.1 Members have previously agreed that all capital projects must go through a 3 Stage process where decisions on which projects progress are taken by SP&R. Members are asked to agree to the following movements on the Capital Programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Transformation Programme - Brook, Robinson and Andersontown</td>
<td>Members have agreed a £105m leisure transformation programme. The first phase of the programme is to progress Robinson, Andersonstown and Brook.</td>
<td>Move to Stage 3 – Committed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Leisure Transformation Programme – Robinson, Brook and Andersonstown – A separate report on the leisure transformation is on the agenda for consideration by Committee today which asks Committee to agree the facilities mixes for the three centres under Phase 1 of the LTP so that these projects can be progressed. If this is agreed by Committee it is recommended that these projects are progressed to Stage 3 – Committed on the Capital Programme. Budgets for these projects have been agreed under the LTP and the Director of Finance & Resources has confirmed that they are within the affordability limits of the Council.

Review of the Council’s estates and assets

3.3 Members will be aware that the Council owns and manages a substantial estate and asset base of approx 500 assets as well
as owning nearly 12% of the land across the city. The estate has increased in size in the last few years both through the delivery of the Council’s own ambitious physical investment programme and through LGR which saw nearly 70 assets transfer to the Council. All of these assets require ongoing maintenance.

3.4 Members will appreciate that the Council has limited financial resources and is under increasing pressure to deliver more with less. These resources will be stretched even further over the coming years not only in terms of both new builds but also in terms of the ongoing maintenance and it recognised that this will necessitate some hard decisions for Members in terms of project prioritisation.

3.5 The SP&R Committee is the Council’s investment decision maker and therefore has a responsibility to look at how it can effectively manage, maintain and maximise the benefits of the assets and estate under its remit. In order to do this Members need to be aware of

- the scope of the current assets and estate
- the location of these assets and their condition
- what the assets are currently used for and the key outcomes they generate and what programmes are delivered out of them
- other key assets are in the local areas.

It is recommended that a comprehensive review of the Council's assets and estate is undertaken to help inform future prioritisation and decision making which will enable Members to take informed decisions about the need for any future projects and also ensure that the benefit of the investment to date in the existing asset base is maximised through the use of innovative programming. Members will appreciate that this is a complex and detailed piece of work. The Council is also developing a corporate asset management system and this study will help inform the development of this system.”

The Committee adopted the recommendations and agreed also that it would like officers to look at the potential for the zoo and other regionally significant projects arising from the city centre strategy and to these being included in a capital funding bid.

Area Working Update

The Director of Property and Projects submitted for the Committee’s consideration the following report:
1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

1.1 To update Members on a number of area related issues for Members consideration.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Members are asked to –

Local Investment Fund

- agree the recommendations from the South and North AWGs in relation to LIF as outlined in 3.1
- note the projects which have been scored (3.4) which have met the minimum threshold and agree that these are progressed to due-diligence.

Request for Council to act as Delivery Agent for other projects

Social Investment Fund

- note that the Council has received a letter of offer from OFMDFM to act as the delivery agent for two SIF projects in the Belfast South Zone – Mornington Community Project and St. Simon’s Resource and Development Centre and to deliver Titanic People in the Belfast East Zone under the ‘Increasing Community Services’ cluster

3.0 Main report

KEY ISSUES

SOUTH AWG

3.1 LIF Recommendations - The South AWG at its meeting on 14th April, made the following recommendations for the consideration of the SP&R Committee in relation to their LIF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>£ Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLIF2-12</td>
<td>Belfast South Community Resources*</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NORTHAWG

3.2 LIF Recommendations - The North AWG at its meeting on 16th April, made the following recommendations for the consideration of the SP&R Committee in relation to their LIF
Strategic Policy and Resources Committee
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Ref No  Project               £ Amount

NLIF2-16  Workforce Training    £30,000

*Members are asked to note that this proposal is subject to going through the LIF process with the project being assessed against the prioritisation matrix – the results of this assessment will be reported back to the next AWG and Committee. All projects will be subject to the full due-diligence process agreed for LIF projects

Projects recommended to be advanced to due-diligence

3.3 Members are asked to note that 4 LIF2 projects which had previously been agreed for in principle funding (WLIF2-16 – Colin Valley football Club; WLIF2-05 – Gort na Mona GAC; WLIF2-10 – St. James’s Community Forum and WLIF2-02 – James Connolly Interpretive Centre ) have now been scored by officers and have successfully met the minimum threshold. It is recommended that these projects now proceed to the Due Diligence stage of the LIF process

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL TO ACT AS DELIVERY AGENT FOR OTHER PROJECTS

3.3 Members will recall that they were previously updated that the Council has been requested to act as the delivery agent for a range of projects funded under a number of external initiatives including the Social Investment Fund (SIF) and Building Successful Communities (BSC).

Social Investment Fund

3.4 The Council has received a letter of offer from OFMDFM to act as the delivery agent for two projects in the South Zone with a SIF funding allocation of over £800,000– Mornington Community Project and St. Simon’s Resource and Development Centre and to deliver Titanic People in the East SIF Zone under the ‘Increasing Community Services’ cluster. In total the Council is now acting as the delivery agent for 11 projects under the SIF initiative.

3.5 FINANCIAL & RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- Financial – £4m has been assigned to LIF2. The current position with regards to allocations is outlined below (if the recommendations from the South and North AWGs as above are agreed)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA WORKING GROUP</th>
<th>TOTAL LIF AMOUNT ALLOCATED</th>
<th>AMOUNT AGREED IN PRINCIPLE</th>
<th>AMOUNT REMAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>£800,000</td>
<td>£163,200</td>
<td>£636,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>£800,000</td>
<td>£796,000</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>£1,200,000</td>
<td>£413,000</td>
<td>£786,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>£1,200,000</td>
<td>£1,178,000</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Resource - Officers time to deliver projects.

3.6 Equality or Good Relations Implications

LIF projects are screened as part of the process.

SIF is an externally funded initiative and equality screening is the responsibility of the managing department.”

Assets/Estates Update

Acquisition and Leaseback of Land at Sally Gardens, Poleglass

The Committee granted approval to the proposed transfer to the Council of lands and the community centre building at Sally Gardens, Poleglass from the Poleglass Community Association @ Sally Gardens (PCA) and to a subsequent leaseback arrangement for the community centre building via the Council’s model for Independently Managed Centres, subject to reaching agreement with the PCA in relation to detailed lease terms. That would be on the basis that the lands to be acquired by the Council would safeguard permanent access, car parking and a site for the potential changing pavilion to serve the Council’s 3G pitch.

Disposal of Land at Falls Park for Belfast Rapid Transit

The Committee agreed to the disposal of an area of land to TransportNI to facilitate the Belfast Rapid Transit on the Falls Rd. It was agreed also to the grant of a licence to TransportNI to enter into Council land at Falls Park to undertake the work required for the Belfast Rapid Transit and associated accommodation works at the boundary of Falls Park.

Belfast City Council as Sponsor Body in Acquisition of a Community Asset

The Committee considered the following report:
1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Members of a request from SOLAS for the Council to act as their sponsoring body in respect of their application to acquire the Parkmore Building from Belfast Metropolitan College (BMC) by way of community asset transfer at a valuation as provided by LPS and to seek Members approval to general principles for dealing with similar requests where the Council is providing support to Community organisations.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 The Committee is asked to:

(i) Agree that the Council should act as the sponsor body for SOLAS in its proposed acquisition of the Parkmore Building
(ii) Note the Council’s position as outlined in the report in relation to future requests for the Council to act as sponsoring body.

3.0 Main report

Key Issues

3.1 SOLAS is a special needs charity which supports children and young people with a broad range of additional needs including autism and ASD. They have established a reputation as being a fair and equitable service provider, supporting families regardless of religious background, ethnicity or ability. They need space, as a matter of urgency, to deliver their after schools, family support programs and special needs youth programs. Currently SOLAS are using hired space at Ballynafeigh Community House as well as space at Donegall Pass Community Centre. SOLAS advise however, that they require a dedicated space that can be refurbished to their specification to meet the unique sensory and developmental needs of the children and young people that they serve.

3.2 At its meeting on the 21st August 2015 the SP&R committee approved LIF funding of £100,000 for SOLAS for the purchase of a suitable building. BMC have offered premises, which have been declared surplus by them, at 248A Ormeau Rd (Parkmore Bld) for sale via the Land & Property Services public sector trawl process (known as the LPS D1 process) and SOLAS have identified those premises as being suitable
for their purposes and they have expressed an interest in acquiring the premises via the Community Asset Transfer process as provided for in the LPS trawl process, with the Council potentially acting as their sponsoring body.

3.3 Community Asset Transfer (CAT) refers to the transfer of an interest in land or buildings from a public authority to a community based organisation. The practice is recognised in Great Britain as a means of delivering regeneration, community empowerment and social enterprise and is supported by policy, legislation and funding. There is no corresponding policy in NI, however, the NI Executive’s Programme for Government 2011-2015 contains a commitment to promote CAT, the Department for Social Development being responsible for developing policy.

3.4 Previously the LPS D1 procedure only applied to public sector bodies and community groups could not acquire public sector assets declared surplus and offered for sale via the D1 process. However the LPS policy changed recently and community groups seeking to acquire an interest in land or buildings offered for sale via the LPS D1 process can do so but need to have a sponsoring body with compulsory purchase powers.

3.5 It is for the asset owner (disposing department) to assess the Community Group’s business plan with input from the sponsoring body as required and if it is satisfied, it is for the asset owner to make a decision as to whether to proceed by way of CAT and on what terms e.g nil value/reduced market value or full market value. It should be noted however that public sector bodies are generally constrained by legislation in their ability to dispose of assets at less than best price (or market value). In this case LPS have assessed the full market value at £110,000 and SOLAS are content to pay the full market value using LIF funding alongside additional funding secured from other sources.

3.6 In addition to the £100,000 funding proposed through LIF, SOLAS have secured £25,000 from Ulster Garden Villages and £10,000 from a private investor. SOLAS will be contributing £15,000 of their own funds towards the refurbishment of the Parkmore Building if they are successful in acquiring the building from BMC via the Community Asset Transfer scheme.

3.7 Aside from providing the compulsory purchase powers (all that is required under the D1 process), one of the sponsor bodies main roles is to assess the group’s business case
and viability appraisals and assure itself that the sponsored organisation is not taking on a liability, and that the social values envisaged are reasonable and sustainable. Council officers carry out this function as part of the due diligence process for all LIF and BIF schemes so there is already a process in place to undertake this assessment as part of the appropriate check on the viability of the project.

3.8 Members should note that by agreeing to act as the sponsoring body for community groups seeking to acquire surplus public property the Council will not itself acquire the property. In the case of the Parkmore Building, the property will be transferred from BMC (the public sector organisation) to SOLAS and the building will not become a Council asset.

3.9 The NI Executive’s policy framework specifies that ‘Third sector organisations will need to be incorporated, constituted for social benefit and to demonstrate an ‘asset lock’ provision to ensure that the asset is retained for community benefit’ and that the asset cannot be sold on the open market. While it would be for the disposing department to put such a restriction on the conveyance to the third sector organisation, it is recommended that this is something the Council may also want to include in any future funding agreements with community groups for whom the Council may agree to act as sponsoring body.

3.10 At its meeting on the 12th April 2016 the Council’s officers due diligence group verified the information provided in support of SOLAS’s application for £100,000 LIF funding. Legal Services were satisfied that the Council has the vires to act as sponsor for SOLAS and that the Council hold appropriate compulsory purchase powers by way of the Recreation and Youth Service (Northern Ireland) Order 1986 to allow the Council to act as sponsor body for SOLAS in the proposed acquisition of the BMC’s Parkmore building at the market value as assessed by LPS (£110,000). Given that the Council is proposing to act as both sponsor and funder, the Council will seek confirmation from LPS that they are comfortable with the Council acting in this dual role and to seek assurance from LPS that they have no issue with the Council seeking to put a charge over the asset.

3.11 It should be noted that officers envisage that further requests may come forward for the Council to act as sponsoring body for other Community organisations as a means of acquiring surplus public assets and it is proposed that where such requests emanate from Council’s funding streams (LIF/BIF etc) and where groups satisfy the requirements of the
Councils due diligence process the Council should consider acting as a sponsor body. However, Members should note that in other cases, given the requirements for the sponsor body to assess business cases and viability appraisals and undertake further due diligence around liabilities and sustainability this could potentially be very resource intensive.

3.12 Financial & Resource Implications

At its meeting on the 21st August 2015 the SP&R committee approved LIF funding of £100,000 for SOLAS for the purchase of a suitable building. There will be no further financial implications for the Council. If SOLAS fail to acquire the building for any reason the building will be offered for sale on the open market by LPS acting on behalf of BMC.

The Council will not be financially liable in anyway should the Group for whom the Council has acted as sponsor body fail to purchase the interest in the land or buildings offered for sale via the LPS D1 process.

3.13 Equality or Good Relations Implications

SOLAS services are provided to the entire demographic of the area. The SOLAS project will help promote equality and good relations between all the section 75 groups.

The Committee adopted the recommendations.

Finance, Procurement and Performance

Contracts

The Committee approved the public advertisement and delegated authority to the appropriate Director using pre-agreed criteria, to accept the most economically advantageous tenders as set out below. The Committee approved also the award of the contracts that had been carried out by arc21 on behalf of the Council as set out in table 3:
Appendix 1 - Schedule of tenders for consideration

Table 1 - New tenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of tender</th>
<th>Senior Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Proposed contract duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfast Tourism Monitor</td>
<td>Donal Durkan</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and delivery of high quality bedding plants</td>
<td>Nigel Grimshaw</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods for resale at Belfast Zoo</td>
<td>Nigel Grimshaw</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for community growing activities</td>
<td>Nigel Grimshaw</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical analysis of samples taken from the North Foreshore</td>
<td>Gerry Millar</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Contracts for extension of contract period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of tender</th>
<th>Director Responsible</th>
<th>Proposed extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tender for collection and treatment of paints and varnishes</td>
<td>Nigel Grimshaw</td>
<td>Month by month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender for cleaning of Belfast Waterfront</td>
<td>Donal Durkan</td>
<td>Until 05 November 2016 and on a month by month basis thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Tenders awarded by Arc21 on behalf of the Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of tender</th>
<th>Senior Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Proposed contract duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tender for municipal waste disposal</td>
<td>Nigel Grimshaw</td>
<td>18 months with the option to renew for up to a further 18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equality and Good Relations

Minutes of Meeting of Shared City Partnership

The Committee approved the minutes and the recommendations from the Shared City Partnership meeting held on 11th April 2016, including:

1. the granting of delegated authority to the Director of City and Neighbourhood Services to approve successful applications for the 2016
Bonfire Management Programme, in consultation with the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Shared City Partnership;

2. the funding for groups which had met the criteria for the Summer Intervention Funding, totalling £75,355, subject to confirmation of funding being received from the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMdFM);

3. that any additional resource provided by the OFMdFM be used to carry out an evaluation of the summer intervention scheme, which would help inform the future development and delivery of the programme; and

4. that the draft Peace IV Plan be submitted as the stage 1 application by 17th May in line with the timetable outlined by the Special European Union Programmes Body (SEUPB) if the Partnership felt that no significant changes were required following consideration of any responses received as part of the ongoing consultation process.

Minutes of Meeting of the Diversity Working Group

The Committee approved and adopted the minutes of the meeting of the Diversity Working Group of 7th April.

Shared Space Framework

The Committee agreed to defer until its next monthly meeting consideration of a report on a Shared Space Framework.

Operational Issues

Energy Update

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of a report on a feasibility study in respect of the management of energy and CO2 within the Council.

EurVoice 2016

The Committee was reminded that European Local Democracy Week (ELDW) was an annual event held each October. The overarching purpose of ELDW was to promote a better involvement of citizens in public life, enhance transparency of local government mechanisms and improve social cohesion, in particular among young people and disadvantaged groups.

It was reported that, for the past four years, the Council had organised and delivered EurVoice events which had allowed pupils from Secondary Schools, members of the Council’s Youth Forum, representatives of the European Youth Parliament and participants from Community Groups in the City to interact with their local Councillors on issues affecting the youth of today.
Following the success of EurVoice events to date, it was felt that it would be worthwhile organising another engaging event for 2016, where both young people and Councillors could meet to discuss the relevant issues which faced the young citizens of Belfast and to build on the themes which had been discussed at the previous event.

The Committee approved the hosting of the Eurvoice2016 event.

**City Hall Management**

The Committee considered the undernoted report which had been submitted by the Director of Property and Projects:

```
1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of Main Issues

1.1 To obtain the Committee’s approval for proposed changes in the arrangements surrounding the use and management of the City Hall.

2.0 Decisions required & Recommendations

2.1 It is recommended that the Committee agrees to the following proposals:-

1) That responsibility for the development and application of criteria governing access to the prestige function rooms in the City Hall and for reporting of recommendations for approval to the Committee be transferred from the Democratic Services Section to the Facilities Management Section during 2016/17, on a date to be agreed;

2) That the Committee agrees to receive a further report during 2016 setting out the proposed revised criteria for access to the prestige function rooms together with a proposed approach to charging and the once-in-three-years rule;

3) That the Committee agrees to receive a report in parallel with (2) above, setting out the estimated structural and cost implications for the Civic HQ unit in relation to acquiring responsibility for the overall management of functions, the management of the Exhibition Area and the management of the new building at 9-21 Adelaide St; This will be in line with the overall Organisational Development Programme and within Council’s affordability limits.

4) That the responsibility for the stock of alcohol for use in civic and non-civic functions together with any associated budgets be transferred to the Facilities
```
Management Section at the same time as the above changes;
5) That the existing arrangements continue in the interim, until the work outlined above has been completed.

3.0 Main report

3.1 Key Issues

The key issues in respect of this report are:-

3.2
- That a single point of accountability for all function management-related activity is established by transferring responsibility for the development and application of the agreed criteria to the Facilities Management Section;
- That a final position on both the revised criteria and the charging regime for commercial functions and the application of the once-in-three-years rule agreed by the Committee in March 2015 be established and implemented;
- That the resources available to the Civic HQ unit be reviewed and in the light of the various changes set out herein.

Background

3.3 Members will be aware that a number of reports have previously been tabled in respect of various aspects of the management and use of City Hall. Most recently, reports were tabled in March and November 2015, and also in March 2016 specifically in relation to the new Exhibition Area. These reports were tabled in order to obtain the Committee's approval of a number of proposed changes, most notably:

a) The implementation of charging for all commercially-based tours of the City Hall;
b) The introduction of a donations box at the end of public tours;
c) Changes to existing door and main gates opening hours in order to widen access to the building;
d) The updating of governance processes in respect of the ILLUMINATE! lighting system;
e) Establishing the operational modalities in respect of the new Exhibition Area;
f) The revision of the criteria currently governing access to the prestige function rooms in the City Hall;
g) The introduction of charging for large ‘commercial’ events in the City Hall;
h) The introduction of a ‘once-in-three-years’ approach for large external functions in the City Hall.

With regard to items (a) – (d) above these decisions have been implemented in full and no further action is needed.

3.4 With regard to item (e) the Committee took the necessary decisions in respect of the operation of the Exhibition Area at its meeting of March 2016 subject to a final report in respect of the final configuration of the various areas, and implementation is underway.

3.5 In terms of actions (f) – (h) above, these relate to the criteria to be used in granting access to the 3 prestige function rooms and to the ability to levy a commercial charge in appropriate circumstances and/or apply a once-in-three-years restriction to specific functions. At time of writing, responsibility for the management of functions is split, with the Democratic Services Section developing and applying the initial criteria and the Facilities Management unit then liaising with function organisers, building the necessary set-ups, providing staffing and overseeing the actual event etc.

3.6 During discussions between the 2 Sections involved it has become clear that there is a consensus that, given the existing synergies, it would be more efficient if the Facilities Management Section assumed responsibility for the development and application of the relevant criteria and reported these to the Committee each month, as well as managing the actual events. This would provide a single point of accountability for all City Hall function-related activity from initial request through to delivery.

3.7 However, taking on this additional function will clearly have resource implications for the Facilities Management (Civic HQ) Section. In addition, the Exhibition Area is scheduled to become fully operational in April/May 2017 and it will also be the responsibility of the Civic HQ unit, as will be providing a comprehensive ‘landlord’ and monitoring role in relation to the new building currently under construction at 9-21 Adelaide Street which is due to be in use by December 2016. It is therefore proposed that, in advance of these various significant changes, the Committee agrees to receive a report setting out the estimated structural implications of the various changes later in 2016. This will be in line with the
overall Organisational Development Programme and within Council's affordability limits.

3.8 It would also be the intention of the Facilities Management Section to table, at the same time, its proposals in respect of the revised function criteria request by the Committee and also proposals in relation to the imposition of charging for commercial functions and the application of the once-in-three-years rule. Once agreed and implemented this would conclude all of the specific changes mandated by the Committee in respect of the use and management of the City Hall as set out in (a) – (h) above.

3.9 It is also the intention to transfer responsibility and any associated budgets in respect of the provision of alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages etc at civic functions to the Facilities Management Section.

3.10 Financial & Resource Implications

The Civic HQ unit will require a review of the resources available to it, and details will be placed before the Committee in a further report during 2016.

3.11 Equality or Good Relations Implications

There may be equality or good relations implications arising from a review and revision of the criteria used to control access to the function rooms, and consequently these proposals will be screened by the Good Relations unit prior to submission to the Committee."

The Committee adopted the recommendations.

Requests for the Use of the City Hall and the Provision of Hospitality

The committee adopted the recommendations for the requests for the use of the City Hall and the provision of Hospitality as set out below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation/Body</th>
<th>Event/Date - Number of Delegates/Guests</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Marine Science Educators Association (EMSEA)</td>
<td>EMSEA 2016 Conference Reception 5th October, 2016 Approximately 200 attending</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception</td>
<td>Delegates will be staying in accommodation in Belfast and the Conference will take place within the city. This event would contribute to the Council’s Key Theme of ‘City Leadership – Strong, Fair, Together’.</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception Approximate cost £500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster University</td>
<td>Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Supergen Research Conference Dinner 12th December, 2016 Approximately 150 attending</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception</td>
<td>Delegates will be staying in accommodation in Belfast and the Conference will take place within the city. This event would contribute to the Council’s Key Theme of ‘City Leadership – Strong, Fair, Together’.</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception Approximate cost £500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWASP – Open Web Application Security Project</td>
<td>OWASP European Conference 2017 Reception 10th May, 2017 Approximately 300 attending</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception</td>
<td>Delegates will be staying in accommodation in Belfast and the Conference will take place within the city. This event would contribute to the Council’s Key Theme of ‘City Leadership – Strong, Fair, Together’.</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception Approximate cost £500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Bar Association (IBA)</td>
<td>IBA 2017 Mid-Year Conference Gala Dinner 26th May, 2017 Approximately 350 attending</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception</td>
<td>Delegates will be staying in accommodation in Belfast and the Conference will take place within the city. This event would contribute to the Council’s Key Theme of ‘City Leadership – Strong, Fair, Together’.</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception Approximate cost £500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Association of Sexual Health and HIV (BASHH) and Society of Study of Sexually Transmitted</td>
<td>BASHH-SSTDI Conference 2017 Reception 18th June, 2017 Approximately 400 attending</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception</td>
<td>Delegates will be staying in accommodation in Belfast and the Conference will take place within the city. This event would contribute to the Council’s Key Theme of ‘City Leadership – Strong, Fair, Together’.</td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception Approximate cost £500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Use of City Hall and Provision of Hospitality</td>
<td>Delegates' Accommodation and Experience</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diseases of Ireland (SSSTDI)</strong></td>
<td>The use of the City Hall and the provision of hospitality in the form of a drinks reception.</td>
<td>Delegates will be staying in accommodation in Belfast and the Conference will take place within the city. This event would contribute to the Council’s Key Theme of ‘City Leadership – Strong, Fair, Together’.</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's University Belfast – School of Planning, Architecture and Civil Engineering (SPACE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK-Ireland Planning Research Conference 2017 Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th September, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 150 attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headmasters’ and Headmistresses’ Conference (HMC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 HMC Annual Conference Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd October, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 400 attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCI UK – Belfast Branch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Reception for XXII World Congress of International Measurement Confederation (IMEKO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd September, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 300 attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Queen's University Belfast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Fellowship Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd June, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 40 attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British Council Northern Ireland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian University Delegation Visit to Belfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th June, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 30 attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This event would contribute to the Council’s key theme of ‘City Leadership – Strong, Fair, Together’ and ‘Better Opportunities for Success Across the City’.
Minutes of the Meeting of the Budget and Transformation Panel

The Committee approved and adopted the minutes of the meeting of the Budget and Transformation Panel of 14th April.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Active Belfast Board

The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting of the Active Belfast Board of 11th April.

Consultation Response to the MDM2017 Geographies

The Committee considered the following report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of the report is to update Members on the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency’s (NISRA) current consultation on the output geography for the updated Multiple Deprivation Measure (NIMDM 2017) and seek their approval to submit a high level response.”
2.0 Recommendations

2.1 The Committee is asked to:

- Approve the responses to NISRA as attached at Appendix 1

3.0 Key issues

3.1 NISRA has been commissioned to undertake an update of the current Northern Ireland Multiple Deprivation Measures (NIMDM 2010), which were last published in 2010 and which remain the official measures until the update has been completed.

3.2 The update is important at this time for a number of reasons, including:

The current measures were largely based on information relating to 2008 and a variety of new or updated information sources will now be available;

Updated information will be pivotal for Local Government Districts in the discharge of Community Planning; and

Other territories of the UK have either initiated or conducted an update of their MDM measures (i.e. Scotland) or conducted their update and published their results (i.e. both England and Wales). As such, an update of NIMDM 2010 will ensure that Northern Ireland can continue to be considered on a more comparable footing with the other territories of the United Kingdom (who have either initiated or conducted an update of their own MDM measures).

3.3 The update of the NIMDM is an important area of work, which will be of both interest and importance to a variety of users. The resulting information from the update will be actively used in the years ahead by NI Departments and others to inform the allocation of significant funding to those areas considered in greatest need and to monitor the effectiveness of spatial policy interventions. At this stage, NISRA are only consulting on the options for the geographical levels at which the deprivation measure will be produced.

3.4 The previous NIMDM 2010 was produced at a SOA level. It was also however possible to report deprivation at a ward level, as SOA boundaries nested within ward boundaries. The below diagram shows the hierarchy of administrative
and statistical geographies in Northern Ireland. The arrows indicate if an exact (straight) or best fit (dashed) relationship is available and valid for all of the larger geographies.

3.5 As a result of local government reform however, administrative geographies changed with 462 new wards (as opposed to the previous number of 582 wards). This is significant in that, SOAs no longer completely nest within the new ward boundaries. For example in the map below the Beechill_2 and Beechill_3 SOAs are now split between the Belvoir ward in Belfast and the Beechill ward in Lisburn and Castlereagh.
Options

There are broadly two options for the output geography for NIMDM 2017:

3.7 **Option I** is to continue (as was the case previously) to base the primary outputs on the SOA geography, which has been in use for over a decade. The SOA geography has, arguably, a number of significant advantages including:

- the continuity of geography over time;
- data availability and quality – it is fully expected that the necessary data that will be required for the NIMDM 2017 update will be both readily available at SOA level and of sufficient quality;
- Small Area (SA) data, which nest completely within SOAs, can be aggregated to generate SOA and, for example, DEA level based results for particular domains and/or indicators where appropriate – albeit the latter on an approximation basis;
- the SA geography is crucial in terms of identifying small pockets of deprivation;
- both the SOA/SA geographies and their associated disclosure risks are familiar to data suppliers;
- the approach broadly aligns with that taken in both England and Wales which use Lower Layer SOAs, with an average population of around 1,600 people, as their primary geographical level for the dissemination of results; and
the results from the update could be released in mid-2017.

3.8 Option II is to undertake a complete re-design of the underlying statistical geography with a view to developing a new set of small statistical geographies that nest within the new Electoral Wards. This would enable the production of deprivation outputs for geographical areas that nest within or equate to wards, while at the same time enabling ward level, DEA level and Local Government District level results to be produced should they be required.

3.9 There are however distinct disadvantages with this approach. Firstly the generation of the new statistical geography represents a significant piece of work which would:

(a) considerably delay the release of the NIMDM 2017 results – potentially by more than six months;
(b) result in a loss of data continuity over time; and
(c) the new sub-ward geography areas will not nest perfectly within the 18 Assembly Areas. The latter will create challenges for assessing deprivation within Assembly Areas. Importantly, the loss of data continuity could of course span all statistical releases and, as such, be wider in scope than the deprivation work should data providers elect to base their future outputs on the new statistical geography rather than the old.

3.10 Secondly, data custodians would have to consider the implications of any move to generate statistics for new statistical and/or administrative geographies both on the grounds of the resource implications and any real and/or perceived disclosure risks (e.g. regenerating historical data for new geographical areas, which inevitably will overlap the old). This could have implications for the range of data that may ultimately be available which, if lacking, could have implications for the viability of producing the new measure. In the event of this real risk materialising then Option I, as the backup position, would have to be deployed despite the lengthy delay to the work and associated increased costs.

3.11 While the consultation paper suggests that Option I is the most viable solution, under this approach there would be no read across from SOA or SA results to the new 462 Electoral Wards - a geography which members understand and identify with. Therefore it is suggested that the council’s response should disagree with NISRA’s proposed approach to base the primary outputs of the Deprivation Update on
SOAs. It is further recommended that officers seek contact with NISRA to understand the 'perceived disclosure risks' associated with Option II and why this could be a barrier to taking this alternative approach.

It should be noted however that creating an alternative small level geography that would fit inside the new electoral wards would effectively create a new baseline for any new data. Trend data from previous years would likely not be possible for risk of disclosure/identifying individuals.

Financial Implications
There are no specific financial or resource implications.

Equality and Good Relations Implications
There are no specific equality or good relations implications.”

Appendix 1

Section 1: Response To The Proposal Of Deprivation Output Geography
There are broadly two options for the output geography for NIMDM 2017. The proposed option (Option I) is to continue (as was the case with NIMDM 2010 and NIMDM 2005) to base the primary outputs on the Super Output Area geography, which has been in use for over a decade. The alternative (Option II) is to develop a new statistical sub-geography that nests within the new Electoral Wards – see Sections 6 and 7 of the consultation document.

To help us understand your data needs and carefully assess those needs against other competing priorities, it is important that you provide as much detail as you can to support your response. This will ensure your view is fully considered in our evaluation.

1. To what extent do you agree with NISRA’s proposed option to base the primary outputs of the Deprivation Update on Super Output Areas?
   - [ ] Agree
   - [X] Disagree
   - [ ] No strong view

*Please include details in support of your views.*
The Belfast City Council local government district area is made up of 60 electoral wards. Elected members are democratically elected to 10 District Electoral Areas made up of between 5 and 7 wards. Electoral wards are a geographical which elected members, council officers and our city partners understand and are familiar with. It is important therefore that the new MDM should be based on geographies that nest within the new wards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Do you have a specific need for deprivation information for the new 462 Electoral Wards?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3a. **Please outline why the information is important for new Electoral Wards?**

As alluded to previously, electoral wards are a geography that elected members, council officers and city stakeholders understand and identify with. The electoral ward boundaries also nest within the current Belfast LGD14 boundary, whereas SOAs don’t.

3b. **Please outline what the information for new Electoral Wards is used for?**

For example, resource allocation, target most deprived areas, policy monitoring, research, etc.

Belfast City Council expects to use information for the new electoral wards to inform both service planning and delivery and targeted interventions at the local level. It is also expected that the information will be important in relation to the community planning process and ensuring that future delivery of public services meets local needs.

The council also has 4 Area Working Groups made up of members representing the District Electoral Areas. Members use information on electoral wards to for research and analysis purposes.

In addition, deprivation information at a ward level is also used to inform decision making processes.

3c. **Please outline how the information on deprivation for new Electoral Wards will be used?**

For example, overall rank, domain-specific rank, individual indicators, etc.
It is expected that the following information on deprivation for new electoral areas will be used by council:

- Overall Ranking; and
- Domain specific depending on the area of work. E.g. A locality planning project may focus on educations and skills and therefore this domain will be important.

3d. Please outline the implications if the information for new Electoral Wards will not be available?

There would be implications for the council’s strategic planning processes if the information for the 60 electoral wards of Belfast will not be available. Service planning and delivery and specific targeted interventions would be constrained as SOAs do not nest within the organisation’s boundary.

There may also be further complications for council allocating grant funding.

In addition, there may also be implications for delivering the community planning process as it is envisaged that future planning may be aligned and delivered at a local area level (electoral wards).

The Committee approved the foregoing comments as the Council’s response to the consultation

Consultation on Enhanced Sports and Recreation Rate Relief

The Committee considered the undernoted report:

“1.0 Summary of Main Issues

1.1 The Department of Finance and Personnel is consulting on a proposed rating policy change which will provide additional rate relief for unlicensed community amateur sports clubs (COSC). Revenue forgone through sports and recreation rate relief represents a cost to Central Government and not District Councils, therefore the proposed additional rate relief would not affect the Councils income streams.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Members are to support the policy proposal to:-

- Allow clubs registered with HMRC as a community amateur sports clubs, that do not have a liquor licence, to qualify for 100% rate relief, rather than the current 80%, in accordance with the new Article 31 (5A) as inserted by Article 1 of the Rates (Amendment) Bill 2016
Members are also asked to note:

- That all community amateur sports clubs with a liquor licence will continue to receive at least 80% rate relief on their sporting facilities.
- The Council’s leisure centres are currently exempt from rates and therefore fall outside the scope of the proposed policy change.

3.0 Main report

3.1 A DFP Consultation Paper on Enhanced Sport and Recreation Rate Relief – Unlicensed Community Amateur Sports Clubs has been received by the Council as part of a targeted consultation exercise.

3.2 The consultation paper proposes a policy change which would increase the current 80% rate relief on sporting facilities for community amateur sports clubs to 100% relief where the club is unlicensed. The current 80% relief on sporting facilities for licensed clubs would remain.

3.3 Financial and Resources Implications

Current estimates indicate that the policy change would generate further savings in rates liability of around £203,000 for community amateur sports clubs in Belfast. There would be no loss of income to the Council as the increased relief would represent a cost to Central Government and not District Councils. The reduction in District rate income as a result of the relief would be offset by a corresponding increase in the Council’s derating grant.

3.4 Equality or Good Relations Implications

There are no specific equality or good relations implications.”

The committee agreed to support the policy proposal to allow clubs registered with HMRC as a community amateur sports clubs, that do not have a liquor licence, to qualify for 100% rate relief, rather than the current 80%, in accordance with the new Article 31 (5A) as inserted by Article 1 of the Rates (Amendment) Bill 2016.

Consultation on the Review of the Code on Recruitment and Selection

The Committee considered the undernoted report which had been submitted by the Director of Organisational Development:
1.0 **Purpose of report**

1.1 To consider the revised Code of Procedures on Recruitment and Selection and agree a consultation response for the Council to return to the Local Government Staff Commission (LGSC) by 27 May 2016.

2.0 **Recommendations**

The Committee is asked to:

- consider and agree the Council's response to the LGSC's consultation on the Review of the Code of Procedures on Recruitment and Selection.

3.0 **Main report**

3.1 In June 2014, the NI Executive formally agreed that the Local Government Staff Commission (LGSC) would be dissolved in March 2017. This has an impact on the existing Code of Procedures on Recruitment and Selection, which is based on the involvement of the LGSC throughout the recruitment process.

3.2 The Commission has made a number of revisions to the Code including the removal of references to the LGSC, and has issued a Draft Revised Code of Procedures on Recruitment and Selection prior to its dissolution to seek councils’ and other stakeholders’ views. The Draft Revised Code of Procedures and a schedule of amendments paper is attached at Appendices 1 and 2.

3.3 The draft response to the consultation questionnaire is attached at Appendix 3 but the main points the Council is proposing to make in its response are as follows:

3.4 Section 40 of the 1972 Local Government Act establishes the LGSC and the powers which it holds. Among other things, it has a power to establish a code of procedure for securing fair and equal consideration of applications to councils and a code of recommended practice as regards the conduct of officers. This is already established in the existing Code of Procedures. Within the revised code it appears that elements of it are not directly related to the power contained within Section 40 of the Act and cannot properly be construed as being mandatory. In fact their inclusion in a code may be unlawful. Clarity is therefore required on the proposed status of the code following dissolution of the LGSC, which body or organisation would oversee a revised
code and what elements (if any) of a revised code would be binding. (See General Comments and Section C). Given the embedded existence of procedures aligned to securing compliance with equality requirements an issue exists as to the need to revise the Code at all.

3.5 The revised document also contains a number of additions and revisions that would cause particular concern to the Council:

- The development of a centralised mechanism for ‘trawling’ within the local government sector and the introduction of a grade promotion banding system (See draft response to Part B Annex 4, pages 6 and 7),
- Proposed procedures for the recruitment and selection of the Clerk and Chief Executive. (See draft response to Part D, Annex 6 pages 11 and 12) and,
- Reference to the Competency Framework for Local Government. (See draft response to Part D, page 10).

3.6 BCC proposes to articulate its strongly held view that each council, as an individual employer, should have in place recruitment and selection procedures that ensure compliance with the relevant equality legislation demonstrate best practice and are aligned to organisational priorities set by their elected members. Councils, as individual employers, should not be restricted by inflexible processes or protocols agreed for the sector.

3.7 BCC is of the view while a best practice framework may be helpful all necessary consultation, negotiation and agreement on employment related policies and procedures is managed at individual employer level through agreed internal consultation and negotiation machinery.

3.8 It would be a matter of considerable concern to BCC if clarity around the obligation on Councils to adhere to these particular elements of the revised code (which BCC would not be in agreement with) is not satisfactorily addressed in the final document. BCC considers it imperative that we receive assurance on absolute discretion regarding the implementation of any element of this document.

3.9 Financial & Resource Implications

There are no resource implications in this report.
3.10 **Equality or Good Relations Implications**

The commentary and proposals outlined in the draft consultation response are fully in line with equality legislation requirements and recruitment and selection best practice."

The Committee approved the Council’s response to the Local Government Staff Commission’s consultation on the Review of the Code of Procedures on Recruitment and Selection and noted that a full copy of the response was available on the Council’s website.

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Elected Member Development Working Group**

The Committee approved and adopted the minutes of the meeting of the Elected Member Development Working Group.

Chairperson