

Development Committee

Tuesday, 25th October, 2011

MEETING OF DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

- Members present: Alderman Stalford (Chairman);
Aldermen Campbell, Ekin, Humphrey and Stoker;
Councillors Austin, Hartley, Hendron, Keenan, Kelly,
Kyle, Mallon, Maskey, McVeigh, Mac Giolla Mhín,
Ó Muilleoir, Reynolds, Spence and Webb.
- In attendance: Mr. J. McGrillen, Director of Development;
Ms. S. McCay, Head of Economic Initiatives;
Ms. C. Taggart, Community Services Manager;
Mr. S. McCrory, Democratic Services Manager;
Mrs. P. Scarborough, Chief Executive's Support Officer; and
Mr. B. Flynn, Democratic Services Officer.

Apology

An apology for inability to attend was reported from Councillor Robinson.

Requests for Deputations

It was reported that no requests had been received.

Belfast Rapid Transit Proposals – Public Consultation on Route Options

The Committee was reminded that the Department for Regional Development had, on 12th October, initiated a consultation exercise on its proposed routes for a pilot project in respect of the Belfast Rapid Transit System. The Director reported that the consultation exercise, which would close on 6th January, 2012, sought the views of a wide range of bodies in respect of the Department's preferred route options which would be established in the east and west of the City, with further routes within the City Centre and the Titanic Quarter. It was reported that Mr. C. de Burca and Mr. R. Totten, representing the Department for Regional Development's Rapid Transit Division, were in attendance to provide a presentation in respect of the proposed routes and they were admitted to the meeting and welcomed by the Chairman.

Mr. de Burca stated that the purpose of the Belfast Rapid Transit System would be to establish a customer-focussed public transport system for the City which would enhance economic growth, regional development and promote social inclusion. He provided an overview of the proposed routes chosen by the Department, as set out hereunder:

- CITI – from Queen’s Quay to Queen’s Road within the Titanic Quarter returning via Station Street and Bridge End;
- EWAY – from East Bridge Street, Albertbridge Road and Upper Newtownards Road terminating at a ‘park and ride’ site near Quarry Corner;
- Westway – from Grosvenor Road, Falls Road, Andersonstown Road terminating at a ‘park and ride’ site near the Dairy Farm and/or the McKinsty Road Roundabout; and
- City Centre – providing a link into the City Centre loop using May Street, Donegall Square South, Howard Street, Fisherwick Place, Wellington Place, Donegall Square North, Chichester Street, Victoria Street and Oxford Street.

Mr. de Burca indicated that the main aim of the project would be to provide an integrated, safe and efficient public service for the City. He stated that the system would operate in conjunction with existing public transport services to provide a better choice for the customer. In addition, a number of ‘park and ride’ facilities would be established at convenient locations on the routes to encourage drivers to utilise the system. He concluded by indicating that he would be happy to meet with the Committee, or individual Members, at a future date to discuss the matter further.

A prolonged discussion ensued in respect of the proposals. A number of Members expressed concerns that both the north and south of the City had been overlooked within the pilot project. The point was made that, in order for the project to be successful, the public had to be assured that the service provided would be efficient, reliable and offer value for money. Members also raised concerns regarding the long-term funding viability of the project and the need to consult with local communities on an ongoing basis.

Mr. de Burca clarified a range of issues in respect of the pilot project and indicated that the proposed routes had been chosen after an initial period of consultation and assessment. He added that the routes had been identified as the most suitable for further investigation and this had been verified as part of a detailed Route Audit Report. He concluded by answering Members’ queries in respect of pricing policies, signage and the extent of engineering work which would be required to enable the system to operate on existing routes.

After discussion, the Committee noted the information provided and noted further that a draft Council response to the consultation document would be considered by the Committee at its meeting in December.

Titanic / Maritime Heritage Signage Project

The Committee considered the undernoted report:

“1. Relevant Background Information

- 1.1 **Members are reminded that at the last meeting of Development Committee it was agreed to defer a decision on Titanic/Maritime Heritage Signage as there was concern that the proposed location of the signs was too heavily focused on the City Centre and did not address the rich cultural and social history which linked the Titanic to communities across the City.**
- 1.2 **Maps have been circulated to Members showing the current signage across the city (blue), proposed new signage (yellow)/replacement signage (red/green) and how the signs will support additional connectivity across the city including specifically the East and West.**
- 1.3 **The Titanic/Maritime Signage was divided into four main themes including TQ Direct, Titanic Trail, City of Merchants and White on Brown road signage.**
- 1.4 **Upon further examination of the cultural and social heritage linked to Titanic/Maritime Heritage, signage has been identified and prioritised for the East and West of the City to be met within the existing budget provision.**
- 1.5 **Within the East it is proposed to connect to the Yardmen Trail which identifies key sites such as Templemore Avenue, McMaster Street, the Yardmen Statue Pitt Park, and links to the proposed Titanic Halt (Bridge End Station) and the route into Sydenham Road and the Titanic Quarter. Furthermore, the trail will reference the connection with the Connswater Greenway. In the West of the City connectivity will extend within Belfast City Cemetery where it is proposed a number of signs will be erected that will identify key city figures of the period. This will include references to the city’s industrialists including Harland, Pirrie and Mackie, but also the ordinary people such as Samuel Scott who was the youngest person to lose his life whilst building the Titanic.**
- 1.6 **In both areas, the additional proposed signage will link the Titanic story and add value to the existing award winning Cultural Tourism Signage throughout the city.**

2 Key Issues

- 2.1 **Members are reminded that the Titanic/Maritime Heritage project was developed as Northern Ireland Tourist Board (NITB) had funding available to support a Titanic Trail in the city and was a priority identified in the Belfast Maritime Heritage study.**

- 2.2 The opportunity of 50% match funding has been used to develop a scheme that will enhance and update existing signage provision and link less well known assets relating to maritime heritage. It is targeted at pedestrian users with the exception of brown and white signage from motorways.
- 2.3 The Titanic/Maritime Heritage signage will be funded from 2011/2012 budgets.
- 2.4 There will be opportunity to extend generic visitor signage in other areas every year.
- 2.5 The Tourism, Culture and Arts Unit is liaising with Titanic Belfast to ensure there are connections within the storyline content of the attraction to other parts of the city.
- 2.6 Whilst this is a signage scheme, the Tourism, Culture & Arts Unit and Belfast Visitor and Convention Bureau (BVCB), will be working through the Local Tourism destinations to develop programmes and initiatives for 2012.

These initiatives will include:

- The integration of tourism signage into the Renewing the Routes programme and other public realm schemes where possible
- Opportunities to extend signage in other areas of the city every year
- Developing storyline content and a suite of products around the Belfast Titanic/Maritime Heritage theme, to link Titanic Belfast with other key places to see around the city. In conjunction with this, a visitor pass has been developed by BVCB to connect visitor attractions via public transport.
- The development of Local tourism destination toolkits as a step by step guide for local areas to develop tourism product.

3 Resource Implications

3.1 Financial

The total costs for this project is £385,394. NITB is currently undertaking an appraisal of the figures and this figure may reduce.

3.2 Development Department has ring fenced a maximum of £190,000 towards this project. Any shortfall of funding will be applied for from NITB Tourism Development Scheme and Titanic Belfast.”

The Director outlined the principal aspects of the report and clarified matters relating to the proposed location of the signs. In response to Members' questions in relation to the feasibility of placing additional signs in further areas of the City, specifically the north bank of the River Lagan, he indicated that, whilst the proposals within the revised report would be submitted forthwith to the Northern Ireland Tourist Board to enable match funding to be secured, Members would be welcome to suggest additional locations for the erection of signage and such proposals would be considered within the context of the Council's overall strategy for the provision of signage across the City. In addition, the Director undertook to update the Committee should there be any additional costs incurred by the Council in the event of the full amount of match funding not being secured from the Northern Ireland Tourist Board.

The Committee adopted the recommendations.

Titanic Belfast - Social Clauses

(Ms. R. Sloan, Titanic Quarter Employability Manager, attended in connection with this item.)

The Committee considered the undernoted report:

“1 Relevant Background Information

1.1 Members will be aware that, at the September meeting of the Development Committee, an update was provided by Titanic Foundation Ltd (TFL) on progress towards social clause requirements during the construction phase of Titanic Belfast. Members requested a further paper from Belfast City Council (BCC) on progress towards validation of the social clause requirements.

1.2 The funding agreement for this project is between all contributing partners including TQ/Harcourt Construction, NITB and BCC. This funding agreement would have included all those conditions set out by the respective funders as part of their financial commitment to the project. There is a suite of legal documentations which underpins this contract and which would be linked to TFL also.

- 1.3 The social clauses included within the construction contract for Titanic Belfast were the first attempt to maximise the social benefits arising from a major public sector funded construction project in Northern Ireland. Experience has since shown that the contractual arrangements for Titanic Belfast have proven to be relatively loose and difficult to manage. As neither the Council nor Department for Employment and Learning (DEL) were involved in drawing up this contract we have had virtually no control over the social clause agreement.

2 Key Issues

2.1 Titanic Belfast Social Clauses

The definition of Long Term Unemployed (LTU) for the purpose of this social clause contract was defined as someone who has been unemployed for three (3) months. This was defined by Construction Industry Forum for Northern Ireland (CIFNI) as the industry definition of LTU. DEL definition of LTU is twelve (12) months as is the DETI definition.

- 2.2 With the definition of LTU set at three (3) months many unemployed tradesmen who lost their jobs during the economic downturn were able to avail of these opportunities meaning that the longer term unemployed were excluded from these opportunities.
- 2.3 A robust validation exercise has been undertaken by DEL to ensure the details of those employees identified by EC Harris on behalf of Harcourt Construction Ltd (HCL) meet the requirements of the social clauses.
- 2.4 To date, eleven (11) LTU have been verified from the information supplied to DEL from Harcourt Construction Ltd (HCL). This differs from the figures quoted at the last meeting by TFL. The remainder have been invalidated by the department because they did not meet the Department's interpretation of the social clause criteria.
- 2.5 While it is clearly recognised that HCL employed people in good faith several of those submitted for validation were invalidated because they failed to leave the unemployment register during their period of employment.
- 2.6 The remainder of non validated LTU were invalidated because they did not meet the required stipulation of being unemployed for three (3) months or more prior to commencing work in Titanic Belfast.

- 2.7 In order to satisfy their social clause requirements for this contract HCL are required to recruit a further four (4) people who are LTU. We have been working with 3D Personnel to find local unemployed people to take these jobs. An open day was held in Gloucester House last month and details of the job opportunities were placed on JobCentreonline. One hundred and forty (140) people turned up for interview.
- 2.8 In relation to the Apprentice opportunities, there was no clear definition of an Apprentice for the purpose of this social clause contract. Much of the Titanic Belfast work was subcontracted out from HCL and BCC had no control of who won these contracts. Most of the subcontractors came from outside Belfast and the Apprentices working for these companies have come from the areas where the subcontractors are based. These were counted towards the social clause contract requirements whether they worked onsite in Titanic Belfast or not.
- 2.9 In the absence of a definition of an apprentice these have been extremely difficult to validate. Seven (7) Apprentices have been validated to date – against a target figure of 38. Fifteen (15) of those submitted cannot be validated, and the remainder, while they are showing up on DEL records, have no record of following any recognised training frameworks and are therefore not deemed to be an apprentice. As no local apprentices have been given a work opportunity in Titanic Belfast HCL have been asked to take on local programme led apprentice work placements during fit out stage. There is no cost incurred to the employer and the trainees are being assisted to complete their qualifications. Roisin Sloan provided a presentation on the programme to sub contractors (two) 2 weeks ago. We are still awaiting a response on this from HCL.
- 2.10 Whilst social clauses are a useful tool these particular clauses were written during a time of economic growth and the sector was experiencing employment shortages. In the current climate of severe recession within the construction sector contractors are reluctant to contract additional staff at all and if they do tend to draw upon the large surplus of unemployed skilled labour currently available in the labour market.
- 2.11 TQ Work Forum
- It is important to note that the Titanic Quarter work forum has not been singularly focussed on implementation of social clauses. A significant amount of work has been done elsewhere onsite.

- 2.12 Four (4) apprentice opportunities have been created on the Game Of Thrones film set. Acapple are so pleased with the quality of these apprentices that they have promised to employ more apprentices when a new series of filming commences.
- 2.13 Twenty two (22) unemployed people (out of a total of fifty (50) job opportunities) have been recruited for Premier Inn. The Belfast City Council Harte Programme and the Department for Employment and Learning Bridge to Employment training programme were combined to facilitate a totally new programme focussing completely on the requirements of Premier Inn. Keith Freeman, Premier Inn is continuing to work with Roisin Sloan and they are currently working on an idea to recruit 3 long term unemployed people and progress them through Premier Inn to supervisor level within a period of eighteen (18) months.
- 2.14 Work placements have been provided to assist two (2) NVQ bricklayers to complete their qualifications. They are both now in full time employment.
- 2.15 A successful breakfast event was held for Titanic Quarter Employers in the new Belfast Metropolitan College campus. One hundred and fifty (150) people attended representing eighty five (85) companies. The event showcased the programmes and services available to employers from DEL, BCC and InvestNI. This event is being followed up with a series of workshops for employers on the programmes they want to learn more about. The first workshop (end of October) is on the ApprenticeNI scheme and ten (10) companies have already registered for this event.
- 2.16 A Titanic Belfast job showcase event was held in City Hall on 20 October. The event was organised to highlight the jobs becoming available, the skills required to obtain these jobs and how they can be obtained. Many organisations were on hand at the event to advise visitors what options they had to up skill ahead of the recruitment process including DEL, BCC, Job Assist Centres and local training organisations. Pre-employment training courses are currently being designed to ensure clients are job ready ahead of any recruitment or job interviews.
- 2.17 Fitzers Catering have been appointed as the franchise caterer for Titanic Belfast. They have announced 200 jobs (a mixture of part time, full time and seasonal opportunities will be available). We are working closely with this company to design pre-employment programmes to meet their needs. Interview facilities have been secured in the DEL Gloucester House office for the first round of job interviews, which will commence in December.

2.18 A recruitment event is being planned for January 2011 to fill the remainder of the Fitzers jobs as well as the core Titanic Belfast jobs. Security and Cleaning will be subcontracted out and we are currently awaiting confirmation of the appointment of the successful companies to enable us to engage with them to assist with further recruitment requirements.

2.19 Lessons Learned

While social clauses did not work as well as they could have during the construction phase lessons have been learned and implemented within the Titanic Belfast Operator Contract.

2.20 Social clauses for the operator contract have now been set as 12 months for the definition of LTU. Twenty five percent (25%) of the workforce will be from the LTU. These will be included in the Fitzers job opportunities.

2.21 As a result of the lessons learned from the Titanic Belfast social clauses DEL are engaging with Central Procurement Directorate (CPD) to ensure that robust and measurable clauses are included consistently in all future public sector contracts.

2.22 A Social Clause Delivery Forum has been set up that will consist of BCC, DEL, CPD, SIB, CIFNI and other Government bodies and stakeholders. This will facilitate discussion and help shape future social clauses. The first meeting will be held on 18 November.

2.23 While it is not yet possible to build social clauses into council contracts BCC are working to ensure that social clauses are built into any collaborative contracts with other government departments.

3 Equality and Good Relations Considerations

3.1 All schemes will be validated by DEL and Belfast City Council and account will be taken of relevant equality and good relations considerations.

4 Recommendations

4.1 It is recommended that Members note the contents of this report and recognise the continued ongoing work between DEL and CPD in relation to social clauses.

A lengthy discussion ensued in respect of the report. A Member made the point that the statistics presented were extremely disappointing and that the needs and requirements of local communities and the long-term unemployed had not been met within the construction contract for Titanic Belfast. He pointed out that the Council should

seek to become more proactive to ensure that its expectations in respect of social clauses would be met and that clarification should be sought on the Council's legal position in this regard. A further Member pointed out that, in light of the figures presented, the Committee should invite the representatives from Titanic Belfast to a future meeting in order that the concerns raised can be discussed further.

After discussion, the Committee agreed to note the information provided and it was noted further that:

- The Director would bring back a report to a future meeting highlighting areas of best practice in the implementation of social clauses from other projects and jurisdictions;
- The Director agreed to seek a legal opinion in respect of:
 - (a) the Council's ability to include the social clauses within Council contracts; and
 - (b) the constraints surrounding social clauses within procurement procedures for other public bodies; and
- to make a request to representatives of Titanic Foundation Limited and Harcourt Developments Limited to attend a future meeting of the Committee to discuss the issue of social clauses.

Councils of the Metropolitan Area - Service Level Agreement

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 15th June, it had endorsed the contents of the Action Plan for the Councils of the Metropolitan Area (COMET) for 2011 till 2015. The partnership, membership of which was comprised from representatives of the Economic Development Units of each of the six Councils within the Belfast Metropolitan Area, was funded through a Service Level Agreement with each Council contributing £5,000 towards operational and project work. The Director reported, given that a new Action Plan for the partnership had been agreed, that it had been deemed necessary to update the previous Service Level Agreement. Accordingly, the Committee considered the contents of a revised Agreement, which had been prepared by the Assistant Chief Executive and Town Solicitor, which clarified administrative and financial procedures, roles and responsibilities of the respective partners from 2011 till 2015.

The Committee endorsed the contents of the Service Level Agreement.

Consultation - Revision of Industrial Development Act 1982

The Committee considered a consultation document in respect of proposed revisions to the Industrial Development Act 1982 and, after discussion, it agreed to endorse the undernoted response:

“Question 1: Should Northern Ireland’s automatic inclusion as an assisted area in the UK be removed?”

Northern Ireland’s automatic inclusion as an assisted area in 1982 was granted due to the unique social and economic circumstances of the time. It is recognised that Northern Ireland has moved on politically, socially and economically since that time, and it can be argued that the decision to grant automatic inclusion as an assisted area status has contributed to that progress through encouraging capital and FDI investment. Regional Aid is the dominant mechanism for providing financial assistance with 72% of assistance to indigenous and FDI businesses in Northern Ireland being delivered through this mechanism.

It is also recognised that by using the current, rather crude statistical data analysis of GVA and GDP, it may appear that Northern Ireland and Belfast in particular are in a position to unfairly benefit from assisted area status compared to other parts of the UK. Belfast City Council recognises the impact of the current economic conditions throughout the UK and in particular in areas of greatest existing relative deprivation.

However from a Belfast perspective, if the proposal was accepted the consequences for Belfast and the Northern Ireland economy as a whole could be potentially extremely detrimental.

If the proposal was to be implemented in its current form, it is likely that using current guidelines on assisted area population sizes and levels of relative deprivation, the Belfast (NUTS level 3) area would experience a loss of assisted area status. The removal of the status, using current guidelines, would be made through a process that:

- (i) Does not recognise the importance of Belfast as an economic generator for the whole of Northern Ireland. The city is responsible for over 50% of GVA in actual value across the region.
- (ii) Does not recognise that the current use of GVA/GDP statistics alone do take account of the importance of the Belfast City Council area as an employment location for the rest of the region. For example:
 - Belfast currently provides employment for 108,000 in commuters from neighbouring districts, over half of all those employed in the city.
 - 30% of all service sector jobs are based in the city;
 - 50% of high tech manufacturing jobs and 60% of computer related jobs for the region are based in Belfast.

- (iii) Does not take account of a wider range of measures affecting city competitiveness. For example, using a range of statistical measures, Belfast was ranked 45 out of 46 European cities in terms of economic diversity. This included measuring the extent to which a few firms dominate the economy, distribution of employment across sectors and comparing the distribution of employment across sectors and comparing the distribution of employment against a diversified economy. As an illustration of this, 38.5% of jobs in the city are in the public sector – the second highest in a survey of 46 European cities.

The city is also the lowest ranked UK city for new business registrations and has one of the highest levels of economically inactive citizens;

- (iv) The 2010 research showed that in the period 2008-2010 employment in Belfast fell by 3.1% and the number of unemployed people doubled. The rate of increase in unemployment in Northern Ireland and Belfast 2008-2010 are the highest in the UK with 14 of the worst performing areas being in Northern Ireland and Belfast ranked overall 5th in terms of rate of increase in unemployment.

If the proposal is implemented as it stands Belfast City Council considers that:

- (i) It represents poor policy coordination in that it is being done in advance of the outcomes of the HM Treasury consultation into the 'Rebalancing of the Economy' and the Northern Ireland Executive's proposals to rebuild and rebalance the Northern Ireland economy. As the regional capital and economic driver, Belfast has a significant role to play in achieving this objective, and to jeopardise its options for investment will have an impact that stretches well beyond the local area.
- (ii) There is a very strong possibility that if proposed guidelines are implemented the resultant fragmentation of assisted area status would make Belfast a less attractive option for investors as the ability to financially support investment would be more complicated or non-existent;
- (iii) There is also a strong possibility that any subsequent division of the city into areas with those without assisted area status could contravene Section 75 legislation relating to equality.

The proposal to remove Northern Ireland's automatic inclusion as assisted area status could undermine some of the forces that have facilitated the political, social and economic momentum that was gathering before the current economic downturn.

Belfast City Council acknowledges the difficulties that other cities and regions are enduring during the current economic downturn. However whilst progress has been made over the last decade and more, Belfast as a city and as the economic generator for the rest of Northern Ireland cannot afford to lose access to any assistance that it can offer businesses to address the ongoing and long-term challenge of creating a more productive, dynamic and competitive local economy.

Question 2. Should the level of aid per project be increased from current level £10m to either £27m (adjusted for inflation) or £50m (adjusted to reflect increase in GDP) or left as it is?

The current cap was established in 1982 and now is the opportunity to revise aid levels to reflect the modern economic demands. Therefore the proposal to raise level of assistance to £50m is supported as being feasible and realistic within the realms of potential investment support.

Question 3. Should the IDA be updated to include telecommunications and broadband in list of "basic services"?

The industrial landscape has been transformed in the period since 1982. Telecommunications and broadband are now essential elements of any infrastructure support that seeks to create a dynamic, competitive economy. As such, we support this proposal.

Question 4. Should IDA be amended to extend the Secretary of State's powers relating to the acquisition and development of land acquired other than under the IDA or Local Employment Act 1972.

The amendment will enable the Government to acquire, manage and develop land outside assisted areas and is currently owned by other public bodies such as Regional Development Agencies. In principle the proposal is supported. However it is unclear whether this policy is relevant in the Northern Ireland context."

Northern Ireland Franchise Show 2011

The Committee was informed that the Northern Ireland Franchise Show would take place in the Europa Hotel on 12th November. It was reported that the aim of the event would be to strengthen the economy and create employment opportunities by promoting franchising as a viable self-employment option. The Members were reminded that the Council had, through a range of initiatives, supported and promoted the concept of franchising, the most recent of which had been a programme delivered in conjunction with Lisburn City Council.

The Director advised the Committee that the organisers of the Show had approached the Council requesting that it consider availing of a sponsorship package for the event. It was reported that in return for its contribution the Council would be provided with a number of promotional opportunities, prominent exhibition space, corporate

branding on associated literature, together with an opportunity to establish and build on relationships with existing and new businesses. The Director, therefore, recommended that the Council avail of one of the sponsorship packages, in conjunction with Lisburn City Council, the cost of which to Belfast would be £750.00.

After discussion, the Committee agreed to provide sponsorship as outlined in the sum of £750.00.

Visit by Irish Technology Leadership Group

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 14th September, it had agreed to host a series of events to coincide with the visit to the City of the Irish Technology Leadership Group from 4th to 6th November. Accordingly, the Committee considered a revised programme of events and meetings, which was tabled by the Head of Economic Initiatives, regarding the visit by the group.

During discussion, a number of Members expressed concern that the revised programme, as tabled, together with the locations chosen for the delegation to visit, did not reflect the wide range of initiatives which were ongoing in all areas across the City. In particular, the point was made that both North and South Belfast had been overlooked somewhat within the itinerary and the question was posed as to whether any political influence had been exerted on officers in respect of the locations chosen for the deputation to visit. In response, the Head of Economic Initiatives indicated that, as part of the normal process in managing such matters, she had spoken to a number of Members in respect of the itinerary for the visit.

During further discussion, the Director clarified issues in respect of the programme and indicated that the matter of how individual Members could have issues included on Committee agendas had been raised with him by the Chairman. The Director stated that he had in turn raised the issue with the Chief Executive who had indicated that the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee was currently reviewing the Council's procedures in respect of engagement between Members and officers and that this issue could be dealt with through the establishment of an agreed protocol. A report in this regard would be considered by the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee following discussion with the Party Group Leaders.

The Director also advised that, on occasion, reports had been brought to Committees at the request of individual Members and, in such instances, this information had been noted on the relevant agendas.

In response to a question regarding of the Council's legal position in respect of outlining within reports the levels of engagement which had taken place between Members and officers relating to items placed on agendas, the Director indicated that he would seek clarification in this regard from the Council's Director of Legal Services and the Democratic Services Manager and that this could be dealt with as part of the revised protocol.

The Committee noted the information provided.

Tall Ships 2015

(Mr. G. Copeland, Events Manager, attended in connection with this item.)

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 23rd August, it had agreed that a bid be submitted to host the Tall Ships in 2015 and agreed also that a sum of £1,300,000 be allocated to support the event should the Council be successful in its application. Accordingly, the Events Manager reported that Belfast had been selected by the organisers as a starting point for one of the races associated with the Tall Ships event in 2015. Given that the City had been successful in its bid, the Events Manager indicated that it would be necessary for the Committee to agree to the following course of action:

- to the re-constitution of the Belfast Tall Ships Company Limited to oversee the Council's delivery of the event;
- to agree that the signed Port Contract be returned to the organisers together with the payment of the initial instalment in the sum of £31,000; and
- to agree to nominate two representatives to Belfast Tall Ships Company Limited.

After discussion, during which a number of Members congratulated Mr. G. Copeland on his work in securing the event for the City in 2015, the Committee agreed to the course of action outlined and nominated the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, or their nominees, to represent the Council on the reconstituted Belfast Tall Ships Company Limited.

Capacity Building Grant 2011/2012 – Lower North Belfast Area

The Committee considered the undernoted report:

“1 Relevant Background Information

- 1.1 The aim of the Capacity Building Grant is to build capacity at a local level. The programme enables community support organisations to build the skills and knowledge of community groups and local people. Capacity building work is development work that strengthens the ability of community groups to build their structures, systems, people and skills.**
- 1.2 The Development Committee 9 June 2010 approved awards of this grant to 18 community support organisations across the city for the period 2010/11. The 22 February 2011 Committee extended these awards for a further year and the 27 September 2011 Committee agreed to further extend these awards for the period 2012/13.**

- 1.3 This extension was to support the planned review of BCC grant across a number of programme areas including the capacity building grant. The strategic environment for review was set out to Committee 27 September 2011 in the report 'Departmental Grant Aid 2012/13'. Specifically our emerging Community Development Strategy, the preliminary work on a Neighbourhood Assets Strategy and the joint project with DSD to review the way in which Community Development / Infrastructure services are supported in the city, all of which will impact on the service grant aid programme. Planning during this interim year will therefore allow us to better integrate and improve our grant investment in order to ensure that the best possible impact is made with the funds administered. It will also ensure a greater focus on delivery against targeted outcomes at both a city and neighbourhood level.
- 1.4 The new programme is likely to result in new requirements being placed on applicant organisations at the time of open call scheduled for autumn 2012.
- 1.5 In preparation for this our staff will work with all current recipient organisations, including any approved organisations in lower north, to support them to build their capacity in regard to any revised programme. The revised criteria will apply from April 2013.
- 1.6 One of the community support organisations funded under the original cohort of capacity grants went into liquidation during 2010/11. In terms of capacity support, this has left a gap in the lower north area of the city. At 22 February 2011 Committee Members commented on this gap and requested that action be taken by officers to address the issue.
- 1.6 An open call has therefore been implemented in regard to this grant which was ring fenced for provision in lower north Belfast for the period November 2011/ March 2012.
- 1.7 As per normal requirements, applicants were required to demonstrate that they meet all eligibility criteria as per the open call in January 2010 as follows:
 - Community Based Organisation: Applicants must be based in a recognised community serving a well defined geographical area
 - Recognised Organisations: Applicants must be able to demonstrate they are effectively managed (as defined by BCC) and compliant with Council's grant aid policy

- **Membership Support:** Applicants must have an appropriate membership base of active participative organisations. To this end applicants must be able to demonstrate ongoing working relationships and a track record of capacity building work with membership groups.
- **Building Capacity:** Applicant must demonstrate their understanding of and commitment to building capacity appropriate to their community. This will be reflected in the track record of the applicants and in the programme of work offered for the period under consideration.
- **Programme of Work:** Applicants must set out the planned programme of work. This will include aims, objectives, proposed outcomes, and impact. The programme must be costed, illustrating value for money, leverage and additionality

1.8 Following the closing date of 8 September 2011, three applications have been received. As with the previous cohort, these applications were assessed by Juniper Consulting. Groups must meet the threshold score of 130 marks to be recommended for funding and recommendations have been calculated (for the 5 month award period) as follows:

Band A (scoring 160-200): attract a maximum grant of £20,693 (5mths pro rata)

Band B (scoring 140-159): attract a maximum grant of £13,795 (5mths pro rata)

Band C (scoring 130-139): attract a maximum grant of £11,496 (5mths pro rata)

1.9 Summary score sheets for each of the applicant organisations have been attached at appendix 3.

2 **Key Issues**

2.1 Two applications have been recommended for funding and are detailed at Appendix 1. Members will note the small marking differential which reflects differing strengths and weaknesses across the scoring categories.

- In terms of application 2062, areas for improvement highlighted by assessment relate to the organisation's proven track record in programme delivery.
- In regard to application 2063, the noted areas for improvement relate to organisational governance and documentation of proposed programme of improvement.

2.2 It is the officer's recommendation that, given both organisations meet the baseline score and due to the small marking differential, both organisations are funded.

- 2.3 The awards, if agreed, will be for the period 1st November 2011 to 31st March 2012 with a possibility of extension for the 2012/13 financial year subject to the submission of relevant monitoring returns and programme of work.
- 2.4 Any successful organisation will be added to the officer support programme for capacity grant recipients in preparation for the new service grant support from April 2013.
- 2.5 One application has been recommended for rejection as it has scored below the threshold of 130 marks. This is detailed at appendix 2.

3 Resource Implications

- 3.1 The allocation for capacity support in lower north has traditionally been £49,664. This is the annual award agreed in the budget estimates for 2011/12 and the basis of future revenue budget estimates for 2012/13. To qualify for this level of funding however the applicant must attain a Band A score.
- 3.2 The organisations recommended for funding do not qualify for Band A. The maximum annual allocation is therefore £33,109. If committee accept the recommendation at Band B grant levels, the 5month pro rata figure would be £13,795 per organisation.
- 3.3 This will result in a total 2011/12 commitment of £27,590 which is within budget estimates.
- 3.4 If both organisations meet the criteria for commitment in 2012/13, this would necessitate an over-committal in the capacity grant total budget by £16,554.

4 Equality and Good Relations Considerations

- 4.1 None

5 Recommendations

- 5.1 Committee is asked to:
 - 1. Accept the recommendations for approval of capacity grant (appendix 1)
 - 2. Accept the recommendation for rejection of capacity grant (appendix 2)

Appendix 1:

Recommendation for Funding

Capacity Building Grant: 1st November 2011 – 31st March 2012
Lower North Belfast

Apps. No.	Name of Organisation	Total Marks Awarded	Amount Requested	Funding Recommended
2062	Small Steps Adult Education Group	150	£26,693	£13,795
2063	Loughview Community Group	151	£26,513	£13,795
Total				£27,590

Appendix 2:

Recommendations for Rejection

Apps. No.	Name of Organisation	Amount Requested	Total Marks Awarded
2061	New Life Counselling	£26,000	125

Reasons for rejection

The application does not meet the minimum threshold of 130 marks.

This is a comprehensive application but does not meet criteria in terms of the following:

1. Geographical area targeted – Greater Belfast, Lisburn, Ballymena, Antrim and Newtownabbey.
2. Programme of work – this is in relation to the development of counselling services only.”

The Committee adopted the recommendations.

**Consultation - Minimum Standards for
Childminding and Day Care for Children**

The Committee was advised that the Department for Health, Social Services and Public Safety had issued for consultation a document in respect of the issue of minimum standards for childminding and day care for children under 12 years of age. After discussion, during which it was agreed that the response be strengthened to reflect the

view that the issue of the scale of charges for childminding be addressed sympathetically, the Committee agreed to endorse the undernoted response as the Council's stance in this matter.

“General Comments

- 1.1 Children and young people are a priority for the Council as can be seen by the substantial resources allocated to play and leisure services. In terms of play alone, Council invests some £1m annually in the inspection, maintenance and equipment replacement in 78 playgrounds across the city. A further £650k is planned in capital works. Council deploy 16 play workers in 6 dedicated play centres and other sites across the city, representing a further investment of £650k per annum. Council also employ a Play Development Officer (PDO) to co-ordinate and develop play work practice; provide training, support and resources and manage a city wide play service. The PDO has links both nationally and internationally, being on the board of the International Play Association UK branch. In addition we operate and maintain 10 leisure centres and all the city's parks.**
- 1.2 Overall we feel that the guidelines are comprehensive, practical and useful. In establishing guidelines for our services we would refer to these standards.**
- 1.3 We do have some suggestions particularly with regard to Food Safety Law enforcement and Health and Safety Law enforcement. The Council agrees that compliance with Food Safety and Health and Safety legislation should be a requirement for the registration of childminders and day care providers. The minimum standards should be developed to give operators and the Early Years Teams within the Health and Social Care Trusts a clear understanding of what the key legislative requirements are and signpost specific relevant guidance. The DHSSPS should develop the standards in collaboration with the Food Standards Agency NI (FSANI), Health and Safety Executive NI (HSENI) and the Environmental Health Service.**
- 1.4 In order to encourage best practice, in addition to the minimum standards specified, the document should be developed to include clearly distinguishable advice in relation to best practice.**
- 1.5 Early Years Teams are well placed to promote, assist and monitor compliance with the key Food Safety and Health and Safety legal requirements, and to promote best practice. The DHSSPS and Trusts should consider the training and development needs of the Early Years Teams to ensure officers are competent to do so.**

- 1.6 The powers within The Children NI Order 1995 (to set reasonable standards and to refuse or revoke registration if these standards are not being met) may provide a more effective regulatory alternative to existing Environmental Health provisions in certain situations.
- 1.7 The Council believes the Early Years Teams and Environmental Health Services should work together to develop close liaison arrangements, locally and regionally, to develop a consistent approach, share information and ensure better regulation. This should include Environmental Health sharing inspection findings with the Early Years Teams and the Early Years Teams referring evidence of significant legal non compliance to Environmental Health for investigation.

Childminders in domestic premises

- 1.8 Belfast City Council has Food Safety enforcement responsibility for childminders. Health and Safety enforcement in such premises falls to the HSENI.
- 1.9 The overall food safety risk from childminders, minding a small number of children compared to other types of food premises, is very low. The Council does not currently inspect such premises and believes that they should be removed from the scope of the general hygiene legislation. The Early Years Teams should take lead responsibility for ensuring food hygiene standards in these low risk premises. The Council believes appropriate specific minimum food safety standards for childminders enforced through the registration requirements by the Early Years Teams, could provide the most effective regulation in this area and would significantly reduce the regulatory burden on childminders.
- 1.10 Considering the NI Better Regulation Strategy, the Council believes DHSSPS should consult with the FSANI to seek a legislative review of this area.

Day Care and Sessional Care Facilities

- 1.11 Belfast City Council has Food Safety enforcement responsibility for all Day Care and Sessional Care Facilities. The Council is also responsible for Health and Safety enforcement in such premises where education is not the main activity. For example a nursery school attached to a Primary School will be the responsibility of the HSENI whereas a crèche will fall to the District Council for enforcement of Health and Safety provisions.

- 1.12 Whilst the inspection frequency will vary dependant on the assessment of risk during the previous inspection, the majority of these premises are subject to an Environmental Health visit every 18 months. The primary purpose of this visit will be to monitor and ensure compliance with food safety legislation. The overall health and safety risk rating applied to such premises is likely to be relatively low, in most cases, so few environmental health inspections will focus on health and safety issues. It is therefore the opinion of the Council that the inclusion of compliance with Health and Safety legal requirements within the standard, together with the effective promotion and monitoring of such standards by the Early Years Teams, provides the best mechanism to ensure adequate Health and Safety arrangements are in place in these premises. Any significant breaches of Health and Safety requirements detected by the Early Years Teams should be referred to the District Council or the HSENI as appropriate for investigation.

Infection Control

- 1.13 Ecoli 0157 is a bacterium which is spread via the faecal oral route. It can cause a particularly serious illness in children with some patients suffering long term kidney failure or even death. Following a recent outbreak of Ecoli 0157 at a nursery school in NI, the Environmental Health Service and the Public Health Agency recognised the need for specific written advice to improve standards for infection control in childcare settings. The PHA subsequently developed the document 'Infection Prevention & Control "Best Practice" Advice for Nurseries and Childcare Settings' in collaboration with Infection Prevention & Control Nurses, Health Protection Nurses, and Consultant in Health Protection, Early Years Leads, Environmental Health Officers and Health & Social Care (HSC) colleagues. The Council believes that this best practice advice should be referred to in the minimum standards document. Furthermore the Council believes that the Early Years Teams should take the lead in promoting and ensuring that suitable arrangements are in place to prevent the spread of infection within childcare settings.
- 1.14 The Early Years teams should refer evidence of significant failures in infection control to the District council or the HSENI as appropriate for investigation as these may constitute offences under existing Health and Safety legislation.

Specific Questions

1 Are the standards easy to understand?

1.15 No - We understand that the minimum standards are not intended as a high level strategic document but rather to clarify the specific standards for registration. However the standards could be developed to give a fuller understanding of what is required.

1.16 With respect to Food safety there is little by way of guidance on the main legislative requirements, existing guidance or tools kits to secure compliance. Examples of relevant tool kits would include the 'safe catering pack' or 'Safer Food Better Business for Childminders.' The document refers to other standards which are not available and some of the references are incorrect e.g. The Basic Food Hygiene Certificate no longer exists. There is no reference to Food Safety within the Food and Drinks Policy, nor any mention of the requirement for a documented Food Safety Management System based on HACCP principles within the Standard.

1.17 With respect to Health and Safety there are good examples of potential hazards and control measures in the safety section, however the list whilst prescriptive in part is not exhaustive and further signposting could be provided. Also there is no reference to Risk Assessments or a Health and Safety policy in the list of policies required section on Page 52.

1.18 The Council believes that the DHSSPS should develop the minimum standards for Food Safety and Health and Safety in collaboration with the FSA, HSENI and Environmental Health Service.

1.19 *Is this single amalgamated document a helpful way to present the standards?*

1.19 Yes, however, if the standard is developed this should be kept under review particularly for childminders should the detailed requirements be substantially less onerous for them.

3 *Is it reasonable to expect providers of services to meet these standards now?*

1.20 Yes

4 *Will any of the standards have significant costs associated with compliance?*

1.21 No additional costs would be anticipated as existing legal requirements pertain.

Summer Scheme Awards 2011

The Community Services Manager reminded the Committee that, at its meeting on 22nd February, it had agreed that funding for community-organised Summer Play Schemes be allocated to qualifying community groups in the voluntary sector following an assessment based on agreed criteria. She pointed out that such grants were awarded at amounts of £1,000, £1,800 or £3,000.

The Committee noted that a total of 93 applications had been received and that funding had been awarded to the undernoted 87 groups which had met the criteria:

Summer Scheme Awards 2011

NAME	Amount Rec
NORTH	
Ardoyne Fleadh Project	£1,800
Artillery Young Mothers Group	£1,800
Ashton Community Trust	£1,800
Ballysillan Youth For Christ	£1,800
Bodybuilders Summer Scheme	£1,800
Carrickhill Residents Association	£2,500
Cavehill Antrim Road Regeneration Forum	£1,800
Cliftonville Community Regeneraion Forum	£1,000
Club Oige Mhachaire Bothain	£1,800
Concerned Residents Upper Ardoyne	£1,000
Glenbank Community Association	£3,000
Hubb Community Resource Centre	£1,000
Kinderkids Daycare	£1,800
Ligoniel Family Centre	£1,800
Lower Oldpark Community Association	£3,000
Marrowbone Community Association	£3,000
Manor St/Cliftonville Community Group	£1,800
Mount Vernon C Development Forum	£3,000
Shore Crescent Community Association	£1,800
Skegoniell Community Group	£3,000
Small Steps Adult Education Group	£1,000
Star Neighbourhood Centre	£3,000
Tar Isteach	£1,800
Vine Centre	£1,800
Westland Community Group	£1,700
Whitecity CDA	£3,000
Wishing Well Family Centre	£1,800

NAME	Amount Rec
SOUTH	
An Droichead Cumann Iarscoile	£3,000
Ballynafeigh CDA	£1,800
Belfast Islamic Centre	£1,800
Bridge Community Association	£3,000
Whizz Kids Afterschool Club (Chinese Resource)	£1,800
Markets Development Association	£2,560
L.O.R.A.G.	£2,500
N.I. Community of Refugees & Asylum Seekers	£2,700
South City Resource & Development Centre	£3,000
Taughmonagh Community Forum	£3,000
Windsor Women's Centre	£1,800
EAST	
Ardcarn Residents Association	£1,800
Ballymac Centre	£3,000
Ballymacarrett/Connswater	£2,500
Belmont Playgroup	£1,000
Bloomfield Community Association	£3,000
Inner East Youth Project	£1,800
KPC Youth	£1,800
Lower Castlereagh Community Group	£1,000
Newtownards Road Women's Group	£2,000
Oasis Caring In Action	£1,800
Short Strand Community Forum	£3,000
Walkway Community Association	£3,000
Wandsworth Community Association	£3,000
Willowfield Parish Community Ass.	£1,800
WEST	
An Munia Tober	£3,000
Ardmonagh Family & Community Group	£3,000
Blackie River Community Groups Ass.	£3,000
Blackmountain Action Group	£3,000
Cairde Gort Na Móna	£1,800
Cairde Naomh Pól	£3,000
Clonard Parent/Youth Group	£1,450
Clonard Residents Association	£1,800
Conway Youth Centre	£1,500
Denmark Street C. Centre	£2,500
Divis Joint Development Play Project	£1,800
Greater Shankill Partnership Early Years	£2,639
Falls Residents Association	£1,800
Falls Womens Centre	£1,800

NAME	Amount Rec
Falls Youth Providers	£3,000
Forthspring Inter Community Group	£1,530
Friends of Careers and Kids	£1,800
Glen Community Parent & Youth Group	£3,000
Glencairn Residents Group	£1,800
Glencolin Residents Association	£2,807
Glór na Móna	£1,800
Hannahstown Community Association	£1,800
Horn Drive Drop In Centre	£1,800
Ionad Uibh Eachach	£3,000
Kids Together West Belfast	£1,800
Link Youth & Young Adult Group	£2,500
Newhill Youth & Community Ass.	£3,000
Roden Street Community Group	£2,500
Shankill Women's Centre	£1,800
Society of St. Vincent De Paul	£3,000
St. James Community Forum	£2,000
St. Stephens Afterschool Club	£2,000
Upper Andersonstown Community Forum	£3,000
Upper Springfield Development	£1,800
Whiterock/Westrock Residents Ass.	£2,000
GRAND TOTAL	£191,686

Applications which did not meet Eligibility Criteria

Name of Group	Reason
Bethlehem Summer Scheme	Incomplete Application
East Belfast Mission	No requirement for, or evidence of, an AGM
	Membership approved by appointed body
St. Malachy's	Incomplete Application
Sandy Row Residents	Transferred to Project Grant (& SPS withdrawn)
St. Theresa's Youth Centre	Former Youth Club
Belfast Central Mission	Funding request for salaries not programme cost
	No evidence of AGM, Committee appointed.

Ms. B. Cook

The Chairman informed the Committee that Ms. Barbary Cook, Policy and Development Manager, would be leaving the Council at the end of October.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman expressed his thanks to Ms. Cook and wished her every success in the future.

Chairman