

SHARED CITY PARTNERSHIP

MONDAY, 14th MAY, 2018

MEETING OF SHARED CITY PARTNERSHIP

Members present: Councillor Kyle (Chairperson);
Alderman Sandford; and Councillors Attwood,
Johnston and Walsh.

External Members: Mr. M. Baker, Education Authority;
Mrs. O. Barron, Belfast Health and Social Care Trust;
Mr. K. Gibson, Church of Ireland;
Mrs. J. Irwin, Community Relations Council;
Mrs. G. Killen, The Executive Office;
Mr. P. Mackel, Belfast and District Trades Union Council;
Superintendent. R. Murdie, PSNI;
Mr. M. O'Donnell, Department for Communities; and
Mr. P. Scott, Catholic Church.

In attendance: Mrs. R. Crozier, Assistant Director;
Mrs. M. Higgins, Senior Good Relations Officer;
Miss. N. Lane, Good Relations Manager;
Mrs. D. McKinney, Programme Manager; and
Mrs. S. Steele, Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies

Apologies were reported on behalf of Mrs. G. Duggan, Ms. M. Greeves,
Mrs. J. Hawthorne and Mrs. M. Marken.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 9th April were taken as read and signed as correct.

Declarations of Interest

Mrs. G. Killen declared an interest in agenda item 7, viz., Request from The Executive Office (TEO) regarding recommendations for Areas of Intervention, in that she was associated with this Programme within her role as Head of Good Relations in the TEO.

New Members of the Shared City Partnership

The Chairperson welcomed those new representatives, who had been appointed from the various statutory agencies, to their first meeting of the Shared City Partnership.

Update on Peace IV

The Partnership considered the following report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

- 1.1 To provide the Shared City Partnership (SCP) with a progress report in respect of the PEACE IV Local Action Plan.**

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Members are requested to note the contents of the report and to recommend to the Strategic and Policy Resources Committee

- **Amendment to Clause 5 of the SCP TOR to ensure compliance with LoO, Standard Conditions and Programme Rules**
- **to reframe the Playing Our Part in the City project and retender.**
- **to adopt protocols for implementation and collaboration with other Councils on the delivery of the PEACE IV programme.**

3.0 Main Report

3.1 Background

As members are aware implementation and delivery of the Belfast PEACE IV Local Action Plan is progressing.

3.2 Programme Update

Implementation of the approved projects is ongoing in line with the various delivery approaches outlined in the PEACE IV plan

As approved by the SCP, the Young Advocates project has been re-scoped into a one year programme with reduced contact hours. The project outputs, outcomes and impacts remain unchanged. The modified project has been submitted to SEUPB for approval, once approved will be re-tendered.

Following a tender exercise, the contract for delivery of the Belfast and the World: Marking the Decade of Centenaries project has been awarded to Corrymeela Community and a project initiation meeting is being arranged.

Assessment of submissions for TechConnects project is currently underway, and it is anticipated that the contract award will be made by end May 2018.

No submissions were received from the procurement exercise for Playing Our Part Project. Feedback from interested suppliers indicate that targets for the project are challenging. Discussions with SEUPB indicate that parental engagement and single identity work may be re-considered. Therefore approval from SCP to reframe the project and tender is requested.

Tender opportunities for the following projects are currently open

BPR5: Connecting Communities

BPR5: Supporting Traveller and Roma Communities (4 Lots)

Shared Space and Services

Aecom, the appointed design consultants are finalising the technical feasibility report. Following this community consultation will commence. A meeting with SEUPB and CPD, confirmed the role of CPD as that of advisor in relation to procurement, regulatory and compliance matters. A representative of CPD has been appointed to the Capital Project Board. PQQ for the appointment of an integrated design team has been issued.

Staff have been appointed by NIHE for the delivery of the CYP Networks Project and engagement with communities is underway.

3.3 Financial Management

Claims for periods 3 & 4 have been verified by SEUPB and deemed 100% eligible for full reimbursement to Council.

3.4 Governance

A desktop review of the governance structure for PEACE IV has been completed by Audit, Governance & Risk Services (AGRS). Key observations recognise that programme implementation is commencing and that governance arrangement, subject to AGRS recommendation, will help ensure that projects are well managed and controlled.

The report highlighted 10 recommendations, summarised as attached. Progress on the recommendations together with LoO conditions (also attached) will be reported monthly to the SCP, this is to ensure compliance with both the AGRS report and LoO.

The AGRS report will be reported to the Council's Assurance Board and the Audit and Risk Panel. The agreed actions will be recorded on MKinsight and followed up as part of future recommendations monitoring.

The current TOR for the SCP (Clause 5) states that the purpose of the SCP is:

To oversee the delivery of the Belfast PEACE IV Peace and Reconciliation Action Plan while also continuing with the core Good Relations agenda for the City including the good relations outcomes linked to the Belfast Agenda and the new Local Development Plan.

Based on AGRS recommendations it is proposed that this clause is modified to

To oversee the delivery of the Belfast PEACE IV Peace and Reconciliation Action Plan, ensuring compliance with the Peace IV while also continuing with the core Good Relations agenda for the City including the good relations outcomes linked to the Belfast Agenda and the new Local Development Plan

TOR for the Thematic Steering Groups and Capital Project Board are currently being refined in line with AGRS recommendations and will be presented to SCP for approval at the next meeting.

3.6 PEACE IV Implementation with other Councils

Neighbouring and Cross Border Councils have contacted BCC regarding involvement of schools, community groups and voluntary organisations (VCO) in the Belfast area with PEACE IV projects being led by other Councils.

It is recommended that SCP adopt a protocol to manage this process based on the following criteria and process:

- (i) project is not the same / similar as that being delivered by BCC (if so, a collaborative approach will be explored)
- (ii) school / vco has an existing relationship with counterparts in the other Council area
- (iii) group has expressed an interest in participating in the project
- (iv) participation will enhance the peace building benefits to the community.
- (v) collaboration will support the implementation of the Belfast PEACE IV Action Plan

The PEACE IV secretariat will manage requests and report accordingly to the Thematic Steering Groups and Programme Board.

3.5 Communication, Engagement and Key Messages

A workshop to co-ordinate key messages and community engagement has taken place. A detailed stakeholder analysis and engagement plan is currently being developed and will then be presented to members.

4.0 Resource Implications

- 4.1 No resource implications. Recruitment of Programme and Project staff is ongoing in line with that approved in the PEACE IV Local Action Plan.

5.0 Equality and Good Relations Implications

5.1 The draft plan has been equality screened and discussed at the Equality Consultative Forum on 13 May 2015.”

The Partnership adopted the recommendations.

Update on the Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme (Verbal Update)

The Senior Good Relations Manager advised the Partnership that applications to the 2018 Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme had been scheduled to close on Friday, 11th May. She reported that, following a meeting of the Members' Bonfire Panel, the deadline had been extended and applications would now be accepted up to 4.00 p.m. on Monday, 21st May.

She provided a brief update in respect of the number of applications received to date and undertook to provide the Partnership with a detailed update at its meeting in June.

A Member stated that he was aware that some groups who had previously applied to the Programme had decided not to apply for the 2018 Programme and he asked for his disappointment to be recorded.

Noted.

Review of the Shared City Partnership

The Good Relations Manager provided the Members with an update in respect of the review of the Shared City Partnership.

She drew the Members' attention to the new composition of the Shared City Partnership and welcomed those new Members who were in attendance at the meeting.

She advised that the Migrant Forum had met on 30th April and had agreed a nomination process. She highlighted that agencies had up until 18th May to submit an expression of interest and the Shared City Partnership would subsequently be advised of its nominee.

In addition, the officer advised that discussions were currently ongoing with the Interfaith Forum in respect of its nomination process.

In respect of the recruitment of the four representatives from the community and voluntary sector, the Partnership was asked to note that Volunteer Now had been selected to undertake the recruitment exercise. She reported that the call for applications had been publicly advertised from 4th May, and the deadline for the receipt of applications to Volunteer Now was 25th May at 4.00 p.m. The Members were encouraged to publicise this information as widely as possible within their respective sectors. The Members were asked to note that the interviews had been scheduled for 14th and 22nd June and that the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson would be asked to participate in the shortlisting exercise and interviews for these appointments. The Partnership noted that it was anticipated that a report would be submitted to the August meeting of the Shared City Partnership requesting that the selected appointments be recommended for endorsement by the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee at its August meeting.

The Members were also reminded that a skills audit had been circulated to all the Members of the Shared City Partnership for completion and return to the Good Relations Manager and she encouraged those who had yet to complete it to do so by the end of May.

The Partnership noted the update provided.

Response to the Inner North West Masterplan

The Partnership was reminded that, at its meeting held on 9th April, it had received a presentation in respect of the Inner North West Masterplan which had been out for consultation. At that meeting, the Members had agreed to convene a walkabout of the area in order for the Members to visually explore and familiarise themselves with the Masterplan proposals. This had taken place on Friday, 27th May.

As the Members were aware the Inner North West Masterplan consultation deadline had been 8th May, therefore, the following response had been reviewed by the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson and submitted in draft form, subject to the endorsement of the Shared City Partnership:

Shared City Response to the Inner North West Draft Masterplan Consultation May 2018.

Background

The Shared City Partnership (SCP) received a presentation from Officers in relation to the Inner North West Masterplan at its meeting on 5th April and agreed that a walkabout would be organised within the designated area. The purpose of the walkabout was to visually explore the current area and design, become familiar with what the Masterplan is suggesting in terms of the three design principles and the 10 Character Areas. The walkabout on 27th April provided SCP members an opportunity to feedback on how proposals could be enhanced, if they had not already, to incorporate good relations implications. In addition, Members would be in a position to voice any concerns should any proposals presented appear to have an inadvertent negative impact on good relations in the City.

The Partnership would like to pass on their thanks to the Officers involved as they conveyed the opportunities and challenges in a way which demonstrated the interlinked, competing perspectives on the future of the city.

General Points

The Partnership understands that the INW is located in the city centre and is bounded by the Millfield/Carrick Hill to the northwest, College St to the south, Fountain Street to Fountain Lane to the south and Royal Ave to the east.

However, SCP would be keen that linkages would be made with other adjoining Master Plans which impact on routes into the area to ensure opportunities can be exploited to better connect local neighbourhoods to the city centre. This would involve linkages which appear seamless and

aesthetically pleasing as well as encouragement of A grade office space for example, which could provide economic opportunities for those in local neighbourhoods as well as others. Perhaps the mechanism of academies could be used to offer training in skills which match those required by the businesses which will be operating in the City Centre or connected areas.

The SCP would also advocate a holistic approach to the Master Plan and are encouraged by the fact that the Department For Communities has aligned its approach to the INW Master Plan. If such a coordinated approach could be adopted by the public/private sectors, this would assist in the assembly of land which could be used to achieve the vision set out in the Plan.

Members also pointed out that while Council and/or others may have a particular vision for the area, often this is constrained by funding only being offered in a piecemeal fashion and available for a limited timescale. Therefore, they put forward that to realise the vision, Council should perhaps hold out for the resources which can put the Masterplan ideals in place.

The focus of the Master Plan should be on people and not infrastructure. It is necessary to have vision as to how people could potentially use the space within the City Centre and then provide the infrastructure which supports this.

The importance of developing shared spaces cannot be underestimated. There should be a significant emphasis on the need for shared social and affordable homes. Given that the communities which circle the city centre experience segregated housing, this may be the last opportunity to create integrated family housing schemes in the City Centre.

Developers could be asked to consider the shared space principles as agreed by Council to ensure they impact on the design of housing, retail, business etc. to create conditions where people feel comfortable and potentially remove any chill factors

We need to ask ourselves if we are looking at incremental or transformational change for the City. Good relations can be a vehicle for change and this should be a bold statement in our key messaging.

Reflections from the Walkabout

SCP members are supportive of the goal to promote City Centre Living and that it should be of mixed tenure on a number of levels.

However, as highlighted during the walkabout, we should not expect prospective residents to have to overcome any further hurdles which other areas do not face.

This means that thought needs to be given to the impact of traffic, noise and pollution on those whom we wish to attract to the City Centre. This includes residents but also businesses – if we wish to have an offering such as cafes/restaurants which utilise outside space and bring footfall to

areas, this needs to be in a relaxing environment, not currently experienced.

If we hope to encourage mixed tenure which includes families, older people etc., then pedestrianisation needs to be investigated with alterations made to where public transport is currently accessed and traffic limited in those areas.

People will require access to amenities – green and open space, play facilities, doctors, dentists etc and preferably within walking distance. Children in particular require a radically different environment than what is currently in place. We welcome the baseline study being undertaken which should provide the Council with an understanding of where the gaps are and what projected growth would require.

The abundance of major traffic junctions within the area which also disconnect communities from the City Centre creates visual and psychological barriers. Apart from the crucial need to address safety concerns for those crossing the junctions, perhaps thought should be given to “going over rather than under”.

Examples from other cities demonstrate that these structures can be aesthetically pleasing as well as becoming destinations in themselves ie. the Peace Bridge in Derry/Londonderry and the High Line in New York.

These can be used as ways of linking communities with each other and address the perception of distance. It can also change the dynamics of a City in a positive way.

Those communities which lie on the periphery should also see benefits from regeneration and potentially the University is also a place for generating ideas given the nature of what they do. The UU could play a larger role within the Masterplan and become part of the community contributing innovative ideas about connection and cohesion.

Examples were given of areas which could benefit from regeneration – one such area included the Lower Shankill which has been underdeveloped and could benefit from a mixed tenure approach as has been adopted in other areas which would assist in integrating the area with the City Centre.

In relation to the type of housing, this should include high end and social and affordable housing. Given the nature of the area, housing may be required to be dense in nature but should be of good quality. We take into account that our population is aging and therefore, we will need more units but smaller in size.

As there is not a strong residential element in the City centre, we need to create the desire for it. In addition, we wish to create neighbourhoods which do not become isolated but rather interact. This is also important in terms of how the student population within the area and the university should be party to discussions as how to achieve this.

Interaction between neighbours will not happen of itself – there needs to be spaces created for this to happen which incorporate the shared space principles – welcoming, safe, accessible and of good quality. This area is

unique as it is not segregated and we should support this with our design and development and not inadvertently contribute to further segregation.

Note that experience has shown that open space which provides a relaxed feel to the City should be accompanied with an animation programme with various activities provided before, during and after work begins to ensure it does not become a place associated with one particular group or becomes synonymous with antisocial behaviour.

Creating communal facilities such as roof top gardens and neighbourhood programmes which animate space around the inner North West which encourage footfall and activity would assist in this regard.

Different programming/animation will be needed to be offered which satisfies a range of people – local city centre residents, local communities living on the periphery of the boundary, citizens and tourists. These will need to be offered at different times of the day. Bank Square is an excellent example of where open space could be better used and enhanced by the plans with programming which can at times create a relaxed atmosphere, be a venue for entertainment, provide hospitality and is sensitive to the needs of the services which are located there.

In addition, we should encourage and develop activities which bring people into the City Centre such as open air book fairs, pop up pocket parks etc.

We need to stress the benefits of encouraging everyone to feel safe and comfortable and ensure services are not limited to one street so we can incur increased footfall which would make the whole area feel safer.

SCP would advocate that active frontage needs to be displayed towards the communities around the boundary of the Master Plan to encourage involvement and buy in. Larger proposed development should explore the idea of having a programme which will encourage people to use the facilities as well as a way of acknowledging the community for its custom.

We recognise the potential to redevelop Smithfield with active frontage and support for hospitality and food services placed at the front to encourage footfall to help upscale traders and create links with St George's Market.

Exploring heritage can be a very positive mechanism whereby local people could be informed about and engaged with the project – could there be space for a programme, particularly for young people whereby they can explore the history to the area and provide feedback on how this can be maintained alongside any new buildings etc. Perhaps this could be linked with the current exhibition in City Hall and promote use of the Central Library in the INW area.

The fact that the area Cathedral Quarter on one side and the cultural corridor around Clifton Street should not be underestimated and full use of this should be exploited to ensure the area retains its unique selling point and develops its “quirky” nature as displayed by the range of small independent shops and promotes a base for culture and arts.

In these cases, the energy to promote and realise the vision takes economics, energy and capacity. We should consider the contribution that

creatives can make to develop the space in the Masterplan and look at who else needs to be on board including those who represent all parts of the vision.

In conclusion, SCP welcomes the chance to respond to the Inner North West Masterplan consultation and would stress that “good relations is good for all of us” The SCP was able to ensure that good relations and community cohesion were put front and centre into the Local Development Plan and we would support that they should be included in the same way within this Masterplan.

The Shared City Partnership recommended that the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee endorse the Shared City Partnership’s draft response to the Inner North West Masterplan.

Belfast City Council Language Strategy

(Mrs. L. Dennis, Equality and Diversity Officer, attended in connection with this item.)

The Members were advised that a new five-year language strategy to make Belfast a more inclusive, welcoming City had been launched by the Lord Mayor, Councillor McAllister, at the City Hall, prior to the meeting.

The Equality Officer commenced by outlining the Council’s aims and commitment to developing and delivering a strategic approach to the promotion of its linguistic strategy. She stated that the Council wished to work in partnership to promote linguistic diversity across the City, to move towards a shared vision of growth, where no one was left behind, in line with the aims of the City’s long-term development plan, the Belfast Agenda.

She advised that underpinning this corporate approach were the following:

- two officers would be appointed. One officer would be assigned responsibility for the promotion, protection and enhancement of Irish, while the second officer would have responsibility for increasing access and inclusion of other languages;
- to increase awareness of linguistic diversity in screening for equality and good relations impacts;
- the development of an internal network to mainstream linguistic diversity;
- the better promotion of positive attitudes towards people with a disability;
- to actively increase the participation of people with a disability in public life;
- to encourage and provide practical support for a range of language traditions, cultural activities and communities, for example, by providing use of the City hall and other venues, or by providing grant-aid for significant events and projects where they meet the funding criteria;
- to be proactive in seeking opportunities to work with different language communities to promote linguistic traditions through different mechanisms including events, exhibitions and publications;
- to respect the right of the public, Elected Members and staff to use their name in the language of their choice and to express their linguistic identity in accordance with the traditions of that language;
- to give consideration to linguistic diversity when planning events and promote the inclusion of and participation from members of different linguistic communities in these events; and

- to encourage tourism and cultural initiatives that reflect the linguistic diversity of the City.

The Partnership welcomed the Language Strategy 2018-2023 and noted that more information was available on the Council's website [here](#)

Request from TEO Regarding Recommendations for Areas of Intervention

The Partnership considered the following report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

- 1.1 To advise members of a request from TEO that Belfast City Council identifies areas that require additional TEO funding in 2018/19 and seek Members' feedback on how best to identify areas.**

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 To ask SP&R to recommend the approach agreed by the Shared City Partnership following consideration of this report.**

3.0 Main report

3.1 Key Issues

TEO have advised that in 2018/19 they are considering the creation of an additional fund of approximately £300,000 province wide that would be used to address short-term gaps in areas where intervention is most needed across all the councils. This fund would:

- identify lead partners in council areas
- help small groups who normally don't access or apply for funding
- fund short-term projects (6-months)

3.2 The Good Relations Unit has been asked to identify:

- 1. Where are the areas in your District Council which have low numbers of good relations intervention relative to need? In other words where are the biggest gaps in your District Council between good relations need and the resource being allocated to address that need?**
- 2. What sort of interventions do you think would be effective in these areas? Do you know of any existing providers/community organisations that you have worked with that you think would be effective in delivering these types of intervention?**

3.3 Members will be aware that the District Council Good Relations Programme (DCGRP) is co-funded by TEO (75%)

and Belfast City Council (25%). This intervention would fall outside that programme.

3.4 In considering how to respond to this request officers have identified the following information which could be used to identify areas:

1. **2017 Good Relations Audit**

Although this research did not identify specific geographies with low capacity in terms of good relations interventions it did highlight that respondents from north Belfast reported higher levels of racism and sectarianism than other areas and that south Belfast reported higher levels of racism. The audit also identified a need to target interventions in interface areas.

3.5

2. **Review of gaps in areas that access support through the DCGRP**

A review of the small grants programme could highlight areas from where applications have not been received or where applications have been unsuccessful. Members may wish to consider that we advise TEO of the top 10 projects who were unsuccessful in their applications to Tranche 1 of the 18/19 round of small grants to identify if they came from areas where there is limited good relations activity and make recommendations on that basis.

Members are asked to consider this information, advise if there are any other sources of information on good relations capacity that could be considered and make recommendations to officers on the agreed approach.

3.6 Officers would suggest that lead partners could be those which are supported through Neighbourhood Renewal funding who would generally have a higher capacity to deliver.

3.7 **Financial & Resource Implications**

All financial resources for this work would be provided directly by TEO. Good Relations Officers would advise on the agreed approach to identifying areas and assist in this work.

3.8 **Equality or Good Relations Implications**

This resource will support activity that will promote good relations.”

In considering the potential allocation of additional funding, several of the Members stated that they did not necessarily agree that identifying gaps from where applications had not been received, or from where applications had been unsuccessful, was necessarily the only way to proceed as there may be particular reasons, for example, other sources of funding available or good relations need were not so prevalent.

A further Member stated he felt it was important that a more detailed analysis of the specific geographies of areas with low capacity in terms of good relations interventions was undertaken. He highlighted that Elected Members had a responsibility to encourage and better promote such initiatives and any available funding streams in these areas.

The Members also noted that it was important to ensure that there was no duplication of provision within areas through other funding streams, for example, Peace IV.

Based upon a number of suggestions by the Partnership, officers undertook to carry out a further evaluation in respect of the current Grant Aid Funding need in relation to specific interventions and to go back to TEO to see what alignment could be made with their findings.

Noted.

Update on the Mural Transformation Programme

The Partnership was reminded that it had previously allocated £5,000 towards the restoration of the 'Shipyards Mural' which had been completed in March 2017, at Banbury Place, East Belfast. In addition, the Council had also painted the wall underneath the restored mural, as part of a commitment to improve the area.

The Senior Good Relations Officer advised that, as well as the restoration of the mural, a bonfire had been removed from the area, the damaged road and pavement had been resurfaced and the area around the mural had been painted and aesthetically improved.

As part of the consultation around the restoration of the shipyard mural, local residents had also identified another wall in the vicinity of the mural that was also being used for political and antisocial graffiti and it was proposed that funding be allocated for the erection of a mural on this wall.

Following a query regarding vandalism of murals, the Senior Good Relations Officer advised that none of the murals funded through this Programme had been vandalised.

A further Member stated that he would like to see greater publicity of the murals and suggested an official unveiling upon completion.

The Partnership recommended that the Shared City Partnership commend to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that it award up to £3,000 for the erection of a mural on a problem wall which was subject to frequent political and anti-social graffiti, at Banbury Place in East Belfast.

Holocaust Memorial Day 2019

The Good Relations Manager reminded the Partnership that Holocaust Memorial Day was an internationally recognised event which sought to honour and remember the victims and survivors of the Holocaust and subsequent genocides in other countries across the world. She reported that each year The Executive Office (TEO) partnered with a different Council area to run the Northern Ireland Regional Event. This year Belfast City Council had been invited to host the regional event, which would be held on 24th January

2019, in the City Hall. This date marked the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau extermination camps.

The Partnership noted that the event had been estimated to cost £3000.00 and that this could be met through existing budgets

The Partnership agreed to recommend to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that Belfast City Council partner with The Executive Office to host the regional event, in the City Hall, on 24th January 2019 to commemorate Holocaust Memorial Day and that it agree to run a programme of events to supplement the main commemoration ceremony.

Update on work on Interfaces

The Partnership considered the following report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

To update the SCP on the expenditure from the 2017/18 DCGRP Action Plan on funding for interface working through the Expression of Interest (EOI) exercise last year and to seek approval to allocate funding from the 18/19 DCGRP Programme for a cross interface health programme..

2.0 Recommendations

- **To note the update in relation to the Expression of Interest for 17/18 and that as agreed by the Partnership previously, a similar exercise will be carried out on 18/19.**
- **To seek approval to co-fund (50/50% with NIHE) to extend a cross-interface health programme in the Clonard/mid-Shankill area in the amount of £1500.**

3.0 Main report

3.1 The SCP will recall that funding of £50,000 was made available through last year’s DCGRP Action Plan to support interface working at the local level. An invitation to submit an EOI was issued in September of last year, with a total of 6 applications received:

- **Suffolk/Lenadoon Interface Group:**
- **Clonard/mid-Shankill Initiative**
- **APAC Association**
- **Belfast Exposed**
- **ABC Trust (Ardoyne/Marrowbone)**
- **CCRF (Cliftonville Community Regeneration Forum)**

3.2 The Unit is still receiving evaluation forms and feedback from recipients of the funding award but information received to date has been extremely positive. For example, feedback from Clonard/mid-Shankill participants is shown below:

- Participants were 20 women (10 x Catholic and 10 x Protestant) who attended a health programme, and cultural activities in each other's areas:
 - 75% strongly agreed that following the programme of activity, they were happy to socialise in a shared space
 - 25% felt the area they lived in was a shared space
 - 25% would like to see the walls come down in the near future
- Anecdotal feedback included the following statements:
 - I feel comfortable coming to a keep fit programme on Shankill.
 - This programme has given me confidence to go to shared space.
 - Since getting involved in this programme we exercise together in each area. But there is more work needed to get both sides engaging more.
 - I would love to see the peacewalls come down but I feel there needs to be more work done with people living beside them to come together more.

3.3 Within the Good Relations Action Plan 18/19, a sum of £50,000 has been set aside for work on interfaces within the Safe Community Theme. Given the success of the funding allocation for interface working at a local level, the Partnership agreed that a similar exercise will be undertaken in 18/19. This would enable beneficiaries to extend their programmes with existing and new participants, and to encourage more applications to the Scheme.

3.4 We intend to bring the groups together in early June to share best practice and to highlight the availability of a second call for EOI's in the DCGRP Action Plan 2018/19. We will advise members of the date and issue invitations to SCP once the date has been finalised.

3.5 The Clonard/mid-Shankill Forum was awarded funding through the 2017/18 Interfaces EOI exercise to deliver a cross-interface health programme, cross-community lantern Parade and Christmas market. The group wishes to sustain the fitness programme (report above) over the summer months until new funding can be sourced. NIHE is willing to co-fund the extension of the programme (£1,500 per organisation) with Good Relations to ensure that the relationships developed between the women can be sustained and developed further. The Partnership is asked to consider contributing £1,500 to allow the extension of the programme.

Financial & Resource Implications

All recommended activity can be delivered in line with existing budgets through the District Council Good Relations Programme (DCGRP) which is 75% funded by TEO.

Equality or Good Relations Implications

Work on interfaces and barrier removal was highlighted as a priority in the 2017 Good Relations audit and is also part of the DCGRP. Work in this area will promote equality and good relations by addressing issues of segregation.”

The Partnership adopted the recommendations.

Request regarding Homeless Jesus sculpture (Verbal Update)

The Partnership was apprised of a request that had been received regarding the possibility of siting a bronzed sculpture entitled ‘Homeless Jesus’ on a bench outside the City Hall to raise awareness of homelessness within the City. The request had also asked that consideration be given in respect of a procession to the City Hall

The Assistant Director advised that this had been discussed at the May meeting of the People and Communities Committee and it had agreed that officers should consult with the Shared City Partnership to explore the request further.

The Assistant Director advised that further details regarding the request would be issued via e-mail to the Members of the Partnership, which would enable it to be given due consideration in advance of the June meeting.

Noted.

Presentation – The Institute for Conflict Research (Verbal Request)

The Partnership was advised that the Institute for Conflict Research (ICR) had undertaken research in light of the concern that many EU/EEA nationals were facing anxiety on their future status in Northern Ireland following Brexit.

The Good Relations Manager advised that this might be an issue which would be of interest to the Partnership and she asked the Partnership whether it wished to receive a presentation on the project.

The Partnership agreed to receive a presentation from the ICR at a future meeting regarding its Brexit and eYou project.

Chairperson