

## **Canterbury City Council Short Topic Scrutiny Review:**

### **Council Approach to Gypsy and Traveller Issues – Final Report**

#### **Introduction**

The Scrutiny Management and Review Sub-Committee approved a short topic review into the Council Approach to Gypsy and Traveller Issues on 14 July. The review panel consisted of:

- Cllr Pepper – Chairman
- Cllr Ashmore
- Cllr McMahan
- Cllr Todd

The review was supported by a small team of officers:

Dan Hamlin – Lead Officer

Nigel Cunningham – Chairman of the Corporate Equalities and Access Group

Sorrel Grantham – Corporate Equalities and Access Officer

Lyn McDaid – Senior Democratic Services Officer (O&S)

As a short topic review, the Member panel was tasked with holding a series of meetings to investigate the topic, make initial recommendations and indicate where further work could be done.

The terms of reference for the review are set out in the review scope set out at Appendix B.

The review concern was that the approach to gypsy and traveller issues could be improved. A greater understanding of Gypsy and Traveller issues, including consultation with the community, other authorities and partners - for example parts of the County Council, police and health services – was required. The review should contribute to future council policy that improves the coordination and consistency of the council's current approach.

The review would provide a 'position statement' on the council's approach to gypsy and traveller issues and to make recommendations that informs a council policy on Gypsy and Traveller issues.

#### **Background Information**

##### **Gypsies and Travellers<sup>1</sup>**

A nomadic way of life is not illegal in this country. Indeed, it is a way of life that has been followed by groups of people all over the world for many generations.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this paper the term 'Gypsies and Travellers' will be used to broadly define the travelling community, although it is accepted that there are many other descriptions used, for example: 'Gypsy' and 'Irish, Scottish, Welsh and English Traveller', etc.

There are two distinct ethnic minority groups within the travelling community in this country. Roma Gypsies form one group, and Irish Travellers form another group. New Age Travellers do not form a distinct ethnic group and were therefore not covered in this review.

There are, of course many different interpretations of who is a traveller and what constitutes an effective definition of the travelling community. This can create difficulties for public bodies when attempting to engage with Gypsies and Travellers. The Commission for Racial Equality states:

*“The absence of reliable national data on the size of the Gypsy and Traveller population is mirrored in the lack of information about them in important areas such as employment and the provision and use of public services. The problem is that Gypsies and Travellers are rarely included as separate racial groups in national, local or sector-based monitoring systems. This means little is known about their experiences or needs, which therefore tend to be overlooked.”<sup>2</sup>*

This concern is reflected in the review scope, which seeks to improve, the councils approach to Gypsy and Traveller issues and by doing so, promote greater understanding.

### **Government Policy**

Currently the government’s objective is to reduce tensions between Gypsies and Travellers and the settled community by sustainable site provision and effective enforcement against unauthorised encampments and developments. A new system for dealing with site provision through: the Housing Act 2004, the Regional Planning body and local authorities in their Local Development Plan documents. Some of this guidance is summarised at Annex A.

### **Canterbury’s position**

According to the most up to date figures for occupied caravans, the number of traveller households in the district is as follows: -

(i)	Authorised encampments	38
(ii)	Unauthorised encampments	13

In common with most of the district councils Canterbury does not have a central point for Gypsy and Traveller issues or officers with specific responsibility for working with the gypsy and traveller community. Most contact is handled by individual departments who engage with the Gypsy and Traveller community in a number of ways:

*Housing Services* – Public Safety Unit deals with issues of unauthorized encampments. Housing services are due to undertake a survey of Gypsy and Traveller housing needs across the district. An action to do this is in the council’s new housing strategy.

---

<sup>2</sup> Gypsies and Travellers: A strategy for the CRE, 2004 - 2007

*Planning* – The planning service deals with enforcement of unauthorized encampments and applications for site use.

*Environment and Street Scene* – Deals with clearance of rubbish from vacated unofficial sites, approximately 3 to 4 per year.

*Local Plans* - deal with the new Local Development Framework, which has to take account of the needs of travellers in terms of specific site provision.

*Policy* - The council's Equalities and Access Strategy has an action plan which has a specific section on gypsies and travellers.

A Management Protocol guides the councils approach to unauthorised encampments for Unauthorised Encampment on Local Authority Land in Kent and Medway. This sets out the legal duties of local authorities and the context duties of enforcement and guides the Public Safety Unit when it deals with unauthorised encampments, usually enabling them to resolve the issue without recourse to legal action.

### **Kent County Council (KCC)**

KCC has a specific section on its website setting out some of the key issues relating to travellers and key contacts for officers in the council's Gypsy Unit which provides advice and guidance to gypsies and travellers.

KCC manages 8 council-owned gypsy and traveller caravan sites in Kent. It also has a select committee examining the issue of gypsy and traveller sites. This is due to report in April. The report is expected to consider:

- Closer working between KCC and district councils to improve the approach to site provision and funding
- A joint approach when lobbying government on traveller related issues
- The creation of mechanisms where the relevant agencies can work together to address gypsy and traveller issues

### **Kent Districts**

To get some idea of how other Kent districts were engaging with the gypsy and traveller community, a brief review of other Kent district websites was undertaken. This showed that very few have any web pages or specific officers dedicated to gypsy and traveller issues. Whilst Tonbridge and Malling have the contact details for individual officers, others merely direct the enquirer onto the KCC website.

Where Gypsies and Travellers are mentioned, it is usually in the context of unauthorized encampments and how to deal with them. The wider social context is not usually referred to, although some authorities scrutiny reviews recommended better co-ordinated access and joint strategies with other public agencies to incorporate the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community.

## **Other notable local government practice**

### ***Oxfordshire County Council***

The Oxfordshire Traveller Management Unit (TMU) service was the first working partnership to take place between the county council; three Basic Command Units (BCUs) of the Thames Valley Police; five district councils; five Primary Health Care Trusts (PCTs); and the Advisory Service for the Education of Travellers (ASET). This example shows how co-located partnerships can be far more effective and efficient than remote resources that work in isolation, and illustrates how synergies can be achieved through shared resources.

The service was set up in January 2003, following a review in Oxfordshire of the gypsy and traveller services. It is a co-located operational partnership dealing with:

- Work arising from unauthorised gypsy and traveller encampments and permanent sites
- Interaction with and the inclusion of gypsies and travellers and settled communities in local issues

While West Oxfordshire was one of the lead areas, the TMU serves the whole county of Oxfordshire. A key element is the setting up of joint-working initiatives, between local authorities and the police, when managing encampments.

### ***Tewkesbury Borough Council***

The council manages 3 sites on behalf of the county council. The council has worked closely with the Gypsy and Traveller community over a number of years. Contact has mainly been facilitated through Paul Kenyon an Environmental Health officer who works with the local gypsy and traveller community and built up strong links over a number of years. Mr Kenyon works with other council services and gives advice on access to health and education services. This work contributed to Tewkesbury being given beacon status for its community cohesion work.

Mr Kenyon describes the work as a series of gradual improvements that build trust. He also says that the council policy of having well-managed sites and a supportive approach to other transitory encampments, helps the council's case with planning appeals and other enforcement work.

## **Review Approach**

The review panel were clear from the outset that the council's review should look more at how the council can engage positively with the Gypsy and Traveller community and look further than issues of planning enforcement and site provision. Many other reviews regarding gypsies and travellers seemed to be more focused on site provision issues or the removal of illegal encampments.

The panel therefore decided to look more holistically at the issues and try to see what could be improved about the council's overall approach rather than concentrate on one particular element.

The panel understood that a short topic review would not be able to fully encompass the diversity of issues around the Gypsy and Traveller community, however the review recommendations would point the way forward for future work in this area.

### **Evidence Gathered during the review**

The review panel felt that the difficulty for councils in working with the travelling community was down to a number of factors. Amongst these were:

- A history of mistrust between the settled community and Gypsy and Travellers
- A lack of clarity and consistency in current and previous legislation
- A lack of permanent and transit sites
- The responsibility for delivering key services being divided between different tiers of local government
- A lack of advice. E.g. within the council there were many different officers that engaged with Gypsies and Travellers but that these were not coordinated and no single 'first contact' point for Gypsy and Traveller issues exists

The panel had three sessions where they heard first hand evidence from a number of witnesses. These included: council officers, those involved with providing services for Gypsies and Travellers and members of the community itself. The evidence from these sessions is summarised below:

#### ***Session 1 – Canterbury City Council***

This session heard evidence from council officers in Local Plans, Housing and Legal and Democratic Services. The main points can be summarised as:

#### **Planning Policy**

The local plan had recommended provision for permanent and transit traveller sites in the district. However the Planning Inspector rejected the transit accommodation allocation at Prospect Farm. The current position is that no new traveller sites have been allocated in the draft Local Plan. New sites will have to be considered in detail as part of the Local Development Framework in conjunction with the Housing Needs Survey (see below). The site provision work will also inform the council response to the revised Gypsy and Traveller Sites circular (see annex A).

However, it is fair to say that no new sites within the district will be identified before 2007 at the earliest.

## Housing

The Housing Act 2004 has introduced a requirement for local authorities to produce a housing needs assessment of Gypsy and Traveller communities. Previous housing needs assessments did not include them. Officers are now in discussion with other districts in East Kent to see if a joint study can be carried out – this will enable an assessment of cross boundary movement as well as the overall numbers in a larger area.

## Legal

It was clear that relations between Gypsies and Travellers and the settled community have not been helped by the lack of permanent and transit sites within the district. Settlement on private sites without planning permission, together with the resulting tensions with the settled community made it hard to reconcile competing demands without recourse to legal action.

It was suggested that conflict could be avoided by greater understanding of the legal framework for planning. This was difficult however as some parts of the Gypsy and Traveller community have low literacy levels. The council should aim for a firm, but fair approach to planning and other issues. This could only be delivered in a context of better communications.

It was felt that Gypsies and Travellers needed an officer to talk to who could give them clear advice. This would help improve communications and eventually, trust. Overall the panel felt that issues over site provision were complex and subject to detailed local and national frameworks and that the review would have a limited impact.

The panel did comment that as the planning issue had such prominence, it overshadowed many other aspects of the debate concerning Gypsies and Travellers. Perhaps the two points may be linked and that many of the processes could be improved by better communication and understanding of the problems gypsies and travellers face – especially when contacting official bodies. It was noted that the council Equalities and inclusion action plan has an action recommending training on Gypsy and Traveller issues for key staff. The panel felt that this part of the action plan needs to be given higher priority and specific funding.

### *Recommendation 1*

*The panel recommended that specific training on Gypsy and Traveller issues should be given to front-line officers, for example those serving in the council's contact centre, to ensure that enquiries from this sector of the community are handled in a sensitive and appropriate manner.*

### *Recommendation 2*

*To help with this improvement in communications, the panel also recommended that to overcome the literacy-related difficulties encountered by travellers that the councils Marketing and Communications team look into*

*non-written ways of communicating key council policies such as planning and housing.*

## **Session 2 – External Agencies**

In the second witness session, the panel interviewed representatives from outside agencies involved in traveller issues. Much of this evidence session focussed on the health, education and social exclusion experienced by the Gypsy and Traveller community.

Many of the comments concerned the need to establish better communication between the travelling communities and agencies. Specific examples were quoted in areas such as planning, council tax, education and health, where good standards of literacy were essential to understanding. However, many in the gypsy and traveller community did not have the required standards and lacked advocates to help them understand.

Many of the pre-requisites for accessing services, such as medical records, and insurance certification relied on a fixed address. Witnesses said that in many cases registration with a GP was difficult and the only recourse was a visit to the local hospital casualty department.

A witness from KCC Minority Communities Achievement Service spoke of the problems she felt Gypsy and Traveller families experience accessing mainstream education. The choice of school was affected by their mobile lifestyle and it was often difficult for them to get their children into a local school. On the one hand if they did not declare their status when enrolling their children in school to assist integration with other children, it was difficult to ensure that they received the appropriate level of support from the education system; on the other hand if they declared their Gypsy and Traveller status there was every chance that discrimination would follow. As no one from the local education authority was called to provide evidence to prove or refute these claims so it is reasonable to suggest that any future work investigating educational exclusion would need to be on hand to provide context and explain any work in progress to deal with this issue.

To the extent that crime and anti-social behaviour was concerned, it was recognised that, like any other group Gypsies and Travellers had criminal elements within their community and that they should be responsible for their actions. However, there was a feeling that the Gypsy and Traveller community suffered from harassment and prejudice in a greater degree than many other sectors of the population and to a greater extent than other minorities. It was suggested that often the presence of a gypsy and traveller site was used as a 'scapegoat' for crime in the local community. Nonetheless it was recognised that work was being done to foster better relations between police and the Gypsy and Traveller community. More specifically, two of the Community Safety Officers in the PSU were singled out for their positive approach.

Overall, communication between various agencies was not good although efforts were being made to address this, and pockets of good practice exist. The problem for the council was how to tie the various elements that interact with the Gypsy and Traveller community together.

Whilst it was appreciated that some parts of the council have engaged with the Gypsy and Traveller community, be it through planning, housing or other areas, coordination of approach and understanding of gypsy and traveller issues within the council would be a good basis for improvement. A more formal approach would build on the existing informal officer group that contains representatives of the main council departments.

The review heard that in a wider sense the culture and life of the gypsy and traveller community is not well known outside it. Although there are pockets of good practice, for example the BBC has information and advice on its website, Members suggested that celebrating the culture of the Gypsy and Traveller community could be something the council could include within its wider cultural programme.

### *Recommendation 3*

*The panel recommended that a specialist officer group be set up to coordinate the councils approach to gypsy and traveller issues and act as a source of information and advice. An officer of appropriate experience and seniority should chair it. It should contain representatives of all the main council departments and have strong links to the council's Corporate Equalities and Access Group and the County Council.*

### **Session 3 – The Travelling community**

This was a short discussion with two of the travellers who had given evidence to the previous session. Many of the points made then were re-stated, especially the need to build trust with the council and other public bodies.

The witness said that they ran a support group for Gypsies and Travellers, assisting with issues related to the completing of forms, for example council tax. They received no support for this and felt that generally Gypsies and Travellers are not well represented by the voluntary sector.

Access to employment is another area where members of the Gypsy and Traveller community have identified issues. It was suggested that much of the seasonal work that sustained the Gypsy and Traveller community is now being carried out by migrant workers from other countries, for example Eastern European migrant workers (although further work would need to be carried out to identify if this was a particular problem in East Kent). Facilitating access to employment and training may be another area where the council could make a difference.

A member of the panel suggested that a role for the council might be to help voluntary Gypsy and Traveller groups to access mainstream funding and build up a network of 'access points' that allowed official bodies such as the council to engage with the diverse travelling community and build trust.

It was suggested by a member of the panel that the council needed a specific officer with responsibility for Gypsy and Traveller issues, although it was appreciated that this was costly and that very few district councils could afford

such a resource. In many cases the expertise is developed ad hoc by council staff that have dealings with Gypsies and Travellers, such as planning and environmental enforcement officers. It was suggested that a way forward might be to share the costs between authorities and have a 'Gypsy and Traveller liaison officer'.

Other suggestions for better relations were that more information on Gypsy and Traveller lifestyles should be made available and that more face-to-face contact sessions such as those carried out by the review should be arranged for key officers.

Disappointingly, the other witnesses were unable to attend the meeting, but the chairman asked for another session to be held after the review had concluded. This might be facilitated under the face-to-face contact sessions suggested above.

#### *Recommendation 4*

*The panel therefore recommended that the officer group suggested in recommendation 3, consider the feasibility of recruiting a specific Gypsy and Traveller liaison officer to lead the council's approach; and if the costs and duties could be shared with neighbouring authorities.*

#### *Recommendation 5*

*It was also recommended that this officer liaison group should commission an audit of informal traveller liaison groups, for example, the Whitstable and Herne Bay Gypsy Support Group. The aim would be to: promote understanding of the council's role, build the advocacy capacity of voluntary organisations and encourage their sustainability.*

### **Discussion**

The history of conflict between the Gypsies and Travellers and the settled community is well documented in many places, for example the Commission for Racial Equality Gypsy and Travellers strategy 2004 – 2007. The strategy also outlines some of the discrimination and inequalities faced by travellers.

In the face of this and evidence heard as a part of the review, the main question is: what can the council practically do about this in the short term and what steps can it take to achieve longer term improvements?

It is clear from the limited enquiries carried out by the review that a clear lead by the council to foster better communication between Gypsies and Travellers and the settled community will help break down some of the barriers to better relations.

The council is already doing some work through the equalities and access policy that contains clear actions for monitoring take up of service, training and consultation. Gypsy and Traveller housing needs will be considered as part of the Housing Strategy Review and the results will inform council planning strategies.

When giving guidance to local authorities on planning applications from Gypsies and Travellers, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Local

Government Circular<sup>3</sup>, states that: “*Local authorities may wish to consider designating a named person to deal with all such enquiries/applications or have a named person with whom the applicants can maintain contact, and consider what specific training may be required for staff dealing with gypsy and traveller applications and the associated issues.*”

This advice builds on comments expressed earlier in the circular recommending that communication with the Gypsy and Traveller community is direct and accessible, to minimise conflict and tension, although the lack of resources is also cited as a further difficulty.

An initial examination of the available data indicated that where good practice exists, it is usually where council’s have ‘looked beyond’ their usual planning related responsibilities and engaged with the Gypsy and Traveller community on a wider basis.

One of the difficulties is that the responsibilities for functions that impact on the gypsy and traveller community are located in separate agencies, for example, planning, health and education. Whilst Canterbury as a district council can improve its approach for the things it is responsible for, it only has an influencing and advocacy role for the work of other agencies.

From the examples above, it seems clear that in authorities that demonstrate good practice, there is a commitment to deal with Gypsies and Travellers in a broader sense than in terms of enforcement. In simple terms this may be clearly communicating what the councils responsibilities are in certain areas to a more complex role of broker between different agencies. The work here would build on the Kent-wide Gypsy and Traveller inter-agency protocol.

#### *Recommendation 6*

*The panel therefore recommended that the council officer group set out in recommendation 3 should look into more effective ways of coordinating the other statutory agency work (health, education) possibly working through the Canterbury District Community Partnership.*

---

<sup>3</sup> ODPM Circular 01/2006 ‘Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites’ 2 February 2006, Annex D, page 23

## **The way forward – summary of recommendations**

To enable a better approach to Gypsy and Traveller issues and to foster an approach that is consistent with the latest government guidance (See Appendix A) the review panel recommends that:

### *Recommendation 1*

*The panel recommended that specific training on Gypsy and Traveller issues should be given to front-line officers, for example those serving in the council's contact centre, to ensure that enquiries from this sector of the community are handled in a sensitive and appropriate manner.*<sup>4</sup>

### *Recommendation 2*

*To help with this improvement in communications, the panel also recommended that to overcome the literacy-related difficulties encountered by travellers that the councils Marketing and Communications team look into non-written ways of communicating key council policies such as planning and housing.*

### *Recommendation 3*

*The panel recommended that a specialist officer group be set up to coordinate the councils approach to Gypsy and Traveller issues and act as a source of information and advice. An officer of appropriate experience and seniority should chair it. It should contain representatives of all the main council departments and have strong links to the councils Corporate Equalities and Access Group and the County Council.*

### *Recommendation 4*

*The panel therefore recommended that the officer group suggested in recommendation 3, consider the feasibility of recruiting a specific Gypsy and Traveller liaison officer to lead the council's approach; and if the costs and duties could be shared with neighbouring authorities.*<sup>5</sup>

### *Recommendation 5*

*It was also recommended that this officer liaison group should commission an audit of informal traveller liaison groups, for example, the Whitstable and Herne Bay Gypsy Support Group. The aim would be to: promote understanding of the council's role, build the advocacy capacity of voluntary organisations and encourage their sustainability.*

### *Recommendation 6*

*The panel therefore recommended that the council officer group set out in recommendation 3 should look into more effective ways of coordinating the other statutory agency work (health, education) possibly working through the Canterbury District Community Partnership.*

---

<sup>4</sup> The costs for this will depend on the numbers of officers trained and the level of training. At the current time no specific funding has been allocated for this training.

<sup>5</sup> The cost of recruiting an officer to deal with Gypsy and Traveller issues is estimated to cost in the region of £25,000 to £35,000 pa. More detailed costing would be required in terms of grade, responsibilities and management on-costs if the recommendation were to be pursued.

## **Appendix A - Revised planning guidance**

As a result of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, where Parliament agreed to review the 1994 guidance on gypsy and traveller sites and planning, the ODPM produced a consultation paper in 2004: *Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Sites*. A government circular was recently released.

### **The new Gypsy & Traveller Sites Circular**

The key changes to the Circular compared to the previous Circular (1/94) are:

- A change to the definition of Gypsy and Traveller - The new definition recognizes that Gypsies may stop travelling, either permanently or temporarily, for health or educational reasons or because of caring responsibilities;
- A requirement that local authorities identify suitable sites for Gypsies and Travellers in their development plan documents. Only exceptionally would it be acceptable to meet needs by specifying criteria for the identification of sites without identifying any specific sites;
- New guidance on drafting the criteria in development plans against which applications for sites not allocated in the plan will be judged. The existing Circular said that criteria should be clear and realistic. The new guidance strengthens this advice saying they should be fair, reasonable, realistic and effective in delivering sites. The draft Circular states that this should result in positive criteria offering greater certainty to applicants and local residents;
- The new guidance also asks local planning authorities to give consideration to allocation of “mixed planning use” sites for Gypsies and Travellers, incorporating both residential and business uses, having regard to the amenity of the area;
- An explanation of how local housing assessments will assist local authorities to quantify the level of need and how the new planning system and the involvement of Regional Housing Boards will translate that need into allocations in the planning process (the Regional Housing Strategy, indicates that Gypsy and Traveller sites will contribute to the stock of rural affordable housing);
- A section on local authorities' responsibilities under the Race Relations Act;
- The inclusion of advice on how local authorities should seek to engage with Gypsies and Travellers and build trust; and
- The inclusion of advice to Gypsies and Travellers, and their representatives, as to how they should engage with the planning system.

## Appendix C - Management Team advice for Executive on Traveller Short Topic Scrutiny Review Recommendations

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Estimated Cost	Management Team advice
1	The panel recommended that specific training on Gypsy and Traveller issues should be given to front-line officers, for example those serving in the council's contact centre, to ensure that enquiries from this sector of the community are handled in a sensitive and appropriate manner	The costs for this will depend on the numbers of officers trained and the level of training. At the current time no specific funding has been allocated for this training.	<b>Accept</b> - subject to funding as part of the Equalities and inclusion policy action plan
2	To help with this improvement in communications, the panel also recommended that to overcome the literacy-related difficulties encountered by travellers that the councils Marketing and Communications team look into non-written ways of communicating key council policies such as planning and housing.	The cost will again depend on level of funding. Discussions with the communications team indicate that providing information in tape format or through postcards would cost in the region of £200 to £500.	<b>Accept</b> - subject to funding as part of the Equalities and inclusion policy action plan
3	The panel recommended that a specialist officer group be set up to coordinate the councils approach to Gypsy and Traveller issues and act as a source of information and advice. An officer of appropriate experience and seniority should chair it. It should contain representatives of all the main council departments and have strong links to the councils Corporate Equalities and Access Group and the County Council.	The costs will mainly be in officer time. A group of officers exists and meets to consider the emerging legislative developments and improve ways in which the council can respond to it.	<b>Accept</b> – A group of officers exists and meets to consider the issues.
4	The panel therefore recommended that the officer group suggested in recommendation 3, consider the feasibility of recruiting a specific Gypsy and Traveller liaison officer to lead the council's approach; and if the costs and duties could be shared with neighbouring authorities.	The cost of recruiting an officer to deal with Gypsy and Traveller issues is estimated to cost in the region of £25,000 to £35,000 pa. More detailed costing would be required in terms of grade, responsibilities and management on-costs if the recommendation were to be pursued.	<b>Decline</b> – The relevant funds are not currently available and very few district councils have the budget to recruit a specialist officer.. Instead the officer group suggested in recommendation 3 should take on this role in conjunction with the Corporate Equalities Group.

5	It was also recommended that this officer liaison group should commission an audit of informal traveller liaison groups, for example, the Whitstable and Herne Bay Gypsy Support Group. The aim would be to: promote understanding of the council's role, build the advocacy capacity of voluntary organisations and encourage their sustainability.	Officer time	<b>Receive and note</b> - Although it might be an inexpensive way of increasing capacity in this area. Suggest including in the working group remit.
6	The panel therefore recommended that the council officer group set out in recommendation 3 should look into more effective ways of coordinating the other statutory agency work (health, education) possibly working through the Canterbury District Community Partnership.	Officer time	<b>Receive and note</b> - This is an issue that lends itself to the Community Partnership although it would be best incorporated into the Health and Wellbeing subgroup of the Community Partnership.