LCCC PEACEPLUS Partnership

**Minutes of the proceedings of the LCCC PEACEPLUS Partnership held in the Chestnut Suite, Civic Headquarters, Lagan Valley Island,**

**Monday 13th November 2023 at 5.30pm**

# In Attendance - Partnership:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cllr Jonathan Craig - Chair | DUP |
| Cllr Uel Mackin | DUP |
| Cllr John Laverty - ZOOM | DUP |
| Ald Amanda Grehan | APNI |
| Ald Michelle Guy | APNI |
| Cllr Gretta Thompson - ZOOM | APNI |
| Cllr Claire Kemp | APNI |
| Cllr Alan Martin | UUP |
| Cllr Gary McCleave (Deputy Mayor) - ZOOM | SF |
| Cllr John Gallen - ZOOM | SDLP |
| Johnny Crymble | EA |
| Des Marley | NIHE |
| Ian McCormick ZOOM | PSNI |
| Janice Cooke | SERC |
| Lynda Vladeneau - ZOOM | SEHSCT |
| Adrian Bird | Resurgam Trust |
| Mabel Scullion | Early Intervention Lisburn |
| Diane Ewart - ZOOM | TADA Rural Network |
| Caroline Birch - ZOOM | Helping Hands Autism |
| Pauline McMullan - ZOOM | Lisburn YMCA |
| Jenny Magee (deputy) | Lisburn YMCA |
| Thomas McKenna | Killultagh |
| Tanya Hughes | Castlereagh East |
| Lynsey Agnew | Lisburn North |
| Martin Busch | Lisburn South |
| Glen Coburn (deputy) | Downshire East |

# 

# Secretariat/ Other Attendees:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Angela McCann | Head of Communities |
| Niamh O’Carolan | Peace Manager |
| Catharine McWhirter | Community Planning Manager |
| Lorraine McCourt | Consultant (for LCCC) |

# Apologies

# Apologies were received from The Right Worshipful the Mayor, Cllr Gowan and Cllr Hynds.

**2. Welcome and Introductions**

The Chair, Cllr Craig, welcomed everyone and invited attendees to introduce themselves.

# 3. Minutes of the Partnership Meeting held on 18th October 2023 and Matters Arising

Cllr Craig invited members to review the minutes of the last meeting for accuracy. Members agreed that the minutes of the previous Partnership meeting held on 18th October 2023 were a true and accurate reflection of the meeting.

RESOLVED: To adopt the minutes of the Partnership meeting held on 18th October 2023 as a true and accurate reflection of the meeting.

Proposed: Cllr Mackin Seconded: Martin Busch

**4. Declaration of any interest or conflict for items on the meeting agenda**

There were no declarations of interest/ conflict made. It was agreed that declarations could be made during the course of the meeting.

**5. PEACEPLUS update**

**SEUPB Directive Memo**

The Head of Communities referred members to the SEUPB memo received by the Peace Manager on the afternoon of Friday 10th November and sent to members earlier in the day. Angela advised that for Theme 1 (capital investments) partners have to be identified before submission of the Action Plan meaning that an expression of interest process needs to be triggered in advance of the Christmas break. In the memo SEUPB had advised councils of a new submission date of 28th March 2024 to accommodate the expression of interest process.

Cllr McCleave asked when the call process needs to begin and Angela explained that once the template is approved, the call will happen before Christmas with a closure date in January. Martin Busch enquired would it only be ‘shovel ready’ projects that could apply and Angela clarified that groups would need to be in a ready state, beyond concept design and preferably have planning in place to be in a certain state of readiness to tie in with the key dates of the PEACEPLUS programme. She continued that there would likely be a mixture of tendered and partner delivered projects.

Cllr Kemp asked that if it only applied to Theme 1, could that element be delayed but Angela confirmed that it was an integral plan and it would be submitted in its entirety for the March deadline. Thomas McKenna requested if the timeline would be affected and the Peace Manager replied that the end date was still December 2027 but this may be reviewed during the course of the programme.

**Theme 2 Projects**

Angela referred members to the list of Theme 2 projects that they received on Friday and to the summary sheet of Theme 2 projects they received earlier in the day. Martin Busch enquired if the same participants could be counted twice if they attended different projects. Consultant for LCCC, Lorraine McCourt explained that each project was distinct so participants can attend different programmes and effectively be counted again as long as progression was achieved in doing so.

Cllr Craig asked could participants be tracked throughout the programme. Lorraine outlined that a pragmatic approach needed to be adopted and the monitoring and evaluation system would pick up participant numbers and other demographic data but possibly not tracking the same participants.

Adrian Bird enquired why the outline project for the LC Youth Council was named and ring fenced when other projects were not specifically identified. He was in support of the Youth Council however recognised that other youth committees were not specifically mentioned. Niamh explained that it was brought up during the consultation process and was identified as a partner led type project. Johnny Crymble clarified that the Youth Council was a community planning priority in the LCCC Community Plan Niamh suggested that the Youth Council element could sit under the Youth Leadership programme and the budgets could be reviewed accordingly.

Cllr Guy questioned why the community split was 60% PUL and 40% CNR. She added that she felt uncomfortable with the community terms especially as many don’t identify as either. Martin Busch agreed with Cllr Guy stipulating that it didn’t reflect community thinking anymore. It was suggested that it be reworded as majority / minority. Niamh explained that as it was a peace programme, SEUPB wanted to reflect that the demographic split of 70/30 in LCCC was reflected in programme participants She added that those who identify as ‘other’ or ‘none’ are included in this ratio. Lorraine McCourt further explained that SEUPB is more relaxed about the community split but there is an aspiration to achieve 60/40, including other cultures.

Ald Guy further asked about the costings in Theme 2 and how they were arrived at. Niamh clarified that this was a draft budget, costings were based on previous programmes, consultations, participant numbers but agreed that the budget could be altered to reflect greater need in certain areas of the different themes.

Cllr Laverty asked could single identity projects be funded and Niamh confirmed that as long as they progressed into cross community activities that it was eligible. Ald Grehan wanted to know why we mention North / South and not East / West as part of the programme but it was explained that that (rest of UK) was not part of the Peaceplus remit.

Caroline Birch asked how we would monitor cross community hours. Niamh said that while the process wasn’t as prescriptive this time,cross community hours need to be purposeful and meaningful. Caroline felt that the unit cost of each project was important reflecting value for money.

Des Marley reflected that sport was a powerful tool for reconciliation and requested that additional funds be allotted to this project. Angela indicated that making budget amendments was in order and members would have to agree those transfers. Martin Busch agreed there were lots of opportunities to engage young people across the offer of the Theme 2 projects. Cllr Kemp reported that she was uncomfortable taking funds off the LC Youth Council. Angela reminded members that there would be further opportunities under Theme 3 projects as well for engaging young people.

Cllr Mackin asked if the Youth Council didn’t receive any funding would it be detrimental to its continuation, otherwise the allotted amount of £30k could be transferred to the Sport project. A discussion ensued about where savings might be made on some projects to increase the fund of others with a greater need. Pauline McMullan said it was important to ask officers to gather more information on the subject of Youth Council vs Sport projects. She suggested that the Youth Council work more collaboratively with other youth forums across the council area. Angela pointed out that the Community Network project could be tender delivered or directly delivered through council as work had been previously done on this through community planning.

It was proposed and agreed that the Theme 2 projects be reworked particularly in terms of budget allocation, taking on board the suggestions, for the next meeting.

# 6. Any Other Business

Cllr Laverty asked if the sound on zoom could be sorted for the next meeting as those attending online had issues hearing some of the discussions.

# 7. Date of Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting was agreed for Wednesday 29th November in the Chestnut Suite.

The meeting closed at 6.55pm.