

## MINUTES

10.00 am – 12.00 noon  
Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2015  
Ivory Place, Brighton Friends Centre, Morley Street, Brighton

### Present:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Cllr Emma Daniel      | Joint Chair & BHCC  |
| Geraldine Des Moulins | Joint Chair & Third Sector Equalities Representative (Disability) |
| Karin Divall          | Adult Social Care, BHCC   |
| Melinda King          | East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service                                 |
| Chris Lau             | Community Works   |
| Cllr Leo Littman      | BHCC  |
| Emma McDermott,       | Communities, Equality & Third Sector, BHCC                        |
| Rachel Musson         | BHCC  |
| Joanna Rowland-Stuart | LGBT Community Safety Forum/Community Works                       |
| Kamini Sanghani       | SEETEC  |
| Councillor Dee Simson | BHCC  |
| Brian Warren          | Business Representation (Chamber of Commerce)                     |
| Laura Williams        | Third Sector Infrastructure Representative (Community Works)      |

### In attendance:

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| John Guzek       | Public Health Information Analyst, BHCC ( <i>Item 6 onwards</i> ) |
| Alistair Hill    | Public Health Consultant, BHCC ( <i>Item 5 onwards</i> )          |
| Sarah Tighe-Ford | Communities, Equalities & Third Sector, BHCC                      |
| Sam Warren       | Communities, Equality & Third Sector, BHCC                        |

### Apologies:

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Annie Alexander | Public Health, BHCC                     |
| Carolyn Bristow | Children's Services, BHCC               |
| Jane Lodge      | Brighton & Hove CCG                     |
| Simon Newell    | Brighton & Hove Connected               |
| David Palmer    | Sussex Police                           |
| Kirsty Walker   | Third Sector Communities Representative |
| Helen West      | Sussex Police                           |

|     |   | Action |
|-----|---|--------|
| 1.  | <b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>  |        |
| 1.1 | Geraldine Des Moulins welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular new members Joanna Rowland Stuart, Cllr Leo Littman and Cllr Emma Daniel. Round the table introductions were made by colleagues in attendance.<br><br>Apologies were noted, as above. |        |

|    |   | Action |
|----|---|--------|
| 2. | <p><b>Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising</b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting. It was noted that the actions from the previous meeting had either been actioned or were in hand.</p>  |        |
| 3. | <p><b>EQulP and the Neighbourhoods, Communities &amp; Equality Committee</b></p> <p>ED explained the background to the Neighbourhoods, Communities and Equalities Committee and made the following key points;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NCE Committee had been set up in response to the Council’s vision for the city in a time of budget cuts. As an asset-based, partnership approach with the public, rather than a corporate approach, the aim of the NCE Committee was to make sure the public felt that they had ownership of public spaces, public services and democracy.</li> <li>• The community sector should be seen as the ‘the jewel in the crown’ with regard to this opportunity for the city, because of their drive to get things done.</li> <li>• For the first time the agenda of neighbourhoods, communities and equalities had a relevant democratic structure and a lead member solely focused on this agenda. With a formal link between EQulP and the NCE committee as Cllr. Daniel as chair of committee and joint chair of the partnership.</li> <li>• EQulP would feed directly into the work of the NCE Committee and vice versa. referring matters both upwards and downwards.</li> <li>• The NCE Committee was a key policy-making committee and ED said that, as Chair, she was committed to driving the agenda. The committee would look outwards rather than inwards and take a positive approach focussing on solutions.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion followed and the following key points were made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EQulP partnership should not be confined by the formal relationship between itself and the NCE Committee. ED confirmed that the partnership would also be able to submit questions, make deputations, etc, in accordance with the normal democratic process.</li> <li>• EM explained that EQulP would develop proposals to be taken to the NCE Committee for their response and as part of the process towards Council sign-up, which would give the EQulP partnership a stronger position in the decision-making process.</li> </ul> |        |

|  | Action                             |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that the NCE Committee was chaired by Cllr Daniel, with Cllr Moonan as Deputy Chair, and membership of the committee included councillors from all three groups, including Cllrs Simson and Littman from EQUiP. LW confirmed that the Community Works representatives would be Jo Martindale of the Hangleton &amp; Knoll Project (for neighbourhoods) and Hannan Mansi of HOPE Sussex (for equalities). Others would be invited to participate on the committee as and when the need arose.</li> <li>• It was noted that Cllr Moonan was taking the lead for the NCE Committee on the issue of rough sleeping.</li> <li>• CL commented that there was a lot more work to be done with regard to GP clusters in different areas of the city and room for improvement in public health, where GPs were key in terms of Adult Social Care. ED suggested giving thought to hubs in communities and how GPs worked in this respect. GDM commented that neighbourhoods and GP clusters did not always communicate with one another very well and the challenge would be in resolving issues around GP clusters. The city has an issue of a myriad of different boundaries for different structures and function, i.e LATs, GP clusters, children centre area.</li> <li>• DS gave assurance that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, of which she was chair, would be keeping a very close eye on the issue of GP provision in the city, as there was significant concern around this issue. DS would provide a link between EQUiP and the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee.</li> <li>• GDM commented that previously the partnership's agenda had been dominated by the council's priorities. She welcomed the NCE Committee's commitment to a partnership approach.</li> <li>• ED gave assurance that the council was absolutely focussed on improving and achieving a more collaboration relationship with partners and residents. Citizen voice and involvement at the heart of service changes. It was acknowledged, however, that the council could not be expected to deliver everything and would more and more take the role of coordinator/enabler where appropriate.</li> <li>• JRS commented that an increasing proportion of the social housing stock was being managed by housing associations and there was a lack of affordable social housing for disabled people. Her experience had informed her that the influence of the Council over third parties in this respect was minimal and she asked whether the partnership felt this was a fair comment. ED to come back with a response at the next meeting. Cllr Littman pointed out that as far as council influence over third parties was concerned, much depended on the wording of contracts with third parties.</li> <li>• It was suggested that the partnership should consider making representations to housing associations/ private developers on accessibility of housing developments, and to consider the role and power of planning, and the council's</li> </ul> | <p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>ED</b></p> |

|   | Action            |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>own housing developments. DS commented that this issue should be addressed through the Planning Committee and fed through the Planning Department.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JRS commented that the Prestamex building could provide a perfect opportunity to make an accessible development from the outset. However, this development was stalled as it had not been given permission.</li> <li>• Members of the partnership to provide ED with contact details of any housing associations they knew of with particular expertise and experience in the field of accessible housing.</li> <li>• It was noted that housing schemes for older people were provided in the city through Guinness and Hanover housing associations and it was agreed to look at these schemes, as well as the council's own development at Whitehawk in terms of accessibility. GDM made the point that older people did not necessarily want sheltered housing, but required accessible housing so they could remain independent in their own homes for as long as possible. It was agreed that this work should be consider as part of delivering the disability and equality work.</li> <li>• DS had attended the recent Health &amp; Wellbeing Partnership meeting, where the need for different kinds of housing had been highlighted, including housing where people were supported but still independent.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. EQUP and the Fairness Commission</b></p> <p>The Fairness Commission has been set up as an independent commission with the aim of ensuring that everyone, no matter where they live in the city, has a share in the economic success and that everyone has the opportunity to lead healthy and productive lives in financial security and in cohesive communities</p> <p>ED explained that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A paper on the impact of welfare reforms would be submitted to the NCE Committee in November.</li> <li>• Members of the Fairness Commission had been invited to sit on the commission as individuals with professional expertise, not as representatives. Each member had been chosen for their track record in understanding and driving policy.</li> <li>• The commission would provide scrutiny over data already available and produce a desktop review. They would look at a range of issues and conduct a series of public meetings.</li> </ul> | <p><b>ALL</b></p> |

|   | Action                             |
|---|------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lines of enquiry to be set up by the commission were not yet known, but the council had set the parameters and had requested only smart targets as a result of the process.</li> <li>The commission's meetings would be in community venue, web-cast as well as signed. It had a Facebook page and a twitter account @FairnessBH</li> <li>It had been decided that the term 'fairness' would not be treated too broadly and the role of the commission would be to examine fair access to good health, good education and good employment.</li> <li>The membership of the Fairness Commission had recently been made public. It was noted that the membership represented a good mix of national and local people and a good blend of experience and expertise.</li> <li>It was noted that the first public meeting of the commission was due to be held on 26<sup>th</sup> November at 6.00 pm. It was intended to hold 6 public meetings in total, 5 of which would have an agenda set by the commission. The agenda of the final meeting had been left empty at this stage. It was likely that each public meeting would focus on one topic. The first closed meeting of the commission was due to be held on 24<sup>th</sup> September.</li> <li>The report of the Fairness Commission would be produced in May/June 2016.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion followed and the following key points were made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GDM suggested that consideration could be given to other ways of engaging people in the process, as public meetings were not necessarily the best place to engage with equality groups. It was noted that whilst any voluntary groups could hold a meeting about Fairness, Community Works would be coordinating this more formally and interested parties should contact either Julia Reddaway or Community Works direct.</li> <li>It was noted that the work currently commissioned by the council with various equality groups (BME, LGBT and disability) would support discussion with these communities about their experience and perspective of fairness using a set of question designed for the Commission. Community Works would also be promoting the questions and urging as many community and voluntary groups as possible to respond to the Fairness Commission. EM to send the questions to EQuIP.</li> <li>LW confirmed that the disability engagement partnership was already looking at how it would facilitate conversations with disabled people on the Fairness Commission questions.</li> </ul> | <p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>EM</b></p> |

|  | Action   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that the partnership should give more consideration to different ways of doing outreach work especially in terms of neighbourhoods. This could be done through the Local Area Teams (LATs).</li> <li>• The Commission would inform the council's budget-making and policy-making. However, it was noted that not every idea/proposal fed into the Commission would necessarily result in a recommendation.</li> <li>• ED commented that not all recommendations would fall to the council to implement. She asked all members of the partnership to help with the challenge engaging people in and getting information back to the Fairness Commission.</li> <li>• JRS pointed out that two sectors of the equality community had not been mentioned so far – the trans community and the deaf community – whom she felt were sometimes overlooked. It was acknowledged that the Trans needs assessment would be fed into the Fairness Commission. ED, as Chair of EQuIP sub-group for Trans gave reassurance that this group would be taking forward the Trans Need assessment recommendations and encouraging Trans involvement in the Fairness Commission.</li> <li>• JRS asked if the FC meetings could be sub-titled as well, as not all deaf people used sign language. ED to check whether this might be possible. It was noted that notes from the Fairness Commission would be circulated after each meeting.</li> <li>• EM to re-send the link to the Fairness Commission to EQuIP, together with information on the Commission's Twitter account.<br/><br/>Twitter: @FairnessBH<br/><br/>Web address: <a href="https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/content/council-and-democracy/fairness-commission">https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/content/council-and-democracy/fairness-commission</a></li> <li>• EM emphasised that the EQuIP partnership's involvement in the processes of the Fairness Commission would be very important, and the partnership would need to consider its response to the Commission's findings and recommendations. It was noted that recommendations would go forward from the Fairness Commission not only to the council but all organisations/sectors in the city relevant to the recommendations.</li> <li>• BW suggested contacting Radio Reverb, as they produced a number of shows aimed at range of different communities. He could provide the contact information.</li> </ul> | <p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>ED</b></p> <p><b>EM</b></p> <p><b>EM</b></p> |

|  | Action                        |
|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>5. <b>Trans Needs Assessment (TNA) – Report from EQuIP Trans Sub-Group Meeting 17.09.15</b></p> <p>Alistair Hill presented this item and explained that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TNA had grown out of the Trans Equality Scrutiny Panel, which had reported in 2013 and recommended that a wider needs assessment be undertaken. There had been early consultation with the Trans community and it had been decided that there was a need for a steering group for the work and in terms of governance a place for the work to be held, to report to and in the long term monitored. It was agreed this should be the EQuIP Trans Sub-Group.</li> <li>A joint strategic needs assessment process had been undertaken and progress reported to the Equality Trans Sub-Group, now chaired by ED. This process had taken a broad perspective and included data collection, interviews, input from stakeholders.</li> <li>The Steering Group had agreed the initial report, recommendations had been discussed and the process had been democratic. The Needs Assessment report would be available on the website within the next week, and an executive summary had been circulated to the partnership.</li> <li>The document 'Trans Living' had been produced in July 2015, which included the findings but not the recommendations.</li> <li>It was noted that this had been a wide-reaching approach focussing on needs and vulnerabilities. 2750 trans people had responded to the surveys but the actual number of trans people in the city was likely to be more than that.</li> <li>Although B&amp;H was perceived as a very trans friendly city, it was not always the safe haven that people thought. There were lower numbers of trans people in</li> </ul> | <p>EM</p> <p>EM</p> <p>ED</p> |

|  | Action |
|--|--------|
| <p>good health than amongst the rest of the community, a high level of mental health need and issues around NHS waiting times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trans people often had more than one identity and this was an important consideration. Improvements had been seen in GPs, pharmacies and SGIs. <i>Clear asset for the city but it was in an early stage of its development.</i> There was a high level of stress reported from people volunteering in those services because the statutory services were not necessarily delivering. Hate incidents and homelessness were particular issues to consider.</li> <li>• It was noted that trans people moved regularly and there were a lot of people on housing lists.</li> <li>• The TNA had 62 recommendations. There was now an awareness of areas where services could be improved and this work was underway, if it had not already been done. It should be seen as a success rather than a failure, in terms of taking it forward through the EQulP Trans Sub-Group.</li> </ul> <p>STF provide reassurance on the above, as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EQulP Trans Sub-Group comprised members of organisations from EQulP and the trans community, the police, and was chaired by ED. Its role since 2013 had been to meet quarterly and review progress on the original recommendations, providing regular updates to provide reassurance on progress. A report on progress against the recommendations from the Trans Equality Scrutiny report was presented annually to the council's Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee (OSC). The proposal now was that a final report would go to OCS closing down the progress updates with most actions having been completed. Outstanding recommendations would be combined and monitored with the TNA recommendations and progress would be reported to EQulP.</li> <li>• At the last meeting of Trans sub-group, the Scrutiny recommendations had been reviewed and their status noted in terms of completion, alteration and monitoring.</li> <li>• The sub-group was due to meet again in 6 weeks' time, to look at the Trans Need recommendations, and report back and generate an Action Plan covering 3 years for all actions to be implemented.</li> <li>• It was agreed that information from each sub-group meeting would subsequently be provided to the partnership. This would be useful in itself but also in deciding whether particular actions, especially those that were 'stuck' needed to come to the partnership board.</li> </ul> |        |

|   |  | Action    |
|---|--|-----------|
| 6 | <p><b>Draft Disability Equality Report and next steps</b></p> <p>John Guzek took the meeting through his presentation (a summary of the disability report circulated to members prior to the meeting) and the following key points were made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EM reminded the group that scoping the Disability Needs Project had been discussed at the last meeting and the project was taking an issues-based approach concerned with social barriers, not a 'needs assessment' concerned with impairment.</li> <li>• Some resources had been allocated from the council and the CCG and the council for the Disability Equality project.</li> <li>• JG confirmed that the definition of disability used in the project was a broad one and that mental health data had also been included in the census figures.</li> <li>• LL asked whether the data included physical disabilities associated with ageing. It was agreed that whilst this would be an interesting analysis, it may not be possible to undertake this in any depth. It was acknowledged that a lot of older people were on their own and it was important to look at all the data.</li> <li>• JRS commented that some people might downplay their disability, eg sickle cell anaemia in the BME community, and suggested that this should be borne in mind when looking at the statistics.</li> <li>• It was noted that the data was based on self-reporting and that this should also be borne in mind, as there may be reasons why people from particular backgrounds might not self-report.</li> <li>• It was acknowledged that some of the data was less robust, but JRS pointed out that there should be robust data on the number of people accessing food banks. JG to check this.</li> <li>• It was suggested that the working group could also look at the Welfare Reform Act. GDM commented that a lot of welfare reforms had not impacted on the city yet.</li> <li>• It was noted that there were more disabled people in employment in this area than average, probably due to smaller employers, CVS employers and self-</li> </ul> | <p>JG</p> |

|  | Action                                      |
|--|---|
| <p>employed people. JRS pointed out that the data did not include figures for people who had been <i>sanctioned</i>?</p> <p><i>DS left the meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JRS asked if it might be possible for a city map of dropped kerbs to be produced and consideration to be given to putting in dropped kerbs whenever a pavement was re-laid. ED commented that the changes at the Vogue Gyratory in this respect had been a great success. GDM said that this discussion should be held whenever a new building was planned.</li> <li>JRS identified a gap in data around sensory impairment and GDM asked JG to address this and provide some data about hearing loss. JG said it might be difficult to break things down further from the data already seen. ED commented that there was a cultural aspect to describing deafness as a disability.</li> <li>It was agreed to set up a Disability Equality Sub-Group of EQUiP, which should not be 'council-centric'. Anyone interested in volunteering for this to let EM know. LW nominated Jenny Moore. It was agreed to invite JG to these sub-group meetings. It was agreed that GDM would chair the first meeting, at which a permanent chair would be agreed.</li> <li>It had been agreed at the last meeting that it was not for EQUiP to decide the way forward. The partnership would present its findings and identify where work was needed and ask stakeholders to come on board. This would be a solution-focussed piece of work, to fit in with the themes of the Fairness Commission. It was suggested that a stakeholder event might be held and the Disability Sub-Group could feed into this.</li> <li>EM confirmed that the work on the Trans, BME and Disability sectors would be done as a phased approach as part of a 3 year Action Plan.</li> <li>ED reiterated that the Fairness Commission would focus on access to good health, employment and education and 'working smart', with the intention of expanding to work in further areas. There was enthusiastic support from the group for that proposal.</li> <li>GDM thanked JG for his presentation, which she acknowledged as a very important piece of work.</li> </ul> <p><b>7. Community Engagement Framework Refresh</b></p> <p>SW reminded everyone about the Community Engagement Framework Refresh consultation due to be held on 7<sup>th</sup> October at the Brighthelm Centre. The refresh would focus on collaboration and resilience. There were still places available and</p> | <p><b>JG</b></p> <p><b>ALL &amp; EM</b></p> |

|   |  | Action  |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p>SW asked those not already booked on the event to consider it, and to promote it amongst their work and social networks. Any questions on the event in the meantime to be directed to SW.</p>   | <b>ALL</b>  |
| <b>8.</b>   | <b>Any other business</b>  |   |
| 8.1   | <p><u>Action Learning Programme on the Social Value Act</u></p> <p>It was noted that the council, the CCG and the community and voluntary sector are been taking part in a national Action Learning Programme on the Social Value Act. ED said the council should be proud of this, as only four local authorities across the country had been chosen to participate. EM to provide an update on this at the next EQuIP meeting.</p>         | <b>EM</b>   |
| 8.2   | <p><u>Launch of Equalities Profile</u></p> <p>Kate Gilchrist had attended the last EQuIP meeting, at which scoping of the equalities profile produced by the data website had been discussed. EM reported that the profile had now been completed as a web-based platform for anyone to use. It was intended to arrange an EQuIP launch event to sell this to other partners, which would probably be a half-day event before Christmas.</p> | <b>EM</b>   |
| <b>9</b>  | <p><b>Date of the next meeting</b></p> <p><b>Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015, 10.00 am – 12.00 noon, Stanmer Room, Brighthelm Centre</b></p> <p>Future meetings:</p> <p>Tuesday 19 January 2016, 10am – noon, Friends Meeting House</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Summary of Abbreviations and Partnerships/Services referenced in minutes:</b></p> <p><b>EQuIP:</b> Equality &amp; Inclusion Partnership<br/> <b>B&amp;HCC:</b> Brighton &amp; Hove City Council<br/> <b>CCG:</b> Clinical Commissioners Group</p> |  | <p><b>CEF:</b> Community Engagement Framework<br/> <b>DEA:</b> Disability Equality Assessment</p> |