

SHARED CITY PARTNERSHIP

MONDAY 10th SEPTEMBER, 2018

MEETING OF SHARED CITY PARTNERSHIP

Members present: Councillor Kyle (Chairperson); and
Councillor Walsh.

External Members: Ms. B. Arthurs, Community and Voluntary Sector;
Mrs. O. Barron, Belfast Health and Social Care Trust;
Mr. J. Currie, Community and Voluntary Sector;
Mr. K. Gibson, Church of Ireland;
Mrs. J. Hawthorne, Northern Ireland Housing Executive;
M Yousuf Hannore, Interfaith Partnership;
Ms. J. Irwin, Community Relations Council;
Mr. P. Mackel, Belfast and District Trades Union Council;
Mr. I. McLaughlin, Community and Voluntary Sector;
Mr. M. O'Donnell, Department for Communities;
Mr. P. Scott, Catholic Church; and
Ms. A. M. White, British Red Cross.

In attendance: 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 recorded on behalf of the Alderman Sandford and Councillors Armitage, Attwood, Johnston and also from Mr. M. Baker, Mrs. G. Duggan, Ms. G. Killen and Superintendent. R. Murdie.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 6th August were taken as read and signed as correct.

Declarations of Interest

Mr. I. McLaughlin declared an interest in agenda item 3, viz., Update on the Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme, as he was a Member of the Lower Shankill Community Association.

Presentation from the Education Authority on Shared Education

The Partnership was reminded that, at its meeting held on 6th August, following the update received from the Northern Ireland Housing Executive in respect of Shared Housing, it had agreed that an update report would be sought from the Education Authority regarding Shared Education.

Accordingly, Mr. S. Bradley, representing the Education Authority, was welcomed to the meeting by the Chairperson.

Mr Bradley commenced by defining Shared Education as follows: 'schools, from different sectors, providing opportunities for pupils, staff and the community to engage in collaborative and meaningful learning experiences'.

He provided the Partnership with an overview of the current participation levels in the shared education programme in Belfast in the various sectors which included nursery, primary, secondary, voluntary grammar and special schools.

The representative explained to the Partnership the rationale behind Shared Education, which included education benefits, societal benefits and economic benefits. He advised the Partnership that the focus was on realising educational and reconciliation outcomes through:

- shared classes and sharing of professional expertise leading to school improvement;
- making better use of limited resources;
- classroom-based learning;
- sustained timetabled curricular based sharing;
- delivering internally by partnership staff;
- whole schools and community engagement; and
- embedded sustainable collaboration.

He explained that the Shared Education vision was that schools from all sectors would be supported to form interdependent relationships which would create shared learning experiences, enabled by teacher professional learning and supported through networks of school improvement. The representative then proceeded to outline the measures being taken to try and realise this vision, which included details in respect of the following four connected programmes:

- DSC SESP;
- CASE (Peace IV);
- Shared Campus; and
- Strule Shared Education Campus.

Mr. Bradley then specifically referred to the CASE Programme which was a Shared Education Project supported by Europe through SEUPB and managed by the Education Authority, with a partner organisation in Ireland, Léargas. The project had a budget of €29m (2017-2011) and was open to schools not previously involved in shared education, however, only to primary and post primary.

He outlined that aims and objectives of the CASE Programme as follows:

- to increase the number of schools and young people participating in shared education;
- to provide continuous professional development for teachers;
- to support partnerships to progress within shared education; and
- to work towards sustainably/mainstreaming.

He outlined the targets, funding and numbers of schools and pupils participating in the programme.

The representative acknowledged that there were ongoing barriers and challenges and he stated that it was necessary to building on existing partnerships and to seek to

extend, enhance and complement existing programmes. Mr Bradley concluded his presentation by highlighting the need for Shared Education to focus on creating local pupil pathways that would enable lifelong contact beyond schools.

The representative then provided clarification on a number of issues which had been raised by the Partnership.

During discussion, the Members emphasised the importance of Shared Education and highlighted the long-term impact that successful Shared Education programmes could have for good relations by helping to create a diverse community for the future. The Partnership was keen to promote the uptake of Shared Education Programmes within local communities and felt that this could be achieved through collaborative working and complimentary programmes with other statutory organisations.

Given the interest in Shared Education, it was agreed that a separate meeting would be convened with the Education Authority, to which all Members of the Partnership would be invited, to discuss further how links could be developed between Shared Education and the work of the Partnership.

The Chairperson thanked the representative for his presentation and he left the meeting.

Presentation on the Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme

The Members were advised that Dr. J. Byrne, was in attendance in order to outline his findings in relation to the 2018 Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme.

Dr. J Byrne then presented his findings to the Members, which included an overview of the Programme and key observations on the July bonfires as follows:

- twenty-eight groups participated in the programme. Fifteen groups received £1,750 a further eleven received £1,250, one received £1,720 and one received £850.00;
- nine groups had a community festival instead of a traditional bonfire;
- eleven sites requested and received a beacon;
- prior to 8.30 p.m. on the 11th of July one site had flags and/or Nationalist/Republican symbols on the bonfire;
- in 2017 three sites had tyres on them, and four sites had flags and /or other Nationalist/Republican symbols on the bonfire; and
- in 2018 council officers were unable to engage with groups on the issues of bonfires until April 2018.

He outlined the issues around cultural activities and highlighted the emphasis placed on the celebration of culture within a positive, family environment through historical discussions and community festivals. He stated that there appeared to be an appetite in many communities to embrace the festivals concept and the potential to amalgamate sites and groups to host a large-scale event and stated that he felt it would be beneficial to explore the practicalities around the Council supporting such an approach. He also stated that it was his understanding that there was widespread support among some community groups for the use of beacons.

He detailed some of the challenges faced by Belfast City Council in terms of encouraging groups to become involved in the programme and concluded by outlining his recommendations going forward.

Dr. Byrne then addressed a number of questions which had been put to him by the Members and left the meeting.

Noted.

Update on Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

1.1 The purpose of this report is to update members on the delivery of the 2018 Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme. An external consultant was appointed to monitor sites that took part in the programme, he will attend the Shared City Partnership (SCP) meeting to present the report findings. A list of all groups who were approved for funding through the 2018 Programme are attached in Appendix 1.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 The Partnership is requested to recommend to the Strategic Policy and Resources (SP&R) committee that they note the contents of this report including the list of groups who received funding through the 2018 Programme, the findings from the monitoring and evaluation report and the details of the Review panel who will consider the participation of groups who failed to meet all of the programme guidelines.

3.0 Main report

3.1 Key Issues

A total of 28 groups took part in the programme this year, 30 groups had initially applied, 2 groups withdrew their application to the programme.

Two of the participating groups were due to receive a beacon but they withdrew their requests for beacons in the final week. Officers will work with these groups to enable them to use beacons in 2019. Officers were involved in extensive community engagement to enable the provision of two beacons on the Shankill Road within a limited timeframe, again officers hope to engage with groups across the city to support increased use of beacons in 2019.

Two groups were awarded funding through the programme after the closing date, this was in line with the June approval for officers to consider any further applications that were submitted in line with the corporate governance in relation to Belfast City Council’s approach to bonfires. These applications were approved by the Director of City & Neighbourhood

Services under delegated authority as approved by full Council in June 18.

The following figures show the numbers of participating groups over the last 4 years.

	Number of July groups	Number of beacons
2015	44	6
2016	32	10
2017	32	9
2018	28	11

The 2018 programme adopted an incentivised approach to support groups to meet the aims of the framework in relation to positive cultural expression, particularly in relation to the collection of materials, burning of tyres and burning of any items such as flags, emblems, election posters and items of clothing. J Byrne was appointed - through an open quotation exercise – to carry out monitoring and evaluation of the programme which included visits to all participating sites on 10 and 11 July.

Members had requested that officers seek to appoint a company who could provide two staff to carry out visits on 11 July. This was included in the specification but the contractor advised that two staff could not be provided - the contractor visited all sites on 11 July. Members will note that the report observations do not extend beyond 8.30pm on 11 July, this is due to health and safety and child protection considerations.

The independent report outlines that:

- the majority of sites on the programme were well maintained and met the aims of the framework**
- the majority of sites on the programme were not fully constructed by 10 July**
- prior to 8.30pm on 11 July no sites on the programme had any paramilitary displays**
- prior to 8.30pm on 11 July no sites had tyres on the bonfire**
- prior to 8.30pm on 11 July one sites had items such as flags on the bonfire.**

Groups linked to all sites for whom no issues have been identified will be eligible to apply for a further £500 to support the delivery of activity from September 2018 and March 2019 that develops community engagement and awareness on issues of positive cultural expression. Officers will update on this element in due course.

Groups representing the site where issues were identified through the monitoring and evaluation report will be invited to attend a meeting with the review panel in August/September. As

previously agreed the chair, vice chair, SCP representative from NIHE and independent member will sit on this panel.

Members will be aware that the issue of bonfires is very sensitive and that there are a range of views on the best way to respond. The 2018 Bonfire & Cultural Expression programme represents one approach to addressing the issues sometimes associated with bonfires and supports positive cultural expression through engagement. Belfast City Council also works with a range of partners to address some of the negative consequences of bonfires.

Financial & Resource Implications

Current costs

Repair, installation and transport of 11 beacons	£120,000
Funding for 28 events	£42,570
Cleansing costs for participating sites	Final costs are not available at time of writing
Monitoring	£3,000
Miscellaneous	£1,500
Total	£167,070

The programme spend is being finalised at the time of writing this report. Members may wish to note that the budget for the programme is as listed below.

Good Relations programme	£50,000
Belfast City Council	£59,500
PCSP	£15,000
NIHE	£35,000
Total	£159,500

Equality or Good Relations Implications/ Rural Needs Assessment

The Bonfire Programme aims to promote the positive celebration of culture which will have a positive impact on good relations. The programme is currently being equality screened.

Following a query regarding the price of beacons, the Senior Good Relations Officer confirmed that they were expensive. In addition, she advised that the use of beacons was often complex, with some locations not being suitable and having different levels of support within communities in relation to their use. She reported that currently there were fourteen beacons.

It was suggested that in order to try and promote the use of beacons within communities that officers would engage with community groups as early as possible to try and establish if beacons could be used as an alternative. Early engagement would also ensure that, if required, additional beacons could be procured.

The Partnership recommended to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that it note the contents of the report including the list of groups, as set out below, who received funding through the 2018 Programme, the findings from the monitoring and evaluation report and the details of the Review Panel who would consider the participation of groups who failed to meet all of the programme guidelines.

2018 Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme – List of awards

	Applicant Name	Award
1.	Ballysillan Youth for Christ	£1,750.00
2.	Belfast City Mission (Island Street Hall)	£1,750.00
3.	Brown Square Development Association (Beacon)	£1,250.00
4.	Clarawood Action Group (Beacon)	£1,750.00
5.	Connswater Community & Services Ltd.	£1,250.00
6.	Cosy Historical & Cultural Society	£1,250.00
7.	Diamond Project (Charter NI)	£1,750.00
8.	Dunmurry Community Association	£1,720.00
9.	East Belfast Alternatives (Bapaume)	£850.00
10.	East Belfast Alternatives (Braniel)	£1,250.00
11.	East Belfast Alternatives (Longfellow Community Event)	£1,250.00
12.	East Belfast Alternatives (Templemore Action Group)	£1,250.00
13.	East Belfast Ladies Historical & Cultural Society	£1,250.00
14.	Eastside Women's Project (Charter NI)	£1,750.00

	Applicant Name	Award
15.	Highfield Residents Association	£1,750.00
16.	The Hubb	£1,750.00
17.	Lower Oldpark Community Association	£1,750.00
18.	The Hubb (New Beginnings)	£1,750.00
19.	Sunningdale Bonfire Group	£1,250.00
20.	Tullycarnet Action Group Initiative Trust (TAGIT)	£1,750.00
21.	Tullycarnet Action Group Initiative Trust (TAGIT)	£1,750.00
22.	Tullycarnet Action Group Initiative Trust (TAGIT)	£1,750.00
23.	Twaddell Woodvale Residents Association	£1,750.00
24.	West Belfast Athletic & Cultural Society	£1,250.00
25.	Wheatfield Action Project	£1,250.00
26.	Whitecity Community Development Association	£1,250.00
27.	Consensus Community Restorative Justice (LSCA)	£1,750.00
28.	Westland Community Group	£1,750.00

Update on Review of Shared City Partnership

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

She reported that, as advised at the last meeting, despite public advertisement, a representative had not been appointed to represent the west of the City. Therefore, as

agreed, the exercise had been repeated with a more targeted approach, this process had closed on 31st August. She advised that dates had been finalised for shortlisting and interview and she hoped to be in a position to provide an update at the October meeting.

She further advised that she also hoped to be in a position to provide a further update in respect of the nomination from the Faith Sector at the next meeting.

The Members were reminded of the need to complete and sign the Code of Conduct form for membership of the Shared City Partnership. She advised that a copy of the form was available should any Member wish to complete it immediately following the meeting.

Noted.

Update on Peace IV

The Partnership considered the following report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

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

2.0 Recommendations

Members are requested to note the contents of the report, specifically the risk in terms of achievement of 2018 interim targets, and to recommend to the Strategic and Policy Resources Committee to:

- **reframe the BPR5 Supporting Communities – Traveller and Roma project**
- **approve the updated Governance Framework**

3.0 Main report

Key Issues

Implementation and delivery of the Belfast PEACE IV Local Action Plan is progressing.

Children and Young People (CYP)

One submission was received for each of the tender calls for the re-scoped projects TechConnects and Playing Our Part. The submissions are currently progressing through the assessment process.

The Young Advocates project is being mobilised by Co-operation Ireland and their partner organisations R-City Youth CIC, Saints Youth Club and Belfast South Community Resources.

Building Positive Relations (BPR)

The tender opportunity for BPR 5 Supporting Communities Minority Ethnic element is currently open. The pre-market engagement session for the Traveller and Roma element of the project suggested areas of improvement regarding the structure of activities. Therefore SCP approval is sought to reframe the project within the original context of the project and then re-tender the opportunity as soon as possible. Approval from SEUPB regarding any changes will also be requested.

Shared Space and Services (SSS)

The public consultation focusing on the Springfield Dam/ Park element closes on 9 September. The feasibility study outlining route options for the various site locations along the necklace of Shared Spaces is being finalised. A briefing session for SCP members on the project, the feasibility study, consultation and future engagement plans is being arranged for end September. Details will be circulated to members once confirmed.

Rebid

A decision regarding the rebid for the further £5.5m (approx.) of funding is expected at end of September 2018. Steps to mobilise projects have now commenced.

Governance

As members are aware, the Governance model for the implementation of the PEACE VI Action Plan was established in May 2017. Given the need to accelerate implementation and as projects now mobilise, the governance model, particularly in relation to the operational tier at Thematic Steering Groups level has been refined as attached. As recommended in the AGRS Governance Review, it is requested that members approve the updated Governance Framework.

Financial & Resource Implications

Expenditure incurred through the programme is fully claimable from the SEUPB subject to compliance with programme rules and regulations. To date the value of claims (Period 1 Jan 15 – Period 15 Jul 2018) submitted to the SEUPB for reimbursement totals £315,400. Processing of claims by SEUPB is ongoing and to date £86,987 (Periods 1-8 up to Oct 16) has been reimbursement to Council, with all expenditure verified as eligible.

Recruitment for the Project Development Officer and Project Manager for the BPR has been concluded and the successful applicants should be in post by end September 2018. No appointment was made for the Project Manager for the CYP theme, this post will be filled temporarily through Agency Staff.

Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment

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

The Programme Manager also asked the Partnership to note that it was proposed that briefing session for Members of the Shared City Partnership would be held on Tuesday, 25th September to discuss the Shared Space Capital Project. She asked the Members to provisionally note this date in their diary and advised that it would be confirmed in due course.

The Partnership adopted the recommendations.

Shared City Partnership Links with the Local Development Plan

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

To advise members of the current consultation process regarding the draft Local Development Plan Strategy and to seek members’ views as to how the Shared City partnership can engage with the consultation.

2.0 Recommendations

That members note the contents of the report and consider the suggested actions as to how the Partnership can engage with the current consultation process regarding the Local Development Plan Strategy namely:

- 1. That members familiarise themselves with the contents of the document and consider the good relations implications contained within the proposals.**
- 2. That a workshop of the Shared City Partnership be arranged to which the Strategic Director and relevant Officers be invited to provide information and discussion around the contents of the Strategy.**
- 3. That Partnership hosts a workshop/seminar facilitated by an experienced specialist/s who can inform and lead discussion on issues around urban planning and cohesion.**
- 4. That following the above, a draft response is brought back to the Shared City Partnership on November and submitted in draft form by the deadline of 15th November.**
- 5. That updates on the draft Strategy Plan particularly impacting on good relations are brought to the Partnership on a quarterly basis for further input.**

3.0 Main report

Key Issues

Further to a presentation from the NIHE at the August meeting of the Partnership discussion around the shared neighbourhood schemes, the Partnership requested that officers submit a report to the September meeting detailing how the Shared City Partnership could feed its views and comments into the consultation on the draft Local Development Plan Strategy.

The Belfast City LDP 2035 will:

- Provide a 15 year plan framework to support economic and social needs in the city, in line with regional strategies and policies, while providing the delivery of sustainable development;
- Facilitate growth by coordinating public and private investment to encourage development where it can be of most benefit to the wellbeing of the community;
- Allocate sufficient land to meet the needs of the city; and
- Provide an opportunity for all stakeholders, including the public, to have a say about where and how development within the local area should take place.

Vision

In 2035, Belfast will be a globally successful, smart regional city that is environmentally resilient with a vibrant economic and social heart. As a centre of learning and business, the knowledge economy flourishes where collaboration and innovation attracts investment, talent and jobs. We will value and conserve our unique natural and built heritage to enhance and develop tourism.

Thriving socially inclusive well connected neighbourhoods, that encourage a healthy active lifestyle with well-designed homes where people love to live. A strong, inclusive local economy will support progressive, safe and vibrant communities. The city will provide a gateway to opportunities locally, nationally and worldwide.

Consultation

The consultation on the draft Plan Strategy was launched at the end of August and those who live, work and study in Belfast are being invited to view proposals for the next stage in a framework for how the city will look by 2035. The entire document can be accessed at <http://www.belfastcity.gov.uk/buildingcontrol-environment/Planning/ldp-plan-strategy.aspx#ldp>

The draft Plan Strategy is available to view online and in person from now until 15 November, with no further representations being accepted after this time. Residents, developers and statutory partners will be able to share their feedback from 20 September and the mechanisms to do this can be found on the Belfast City Council website.

Drop-in consultation events are also taking place in communities across Belfast where people can learn more about the draft Plan Strategy and hear how they can have their say:

- Wednesday 29 August – Innovation Factory (11am-1pm)
- Thursday 30 August – Girdwood Community Hub (2pm-4pm)
- Tuesday 18 September – Skainos Centre (6pm-8pm)
- Thursday 20 September – City Hall (10am-2pm)
- Tuesday 25 September – Olympia Leisure Centre (6pm-8pm)

It is essential that the Partnership views the draft Strategy Plan through the good relations lens as this plan is the framework for guiding decisions on how the city will grow in order to meet ambitious targets laid out in its community plan, the Belfast Agenda.

The document sets out the ambitions and policies for housing, infrastructure and sustainable growth in Belfast, and follows extensive consultation with residents, businesses and statutory partners last year. Among the priorities are a focus on inner Belfast and providing new homes in the city centre, maximising the potential for development in accessible locations and support for more sustainable proposals that recognise the realities of climate change.

It also outlines some of the ways Council and others plan to achieve inclusive growth, from identifying the need for nearly 32,000 new homes to ensuring we can accommodate the investment required to fulfil the goal of bringing 46,000 extra jobs to Belfast.

Good Relations Implications

The draft Strategy Plan includes community cohesion and good relations as a key strategic policy which will impact on the 4 main strategic aims and objectives: Shaping a liveable space, creating a vibrant economy, building a smart connected, resilient place and promoting a green and active place.

The Plan proposes a policy around meanwhile uses in interface areas to encourage the 'normalisation' of contested community spaces which includes the reuse of vacant buildings and unused sites adjacent to the interfaces to encourage social interaction and build shared community resilience

The targets mentioned previously around housing and jobs will have a significant impact on good relations –where will these houses be built; will they be built in areas around the city centre or in outlying areas and will they be designed in such a way to create a diverse community with accessible services?

In relation to jobs, what kind of jobs are being sought, where the skills will come from; do we currently possess these and can we prepare communities in advance, especially those which suffer from social and economic deprivation?

Also, it is essential that decisions around land planning and use do not first negatively impact on good relations and cohesion, however, unintentionally. But also, are there opportunities to promote and enhance good relations and equality by how we design the city? Do we look at an area as a whole in how it connects across communities? Do we need to design innovative projects which will address a number of issues within communities/areas and support development which will bring about transformative change? Can we consider values when looking at disposal of our own land which are not just about the market value but also about good relations, cohesion and sustainability?

The Strategy will set a framework which we want to ensure will not compromise the ability of future generations to develop Belfast but also will not have unintended consequences in relation to deepening segregation in the City.

Suggested Actions

- That members familiarise themselves with the contents of the document and consider the good relations implications contained within the proposals.
- That a workshop of the Shared City Partnership be arranged to which the Strategic Director and relevant Officers be invited to provide information and discussion around the contents of the Strategy.
- That Partnership hosts a workshop/seminar facilitated by an experienced specialist/s who can inform and lead discussion on issues around urban planning and cohesion.
- That following the above, a draft response is brought back to the Shared City Partnership on 5th November and submitted in draft form by the deadline of 15th November.
- That updates on the draft Strategy Plan particularly impacting on good relations are brought to the Partnership on a quarterly basis for further input.

Financial & Resource Implications

Costs associated with the above suggestions actions would include the expense of the facilitator/s and venue/hospitality which can be taken from existing budgets.

Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment

An accompanying draft equality impact assessment has been undertaken on the draft Development Plan Strategy and is currently out for consultation.”

Several Members referred to the summary consultation document and expressed concern that there was not enough focus given within the summary document to the importance of the influence of good relations within the proposals.

The Good Relations Manager advised that the good relations influence was clearly documented within the full strategy document, however, she undertook to report these comments back.

A further Member highlighted the importance of liaising with the local community and voluntary sector in an attempt to promote the consultation process. She further explained the need to articulate the process clearly to the various stakeholders in order to ensure that maximum community involvement was achieved.

The Committee:

- agreed to convene an officer led discussion workshop of the Shared City Partnership which the Strategic Director and relevant officers would attend in order to provide information and discussion around the content of the Strategy;
- agreed to hold a workshop/seminar during October, which would be facilitated by an experienced specialist who could inform and lead discussion on issues around urban planning and cohesion;
- noted that following the workshop/seminar, a draft response would be submitted to the November meeting of the Shared City Partnership to be submitted in draft form by the deadline of 15th November; and
- agreed that updates on the draft Strategy Plan, particularly those impacting on good relations, would be submitted to the Partnership on a quarterly basis to seek further input.

Interfaces

Update on Interface Expressions of Interest 2018

The Good Relations Manager reminded the Partnership that the Good Relations Unit had ring-fenced £50,000 from the District Council Good Relations Action Plan for the Interface Expression of Interest exercise in 2018/19. The invitation to submit an Expression of Interest had been launched at an event in Crumlin Road Gaol on Friday, 21st June with a closing date of Friday, 27th July.

The officer reported that five applications had been received with three attaining a score exceeding the 55% threshold for funding, a total of £16,660 was awarded.

The awards were made under the delegated authority of the Strategic Director of Neighbourhood Services and the successful applications had been notified.

The Committee was advised that the remaining £33,340 would be returned to the Good Relations Action Plan budget for funding Tranche 2 of the Good Relations grants call and related interface programme expenditure.

The Partnership noted the list of organisations, as set out below, which had been approved for funding totalling £16,600, under the delegated authority of the Strategic Director of City and Neighbourhood Services, for the Interface Expression of Interest Exercise.

Appendix 1. DCGRP Interfaces Expression of Interest Exercise 2018/19

Organisation:	Details of Proposal:	Budget requested:	Delivery Timeline:	Score:	Final award:
CCRF	Building Futures Without Walls: Re: CPA interface Work with 12 x local young people (6 x either side of interface) Build relationships (team-building, residential) Programme exploring shared space at the interface Reduction, Removal or De-classification of barriers	£9,705	Oct 2018-Feb 2019	76/100	£5,100
Belfast Exposed	Can You See What I See?: 40 x young people (13-17) either side of Cupar Way interface Conway Education Centre (Syrian refugee); Falls Women's Centre; Impact Training and Greater Shankill Alternatives 10 x photography workshops Final Peace Wall exhibition	£3,100	10/10/2018-28/02/2019	73/100	£2,560
St Matthew's FC	East Belfast United: St Matthew's and Ridgeway Rovers FC (Dundonald) engage in 20 x week football programme with Short Strand drug and Alcohol Awareness Group and Community Forum	£6,700	Sept 2018-Jan 2019	50/100 No Award	£0

Organisation:	Details of Proposal:	Budget requested:	Delivery Timeline:	Score:	Final award:
	ASB/Drug & Alcohol Awareness/Bullying Delivered in Doyle Youth Club				
Clonard/Mid-Shankill	Clonard and Shankill Women: Capacity and relationship-building programme between 2 x interface communities re: using Lanark Way as a shared space Core group of 40 x women Health & fitness; yoga; craft classes (Xmas market on Lanark Way) Shared history tours	£10,000	Sept 2018-March 2019	84/100	£9,000
APAC	APAC's Looking through Walls and Divided Cities (Part 3): Re-image local barriers to stimulate debate Collate documentary evidence on life in 4 x segregated cities Exhibition in Portadown/Lurgan and North and West Belfast City Gallery projection on interface walls in Belfast	£3,173	Oct 2018-Feb 2019	50/100 No award	£0
Total applied for:		£32,678			£16,660

Response to IFI Peace Walls Consent Paper

The Partnership was reminded that, at its August meeting, the Partnership had considered a draft consent paper which had given consideration to addressing the situation where community consensus could not be achieved regarding the removal, re-imaging or reclassification of peacewalls. At that meeting, the Partnership had agreed that Members of the Partnership would forward any comments they had in relation to the response to the International Fund for Ireland's (IFI) Peace Walls Programme proposed Draft Consent Paper to the Good Relations Manager.

The Good Relations Manager advised that a number of comments had been received and she drew the Members' attention to the response that had been collated.

The Partnership recommended to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that it endorse the attached collated response as the Council's response to the IFI Peace Walls Programme:

Appendix 2:

Shared City Partnership Response to the Draft IFI Peace Walls Programme Consent Paper May 2018.

Introduction

The Shared City Partnership welcomes the opportunity to comment on the above paper regarding the sensitive and challenging issue around consent and how to improve the lives of those living and working near interfaces.

This response has been collated through the Shared City Partnership which reports directly to the Council's Strategic Resources and Policy Committee. The membership of the Partnership is composed of elected members, representatives from the statutory, community and voluntary, faith, trade union, business and ethnic minority sectors.

Its role is to assist the elected political leadership of the Council, staff, diverse civil society interests and partnering agencies to engage pro-actively on all Good Relations issues on behalf of citizens and be a collective voice, promoting a common vision for Good Relations in the City.

Comments

The Partnership considered the draft consent paper produced by the IFI Peacewalls Programme groups at its meeting in September and would offer the following comments:

The Partnership would acknowledge the difficulties experienced in trying to achieve community buy-in in many areas but this can be particularly challenging around sensitive issues such as peacewalls.

Agencies and sectors such as those represented on the Partnership have all been involved in such work at various junctures and the paper is a brave step to produce guidelines that will 'help progress and manage the alteration or reclassification of the structures concerned.'

It is certainly good practice to have an open, inclusive and transparent procedure/set of guidelines for local people and communities living in close proximity to the structures as this enables ownership and accountability around the agreed actions, how they will be resourced, implemented and by whom. Communication is also key to ensure that all involved are aware of what is happening at each stage.

While it is important to emphasise consultation and consent, there are still too many generalisations contained within the paper including the definition of close proximity, the meaning of consent and consensus and how these two concepts interact.

The paper acknowledges that each barrier is both 'unique and complex' which would be the view of most of the agencies around the table the paper appears to aim for a 'one-size fits all' approach to consent.

The paper could benefit from alluding to the sort of help and support that individual residents will need to bring about the confidence necessary to engage in the barrier removal debate.

What about areas where there are no immediate neighbours from any community living beside walls as opposed to where they form part of the residents' immediate space?

What about those who may not live near the barrier but work in the area e.g. Townsend Street, Argyle Business Centre.

There is reference to the relevant agencies and we often take this to mean the Housing Executive, Department for Justice, Council including Elected Members, PSNI, Department for Communities and The Executive Office. It is essential that other aspects such as Planning, Department of Infrastructure and the Education Authority are included as necessary.

The Partnership would be interested to hear the views of the agencies with responsibility for removal of barriers and those mentioned in the paper and how this paper could assist in moving the discussion forward.

The paper states that "In the final analysis, where the wider community does not reach consensus with the views and needs of those most impacted by any proposed changes, decisions on the way forward must be strongly weighted in favour of those who live closest to and who are most impacted by the structure in question. Those most impacted may wish the status quo to pertain and this must be respected."

The above guideline would need further work and elaboration – what factors determine who is most impacted, how are concerns weighted and are the issues raised locally all given equal weighting?

Is there an assessment involved as to how an approach which does not have agreement will impact on relationships within an area?

The reference in the final paragraph that states that where the assessment concludes that there are concerns that cannot be overcome, the 'status quo' will pertain contradicts the Review Process set out at the end of the document and also contradicts the T:BUC 2023 deadline.

Review Process

In relation to the Review Process, the Partnership would have a number of questions:

Under what authority would such a Panel be convened?

Have discussions taken place with The Executive Office in relation to chairing such a panel as outlined in the paper?

Is it reasonable to expect a government official to chair a panel which is tasked with making a decision on such sensitive and controversial issues?

How would independent members be determined and what experience would be required to fulfil this task?

We would presume gathering evidence and testimony would take a considerable length of time based on other similar processes. Therefore, it would be impossible to convene the panel at short notice and have a judgement made within a brief period of time.

On what basis could judgements be made?

What standing would the judgements of such a panel have – would they be legally binding and in all likelihood would be open to legal challenge?

The mention of a review panel with power to make legally binding decisions almost suggests that a solution could be forced upon a community or communities which could have the opposite effect of what was intended.

Recommendations:

That those agencies involved with the barrier removal process be engaged further in a discussion around guidelines to ensure consistency.

That any emerging guidelines be published with the opportunity for those most impacted by the structures to add to/improve those guidelines

That the step-by-step approach of engagement be weighted and scored in favour of those most impacted by any changes to structures. However, more clarity is required about what constitutes consent; definition of 'close proximity' to barriers etc.

That consultation be extended to those who work in or own businesses near barriers e.g. Argyle Business Centre, Townsend Enterprise Park

Need for more statutory agencies to become involved e.g. Youth Service, Planning, and Department of Infrastructure etc.

Consultation must ensure that it covers different demographics – gender, age, homeowners, business owners etc. If schools are located near the barrier, pupils and parents should be included in any consultation

Draw up some indicators for measuring consensus to ensure that 'group' decisions are not overlooking 'minor' voices with serious concerns

Share best practice where available i.e. those residents that have been through the barrier transformation/removal process sharing their experience

That peacewalls need to be examined in their locality in relation to need but that cognisance should be taken of how the Local Development Plan could assist with transforming areas which would have real benefits for those most impacted.

That the concept of a review panel requires more in-depth discussion with the relevant agencies, particularly with The Executive Office given that they have been mentioned in the paper as overseeing such a process.

Good Relations Strategy

The Good Relations Manager provided the Members with an update in respect of the development of the new Good Relations Strategy. She advised that work had been ongoing throughout July and August to develop an initial draft strategy for consideration by the Members. This had included a number of engagements sessions with various stakeholders.

The Partnership noted that a draft report was currently being developed which would be submitted to the October meeting of the Partnership, subject to the approval of the Partnership and the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee. The draft strategy would then go out to public consultation, via the Council's Citizen Space portal, following ratification at the November Council meeting.

The Good Relations Manager summarised the four main areas that the consultation had been based around and she drew the Members' attention to a summary document which detailed the core messages that had been received as part of the consultation exercise.

Following a query from a member of the Partnership, the Good Relations Manager confirmed that, as consultation was ongoing, it would be appropriate for any of the recently appointment members of the Board to make a submission or to comment on the draft strategy.

Noted.

Request for Nomination to NISMP/NILGA Working Group

The Good Relations Manager advised that the NI Strategic Migration Partnership (NISMP) was seeking nominations to a cross-council Sustainable Communities and Demographics Working Group.

She reported that it was anticipated that this Working Group would be instrumental in identifying and addressing council needs and concerns relating to changing demographics and ensuring that these were understood by decision makers at both Westminster and Stormont. In the first instance, it was proposed that the primary focus of the group would be to determine the impact of migration on the economic and social priorities for each council.

The Working Group would comprise of both officer and Elected Members. The Partnership noted that the Good Relations Manager had been appointed as the Council officer to sit on the Working Group.

The Partnership recommended to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that both the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Shared City Partnership be nominated to sit on the aforementioned Working Group.

Good Relations Week 2018 (verbal update)

The Good Relations Manager reminded the Partnership that Good Relations Week was being held from 17th – 23rd September. She advised that, as previously agreed, the Council was hosting a conference in the City Hall to mark International Day of Peace on 21st September from 10.00 a.m. – 1.30 p.m. The process around the Council's Good Relations Strategy would be referred to at this event and she encouraged the Members of the Partnership to attend and to promote it within their various sectors.

In addition, the Council had organised a Living Library event on Monday, 17th September and the Members were invited to register with the Good Relations Unit if they wished to participate.

Ms. J. Irwin then drew the Members' attention to a booklet which had been circulated which detailed the numerous events being held throughout Northern Ireland during Good Relations Week. She advised that a new website, which was available [here](#),

had been created which would enable people to search for events by council area, day and type of event. She encouraged the Members to visit the site to see all that Good Relations Week had to offer.

Noted.

Chairperson