

**Waterford Local Community Development Committee
Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Dungarvan, Co Waterford
3rd December 2015**

In attendance: Cllr John Cummins (Chair), Cllr Liam Brazil (Vice Chair), Michael Walsh, Michael Quinn, Jimmy Taaffe, Jim Gibson, Liam Daly, Joe Stokes, Gabriel Foley, Garrett Wyse, Cllr John Pratt, Nick Donnelly, Heather Kiely, Niall O'Brien, Willie O'Donoghue

Apologies: Prof. Willie Donnelly, Senan Cooke, Lar power (Chief Officer)

Staff: Lisa Grant (Deputy Chief Officer), Vinnie O'Shea, Don Tuohy

New Members

The Committee were informed that Senan Cooke would be replacing Jamie Moore as PPN C&V Rep on the LCDC.

Minutes & Matters Arising

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 24th September 2015 were proposed by Cllr Liam Brazil and seconded by Michael Walsh. There were no matters arising.

Correspondence

Copies of correspondence were circulated in advance of the meeting

1. Resignation of Jamie Moore.
2. Jim Gibson regarding the LDS.
3. Circular 06/2015: Closure of LEADER 2007-2013

LEADER

Jimmy brought members through the response to Pobal queries to the LDS submitted to the Department in September 2015. A copy of this response document along with a revised copy of the LDS was circulated in advance of the meeting.

One of the queries raised was that the LAG does not demonstrate an acceptable gender balance. There as a discussion on the importance of aspiring towards achieving a minimum of 40% female membership.

It was noted that given that the composition of the LCDC is outlined in legislation and that it was an aspiration to have senior individuals represented within the identified organisations it might not be practical to seek the nomination of two candidates from these organisations.

In relation to Section 3: Participative Feedback, Jim raised his concerns that the 16% of the total budget for social inclusion is primarily for facilities.

He stated that the social inclusion priorities should reflect the national priorities included under Better Outcomes & Brighter Futures and the Waterford Children's Services Committee Action Plan which were prepared following significant consultation.

As Area Manager for Túsla and Chair of the Children's Services Committee, Jim expressed his concerns about the lack of services and the lack of cohesiveness of services across rural Waterford which should be addressed through both LEADER AND SICAP. Liam noted that this reflected an issue he raised at the last meeting where he requested that the LCDC look at the potential synergies between SICAP and LEADER.

Jim noted that Clodagh House in Portlaw provided a good model of a community development approach to accessing services for children and families. Clodagh House is

utilised by a number of service providers and a range of agencies and organisations across all stages of the life cycle.

Jim requested a guarantee that 16% of the total budget would not be spent solely on facilities and that part of the budget be spent on community development within communities.

Jimmy referred to Page 83 Table 56 of the LDS and highlighted that of the €745,000 allocated under this action, it was proposed that €660,000 be allocated to capital projects with the balance allocated to training.

Liam raised a query in relation to a point in the Feedback Commentary (Page 8, Pt 4) which referenced consultation with the Intreo/LES Office. Liam is to discuss more appropriate wording with Jimmy for inclusion in the LDS. In addition, Liam asked for insight into the engagement LEADER has had with the unemployed.

In terms of amending the LDS, Michael Walsh asked what it was the LCDC were trying to achieve. He noted that state agencies had not historically provided services in rural Waterford but questioned whether it was the role of either LEADER or SICAP to address this lack of delivery by state agencies. He noted that LEADER's role should be to remove blockages. He further noted that the vast majority of towns and villages have a facility which could be used to deliver a similar model to the one developed in Clodagh House. It was agreed that service hubs provided a good model and that services should be more concentrated.

To help inform the discussion on the social inclusion allocation, Vinnie gave a short presentation on the community elements of the LECP with an emphasis on developing Communities of Place, which will focus on hubs and service delivery networks. He acknowledged that there is an issue with service provision but that these service hubs could provide an opportunity to enhance existing facilities, to provide outreach and to provide access opportunities e.g. rural transport.

Vinnie recommended that the Community of Place plans would inform the LDS and where community hubs are needed, which would provide a more sustainable model than a public call. He also noted that he felt that there were a number of priority areas that should be included that are not listed in the LDS such as Tramore, Kilmacthomas and Lismore.

He suggested that there should be an initial focus on capital works in areas that don't have facilities and then focus on programme delivery. In some areas, consideration should be given to enhancing existing facilities rather than developing new facilities.

Jimmy responded that there are a number of parent and toddler groups and crèches in rural towns and villages and that there is a lot of activity in the children and family services area and that the issue was connecting these services to the people.

Jim proposed that the LDS would be amended to include a statement to the effect that 'The LDS demonstrates that the LAG is committed to social inclusion under the LEADER Programme' and further that 'the priorities identified under the social inclusion measure should be linked with the Waterford Children's Services Committee and their Strategy' and that this connection should be clearly stated and that these should influence the allocation of funding for children and young people in rural areas.

Liam sought clarification on the discrepancy between the allocation to social inclusion in Table 22 in the Feedback Commentary and Table 56 in the LDS. Jimmy clarified that the correct figure was the one in Table 22 of €865,000. This extra allocation to social inclusion was the result of a reduction in the enterprise section.

Heather suggested that this budget should be adjusted so that the majority is not capital expenditure but is more balanced with equal focus on engagement with people. She queried if support could be put towards an Outreach Worker to target the hard to reach but it was clarified that salary costs were not an option.

Michael Walsh queried what are the priority areas that the LCDC wants to fund, where are the gaps in terms of community facilities and what does community development look like?

Jim advised that there needs to be a focus on preventative support services and that the LCDC should aspire to develop similar models to Clodagh House.

It was agreed to increase the allocation of funding to rural youth as outlined in Page 90 Table 63. The amount allocated under Strategic Action 'Rural Youth Service Delivery Model' is to be increased from €50,000 to €80,000 with the increase to be taken from the increased allocation to social inclusion of €120,000. In addition, the text is to be amended to provide for investment in youth services rather than capital investment in youth facilities.

It was also agreed that Table 25, Page 46 should be amended. The identified locations are to be removed and reference made instead to support for future community facilities should be informed by the Community of Place Plans under the LECP and the Waterford Children's Services Committee Strategic Plan.

Under Section 7: Financial Plan, Jimmy advised that it was originally intended to finish actions by 2018 but at Pobal's request these dates have now been extended to 2020 but with the intention of aiming to complete actions by 2018 to attempt to secure additional funding post 2018.

The adoption of the revised LDS, subject to the inclusion of the above amendments, was proposed by Cllr John Pratt and seconded by Garrett Wyse. In order to maintain the 51/49 balance, Michael Walsh abstained from the vote. The revised LDS was adopted unanimously.

In relation to the RDP Operating Rules and Procedures Manual, Lisa advised that these documents had been circulated for information and that there would be a presentation on the key aspects of these documents at the next meeting.

Conflict of Interest forms were circulated and members were requested to complete these with membership of any Boards or officer positions that might cause a conflict of interest when evaluating future LEADER funding proposals.

Proposed membership of the LEADER Evaluation Committee were circulated in advance of the meeting. The members were proposed by Nick Donnelly and seconded by Cllr John Pratt.

SICAP

Don gave a presentation on SICAP outlining the key priorities and dates for 2016 (Copy of presentation circulated with the minutes).

Don asked for nominees to sit on a Sub Committee to help develop the SICAP Annual Plan. Jim Gibson, Nick Donnelly and Heather Kiely agreed to assist.

AOB

Cllr Brazil enquired as to whether there was any update on the Suicide Prevention Plan. Vinnie advised that he has met with Sean McCarthy (HSE Suicide Officer) to progress this. The

plan is to bring together all related health structures pre Christmas regarding the action plan and there will be an update at the February meeting.

Calendar of meetings for 2016 circulated at the meeting.

Cllr Cummins thanked the members for their input into the discussion the LDS and wished all members a Merry Christmas.

Next Meeting: Thursday 4th February 2016 at 9.30am, Council Chamber, City Hall, The Mall

Approved by: _____
Chair of Waterford LCDC

Date: 4th February 2016