

<p>months. Civic Voice will be helping to facilitate these visits.</p>	
<p>MM asked where Nick Boles was looking to visit. SG responded that Alnwick is on the list while other places are currently being discussed. SG would be responding with a list of locations to his office.</p>	SG
<p>SG mentioned that Nick Boles would be willing to write to local authorities that seem to be holding up the development of neighbourhood planning. MM wanted to know how we were taking this forward. SG explained that the Minister had offered to write to specific Councils to help encourage them engage with civic societies to take forward neighbourhood plans, e.g. a letter to the Ramsgate authority. This will be handled carefully and where it would be of strategic importance to Civic Voice and the Civic Society movement</p>	SG/JW
<p>JW mentioned the recent development in the news about the Community Infrastructure Levy whereby areas were able to “top slice” 25% for the benefit of the local area – if a neighbourhood plan had used a particular method. JW suggested staff make reference to this in a future newsletter.</p>	IH
<p>SG explained we are hoping to meet with Nick Hurd and Sec of State Eric Pickles soon. HM wanted to know what board member would be attending the meeting. SG confirmed the Chair would be attending and the Director and Chair would feedback to the Board when the meeting has happened.</p>	SG/PR
<p>SG confirmed that Nick Boles said that we should go and talk to him if we are not going to be involved in any of the Supporting Communities in Neighbourhood Planning work. He said we should approach him for an application for support funding.</p>	SG
<p>PR, JW and SG gave an update on the All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) which had its AGM in November. We had the necessary 20 signatories, which is made up of a good balance from all sides of the House.</p>	
<p>NS wanted to know what strategy existed for the APPG and that it needs to be carefully managed. NS wanted to see a strategy for using the group for a future meeting. NS congratulated officers on the success of the PDR campaign and suggested we might want to follow it up with “one last call to action”.</p>	SG
<p>MM wanted to know how many MPs were involved in the APPG. SG explained 20 signed and IH explained they were listed on the website. HM said we should encourage groups to visit the website to see if their MP is listed.</p>	
<p>MM asked if we would be looking for private sector support for the APPG. SG said we would. JK said he would be happy to help with private sector support, if asked.</p>	
<p>SG mentioned that Sec of State Eric Pickles had been invited to meet with the Civic Day 2012 Award winners at the House of Commons and help launch Civic Day 2013. PR felt it may prove difficult for people from Scarborough to attend for instance but JW stressed he felt it would be worthwhile and a good promotional tool for Civic Voice and the movement. It was agreed that SG should pursue the opportunity and keep the Civic Day team informed.</p>	SG
<p>IH gave an update on the permitted development campaign which has become our most successful civic movement campaign for participation since we launched. Over 370 MPs across the country were contacted by civic groups – even more than for the National Planning Policy Framework. MM and NS asked if we would be writing up a “summary campaign report” to feedback to members on this campaign. Staff said we would.</p>	IH

<p>On IH's suggestion the board made formal thanks to DT and the Coventry Society for all their effort in helping to produce a fantastic AGM. MM explained he felt it was becoming a key event for Civic Voice and that it was great to see people becoming real friends. JW supported this.</p> <p>IH and DT gave the group an update on the Civic Leadership Course which took place in Birmingham in September. 14 delegates attended from groups across the country.</p> <p>PR formally wanted to thank Jennifer Howells on behalf of the civic movement for the support she has offered. IH was asked to feed this back to Jennifer.</p> <p>JK said it was pleasing to see the success of this group and hear about the email conversations taking place. JK felt that there was room for a civic movement "campaign group" based on this model and that we should investigate it. JK also suggested it may be left up to the Civic Leadership Course group themselves to decide what is the best way for them to stay connected going forward. We cannot hold their hand forever he suggested. Others agreed but felt we wanted to encourage communication without investing too much resource.</p>	<p>IH</p> <p>IH</p>
<p>Vision/Mission/Strategic Objectives/Values</p> <p>Staff put the vision and mission up onto a screen to help the discussion. It was updated that the current statements were versions from the November Awayday (and a refresher as part of our three year review). After some short discussion, DT, HM, MM and JW suggested slight amendments.</p> <p>The Vision was changed and agreed to be</p> <p><i>The civic society movement promotes and celebrates what is valued from the past and works to improve what is developed for the future so that everyone can be proud of where they live.</i></p> <p><i>To achieve this civic societies will have a strong local presence and be part of a movement with Civic Voice as an influential national voice, which will benefit the whole community.</i></p> <p>The Mission was agreed as</p> <p><i>Civic Voice leads and supports civic societies as a national movement for quality of place, with people actively improving their towns, cities and villages</i></p> <p>NS queried whether Campaigning was really a value. He acknowledged that this is what we do and it didn't feel right as a value. JW supported this. JW suggested that the values be given a different order. This was agreed by HM. The order of the values are now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☛ Independent in our views ☛ Grassroots and Responsive – accessible and transparent, with a bottom up approach ☛ Inclusive – engaging with the whole community and spreading the benefit ☛ Networked – developing partnerships to make the most of the strength of the movement ☛ Campaigning – providing a national voice and promoting our vision <p>It was agreed to share these with members through the newsletter.</p> <p>SG said PR, IH and SG would now be taking the above and linking in with our</p>	<p>IH</p>

<p>strategic objectives. MM said that board members should be involved in the formation of the strategic objectives. JK supported this. Agreed to discuss with interested board members before April board meeting. The strategic objectives would be discussed at April.</p>	<p>SG/PR/IH</p>
<p><u>Programmes Update</u> <u>Protect our Place</u></p> <p>SS gave a short update on how the Protect our Place project had been going. This involved a short presentation that highlighted some key stats from the work.</p> <p>MM wanted to know if SS was happy with the geographic spread of responses for the survey. SS said in general she was. NS suggested it can sometimes be hard to get a complete national picture for surveys like this, but over 230 responses should be regarded as a positive. DT, JW and HM agreed.</p> <p>All thanked SS for giving the talk and said they were very pleased with the work she had produced so far. Several members emphasised that they wanted to see a draft report before it was finalised and presented to the project Sounding Group. MM emphasised the board should be able to feel as though they can input at a relevant stage.</p> <p><u>Civic Day update</u></p> <p>IH gave an update on Civic Day and Civic Watch. NS felt as though real potential could exist around Civicwatch and that it could easily get media attraction. He suggested that 4000 responses to a trial idea was excellent and we should encourage more groups to take on Civic Watch this year. MM asked if groups could participate in Civicwatch during anytime of the year, or just Civic Day. IH responded that for the first year, it was a very much a pilot. We would like to see it linked with Civic Day going forward, but groups should feel free to use the tool for whenever they want. IH emphasised that Civicwatch will have a greater role to play this year.</p> <p>IH informed the board that since the departure of Freddie Gick from the board, the Civic Day team has not had a Trustee on it. JW volunteered to participate.</p> <p><u>Marsh Awards</u></p> <p>IH and PR led a discussion on the Marsh Awards. The Chair expressed concerns were that despite the fact that David Lovie and PR put a lot of work into selecting the proposed winners. However, Brian Marsh chose quite another set of winners which were nothing like as relevant to CV as those originally selected. Overall the board agreed that the Marsh Awards were beneficial and that they were worthy Awards. JK said that it looks good that they are being awarded from an external organisation. NS mentioned that CPRE also get support from the Marsh Awards. It was agreed to keep the Awards relationship open but to learn lessons from this years.</p> <p>It was agreed to look again later in the year at the Trustee who will join this group – replacing David Lovie.</p> <p>JW asked if Eric Pickles would hand out these awards but it was explained it was the Civic Day Awards he was involved with.</p> <p><u>Heritage Open Days</u></p> <p>SG gave an update on Heritage Open Days, most notably reporting on the consultants report about options for the future. SG explained that based on this report, a focus group had been convened to discuss the options. PR, SG and David Lovie attended the workshop.</p>	<p>SS</p> <p>JW</p> <p>PR/IH</p> <p>All</p>

<p>SG explained that it is now acknowledged that redundancy costs and TUPE are two very real barriers to the progression of HODs for the different partners. National Trust currently have their lawyers looking through the delivery contract with English Heritage to see what manoeuvrability is available.</p> <p>MM said as far as he was concerned, nothing could happen until TUPE was sorted out. NS and DT both emphasised that we should seek to avoid any financial risk to Civic Voice both in the short term and long term. NS said that we should seek to engage in long term discussions about HODs until the time when we think it will be too much a liability to continue. JK said that having a legal background he would be happy to assist if called upon.</p> <p>All agreed that TUPE was the issue and until this can be dealt with, no real decision from a Civic Voice perspective can be taken. The board asked to be informed about all major decisions on HODs between board meetings.</p>	
<p><u>Budget and Management accounts</u></p> <p>A set of financial figures to end June were circulated by MM. MM explained that nothing major had changed on the figures other than we had spent more on travel than originally expected. He wanted confident figures about projected income before he was comfortable at putting them in the long term forecast.</p> <p>MM finished by saying we will be making a 60k end of year loss unless further external funding is found. We have enough money in the bank (via reserves) to see us through to 2015 but emphasised we need money!</p>	
<p>Funding update</p> <p>SG stressed confidentiality on his update due to commercial sensitivities. All agreed. SG talked about a project with Mastercard in the region of £40,000 to help support independent audits on the high street.</p> <p>DT queried the financial figures behind this and explained that we should not be underestimating the real time involved in work – especially the real costs of staff. We do not want to develop a relationship only for it to not be delivered to the level we wish, or worse, at a cost to us! NS also said that we should not undersell ourselves.</p> <p>MM said he expected to work closely with staff before any final numbers were submitted and would expect to sign it off. SG made clear that this would be so.</p> <p>MM queried with the numbers being expressed would Civic Voice be able to have the time and capacity to support such a project. PC said that we needed to be careful in that we did not want to over burden groups with many different projects.</p> <p>PC explained a situation whereby Leeds Civic Trust, although managing to raise some significant funds for a project around monitoring listed buildings, seemed to be struggling to recruit volunteers to participate. HM and JW said this was an interesting issue and something we did need to be aware of. NS said we have been successful, but he supported that we did not want to over stretch groups.</p> <p>DT had a slight different view by saying that the strength of the civic movement is its diversity and this means that different groups will respond to different interests. <i>“What may interest Chester may be completely opposite to Liverpool or London”</i>.</p> <p>HM wanted to know how a potential “neighbourhood plan high street” would link into work with the Mary Portas work. SG said it would be in year’s 2 and 3 so we could learn from Portas.</p> <p>PR agreed that projects around the high street are sensible for Civic Voice – as</p>	<p>SG/IH/MM</p>

<p>long as the logistics and process can be agreed.</p> <p>PC wondered if we wanted to try and look at financial incentives to get groups to be involved. PC stressed he was not talking about “paying” groups, but felt that a little bit of funding to encourage participation is sometimes all a group needs to be able to get involved. Several liked this idea, if it can be made to work.</p> <p>Network Rail SG gave an update on possible sponsorship with Network Rail to support Civic Day. It would involve £10,000 to cover core activities and a project with 400 Friends of Railways. DT liked this suggestion and felt it was a good way to open us up to more groups.</p> <p>JW asked SG what price he thought Civic Day should be getting sponsored for. SG responded at least in the region of £50k but stressed we should not undersell it. However we also have to be realistic, for instance we may gain less finance but have other forms of support from a sponsor.</p> <p>JW queried if we could go back to Esmee Fairbairn for funding. NS wondered whether we should or at least wait a year. PR said they would only fund another year if it was a new project. They would be reluctant to keep core funding us. IH explained that Esmee would want a final report before we can even ask about further funding. They have made this clear to us already.</p> <p>DCLG</p> <p>SG explained that we are still hopeful of core funding from DCLG and will soon be submitting a report on neighbourhood planning called Making it Work.</p> <p>DT queried the rationale to this and suggested we do something different to this and show uniqueness i.e. “things stopping neighbourhood planning” and maybe write some detailed case studies on the areas where it is not happening.</p> <p>The final report will be circulated to the Board</p>	<p>SG</p>
<p>Membership Review</p> <p>IH led the group through a short slide presentation that summarised the membership review work. JW, MM and HM who had each been on the membership review had also contributed.</p> <p>A motion was put to the board recommending that the membership fee for 2013/2014 be kept at the current rates, but, a longer-term membership review will take place to look at being in a position to announce at the October AGM a new membership structure for a period of 3 years. The board agreed to the recommendation from the membership panel.</p>	
<p>The board held a private item. Staff left the room.</p>	
<p><i>NS left the meeting and staff re-joined the room.</i></p>	
<p>Planning Panel</p> <p>IH led the group on a discussion on the Planning Panel. DT summarised that from his position the panel works fine and that we cannot be expecting people to give up days of time to attend meetings.</p> <p>DT summarised that the process for responses works well in that IH gathers thoughts from Civic Voice members and the panel; shares an initial draft with the</p>	

<p>Planning Panel and then that it is worked up into a final document. HM stated that she had heard some concerns, which others expressed to her.</p> <p>IH said that the group could always work better but it is a matter of balancing the time commitment and different skills. IH emphasised that cross-communication amongst panel members has increased recently.</p> <p>HM suggested that the board should see any consultation response before it is submitted</p>	<p>IH</p>
<p><i>IH and SS left the meeting at this point.</i></p>	
<p>Civic Panel</p> <p>SG gave a verbal update of the meeting held by the Panel the previous weekend and was requested to send round a copy of the Smart Growth statement around to the Board. SG was asked to write a short paragraph on each of the areas of potential interest to the Panel for the Board-see attached</p> <p>Core Cities</p> <p>SG updated the Board on the Core Cities group and feedback he has had from some members of the group. SG said that he was keen to take forward from a learning/networking perspective and strategically, e.g. party Manifestos etc. A debate was had about the group and purpose. One suggestion was around the group's title and is its membership exclusive to societies from core cities. It was suggested we consider "cities network" for example.</p> <p>JK offered to work with SG/IH to take forward/Chair the group. All agreed that JK and staff should meet and discuss options on taking forward.</p> <p>Staff to distribute the link for the Centre for Cities "City Outlook 2013" Report</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>JK/SG/IH</p> <p>IH</p>
<p>Local Lists</p> <p>SG presented the report developed by IH. A discussion was had across the Board</p> <p>Comments included that if a LA was not keen to take a Local List forward it may be difficult for a Civic Society to do so. A Local List may not have any effect if the LA doesn't/can't take forward. In addition Conservation Officers were overworked/under paid so might not be able to help. If a local List is taken forward it needs to be linked to the LDF. The best Local Lists may be those led by a Civic Society, but may not stand up to scrutiny.</p> <p>However SG reminded the Board that a campaign on Local Lists was voted on at the AGM and that we should look to investigate further. This also relates to a conversation that SG had with Director at EH. Board decision is to work with LAs that would adopt a Local List. SG and IH asked to report progress at the next Board meeting.</p> <p>Permitted Development:</p> <p>SG presented the report that had been mentioned earlier in the meeting. The Board accepted the report.</p> <p>War Memorials:</p> <p>PC introduced item describing initial thoughts reporting that there was a 6 years funded programme. PC and IH are due to meet with HLF to discuss and identify if/where Civic Voice could get involved in "niche" areas of the existing programme.</p>	<p>SG/IH</p>

<p>PC also meeting with the Director of the War Memorial Trust on 23 Jan. Will discuss what support Civic Voice/Civic Soc can offer.</p> <p>There are 65k entries not on the current list and PC explained more about the web-based data base to the Board including the photo-website for memorials and their links to a Google-map</p> <p>PC/IH have worked up some ideas, as in the report to the Board. HLF are concerned that they have not had many applications for the grant available-only 5 to date and not of a high standard. One thought was that potentially we could train our members through the WMT or through HLF funding. Focus could be, for instance, on memorials not maintained/not having a complete list of names/etc.</p> <p>A potential project could be for 3-5 years, with a start in 6-8 months. Would need to involve Civic Soc. in the scoping. The Board agreed that the project needed developing (all)</p> <p>PR asked SG for thoughts on the way forward. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PC to have the conversation with the WMT 2. PC and IH to meet with HLF to discuss options 3. PC and IH to develop a proposal on the back of these conversations 4. Draft proposal to PR/MM/SG 5. Agreed final version to Board for approval <p>Board agreed with SG thoughts and asked PC and IH to continue to develop based on this</p> <p>Community Right of Appeal</p> <p>JW and SG gave a verbal account of conversations with Chris Skidmore MP who is taking forward a Private Members Bill. Going for 2nd reading on the 1st of March. Board agreed to support and requested that JW/SG to continue to develop and keep Board informed of developments when appropriate.</p> <p>Thoughts were expressed to involve Civic Soc. members in lobbying their local MPs to support the second reading. It was suggested that SG could send Chris Skidmore MP a copy of those MPs on the APPG list</p> <p>Plaques:</p> <p>There was a general discussion about the reports concerning the plaque scheme. JK being very informed and shared knowledge with all. It was expressed that there was no point in Civic Voice discussing potential assistance/taking a position as the EH issue was only focussed in London and related to the back-log (HM)</p>	<p>PC/IH</p> <p>JW/SG</p> <p>SG</p>
<p>AOB</p> <p>JW volunteered to sit on the Constitution working group. SG/IH agreed to arrange a suitable date for the group to meet as requested by Board</p> <p>PR formally closed the Board meeting at 1738</p>	
<p>Date of next meetings</p> <p>The dates for future meetings are all in London (venue TBC)</p>	

Note the changes to some provisional dates.	
---	--

- April 16
- June 25
- September 11
- November 19