

## Feedback from Breakout Sessions

### Question 1

What role should Community-Led Plans fulfil?

- a) Community Focus
- b) Strategic-focus
- c) Combination of Local and Strategic

### Question 2

Does the relationship between Parish/Town Councils and Community Partnerships/Steering Groups help or hinder achieving actions?

What is the best way to move this forward?

### Question 3

What is the best way for the District and others to engage with communities in order to pick up the priorities they outline?

### Table 1

Communication

- District to receive the plan and give feedback and action
- 6 monthly – HALC/HDC
- Role of District Cllr to engage with the plans and feed to higher level
- But/what about County level actions?
- Communication issues between Parish Council and Community Partnership – need co-ordination and guidance

### Table 2

#### Q1

People need to be consulted and keep involved

Community focus – cascade up to strategic level but then communicate actions back to the community

Must see end result either community or district level

Need some quick wins to keep community engaged

#### Q2

Parish Councils do not get involved with economy issues e.g. advertising local jobs

Community Partnerships – not bound by red tape, can access funding not available to local authorities

Communication between PC's and CP's is key

PC's and CP's need the support at a strategic level, not just money – support their ideas

#### Q3

Face to Face

### Table 3

#### Q1

How do Parish Plans feed into Council?

Valuable input

May be affected by top down decisions

Community plans should be aspirational

How does Horsham Town Centres fit in?

Appraisal was fed in needs updating

How do we (HDC) use info?

Group Parishes geographically

Difficult to get together (time wise)

Share facilities

Need to find out how many parishes have common goals? E.g. need for health, youth club

Need coordinator to take overall responsibility and feedback

Need for unbiased consultation – use university research?

Need to preserve individuality but not be parochial

Local issues can be achieved at parish level – feel good factor – satisfaction

Bigger strategic issues are more of a wish list for DC or CC

Section 106 Money is restricted to local area – cannot/will not share

E.g. could share speed activated signs

Opportunity to share facilities and make group representations for facilities

## **Q2**

Fear of problem with non-elected Steering Groups/Community Partnership superseding Parish Councils  
Parish should approve projects

Danger of big brother (Community Partnerships with larger areas) taking over small parishes

Parishes should be represented on CP's and have a say on membership

CP's may just become talking shops

Enough analysis – now actions and implementation. Allocate the top priorities out to appropriate partners and start delivering

Opportunity to look at shared issues – power of collaboration pressure e.g. SID's and road safety

Clustering opportunities/geographical – but not to lose local distinctiveness. Ensure places not all the same

## **Q3**

Research – universities

Does HDC already have enough data to assess priorities?

## **Table 4**

### **Q1**

Combination of local and strategic

Make clear our part of plan what is strategic

### **Q2**

Strengthen HALC in some way

Improve working of relations between HALC/Parishes and HDC

### **Q3**

Community

- Liaison between Parish Councils
- Catchments /clusters
- Mini CLC's
- Value if relevant
- Not too big

## **Table 5**

### **Q1**

c) Combination – understand purpose – aspirations

### **Q2**

Positive in general

### **Q3**

Service Areas – Hub

Cluster alignment

Topic determines hub/boundaries

- Key to communicate/talk
- HDC to embrace clusters need
- Precept reflection
- Results

## **Table 6**

### **Q1**

A mix of local and strategic – no contradiction between them necessarily: residents asked for their priorities

Template would be helpful – how to produce a CP, but NOT if it seeks to skew local views – people don't like to be led!

Clustering seems to make sense for producing influential plans – see No. 3.

## **Q2**

Are both necessary

Southwater example – not easy at first but once roles clear, progress was made

Could Parishes and Community Partnerships work together with Partnerships getting funding for a shared project

Could there be a shared plan or one plan to save duplication

## **Q3**

Clustering seems to make sense on common issues – picking/selecting clusters based on e.g.

- Statistical evidence
- HDC political arrangements
- Service centres

Clustering is the mechanics for achieving actions

- HDC rep on each PC already supports good communication
- No single methodology will do 'Horses for courses'

Clusters would give a more powerful case/message for evidence based decisions

Would cluster members be willing to share resource e.g. Section 106 reserves

Clusters – selection method suggested already

- Recycling
- Health
- Education

Consult/engage with young people

Make it relevant

Parish consultations rely on meetings and formal consultation where usual suspects turn up

## **Table 7**

Neighbourhood Council's work closely together – more so when possibility of being parished in town  
Being kept informed in the loop is important. Two meetings a year would be useful. Big issues with town decisions that affect the whole district

Economy – give a voice. This sorting process – BRWG – on special charge

Inject information to local communities

Coldwaltham housing is the main issue

Steining and district – balanced relationship

Undertake a wider community plan, carries more weight

Retain identify of smaller parishes

Community does not = 1 parish