



A G E N D A

**Thursday 26 April 2012 at 6.30 pm
Council Chamber, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN1 1RS**

- 1 Apologies**
- 2 Declarations of Substitute Members**
- 3 Membership Changes**
 - a Membership Applications (none)
 - b Changes of Representatives (attached) (Pages 1 - 6)
- 4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting 29 March 2012 (Pages 7 - 14)**
- 5 Matters Arising**
 - a Announcement from the Chairman
 - b Neighbourhood Planning
Presentation on Neighbourhood Planning by Louise Phillips, Planning Policy Manager.
 - c Urban Design and the TCAAP
Presentation Alan Legg, Urban Design Team Leader.
 - d Anti-social Behaviour / Alcohol Fund Bid (Pages 15 - 28)
Presentation from Frances Taylor, Community Safety Co-ordinator. Views from the Town Forum are sought on the attached document.
- 6 Reports from the Town Forum Working Groups**
 - a Water in the Wells Working Group
- 7 Updates from Local Residents' Groups**
- 8 Any Other Business**

Date of the Next Meeting 24 May 2012

This page is intentionally left blank

Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum
Membership Changes as of 20 April 2012

1. Camden Road Traders Association is changing its name to Camden Road Guild and would like to continue its membership of the Town Forum. The named representative will change from Mr Jonathan Wright to Ms Sue Kaner.
2. The Regina Court Resident's Association have been written to regarding lack of attendance at the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum meetings, and their representative, Ms S Casey, has requested that the Association be removed from the membership of the Town Forum due to time commitments.
3. Voluntary Action Within Kent have been written to regarding lack of attendance at the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum meetings, and their representative, Ms Charlie Fox has requested that VAWK is removed from the membership for the time being, whilst the organisation seeks to appoint a new representative. They have requested to continue receiving agendas and minutes of the Town Forum as an 'interested party'.

Jane Clarke, Local Democracy Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

RTW TOWN FORUM MEMBERSHIP

APRIL 2012

Association/Group	Primary Representative	Substitute
Access Group	Ms Sarah Brown	
Albion Road Residents' Assoc.	Mr Peter Gemmill	
Banner Farm Residents' Assoc.	Mr John Goodfellow	Veronika Segall Jones
Benhall Mill Road Land Association	Mr Altan Omer	
Beulah Road Residents' Association	Chris Morris	Dr P Whitbourn
Boyne Park Residents' Association	Dorothea Holman	Jeanne Michau
Broadwater Rise Residents' Association	Mr Chris Wigley	Mr Joe Challis
Calverley Park Residents' Association	Jane Fenwick	Kate Bishop
Calverley Park Crescent Freeholders' Association	Mrs Betsy Dix	Mr Peter Perry
Camden Road Traders' Association Camden Road Guild	Mr Jonathan Wright Ms Sue Kaner	
Camden Park Residents' Association	Mrs Michele Hull	
Citizens' Advice Bureau	Ms Linda Chamberlain	
Civic Society of RTW	John Forster	John Cunningham
Clarence Road Users' Association	Mr David Webster	Ms Kate Sergeant
Clarendon Area Residents' Association	Mr David Thompson	
Crossways Community	John Neel	
4 Roads Residents' Association	Arthur Hutchins	David Stocker
Friends of the Commons	Sally Balcon	Dr Ian Beavis
Friends of Grosvenor & Hilbert Parks	J.Paul Lambert	David Barnett
Friends of the Grove	Jonathon Brooks	
Friends of the TW Museum, Library & Art Gallery	Anne Stobo	Anne Forster
Friends of Woodbury Park Cemetery	Miss Angela Phillips	Mr David Bushell

Appendix A

Updated: 18 April 2012

Grove Hill Residents' Association	Mrs K Fisher	
Grantley Court Residents Association	Ms Lorna Blackmore	
Hawkenbury Village Association	Mr Michael Doyle	Mary Wardrop
Inner London Road Residents' Association	David Wakefield	Commander George Lawson
Kingswood Residents' Association	Kyrios Kyriacou	
Molyneux Park Road Residents' Association	Victor Webb	
Oak Road Community Association	Alan Bullion	
Pantiles Traders (Association of)	Stephen Marshall	
Poona Road Residents' Association	Mike Brondbjerg	Polly Brondbjerg
Regina Court Residents' Association	Miss S M Casey	
Residents' First	Jenina Pendry	Stephen Bowser
Rock Villa & Hanover Residents' Association	Mr I Naismith	Mr John Higgs
Royal British Legion T Wells Branch	Lt Col John Mattei	
Sherborne Close Management Ctte	Mary Wardrop	
Skinners Six Roads Residents' Association	Lesley Herriot	
Soroptimist International	Ms June Bridgeman	Mrs Judith Farnie
St John's Retailers' Association	Ms Andrea Afrifa	
St John's Road Residents' Association	Marguerita Morton	Tony Mole
Telephone House Neighbours' Association	Katharina Mahler-Bech	
TN2 Community Trust	Alison Baker	Zoe Jangaard
Transition Tunbridge Wells	Kate Sergeant	Carole Barnes
Tunbridge Wells Girls' Grammar School	Mary Burgess	Gill Field
Tunbridge Wells Over Fifties Forum	Mrs Maggie Fraser	David Morris
Tunbridge Wells Twinning	Professor Michael Holman	Christine Philip

Tunbridge Wells Village Residents' Association	Mr Matt Goodwin	
Upper Stone Street Residents' Association	Roger Walsh	Helen Featherstone
Voluntary Action for West Kent	Ms Charlie Fox	
Warwick Park Residents Association	John Cunningham	
Woodbury Close Residents Association	Mr Christopher Thomas	

Councillor Members of RTW Town Forum from May 6th 2011

Ward: Broadwater
Barbara Cobbold

Ward: Culverden
Ronen Basu & Nicholas Rogers & Leonard Price

Ward: Pantiles & St Mark's
Glenn Hall & Leonard Horwood & James Scholes

Ward: Park
Peter Bulman & Sean Lockhart & Catherine Mayhew

Ward: St James'
Benjamin Chapelard & David Neve

Ward: St John's
Caroline Derrick & Tracy Moore & Trevor Poile

Ward: Sherwood
Bob Backhouse & Lynne Weatherly & Frank Williams

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS TOWN FORUM

Thursday, 29 March 2012

Present: David Wakefield (Chairman), Jane Fenwick (Vice Chairman), John Goodfellow, Chris Morris, Dorothea Holman, Betsy Dix, John Forster, David Webster, Sally Balcon, David Barnett, Jonathon Brooks, Anne Stobo, Angela Phillips, Lorna Blackmore, Michael Doyle, George Lawson, Stephen Marshall, Stephen Bowser, June Bridgeman, Katharina Mahler-Bech, Kate Sergeant, Maggie Fraser, Michael Holman, Christopher Thomas.

Councillors: Cllr Basu, Cllr Mayhew, Cllr Neve, Cllr Derrick, Cllr Williams.

Other Members in Attendance: Councillors

1. APOLOGIES

John Cunningham, Cllr Scholes, Alan Bullion, Mary Wardrop, Peter Perry, Marguerita Morton, Tony Mole, Cllr Poile, Kyrios Kyriacou, John Mattei, Cllr Price, Cllr Bulman, Altan Omer, Cllr Chapelard.

2. DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

None.

3. MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

None.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 23 FEBRUARY 2012

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a correct record with the following change:

6A Water in the Wells Working Group

Discussion

“It was noted that the Ice Rink had made a loss of £100,000, which was due in part to the warm weather and the need to bring in an electricity generator.”

5. ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Chairman informed the Forum that this would be a new standing item included on each agenda to ensure actions decided at the meeting would be followed up.

23 February 2012

5A Public Realm Scrutiny Update

AS Action: The disabled access group agreed to feed in further comments to the scrutiny review via Anne Stobo (AS).

AS would speak to Michael Coggles regarding comments the disabled access group may wish to feed in.

Ongoing.

DW Action: The Chairman agreed to organise a presentation from Alan Legg, Urban Design Team Leader, for a future meeting.

DW would arrange for Alan Legg to attend the April meeting of the Forum.

Completed 04.04.12.

5B Letter to County Councillors Regarding Library Photo Booth

DW Action: Members noted the item and the Chairman agreed to follow this up and report back to the meeting at a future date.

DW reported that he was awaiting statistics for use of the photo booth from the library and would report back at a future date. To give weight to the issue he urged Forum members to complain individually to the Library and to County Councillors about the severe reduction in notice board space.

Ongoing.

5C Draft Consultation Response for Local Heritage Assets

DW Action: The Chairman agreed to send in a consultation response with the discussion points included.

Completed 27.02.2012.

6A Water in the Wells Working Group

ALL Action: Forum members agreed to help raise the profile of the initiative by talking to their own group about the project, and ensuring that when speaking to Councillors and officers, they would press for it always to be on the agendas of the decision making groups within the Council.

Ongoing.

7A Neighbourhood Planning Workshop

DW Action: It was agreed that the Chairman undertake an exercise to plot the areas already represented across the town, and seek to fill any areas where there were gaps. The Forum could then start work on a set of individual Neighbourhood Plans.

Ongoing.

7B Joint Transportation Board Update

ALL Action: Members who had comments to make about railings in town could contact County Councillor Roy Bullock, Borough Councillor David Neve, County Councillor Kevin Lynes, County Councillor James

Agenda Item 4

Scholes or Borough Councillor Catherine Mayhew.

Cllr Mayhew reported that the group had looked at railing placements with recommendations to remove some and retain others. Cllr Neve welcomed that KCC officers had listened to local concerns and knowledge and felt the exercise was a success.

Completed 03.2012.

JG/
ALL Action: John Goodfellow would feed in the Town Forum's views on this issue to the JTB. Members who had specific comments to feed in could contact Mr Goodfellow separately before the JTB meeting.

Completed 03.2012.

7C TWITA

ALL Action: Members interested in attending the launch event should contact the Local Democracy Officer for more details.

Completed 03.2012.

6. MATTERS ARISING

6A. TWITA

Councillor Derrick informed the Forum that this initiative had been launched on 1 March 2012. Child casualties on roads had been rising and the number of road incidents in the Borough was higher than the national average. TWITA had been formed to address these issues, and was aimed primarily at educating children between 10 and 14 years old, but also expanding to 16-17 year olds and 17-24 year olds. It was noted that road accidents were the biggest killers of the 17-24 year old age group.

Actions

ALL That Forum members think of ways in which they could get involved with the work of TWITA, in particular ways to hold a fund-raising event to raise the profile of the work.

ALL That Forum members lobby KCC to reduce traffic speeds outside of schools to 20mph.

6B. FRIENDS OF CALVERLEY GROUNDS

The Vice-Chairman noted that a preliminary meeting of this group had been held on 29 February 2012, and the next meeting was set for 18 April 2012 between 7pm and 8.30pm in the Calverley Grounds Cafe.

7. PEDESTRIANISATION IN TUNBRIDGE WELLS

The Chairman informed members that this update would be on North Farm traffic improvements and A21 duelling, rather than pedestrianisation in Tunbridge Wells.

Agenda Item 4

The Chairman introduced the TWBC Portfolio Holder for Planning & Transportation, Councillor Ransley, TWBC Head of Economic Development, David Candlin, and KCC Partnership Officer, Chad Nwanosike, to the meeting.

Councillor Ransley addressed the Forum and said that whilst public transport was the preferred method of transport across the Borough, KCC were reluctant to subsidise buses, and people preferred car travel because it was safe and convenient. He also noted that cars entering town provided much needed parking revenue.

However, North Farm and the A21 were congestion problems that did need addressing, and through the Locality Board KCC and TWBC had agreed to spend £30,000 on a traffic study to produce options for the area.

Sally Balcon suggested a one-way system being introduced for North Farm. Councillor Ransley felt this would impose a lengthy detour on motorists wishing to turn left, and would not work. Mr Nwanosike said that the study would look into the feasibility of a one-way system. Results were expected in May.

June Bridgeman felt a radical solution was needed and queried whether duelling the A21 would make the situation better or worse. She also suggested railway improvements as a measure. Councillor Ransley said modelling showed A21 duelling would have a positive effect. Several of the exits were unsuitable, and a second road tunnel under the railway would be too expensive, so improving the A21 was the best option.

Chris Thomas asked what KCC Highways were doing with regard to traffic light timings at the B&Q turning, and whether any arguments against the traffic increase were put forward at the time of building North Farm. Mr Nwanosike replied that the B&Q turning already had the most sophisticated type of traffic system on the market. Traffic movements in the area were complex, but would be monitored and adjusted remotely in 6-8 weeks time to help with the situation.

John Goodfellow suggested another route for access along Dowding Road and Kings Standing. Mr Nwanosike replied that it would be technically difficult to put another access onto the A21.

Councillor Neve felt that S106 monies from historic developments in the area should have been used to part fund a more radical solution for the present that would properly alleviate traffic issues. He noted a "blue route" had been devised in 2001, and this should be re-considered

Councillor Mayhew felt money would be better spent on improvements to the town centre environment, including pedestrianisation of certain areas. Mr Candlin replied that money was being spent on remedying existing problems to improve the current situation, and it was noted that the A26, A264 and Pembury Road would be assessed as part of the study as well.

Chris Thomas asked how many sites changed planning permission at North Farm and Councillor Ransley explained that planning permission wasn't needed once a use class was granted as it stayed with the building, and several different businesses of a similar type could use it.

Agenda Item 4

Rob O'Callaghan said that whilst there was no money for A21 improvements, resolving the issues would have an enormous rate of return and benefit for the community if undertaken.

John Forster suggested a one-way scheme through the bridge, which might lengthen distances, but not times. Mr Nwanosike agreed that this could be looked at as part of the study.

Councillor Ransley went on to talk about improvements that could be made to the St John's Road area, and referred to a scrutiny review that had been conducted in 2009 with a six point plan for improvements. He had given out a sketch drawing of the plan to members, and asked for the Forum's opinion on the plans.

Councillors Neve and Derrick agreed that the scrutiny review had been worthwhile and supported the plan.

Forum members raised some concerns over the usability of the scheme for pedestrians, whether there was enough turning space, if a linked roundabout might be more appropriate, and whether the bus lanes would be affected. Councillor Ransley agreed these were all minor issues that needed further investigation. Overall however, Forum members were supportive of the scheme, and asked Councillor Ransley to take it forward in the most appropriate way.

Councillor Ransley went on to talk about shared space schemes, which were more feasible than pedestrianisation. Councillor Mayhew agreed that this was a more modern way forward.

Forum members agreed with the idea of more shared space areas, and Anne Stobo and John Goodfellow felt that this should go hand-in-hand with a reduction in speed limits to 10mph or 20mph. Anne Stobo suggested a shared space outside the Town Hall, which would highlight the heritage of the building and improve disabled access.

John Forster and Councillor Derrick proposed non-traditional traffic calming measures such as planting trees to reduce line-of-sight and Mr Nwanosike agreed that speed reduction measures were a better option than speed enforcement measures.

Actions

- | | |
|-----|---|
| DW | Mr Nwanosike agreed to return to the Forum in June with the results of the modelling study. |
| BR | Councillor Ransley agreed to take the scrutiny review plan to Locality Board in June to progress the St John's Road scheme further. |
| JG? | Councillor Neve requested that a proposed bus extension scheme from Woodbury Park to Mount Ephraim be considered by JTB. |
| BR | The Forum requested that Councillor Ransley press ahead with introduction of shared spaces in the town centre. |

8. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING

The Chairman updated the Forum on a Neighbourhood Planning session that he had attended. The Forum could have a role to play under the emerging National Planning Policy Framework by producing a Neighbourhood Plan.

Other members discussed aspects of the Localism Act, the Town Centre Area Action Plan and the Core Strategy, which were all relevant in terms of planning for the town's future. Councillor Mayhew clarified that the Neighbourhood Plan had to take account of the Core Strategy, and other policies, but allowed local people to state what they felt was important for the town.

Visiting Council Member Councillor Hills said that the allocations policy also needed to be considered in terms of uses for different plots of land.

June Bridgeman raised the issue of representation in the Town Forum and felt that the northern parts of town were not well represented. It was noted that this was an action from a previous meeting that was being taken forward by the Chairman.

Actions

DW The Chairman agreed to ask Louise Phillips, Planning Policy Manager, to attend April's meeting to explain Neighbourhood Planning further to Forum members.

9. WORKING GROUPS

9A. WATER IN THE WELLS

Michael Holman gave a further update on the work of the group and said that water features needed to be a part of the TCAAP. There had been £100,000 allocated to Calverley Grounds to install a three-phase electrical generator, but this would only serve current initiatives such as the ice rink. More long-term electricity plans were needed if a water feature in the park was to be a realistic possibility.

The 'Courier' was interested in the work of the group and Mr Holman had done a short interview with a reporter. He had concentrated on the the vision for TW as a town of "pleasure, leisure, health and wealth". He appealed again to Forum members to speak to the residents in their associations to see if any professional skills were available to help with the project. Money would be available for appropriate schemes through S106 contributions. The Friends of Grosvenor and Hilbert Parks had been allocated over £300,000 of 106 monies for work in the parks and had also applied for Heritage Lottery Fund money. It would be good, Michael Holman, observed, if some of the 106 allocated money could be used to bring back water features into the park.

Lastly, Mr Holman referred to the art in the public realm project, which featured art work entries that referred to water in some aspect. He encouraged Forum Members to vote for their favourite entry.

Councillor Mayhew added that the consultation for the art in the public realm had been extended, and that a study had been commissioned to assess

Agenda Item 4

whether the spring waters in the Pantiles had dried up permanently, or if this was simply a temporary issue.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10A. LOVE WHERE WE LIVE AWARD

The Chairman asked the Forum if they would endorse an application for a Lifetime Achievement Award for the late Councillor Peter Crawford, and this was agreed.

Actions

DW The Chairman would write an entry for the Love Where We Live Awards on behalf of Councillor Peter Crawford.

10B. STREET CLEANING

Dorothea Holman alerted Forum members that the Boyne Park Residents' Association had successfully liaised with Cory Environmental and TWBC to have car parking restricted early on two successive mornings and get both sides of the streets properly cleaned.. She urged other residents' associations to get in contact with her for help or advice on how to approach this process if they felt their streets also needed proper cleaning.

10C. TUNBRIDGE WELLS IN BLOOM

Councillor Basu said that Tunbridge Wells in Bloom had been launched this week in Calverley Park, and the group was gradually approaching different parts of the town to do small things around this project. Students had planted snowdrops recently and whilst the lack of rain was an issue, the Olympic route would be decorated with flowers.

NOTE: The meeting concluded at 8.30pm.

This page is intentionally left blank



Alcohol fund prospectus

Alcohol fund prospectus

Context

Crime and anti-social behaviour caused by alcohol abuse is a widely recognised problem across England. According to a 2010 Home Office Impact Assessment¹, alcohol-related crime is estimated to cost £8bn-£13bn a year. This estimate takes into account the costs in anticipation of crime, the direct physical and emotional cost to victims, the value of lost output, and the costs to the health service and the Criminal Justice System.

In her third report as Government Champion for Safe and Active Communities, Baroness Newlove set out the importance of tackling the damage associated with problem drinking² and announced a new Government fund to help address this, which she will lead. To read a copy of the report please visit:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/communities/buildingsafecommunities>

Problem drinking and the new fund are covered on pages 26-27. There are also examples of good practice and participatory budgeting in the report.

The new fund will be available for up to 10 community partnerships, through local authorities, to spend over a two-year period with each successful bid receiving in the region of £45,000 per year.

We are looking for partnership working which engages local people to be central to how this money will be used.

- Applicants will therefore be asked to set out how community groups, local residents, the police, young people and retailers are central to the action that will be taken.

We will also be looking for some, or all, of the money to be allocated through a participatory budgeting exercise. In other words, local people and community groups must be included in choosing projects the money supports.

<http://www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk/>

¹ <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/impact-assessments/IA10-149.pdf>

² E.g. binge drinking and under age drinking

To recap

The group bid for funding must include representatives from interested bodies such as the local authority, police, health and education services, the local community, local retailers and interested private sector alcohol industry representatives. The bid should clearly identify the local problems and outline a strategy to deal with them.

Annex B provides an example of what a project might look like, including outcomes. This is an example and it is not necessary to have all those partners.

We are looking for local solutions to local problems so send us your ideas.

Outcomes of the fund

As outcomes of the fund, we expect to see:

- 1) a direct measurable reduction in anti-social behaviour, and
- 2) the development of stronger partnership working between agencies and local communities, in those areas in receipt of funding.

We expect the individual groups making up the partnerships to play a role in determining how anti social behaviour is measured, but this would be consistent with criteria agreed with the police to ensure evaluation is recognised across the areas.

Baroness Newlove will work closely with all successful areas and take a keen interest in their progress. We would expect the successful areas to network together and potentially take part in media opportunities so that their progress can encourage others. Indicators we would expect partnerships to consider for use in measuring their success include:

- there is less binge drinking and affected areas become calmer – indicator would be a reduction in the number of anti-social behaviour incidents related to alcohol consumption
- the consumption of alcohol by young people reduces to safe levels – indicator would be fewer A&E admissions to the local hospitals or fewer ambulance call outs as a result of drinking
- there is a reduction in purchasing of alcohol made on behalf of under 18s (“proxy purchasing”).

Funding arrangements

The Department for Communities and Local Government has committed £1m to support this Fund, to be equally split across the 2012/13 and 2013/14 financial years (i.e. £500,000 per financial year). The Fund is applicable to England only.

The Fund will expect to award in the region of £90,000 in total to successful bids (up to 10 communities). Payment will be made to the lead Local Authority of the bid through a Section 31 grant under the Local Government Act 2003 and will be made in two equal annual payments. At the end of the first year we would expect to hold a progress review for the 10 areas.

The purpose of this funding is to provide an opportunity for local areas to test innovative community-based approaches to tackle the issues arising from problem drinking.

We are also encouraging applicants to highlight within their overall application, any discrete projects, to be undertaken in partnership with a community group, which could proceed with a smaller amount of funding (in the region of £10,000) even if the overall bid were unsuccessful. Recipients of these smaller grants will be notified at the same time as successful bidders for the main funding.

Whilst the Fund is not a precursor to a more wide-spread Government – supported fund, it is envisaged that those approaches that are successful can be replicated by other local areas.

Broad timetable for delivering the fund

Timetable for completing the alcohol fund prospectus	
23 March 2012	Publication of prospectus on DCLG's web site and other appropriate networks
1 May 2012	The deadline for local authorities to submit completed applications is 1 May 2012 (sent by 5pm)

The Government is inviting applications, structured around the selection criteria below and no more than 5 pages in total, from anywhere in England (rural or urban, combination of Local Authorities) to be sent no later than 5pm on 1 May 2012 to: baroness.newlove@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Agenda Item 5d

Applications should be submitted by the local authority on behalf of the respective partnership members. It should be accompanied by a short supporting covering letter from the local police, trade representatives and a community group or residents' association. A template for this covering letter is attached at Annex A.

Selection process and timetable

23 March/1 May 2012	There will be a recorded video message from Baroness Newlove on the DCLG website encouraging bids
1 May 2012	Deadline for applications
2 May – 11 May	Assessment of bids against the selection and ranking criteria. Applicants may be asked for additional supporting information during this period so please ensure contact details are available to provide if asked.
14 May	Decision and announcement. DCLG to agree and inform successful local authorities, and provide feedback to all areas.

Bid criteria

Proposals will be assessed against the following criteria:

<p>1. Clear partnership working</p>	<p>Bids will need to demonstrate clear partnership working led by a local authority with multiple partners (which could include other local authorities) to ensure value for money. This will need to include the local community, representation from the Police Authority and retailers as a minimum requirement. We would expect the strongest bids to include health and education services and interested private sector alcohol industry representatives. Evidence of successful partnership working in communities especially with young people on previous projects will be welcome.</p>
<p>2. Evidence of governance</p>	<p>Evidence of a governance/operational board which would meet regularly to manage the funding. We are happy for local areas to adapt existing structures for this purpose, rather than setting up new boards.</p>
<p>3. Clarity of purpose</p>	<p>Clear identification of the issues/problems arising in the area covered by the bid and a clear strategy prepared to address those issues.</p>
<p>4. Funding</p>	<p>Well- developed proposals on what the money would be spent on. The proposals should include how some or all, of the funding will be allocated through a participatory budgeting exercise, and that local people have been consulted.</p>
<p>5. Sustainability</p>	<p>Whilst this fund is a one-off, proposals should provide evidence of how the project will continue, after the conclusion of the funding period, or if it is to be completed within the lifetime of the funding provision, that it should have reference to an exit strategy.</p>

6. Community involvement	Clear evidence that the bid has been collaboratively developed around expressed views of the local community, including young people (for example, recent community engagement work) and all or some of the funding set out in the proposal will be allocated through participatory budgeting.
7. Monitoring	Clear evidence of what the objectives of the proposals are and how these will be measured. The Department will be looking for regular updates of progress, including evidence for what approaches have worked and what they have delivered.

For those bids that have strong evidence in support of the bid criteria and are able to become one of the recipients of this fund, the following criteria will also be used to help rank and select Local Authorities' proposals:

Ranking criteria	
8. Ambition	A clear statement of the aspiration and scale of ambition to tackle the issue of problem drinking in the local community, including any innovative approaches.
9. Sharing learning	Government wants to share the learning and good practice from the selected recipients. It would be useful if proposals could set out how learning from these pilots might best be captured and shared with other areas.

As noted above, in the case of unsuccessful main bids, smaller grants may be available for discrete projects. Such projects must be clearly identified in bids and will be considered against the following criteria:

Assessment criteria	
10. Clear partnership working	Projects must evidence clearly how they have been developed in partnership with a community group
11. Clarity of purpose	Projects will need to have clear tangible action that helps local people to address the effects of problem drinking in their neighbourhood.
12. Community engagement	Projects will need to set out how they are bringing residents and local agencies together.

Applicants are asked to indicate in their applications which elements of the overall proposal they would like to be considered for this funding.

Further information

Further information on this fund can be sought from Baroness Newlove's recorded video message on the DCLG website: www.communities.gov.uk

Annex A

Partnership Declaration

Name of Authority/Area:

Project Title:

Council representative signature (lead on Alcohol Policy):

Police representative signature (lead on Alcohol Policy):

Retail Representative signature (lead on Alcohol Policy):

Community or Resident Group Representative signature:

Please provide a brief summary of your proposal and how this meets the criteria in this prospectus:

.....
.....
.....

Please indicate whether you would be happy to work with Baroness Newlove’s team to record progress and produce feed back on the project. Y/N

Please indicate whether you would be happy to work with other successful areas and part of a wider group to share best practice. Y/N

Please indicate whether you would be happy to take part in publicity and promotion of good practice. Y / N

have you received any government funding if so from where, when and how much? (Does not mean you will not qualify for this Fund)

.....
.....
.....

Please list other organisations that you will be working with on this project:

e.g. Health representative, Youth representation etc.

.....
.....
.....

Annex B

Best practice example and outcomes: Anytown Partnership

'Anytown' has a problem with groups of teenagers illegally drinking, abusing passers-by, littering, and using a local park to "hangout". Parents with young children cannot use the facilities because of the loud and sometimes foul language. Elders living close by to the park are intimidated and feel trapped in their homes.

1. A group of concerned residents and parents complain to the Local Neighbourhood Policing Team who raises the issue with the Anti Social Behaviour Officer at the Local Authority. They call a meeting at the town hall, as they all agree something has to be done. They form the '**Anytown Community Partnership**' to tackle these ongoing problems together.
2. The Police enforcement officer sets up a proxy alcohol purchasing project asking young people to buy drink from a corner shop they suspect are selling alcohol illegally to underage young people. When confronted, the sole trader and his wife are ignorant of the law and penalties. The Partnership enlist the help of the local branch of a national supermarket who then offers small alcohol retail outlets, including the owner of this shop, free training on alcohol legislation, responsibilities and the penalties, alongside their own staff.
3. A local charity involved in supporting parents and young people help by going into local schools, colleges and youth clubs explaining why this Anti Social Behaviour caused by young people is unacceptable and enlisting the co-operation of the parents. They stress the negative health aspects alongside irresponsible and underage drinking. They are accompanied by an A&E doctor, a parent of a child killed by a drunk driver, and an ex offender who talk about the devastating effects of alcohol abuse. A similar programme runs in the local University tackling the effects of binge drinking among students.
4. The partnership gets a local nightclub owner to open early for totally alcohol free events targeting young people so they have somewhere to enjoy themselves without being a nuisance or a danger to others.
5. The Partnership would look to test a range of technology including alcohol meters, alcohol test strips and sobriety 24/7 (reducing reoffending from alcohol induced violence and crime) as their local Chief Constable is right behind their work.
6. The outcome is that the community as a whole is a safer and happier place to live and work in. The partnership has pulled together statutory agencies, voluntary sector, and local people. They go on to address other issues together and develop a better understanding, not work in

isolation. Money saved in this reduction in anti social behaviour (removing litter, graffiti, calling out Police through incidents from irate residents etc.) is used in more positive youth engagement programmes and other neighbourhood improvements, which the whole partnership vote on, and help deliver.

The “Anytown” partnership can prove it has local people, local authority, police, education, young people and health practitioners working together to tackle anti social behaviour issues connected to alcohol. They have asked for funding for a multi agency strategy which they have ALL decided is the best way to eradicate the problems they face.

Some factors in the winning bid include:

- Youth and community engagement
- Parent/victim support
- Community mediation
- Training and development
- Youth diversionary projects

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

March 2012

ISBN: 978-1-4098-3403-8