



Report to Cabinet

Subject Area-Based Initiatives
Date 7 April 2005
Author Head of Cabinet Office

1. Purpose of the Report

- § To inform Cabinet of the Gedling Partnership's recent decision on the adoption of areas to be subject of Area Based Initiatives in the coming year.

2. Background

Following the success of work to address a range of community safety and wider quality of life issues in the Honeywood Gardens area of Carlton in 2003, the Council agreed to expand such Area-Based Initiative activity to other areas of the Borough in 2005/06 and beyond.

This commitment forms part of the agreed CPA Improvement Plan.

Delivery of Area-Based Initiatives is very much a partnership-focused activity, requiring the participation and support of various public agencies, as well as the communities involved.

It was therefore felt most appropriate to progress Area-Based Initiatives through the Gedling Partnership, in which all key agencies are involved.

The Partnership Executive recently considered a report on the issue, a copy of which is attached at **Appendix A**. The report explains in more detail what an Area-Based Initiative is and how each will be progressed.

3. Proposal

Based on the information provided, and after further discussion, the Gedling Partnership Executive agreed that Area-Based Initiatives should be progressed in the following two Super Output Areas during 2005/06.

SOA E01028147 – Bonington Ward (area around Warren Hill)

SOA E01028212 – Valley Ward (area around Carlton Forum Leisure Centre)

Details of the reasoning behind the Partnership's decision are set out in the minutes of the Executive's 10 March 2005 meeting, an extract from which is attached at **Appendix B**.

Maps showing the locations in more detail will be available for reference at this meeting.

4. Resource Implications

Resources for the development and co-ordination of Area-Based Initiatives have been made available through the Council's recent investment in capacity through the Cabinet Office.

Financial and other related support will also be sought from other agencies for both organisational and practical service delivery activities within their respective areas of responsibility.

However, depending on the detailed issues requiring attention in each area, there may be a need for council departments to give a particular priority to enhancements in service delivery or investments in service improvements in the areas selected, as was the case with some activity in Honeywood Gardens. It would be consistent with the council's priorities and with its stated CPA Improvement Plan if departments could afford due priority to any requests made and, if appropriate, ensure that resource development bids are submitted as part of future Budget/Service Plan developments to meet needs identified through the Area-Based initiative process.

5. Recommendation

Members are recommended to note the report and confirm Cabinet support for the Council's own involvement in Area Based Initiatives.

Appendix A

Gedling Partnership **Working together**

Report to Gedling Partnership Executive

Subject: Area Based Initiatives

Date: Thursday 10th March 2005

Author: Stephen Bray & David Evans, Gedling Borough Council

1. Purpose of the Report

- § To provide the Executive with the criteria and information necessary to make informed evidence based decisions in the process of identifying Area Based Initiatives (ABI) for Gedling.

2. Background

Following a presentation by the Community Partnerships Manager to the Gedling Partnership Board on 3rd November 2004, the Board agreed that the implementation of Area Based Initiatives (ABI) would be an appropriate means for tackling deprivation within the Borough. The Board subsequently gave the Gedling Partnership Executive the responsibility for identifying suitable ABI's.

ABI's were first discussed by the Executive at their meeting on 26th January 2005. Members asked for a report suggesting the information and criteria which should be taken into account in identifying a possible ABI, and the means by which an ABI should be coordinated and managed. The report would then help guide the identification of new ABI's for Gedling.

ABI's are a development of the work carried out by partners in the Honeywood Gardens area of Carlton Hill in 2003/2004. They also fit well with current government proposals with regard to neighbourhood development.

3. Proposal

3.1 What is an ABI?

ABI's are partnership resourced and managed initiatives targeted towards areas of deprivation at neighbourhood/sub-ward level. They aim to improve the quality

of life for all the community within a defined geographical area through intensive partnership based intervention. Partners work together to pool and divert resources to tackle deprivation and community cohesion as appropriate, over a sustained and focused period of time. ABI's are not a '*quick fix*'.

3.2 What issues should an ABI address?

An ABI should confront inequalities and bring about an improvement in the overall quality of life experienced within a community. In addition, but not exclusively, an ABI should address the priority themes of Gedling Partnership. The exact issues to be addressed, and the relative balance of these issues, will vary according to the circumstances of the specific neighbourhood under review.

3.3 How should an ABI be managed?

It is proposed that the work carried out in Honeywood Gardens is used as a model for development. The Honeywood ABI proved to be very successful, and it would be sensible to take advantage of the experience gained from both the successes and failures of the work undertaken.

The local community should be firmly at the centre of any ABI. Partners will engage with individuals and community groups to secure their involvement throughout the initiative. In an area where a formal community group does not exist, efforts will be made to establish one. Community involvement is key to the success of any ABI, as the community must support and take ownership of the work undertaken. It is further proposed that ABI's should be developed with the engagement and consultation of local Ward Councillors. This too is consistent with latest government thinking on local leadership.

To effectively manage an ABI, a structure is required to ensure inter and intra-agency collaboration. It is therefore proposed that an ABI steering group is established for each ABI to include representation from the local community and all major partners – Gedling Borough Council (Cabinet Office staff including Community Projects Officers; all other departments as appropriate; Officer Group), Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottinghamshire Police, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue, Gedling Council for Voluntary Service, Gedling Primary Care Trust. It is proposed that Netherfield Partnership should be used as a model for developing the steering group.

The steering group should have the following responsibilities:

- Secure the commitment of all relevant partner organisations to the delivery of ABI work.
- Prepare ABI programme and project plans

- Performance management
 - Agree aims and objectives
 - Ensure achievement of the outcomes stipulated for the ABI by the Partnership Executive
 - Recommend to the Executive relevant performance indicators/measures and then put in place systems to enable the group to report to the Executive on progress with regard to those indicators
 - Agree milestones

- Monitoring and review process

- Agree exit strategy

3.4 Resourcing

Community Project Officers recently appointed by Gedling Borough Council to support partnership working would have a key role to play in coordinating ABIs and liaising with the communities involved. They will be the key link between the statutory and voluntary sector, and local communities. They may also seek out and submit funding bids for specific projects. However, they cannot deliver these projects alone and will need active ongoing support from other agencies, and Gedling Borough Council departments, if ABIs are to be successful.

Successful ABIs will require leadership/managerial support from the project steering group as well as practical, on the ground support with activities relating to community development, community safety and practical project delivery. This will have implications for Leisure, Youth Services, Highways, Housing, Education, Social Services etc. as and when needs require.

All organisations involved will be expected to either invest additional resources into ABIs, or '*bend*' current spending to fit. As outlined above, external funding opportunities will also need to be researched.

3.5 Performance Management

For each agreed ABI, an overall programme plan should be developed. This should include key milestones, clearly defined outcomes based on community priorities, and specific projects and initiatives where appropriate, all backed by individual project plans. Lead responsibility and accountability for specific projects should be clearly defined.

Overall accountability for the programme should rest with the steering group on behalf of Gedling Partnership. The steering group should receive regular

progress reports, and feedback reports on progress to the Executive. Detailed arrangements for performance management should be in line with Gedling Partnership's agreed performance management framework.

3.6 How should an ABI be identified?

It is proposed that the identification of ABI's should be evidence based through the use of the latest Indices of Multiple Deprivation (2004) information for the Borough. This process should be supported with anecdotal information from partner organisations, and the latest Borough/Ward crime figures.

The Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) are measured at a sub-ward geographical level known as a Super Output Area (SOA). Wards may have between one and five SOA's dependent on the size of their population. Each SOA in the country is given a score and rank for each of the following domains of deprivation – Income; Employment; Health Deprivation and Disability; Education, Skills and Training; Barriers to Housing and Services; Living Environment; and Crime. In addition, an overall score and rank is given for each SOA by combining the scores given for each of the seven domains.

To aid the Executive in the process of identifying Area Based Initiatives, the following appendices are included at the end of this report:

- Appendix. 1 lists the top ten most deprived SOA's in the Borough for overall IMD and each of the seven IMD domains. SOA maps will be provided at the meeting.
- Appendix. 2 explains each of the IMD domains and provides a break down of the indicators used to calculate each domain score.
- Appendix. 3 provides the latest Gedling Beat Area crime figures.

Given the Partnership's priority themes, the Executive may want to place greater weight on the domain scores relating to Crime; Health Deprivation and Disability; and the Living Environment. It is felt however, that they should not be the sole determinants when deciding where ABI's should be progressed.

It is proposed that the Executive should use the information provided to initially identify **two** Area Based Initiatives. Bearing in mind the intensity of these programmes it is felt that this is the most that can reasonably be delivered, particularly if ongoing one-off interventions are to continue in other areas.

3.7 Implications for work in other areas

Projects in other areas should not stop or be prevented as consequence of the operation of ABIs in Gedling. In particular, the Gedling Community Safety Partnership will continue to identify and deal with crime and anti-social behaviour "hotspots" as and when appropriate, through the implementation of short-term intervention projects operating for approximately three to six months.

However, it must be stressed that an ABI is a long term commitment and, all other things being equal, should be given due priority by all partner organisations once the initial commitment is made. There will need to be a clearly defined exit strategy to avoid open-ended commitments.

3.8 Timing

Assuming agreement can be reached at the meeting on the two areas to be covered by ABI's in 2005/2006, it is proposed that initial community engagement should begin as soon as final agreement is reached. Given the likely need to commit resources, individual parties may need to seek the agreement of their own organisations for involvement in the programme. It would be helpful if this could be secured by mid April 2005.

Community capacity building is likely to take quite a long time, so it is unlikely that a full programme plan will be agreed for implementation in either of the chosen areas any sooner than the end of December 2005. The intention would then be to set out a full programme to cover an approximate eighteen month to two year period, depending on the detail of issues and projects involved.

Exit strategies should seek to allow the draw back from intensive engagement by mid 2007, although some ongoing support is likely to continue.

None of the above should preclude early action on specific issues raised by the communities affected by ABI's. Indeed, it will be important to secure '*early wins*' in each area during the first six to nine months of community engagement.

4. Recommendations

Executive to discuss and endorse the proposals outlined within the report.

APPENDIX. 1 – OVERALL IMD

RANK WITHIN GEDLING WARD		SOA	IMD SCORE	RANK OF IMD (where 1 is most deprived)
1	Bonington	E01028147	41.88	4060
2	Killisick	E01028173	41.01	4303
3	Netherfield & Colwick	E01028186	34.97	6247
4	Daybrook	E01028166	31.17	7641
5	Netherfield & Colwick	E01028187	31.07	7693
6	St Marys	E01028209	29.97	8142
7	Calverton	E01028153	29.18	8505
8	Daybrook	E01028165	27.94	9071
9	Daybrook	E01028167	27.78	9143
10	Valley	E01028212	27.68	9181

INCOME

RANK WITHIN GEDLING WARD		SOA	INCOME SCORE	RANK OF INCOME SCORE (where 1 is most deprived)
1	Killisick	E01028173	0.35	2181
2	Bonington	E01028147	0.35	2321
3	Netherfield & Colwick	E01028187	0.27	4730
4	Netherfield & Colwick	E01028186	0.22	6847
5	St Marys	E01028209	0.19	8217
6	Daybrook	E01028166	0.19	8475
7	Valley	E01028210	0.18	8671
8	Calverton	E01028153	0.18	8733
9	Valley	E01028212	0.17	9534
10	Killisick	E01028174	0.17	9680

BARRIERS TO HOUSING AND SERVICES

RANK WITHIN GEDLING WARD		SOA	BARRIERS TO HOUSING AND SERVICES SCORE	RANK OF BARRIERS TO HOUSING AND SERVICES SCORE (where 1 is most deprived)
1	Newstead	E01028189	31.60	6114
2	Bestwood Village	E01028142	29.02	7856
3	Ravenshead	E01028200	28.62	8152
4	Lambley	E01028178	27.92	8732
5	Carlton	E01028156	22.12	14276
6	Ravenshead	E01028198	22.07	14334
7	St Marys	E01028205	21.33	15145
8	Gedling	E01028168	19.93	16642
9	Ravenshead	E01028199	19.47	17139

10 Woodborough E01028213 19.24 17373
EDUCATION SKILLS AND TRAINING

RANK WITHIN GEDLING WARD	SOA	EDUCATION SKILLS AND TRAINING SCORE	RANK OF EDUCATION SKILLS AND TRAINING SCORE (where 1 is most deprived)
1	Killisick E01028173	64.91	1313
2	Bonington E01028147	63.31	1479
3	Valley E01028212	51.48	2915
4	Calverton E01028153	46.67	3753
5	Netherfield & Colwick E01028187	45.87	3919
6	Killisick E01028174	43.02	4469
7	Netherfield & Colwick E01028185	38.40	5540
8	Netherfield & Colwick E01028186	37.85	5673
9	St Marys E01028209	37.82	5683
10	Phoenix E01028192	37.40	5798

HEALTH DEPRIVATION AND DISABILITY

RANK WITHIN GEDLING WARD	SOA	HEALTH DEPRIVATION AND DISABILITY SCORE	RANK OF HEALTH DEPRIVATION AND DISABILITY SCORE (where 1 is most deprived)
1	Netherfield & Colwick E01028186	0.83	5884
2	Valley E01028210	0.65	7714
3	Killisick E01028173	0.64	7865
4	Calverton E01028153	0.63	7920
5	Gedling E01028171	0.63	7986
6	Calverton E01028154	0.56	8650
7	Daybrook E01028166	0.54	8864
8	Carlton Hill E01028161	0.51	9273
9	Bestwood Village E01028142	0.44	10116
10	Daybrook E01028167	0.44	10218

LIVING ENVIRONMENT


RANK WITHIN GEDLING WARD	SOA	LIVING ENVIRONMENT SCORE	RANK OF LIVING ENVIRONMENT SCORE (where 1 is most deprived)
1	Daybrook E01028165	39.44	5178
2	Daybrook E01028167	37.82	5667
3	Bonington E01028144	36.90	5978
4	Netherfield & Colwick E01028186	36.06	6278
5	Carlton Hill E01028160	33.42	7289
6	St Marys E01028209	31.54	8032
7	Porchester E01028194	28.80	9273
8	Carlton E01028158	26.29	10454
9	Phoenix E01028191	25.63	10804
10	St Marys E01028208	25.04	11108

CRIME

RANK WITHIN GEDLING WARD		SOA	CRIME AND DISORDER SCORE	RANK OF CRIME AND DISORDER SCORE (where 1 is most deprived)
1	Bonington	E01028147	1.47	1285
2	Daybrook	E01028166	1.43	1445
3	St Marys	E01028208	1.27	2159
4	Bonington	E01028144	1.23	2362
5	Daybrook	E01028165	1.22	2381
6	Carlton	E01028159	1.22	2423
7	Carlton Hill	E01028161	1.21	2446
8	Porchester	E01028193	1.18	2656
9	Daybrook	E01028167	1.17	2710
10	Bonington	E01028146	1.16	2774

EMPLOYMENT

RANK WITHIN GEDLING WARD		SOA	EMPLOYMENT SCORE	RANK OF EMPLOYMENT SCORE (where 1 is most deprived)
1	Killisick	E01028173	0.20	3784
2	Netherfield & Colwick	E01028186	0.18	4762
3	Daybrook	E01028166	0.15	6865
4	Bonington	E01028147	0.15	6949
5	Calverton	E01028153	0.15	7213
6	Phoenix	E01028192	0.14	7555
7	Carlton Hill	E01028164	0.14	7904
8	Valley	E01028211	0.14	8215
9	St Marys	E01028209	0.14	8248
10	Netherfield & Colwick	E01028187	0.13	8725

 Denotes top 20% most deprived nationally

APPENDIX. 2 - The Domains Explained

Income Deprivation Domain

The purpose of this Domain is to capture the proportion of the population experiencing income deprivation in an area:

- Adults and children in Income Support households (2001).
- Adults and children in Income Based Job Seekers Allowance households (2001).
- Adults and children in Working Families Tax Credit households whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60% of median before housing costs (2001).
- Adults and children in Disabled Person's Tax Credit households whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60% of median before housing costs (2001).
- National Asylum Support Service supported asylum seekers in England in receipt of subsistence only and accommodation support (2002).

Employment Deprivation Domain

This domain measures employment deprivation conceptualised as involuntary exclusion of the working age population from the world of work:

- Unemployment claimant count (JUVOS) of women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64 averaged over 4 quarters (2001).
- Incapacity Benefit claimants women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64 (2001).
- Severe Disablement Allowance claimants women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64 (2001).
- Participants in New Deal for the 18-24s who are not included in the claimant count (2001).
- Participants in New Deal for 25+ who are not included in the claimant count (2001).
- Participants in New Deal for Lone Parents aged 18 and over (2001).

Health Deprivation and Disability Domain

This domain identifies areas with relatively high rates of people who die prematurely or whose quality of life is impaired by poor health or who are disabled, across the whole population:

- Years of Potential Life Lost (1997-2001).
- Comparative Illness and Disability Ratio (2001).
- Measures of emergency admissions to hospital (1999-2002).
- Adults under 60 suffering from mood or anxiety disorders (1997-2002).

Education, Skills and Training Deprivation Domain

This Domain captures the extent of deprivation in terms of education, skills and training in a local area. The indicators fall into two sub domains: one relating to education deprivation for children/young people in the area and one relating to lack of skills and qualifications among the working age adult population.

Sub Domain: Children/young people

- Average points score of children at Key Stage 2 (2002).
- Average points score of children at Key Stage 3 (2002).
- Average points score of children at Key Stage 4 (2002).
- Proportion of young people *not* staying on in school/school level education above 16 (2001).
- Proportion of those aged under 21 not entering Higher Education (1999-2002).
- Secondary school absence rate (2001-2002).

Sub Domain: Skills

- Proportions of working age adults (aged 25-54) in the area with no or low qualifications (2001).

Barriers to Housing and Services Deprivation Domain

The purpose of this Domain is to measure barriers to housing and key local services. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: 'geographical barriers' and 'wider barriers' which also includes issues relating to access to housing, such as affordability:

Sub Domain: Wider Barriers

- Household overcrowding (2001).
- LA level percentage of households for whom a decision on their application for assistance under the homeless provisions of housing legislation has been made, assigned to SOAs (2002).
- Difficulty of Access to owner-occupation (2002).

Sub Domain: Geographical Barriers

- Road distance to GP premises (2003).
- Road distance to a supermarket or convenience store (2002).
- Road distance to a primary school (2001-2002).
- Road distance to a Post Office (2003).

Crime Domain

This Domain measures the incidence of recorded crime for four major crime themes, representing the occurrence of personal and material victimisation at a small area level:

- Burglary (4 recorded crime offence types, April 2002-March 2003).
- Theft (5 recorded crime offence types, April 2002-March 2003, constrained to CDRP level).
- Criminal damage (10 recorded crime offence types, April 2002-March 2003).
- Violence (14 recorded crime offence types, April 2002-March 2003).

Living Environment Deprivation Domain

This Domain focuses on deprivation with respect to the characteristics of the living environment. It comprises two sub-domains: the 'indoors' living environment which measures the quality of housing and the 'outdoors' living environment which contains two measures about air quality and road traffic accidents:

Sub-Domain: The 'indoors' living environment

- Social and private housing in poor condition (2001).
- Houses without central heating (2001).

Sub-Domain: The 'outdoors' living environment

- Air quality (2001).
- Road traffic accidents involving injury to pedestrians and cyclists (2000-2002).

Overall IMD

The table below sets out the Domain weights which were used to combine the seven domains into one overall Index of Multiple Deprivation.

Domain Weights for the IMD 2004	
	Domain Weight
Income deprivation	22.50%
Employment deprivation	22.50%
Health deprivation and disability	13.50%
Education, skills and training deprivation	13.50%
Barriers to housing and services	9.30%
Crime	9.30%
Living Environment deprivation	9.30%

APPENDIX. 3 – Gedling Beat Area Crime Figures

	VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	ROBBERY	DWELLING BURGLARY	OTHER BURGLARY	THEFT & HANDLING	VEHICLE CRIME	FRAUD & FORGERY	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	DRUGS	OTHER	TOTAL
ARNOLD TOWN CENTRE	81	5	4	43	263	78	45	54	12	10	595
BESTWOOD VILLAGE	14	0	16	32	22	31	0	16	2	1	134
BONINGTON	76	5	103	83	87	80	2	195	6	14	651
CALVERTON	52	2	20	42	96	106	15	119	5	7	464
DAYBROOK	57	3	69	73	120	155	8	155	10	6	656
KILLISICK	32	0	19	13	33	37	4	67	4	5	214
KINGSWELL	32	12	34	55	69	65	1	83	10	3	364
LINBY AND PAPPLEWICK	5	0	12	25	18	31	44	24	6	1	166
MAPPERLEY PLAINS	45	3	42	57	78	60	18	88	0	6	397
NEWSTEAD	12	1	9	13	26	15	0	29	3	0	108
RAVENSHED	12	0	23	23	75	70	8	64	9	2	286
ST MARYS	58	2	31	25	44	52	68	62	4	3	349
WOODBOROUGH	9	0	8	5	27	21	2	9	0	1	82
WOODTHORPE	17	3	60	45	107	69	2	63	2	5	373
BURTON JOYCE	3	1	17	25	22	26	4	27	3	0	128
CARLTON	78	8	41	75	123	92	42	173	10	15	657
CARLTON HILL	72	14	44	48	72	117	3	169	8	10	557
COLWICK	14	1	17	27	33	32	15	46	3	2	190
GEDLING	50	5	40	76	99	70	19	83	7	10	459
LAMBLEY	8	0	5	19	24	29	1	10	2	1	99
NETHERFIELD	84	5	36	77	189	107	32	145	6	3	684
PHOENIX	53	2	18	49	45	57	14	74	2	11	325
PORCHESTER	47	6	29	51	92	99	7	73	7	11	422
STOKE BARDOLPH	1	2	0	2	3	9	1	2	0	1	21
ST JAMES	28	0	9	19	38	31	9	48	4	2	188
VALLEY	48	8	26	44	53	45	8	111	4	3	350

The table above show the crime figures recorded in each Gedling Beat Area over the last ten months up to the end of January 2005. When using these figures the Executive should be aware that the Beat Areas do not always share Ward boundaries e.g. Arnold Town Centre comprises parts of 4 different Wards.

The table below provides the Borough totals for each classification of recorded crime over the last ten months:

VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	ROBBERY	DWELLING BURGLARY	OTHER BURGLARY	THEFT & HANDLING	VEHICLE CRIME	FRAUD & FORGERY	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	DRUGS	OTHER	TOTAL
988	88	732	1046	1858	1584	372	1989	129	133	8919

Appendix B

Extract from minutes of Gedling Partnership Executive – 10 March 2005

5. Area Based Initiatives

LJ provided the context for the report presented to the Executive and gave an overview of the criteria to be considered when identifying Area Based Initiatives. The Executive was then invited to formally agree the proposals outlined within the report.

Executive discussed the proposals outlined within the report and considered the information provided for identifying Area Based Initiatives.

Resolved: Executive agreed to use the information provided to allow the evidence based identification of two Area Based Initiatives. ABI's to be developed as outlined within the report.

Resolved: Executive agreed to focus Area Based Initiatives away from areas that have already received large scale, sustained intervention.

Resolved: Executive agreed to target Area Based Initiatives in and around the following Super Output Areas (SOA):

SOA E01028147 – Bonington Ward (area around Warren Hill)

SOA E01028212 – Valley Ward (area around Carlton Forum Leisure Centre)

Action: GBC Community Project Officers and all partners to be informed of the areas identified to ensure immediate engagement in work.