



Leicester
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED

*Abbey, Beaumont Leys, Eyres Monsell,
Freemen, Latimer, New Parks, Spinney Hills.*

FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS

**Corporate Directors Board
Cabinet Briefing
Leicester Partnership
Cabinet**

**29th January 2008
4th February 2008
20th February 2008
3rd March 2008**

**NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT 2008/09
AND FUTURE NEIGHBOURHOOD WORKING**

Report of Service Director for Accommodation and Tenancy Support

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform decisions about Neighbourhood Management for 2008-09 in the context of the city's wider strategic direction on neighbourhood working, including the development of Ward Community Meetings.

2. Summary

- 2.1 Neighbourhood Management in Leicester is funded for four years from 2006-07 to 2009-10 through the 'neighbourhood element' of the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund. However next year, in 2008-09, the funding tapers down to encourage mainstreaming.
- 2.2 At the same time, a number of initiatives around neighbourhood working are being planned or developed in the city.
- 2.3 Chief amongst these is the new Ward Community Meetings from April 2008. It is intended that WCMs will be developed to have a key role in bringing local people closer to decision making and devolving decisions to local level.
- 2.4 As Government funding for neighbourhood management tapers off we need to start the process of integrating the lessons learnt from neighbourhood management into mainstream arrangements.

- 2.5 Section 4.4 of this report sets out some key characteristics of success and lessons learnt that need to feature in the transition to mainstream arrangements. In summary these are the need for –
- performance management at neighbourhood level
 - services that are joined up at the front end
 - clear signals of investment at the neighbourhood level
 - inspired residents with the capacity for self help
 - extensive outreach tailored to community characteristics
 - siphoning neighbourhood intelligence up to decision makers
 - real joint working in the neighbourhood
 - improving the targeting, tailoring and take up of services
- 2.6 In Leicester, three different approaches were taken to Neighbourhood Management.
- In the first approach, most of the ‘neighbourhood element’ funding was split between St Matthews/St Marks and Saffron to provide a full time Neighbourhood Manager, a team assistant, and a revenue budget of £120,000 for 2007-08 in each of the two neighbourhoods.
- 2.7 The second approach is that a “housing based” model was set up in New Parks, Beaumont Leys/Abbey Rise/Stocking Farm and St Peters with a lower level of resourcing, which provided each neighbourhood with a part-time Neighbourhood Manager (who is also a Neighbourhood Housing Manager), an Assistant Neighbourhood Manager and £15,000 non staffing revenue budget.
- 2.8 Finally in Braunstone, Neighbourhood Management was set up using a mix of New Deal for Communities, Neighbourhood Renewal Funding and other sources of finance, as part of sustaining and continuing some of the work developed by the New Deal programme. There are no specific funding issues for Braunstone in 2008-09 as the New Deal grant continues – but any longer term decisions about mainstreaming neighbourhood management need to include Braunstone too.
- 2.9 The purpose of the three-fold approach was to see how far the housing model could deliver neighbourhood renewal without the higher level of funding represented by the Government’s approach which was implemented in St Matthews / St Marks and Saffron.
- 2.10 If the ‘housing model’ could deliver, this would have positive implications for future sustainability as it would be a lower cost model to mainstream.
- 2.11 Officers carried out an evaluation of Neighbourhood Management in Autumn 2007. The schemes all reached their milestones in year one, and had achieved a number of successful outcomes for local residents, and played a key role in improving the way key services were being targeted, tailored and taken up in each neighbourhood.
- 2.12 Performance against indicators set out in each Neighbourhood Delivery Plan is now reported on a quarterly basis to the city wide multi-agency Neighbourhood Management Board and GOEM.

- 2.13 However, the Autumn 2007 evaluation also concluded that the three Housing based schemes have a notably higher risk of not being able to deliver the actions set out in their respective Neighbourhood Delivery Plans than those areas that received higher funding. Officers therefore advised in the Autumn that a viable Neighbourhood Management scheme needs a higher level of funding than the 'housing' areas have so far received.
- 2.14 It is suggested that a viable scheme requires a full time neighbourhood manager, an assistant neighbourhood manager and a non staffing revenue budget that is considerably bigger than £15,000 to be likely to be able to deliver their own neighbourhood plans. In 2008-09 Government 'neighbourhood element' funding will be £412,800. The two full time staff would cost £82,000 per area. If a non staffing budget of £55,600 per area is added, making total of £137,600 per scheme, then Government funding next year can continue to sustain three of the five schemes for a further year.
- 2.15 This report proposes that the three areas to continue into 2008-09 should be St Matthews / St Marks (as a split scheme), Saffron, and New Parks, based on comparative levels of deprivation and compatibility with Ward Community Meetings and natural neighbourhoods.
- 2.16 These three areas that continue will undergo a further evaluation towards the end of 2008-09 to inform further decision making.

3. Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED that:

- a) For 2008-09 the three neighbourhood management schemes based in St Matthews/ St Marks, Saffron and New Parks receive funding of £137,600 each to support a Neighbourhood Manager, and an Assistant Neighbourhood Manager (total cost £82,000) and a non staffing revenue budget of £55,600 each.
- b) These three schemes are evaluated towards the end of 2008-09 to inform future decisions.
- c) The St Matthews and St Marks scheme is split into two separate arrangements.
- d) The boundary of the New Parks Neighbourhood Management area is amended to include the lower super output area around Tatlow Road etc. which is now in the bottom 5% of the IMD 2007 and to exclude the Stokes Drive area.
- e) The St Peters and the Beaumont Leys/Stocking Farm/Abbey Rise neighbourhood management schemes are wrapped into their respective Ward Community Meetings from 2008-09.
- f) The lessons learnt from the neighbourhood management pilots (set out in section 4.4 of this report) are carried forward into the development of wider neighbourhood working in the city, particularly the ward community meetings.

4.1 Report

4.1.1 Progress report

4.1.2 The 2007 evaluation reported that each neighbourhood management scheme had achieved its planned milestones:

4.1.3 A wide range of **early practical improvements were delivered with resident involvement** such as environmental improvements, youth provision and referrals to services such as employment and training.

4.1.4 **Neighbourhood Boards are up and running.** They consist of residents, councillors, service providers and the voluntary and community sector representative from the Leicester Community Network. The neighbourhood boards are functioning well and attracting other residents and partners to want to work with them. Their mood is positive and ambitious and they represent a new foundation for developing social capital in each area. They are currently undergoing a training and development programme.

4.1.5 The Neighbourhood Boards have completed their comprehensive **Neighbourhood Delivery Plans**. Developed through consultation and the involvement of local people, the plans set out local residents' own priorities for their neighbourhood. The plans also provide an in-depth analysis of the neighbourhood against each of the key neighbourhood renewal themes of crime, health, environment, worklessness, education and housing. They build on previous community plans produced in the areas and measure the current deprivation gaps in each theme, and set out agreed action to tackle them.

4.1.6 Feedback from GOEM is -

GOEM are really impressed with the progress to date and much of this is due to the hard work of the Neighbourhood Managers, who have faced many challenges over the last 18 months, and the support they have received from the project director and project manager.

This [view] is supported by [the Area Director for Leicester and Leicestershire] Jan Sensier's comments at the LAA review in July when she commented that "Leicester was doing a very good job on neighbourhood management and that the neighbourhood managers should be very proud of their achievements". To date there have been a number of quick wins regarding reducing litter and anti-social behaviour and a number of items have been purchased and existing facilities improved that are having a positive impact on residents lives on the various estates.

However, the long term success of the pilot will be judged on how successfully neighbourhood management has changed service provision to be more responsive to the needs of the residents. With this in mind GOEM would support additional funding being provided to support the 'grow your own' approach as we feel this would facilitate a greater impact in these areas and build on the excellent work that has taken place to date.

GOEM, 13th September 2007

4.2 Financial details

- 4.2.1 The funding for neighbourhood management in the five neighbourhoods other than Braunstone is provided by Government over four years through the 'neighbourhood element' of the Safer and Stronger Communities (SSC) Fund.
- 4.2.2 In Braunstone the New Deal scheme will stop receiving NDC grant in 2010-2011; and neighbourhood management has been set up to help sustain the work achieved by the BCA after NDC funding runs out. The Braunstone Neighbourhood Support Project is funded in 2007-08 through a combination of NDC grant, other public funding and NRF. In 2008-09 neighbourhood management in Braunstone will receive NDC grant of £210,919 and in 2009-2010 it will be £23,665.
- 4.2.3 The Government 'neighbourhood element' funding for the other five neighbourhoods is pooled in to the Local Area Agreement. In addition, the city council's Adults and Housing Department provides resources in kind through the employment of three part time neighbourhood managers in three of the five neighbourhood management schemes, together with the services of a Service Director acting as Project Director and line management of the three Neighbourhood Managers through Landlord Services Managers.
- 4.2.4 However in years 3 and 4 of the programme (2008-09 and 2009-10) the 'neighbourhood element' funding tapers off to encourage local partnerships and councils to mainstream the arrangements.

Year	'Neighbourhood element' funding taper	'Neighbourhood element' funding amount
2006-07	80%	£412,800
2007-08	100%	£516,000
2008-09	80%	£412,800
2009-10	50%	£258,000
TOTAL		£1,599,600

- 4.2.5 Government funding for 2008-9 will be 20% less than the funding being received this year. This represents a shortfall of £103,200. In the final year of Government funding, (2009-10), only 50% of the current years funding will be received.
- 4.2.6 These reductions mean that neighbourhood management as it has been provided so far cannot be sustained into next year and thereafter without additional funding.
- 4.2.7 Neighbourhood management costs considerably less than the multi-million pound approaches of regeneration schemes such as New Deal for Communities or the Single Regeneration Budget. This is because neighbourhood management is based on the realisation that even high cost regeneration schemes like New Deal at around £50m for

a neighbourhood spend a lot less than the mainstream statutory and voluntary sector do in the same neighbourhood.

- 4.2.8 So the driving principle of neighbourhood management is that the key to transformational change must be to concentrate on making those much bigger mainstream budgets work better for local neighbourhoods and local people. Neighbourhood management does not seek to add large numbers of new projects to the existing infrastructure – it seeks to make the existing infrastructure work better.
- 4.2.9 Although Neighbourhood Management is relatively low in cost, it does need resources. It must be noted that as well as being considerably lower in cost than previous types of regeneration scheme, the levels of funding we have given each of our neighbourhood management schemes in Leicester is also lower than for the 35 Government neighbourhood management pathfinders which were set up elsewhere in the country in 2002-03 who each received either £500,000 a year (round one in 2002) or £350,000 (round two in 2003). Those pathfinders typically consist of teams of 5-6 people compared to the 1-2 people per neighbourhood in Leicester.
- 4.2.10 In Leicester a great deal has been achieved in each of the five neighbourhoods. But transforming neighbourhoods is not a short term task. In those months we have had the opportunity to learn about what can and what cannot be achieved with the resources that were allocated.

Three approaches to neighbourhood management in Leicester

- 4.2.11 Three different approaches to neighbourhood management were set up in Leicester last year -

1. ***The 'Government model'*** in two neighbourhoods - Saffron and St Matthews / St Marks

Full time Neighbourhood Manager (recruited from a national field) and team asst.	£69,000
Running costs	£116,000
Total cost per neighbourhood per year	£185,000

2. ***The Housing based model*** in three neighbourhoods - St Peters, Beaumont Leys/Abbey Rise / Stocking Farm and New Parks

Part time Neighbourhood Manager (who is also Housing Manager).	Costs borne by Adults & Housing Department
Full time Assistant Neighbourhood Manager	£33,000
Running costs	£15,000
Total cost per neighbourhood per year	£48,000 plus Housing support

(Note - employment figures include 25% on top of salaries to cover the costs of pensions and national insurance)

3. **The Braunstone model.** A 'Neighbourhood Support' project was set up funded in 2007-08 by a mix of sponsors plus NDC grant and NRF to help sustain the ongoing renewal of Braunstone beyond the NDC programme by harnessing and building on the resident involvement that has been achieved so far by the Braunstone Community Association.

4.2.12 The purpose of setting up different approaches was set out in our proposal to the Cabinet, the Leicester Partnership and GOEM in May 2006 -

These approaches will give us a foundation for learning about and delivering change in deprived areas, to improve the quality of life for people who live there.

In the next few years we want to have a clear idea of how to invest mainstream funds in creating a sustainable infrastructure for neighbourhood management when Government regeneration funding expires.

4.3 Criteria for continuing schemes

4.3.1 There are three criteria that can be used to determine which areas go forward for a further year – deprivation levels, lessons learnt around the relationship between neighbourhood management areas and natural neighbourhoods, and whether the neighbourhood area can work within the new ward community meeting structure.

4.3.2 Taking the average deprivation scores from across the priority LSOAs in each priority neighbourhood indicates that the top three most deprived neighbourhoods are St Matthews/St Marks, Saffron and Beaumont Leys / Abbey Rise / Stocking Farm. However, the experience of neighbourhood management in Beaumont Leys/ Abbey Rise/Stocking Farm has shown that it is difficult to operate across what are effectively three neighbourhoods; further split across two wards. New Parks, by contrast is a single, more cohesive neighbourhood which sits within one ward.

4.3.3 It is therefore proposed that the three areas to continue into 2008/09 are St Matthews and St Marks (split into two schemes – see section 4.6), Saffron and New Parks.

4.4 Lessons learnt from neighbourhood management

4.4.1 Decisions about neighbourhood management should sit in the wider context of the city's strategic direction for neighbourhood working and the reshaping of services to meet the diverse and changing needs of Leicester people as part of our Leicester 25 vision.

4.4.2 It is particularly important not to lose sight of the characteristics of success that neighbourhood management is demonstrating and to build those characteristics into all mainstream approaches.

4.4.3 Neighbourhood management is demonstrating that effectiveness at neighbourhood level – particularly in priority neighbourhoods - revolves around a number of key processes -

Bringing performance management to the neighbourhood level in order to help make sense of what works and what needs to be commissioned and decommissioned. The neighbourhood management schemes each operate to a performance framework of key city wide performance measures disaggregated to neighbourhood level (or the nearest proxy) combined with indicators developed from residents' own priorities for action. These form the backbone of the neighbourhood delivery plans and of quarterly monitoring to GOEM and the citywide, multi agency Neighbourhood Management Project Board. The performance indicators were aligned to the LAA and it is recommended that future neighbourhood initiatives – including ward community meetings – do the same.

Designing **services that are joined up at the front end**. For example in St Matthews neighbourhood management has brought together a consortium of statutory and voluntary employment training providers so that gaps overlaps and unclear pathways to training and jobs are tackled. This work needs to continue.

Producing **clear signals of investment** through physical improvements in public buildings and spaces. This makes them not only more functional but also sends a message to local communities that their neighbourhood is benefitting from investment, which in turn builds the trust needed to involve them in decisions. However it is essential that the community has a role in determining how that investment is made. Neighbourhood management has lead investment and improvement in green spaces (example include community reparations environmental schemes, Healthy Youth Garden in New Parks , Bushey Park on St Matthews , Kingfisher Youth Centre in Saffron, Ball Court in St Peters, the Boys and Girls Club in New Parks, the Barn in Beaumont Leys).

Fostering **inspired residents** and rewarding a can do attitude. Making people feel they are part of something. This helps us to move away from 'lazy community engagement ' we often do, that focuses on a small handful of usual suspects. Future engagement needs real effort such as that put into events such as the multi agency street parties arranged by neighbourhood management - that help to develop widening circles of active and informed residents who will develop capacity for self help rather than simply being the 'hard to reach targets' for services they are told they need because they are 'deprived'.

Positive outreach often the only way to connect vulnerable people with services is to knock on their door, even when services are located in the neighbourhood. Neighbourhood management carried out a 'Be informed' programme - getting agencies together to call on people at home and provide information and consult over very local schemes. 'Be informed' has resulted in high levels of referrals for example to the Highcross jobs days.

Siphoning neighbourhood intelligence to decision makers. Neighbourhood management provides a ready made infrastructure for local involvement so new initiatives or services don't always need to invent their own. It has informed and helped

to implement initiatives such as the Community Justice Centre for Saffron, neighbourhood policing in all areas, the targeting and coordination of post 19 learning and the Highcross Leicester training and recruitment programme.

Real joint working on the ground. The neighbourhood boards and the neighbourhood delivery plans brought key service providers together and gave them a set of joined up action agreed with local residents. The involvement of residents as equal partners in the process is one of the best catalysts for eliminating the silo mentality – as residents are the loudest critics of it.

Improving the tailoring, targeting and take up of services is where neighbourhood management can add value because it has been able to advise service providers on specific characteristics of the community itself and of the barriers that stop local people using the services. Without neighbourhood managers, services will need to invest more in building their own community knowledge – and make sure that the connections between community based staff go back up the chain to the ‘service designers’. Sometimes a simple change of personnel in a local area can remove a potential critical resource of this kind.

4.5 The transition from neighbourhood management to other forms of neighbourhood working

4.5.1 There is also a range of other related issues with which Neighbourhood Management needs to be joined up. Chief amongst these is the new Ward Community Meetings (WCMs). Members are keen to see neighbourhood management sit 'on top' of these arrangements. For 2008-09 the continuing neighbourhood management schemes will need to integrate with WCMs. In practice this means that –

- The Neighbourhood Manager will report progress to the ward community meeting
- The Ward Action Plans will be linked to the Neighbourhood Delivery Plan
- The Neighbourhood Manager will help to take forward issues in the neighbourhood management neighbourhood that are brought up at the WCM

4.5.2 In St Peters and Beaumont Leys, Abbey Rise and Stocking Farm the groundwork established by neighbourhood management will be wrapped into the WCMs from April 2008. Officers will examine ways in which this can be done – for example –

- Resident members of Neighbourhood Boards could be co-opted onto the WCM
- Ward Action Plans will need to have regard to Neighbourhood Delivery Plans, and the WCM will seek to deliver the commitments in the Neighbourhood Delivery Plans.

4.5.3 We also need to link in other area based developments, for example

- the developing new role for Housing Managers
- potential new investment in community centres through releasing assets in the city centre

- the appointment of extra staff in environment to link with the ward community meetings - they should take some of the work of tackling environmental issues away from neighbourhood management
- the introduction of street wardens
- the development of the employment access centres out of the City Strategy Plan
- the deployment of the new Working Neighbourhoods Fund which replaces NRF next year.

4.6 Splitting St Matthews and St Marks

4.6.1 In setting up Neighbourhood Management, the St Matthews and St Marks estates were treated as one neighbourhood management scheme, mainly because of the small size of each estate. This means one neighbourhood board covers both areas (although resident's seats have been divided into six for St Matthews and six for St Marks). There is one neighbourhood delivery plan, one set of performance data and one set of key priorities for the area.

4.6.2 However in practice there have been some difficulties in trying to work with both areas in one scheme; with a tendency for St Matthews' issues to sometimes dominate St Marks'; and they are different communities with a different make-up and needs.

4.6.3 For this reason it is proposed that the two areas are split for the purpose of neighbourhood management. In practice, this means the Neighbourhood Manager will -

- Separate out the Neighbourhood Board into two boards
- Report separately to Spinney Hills (for St Matthews) and Latimer (for St Marks) Ward Community Meetings
- Identify the different key indicators of performance and deprivation for each area, rather than lumping them together
- Carry out separate community engagement activities for each area; and
- Take forward separate sets of priorities for each community.

4.7 Boundary of New Parks Neighbourhood Management area

4.7.1 The IMD 2007 confirms that there is an area to the west of New Parks, around the Tatlow Road which ranks 17th most deprived in Leicester. In addition the IMD confirms that the Stokes Drive area is a considerably lower priority, ranking 109th. It is therefore proposed that the boundary should be redrawn to include the Tatlow Road area and exclude the Stokes Drive area to reflect this. The New Parks Neighbourhood Panel (the equivalent of the neighbourhood board in the other areas) and New Parks ward Councillors are in support of this proposal.

5. Headline financial and legal implications

Financial implications

- 5.1 The report is primarily concerned with the financial issues relating to Neighbourhood Management. The funding for this initiative has been channelled through the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF), then the Local Area Agreement (LAA) and now through the consolidated Area Based Grant (ABG). The funding streams within the ABG are not ringfenced and can, therefore be used in any way which best meets the priorities of the City, as set out in the Local Area Agreement documentation. Such decisions on the direction of funding must be informed by discussion with and recommendations from the Leicester Partnership.
- 5.2 The “Neighbourhood element” has been funded from the Safer, Stronger communities fund in the LAA. This fund covers other activities in addition to the Neighbourhood element, such as tackling Anti-social behaviour, building safer communities and the development and implementation of a drugs strategy. The Safer, Stronger Communities Fund is planned to reduce over the next three years as follows:

	2007/08 £	2008/09 £	2009/10 £	2010/11 £
Safer Stronger Communities fund within the ABG	1,128,159 (note)	803,135	648,135	Nil

Note – excluding the one-off allocation of £642,442 Waste efficiency grant.

- 5.3 In addition to the Safer, Stronger, Communities fund, the ABG also includes the Working Neighbourhoods Fund, which replaces the NRF. The guidance on the use of this fund is outside the direct scope of this report but it is of relevance when considering the totality of funding targeted at neighbourhood issues.
- 5.4 The Leicester Partnership will make its recommendations for the use of ABG funds, and will propose amounts to be allocated to each of the delivery groups –including the Safer, Stronger communities group. This group will then be responsible for reporting on performance, in terms of both finance and outcomes or achievements. The detailed allocation of funding within the Safer, Stronger Communities theme will be the responsibility of that delivery group.
- 5.5 The Cabinet of the City Council, in recognising the ABG funding and the recommendations of the Leicester Partnership, must consider the impact of the proposals on its wider budget planning and service planning. The Cabinet may decide to allocate additional funds from its mainstream budgets to “top-up” the ABG funds. This report proposes that there should be no such “top-up”. The report also makes proposals for the use of the 2008/09 ABG Safer and Stronger Communities fund.

Andy Morley
Head of Accountancy

Legal implications

5.6 There are no additional legal implications at this stage.

Peter Nicholls
Service Director – Legal Services

6. Other implications

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	Yes/No	Comment
Equal Opportunities	Yes	Neighbourhood Management is intended to shape policy on a wide range of services and issues to achieve improvements in neighbourhoods
Policy		
Sustainable and Environmental		
Crime and Disorder		
Human Rights Act		
Older People /People on Low Income		

7. Comments from the Leicester Partnership

The Leicester Partnership received this report at their meeting on the 20th February. A number of comments were made:

- Dave Brennan said that at the outset of the project he had not agreed with the Housing based model, as he could see there could be a conflict of interest between the need for neutrality versus the delivery of a housing service.
- He also said that that the Braunstone neighbourhood management scheme was funded from a variety of sources, and that maybe this approach could be developed for the other schemes. Philip Parkinson agreed, and said that this option should be explored through the Partnership Executive.
- Dave also said that he did not agree with the supposition in the report that ward community meetings would be capable of taking forward the work that had been developed by the neighbourhood management schemes.
- Chris Garnham was very supportive of the work that neighbourhood management had undertaken, and he would like to have seen it continue in all of the current neighbourhoods. He said that it is important that the lessons learnt so far – set out in the report - are applied to any future neighbourhood working.
- Dee Martin said that it is important that communities of interest are not forgotten.

- Chino Cabon said there should be a more in depth evaluation which would look at other schemes in existence in the neighbourhoods

8. Background Papers

- Neighbourhood Management: evaluation and future
Cabinet briefing: 29th October 2007
- Neighbourhood Management
Cabinet: 15th May 2006
- Neighbourhood Element of the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund
Cabinet: 5th December 2005

9. Report author / officer to contact

Cathy Carter
Leicester Partnership Team
0116 252 6719
cathy.carter@leicester.gov.uk

Key Decision	Yes
Reason	Is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising more than one ward
Appeared in Forward Plan	Yes
Executive or Council Decision	Executive (Cabinet)