



Leicester
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED
All Wards

FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS:

CYPS scrutiny
Cabinet

3 November 2009
9 November 2009

13-19 Integrated Service Hubs (ISH) Capital Strategy

Report of the Strategic Director, Children

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report details the direction of travel for the capital strategy for the development of Integrated Services Hubs across each of the eight neighbourhoods within the City and lists the preferred locations of the hubs in each neighbourhood.
- 1.2 The establishment of the Integrated Services Hubs (ISH), and the ongoing development of extended services, will make a significant contribution towards the One Leicester commitment to investing in our Children and Young People by improving the availability of services provided directly by the Council and those partner agencies to work in a co-ordinated way to meet the needs of young people. Our priority is to narrow the wellbeing gap and remove barriers to raising educational attainment by improving our ability to allocate, coordinate and manage resources in response to local need.
- 1.3 The report seeks approval for the utilisation of the following funding streams to secure the development of the 13-19 Integrated Service Hubs across the city:
- the acceptance of successful bid to the Government's co-location fund of £3,210,000
 - the allocation of £1,265,000 from the extended services capital grant
 - The allocation of £685,000 from the BSF capital fund.
- 1.4 A report is being brought at this early stage, prior to the completion of detailed costings and feasibility studies to support the proposed sites, in order to fit with the current BSF timescales which will allow the alignment of the three funding streams outlined above and increase the overall capital spend available, and therefore allow for early planning, noting that the Co-Location Fund has to be used by 31st August 2011 to avoid any repayment.

- 1.5 The report also seeks the early release of £100,000 out of the £1,265,000 Extended Services Capital Grant to enable the development of Mayfield as an interim hub for the central area to proceed in line with Phase 3 Children's Centre development agreed by Cabinet on 03/08/09 to enable the scheme to progress.
- 1.6 The Revenue strategy for the hubs will be developed on a site-by-site basis with partners in schools and youth centres. A further report will be brought back in January 2010 outlining the detailed Revenue Strategy to support the Capital strategy and further details of the costing exercises in relation to each proposed site.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The Children Act 2004 requires Local Authorities and their partners to improve outcomes for children and young people. It asks Authorities to review services and how they are provided, including considering the mechanism of greater integration of services as a means of achieving:

- improved outcomes
- improved service user experience
- greater organisational efficiency
- alignment with national policy

- 2.2 Guidance on Children's Trust arrangements requires local authorities to bring together everyone who work with families and children including, for example, Health services, the police, Connexions, schools, colleges and housing organisation, depending on the circumstances of the local community.

- 2.3 The vision for Leicester is:

“To develop an entitlement offer to all children and young people that provides integrated neighbourhood services that are accessible, inclusive, sustainable, evidence-based where funding follows need and results in measurable improvement of outcomes.”¹

- 2.4 Nationally, Local Authorities have found that successful delivery of prevention and early intervention level services requires staff from a range of services and agencies to be based together.

- 2.5 In June 2008, Cabinet received and approved a report that set out proposals for the establishment of Integrated Services Hubs across the 8 areas in the City.

- 2.6 The Hubs for 0-12 year olds are part of the Children's Centres strategy (a total of 23 being developed across the city by 2011) with one main hub in each locality. Phase 3 Children's Centre proposals were approved by Cabinet on 3rd August 2009.

- 2.7 The vision for the 13-19 development is to establish facilities in each neighbourhood that can deliver activities for young people (the Local Youth Offer), including Targeted Youth Support, co-location of the integrated team and be a focus for local co-ordination and participation alongside other service

¹ Cabinet, June 2008

delivery points across the neighbourhood. We are, striving for a single hub in each locality, where staff are located together, with services being provide in a number of additional places within the same locality in line with the hub and spoke model that Children's Centres operate to.

2.8 A standard Accommodation model has been developed for the 13-19 Integrated Service Hubs to include:

- Reception area
- Flexible multi-agency room large enough to hold multi-agency meetings and deliver activities for young people
- 2 Smaller flexible rooms
- Open plan office for up to 10 workstations
- 2 Confidential interview/contact rooms
- Toilets
- Storage
-

2.9 The delivery of integrated services is via a **hub and spoke model**, based on the children's centre model of delivery, which has proven to be successful in improving outcomes for children. The hubs will be sites for the co-location of staff from a range of services and agencies supporting children, young people and their families within each locality. This model ensures that all staff working in neighbourhoods share a common responsibility for local children and young people, enabling them to work with communities to identify local need and work together to improve outcomes for children, young people and families. Staff based in the same building or hub, will carry out joint assessments (e.g. Common Assessment Framework {CAF}), share information and become more effective and efficient in the delivery of services, sharing space, support services and management arrangements.

2.10 For parents/young people this means that they can access services and professionals close to home, explain their difficulties once only to one professional, who can arrange assessments, organise a meeting and make sure that an action plan is produced with the right services put in place to meet the young person's needs in a timely manner. For example, issues relating to behaviour and attendance, early involvement in offending, or parenting difficulties which will impact upon the young person's educational attainments, help reduce risk of NEET (not in education, employment or training) or early involvement with the Youth Justice system, etc.

2.11 It is not anticipated that the hubs are the only point for the co-location of staff and delivery of services across the locality, but this will be spread across a range of buildings in each locality. We would want to also develop spokes to be strategically placed in communities to maximise the access for the young people and their families.

2.12 There is no specified capital funding available for the development of 13-19 hubs. However. a successful bid has been made to the Government's co-location fund and a sum of £3,210,000 has been secured. The funding is conditional upon:

- the Council putting forward a sum of £1,950,000 into the co-location pot; and.
- the funding being fully spent by the 31st March 2011.

2.13 A sum of £685,000 has been made available through the BSF programme and a further sum of £1,265,000 has been identified through the Extended Services Capital Grant. The total contribution to be made by the Council is £1,950,000 and this meets the co-location funding requirements. It is proposed to deliver the 13-19 ISH programme alongside the main BSF Programme. This allows us to take an innovative approach to all our available capital funding to ensure that our BSF schools are well equipped to use their space to improve outcomes for children and young people, by basing appropriate professionals on school sites, accessible to school staff, parents and young people.

2.14 The Extended Services Capital Grant of £1,504,000 is detailed within block C of the Capital Programme, which requires Cabinet approval for spend. This report deals with seeking approval for £1,265,000 expenditure from this grant. Spending proposals for the balance of the Extended Services Capital Grant (£235,000) will be subject to a separate report.

2.15 Cabinet on the 3rd August approved the development of a Children's Centre on the site of the former Mayfield Family centre. There is sufficient capacity within the building to accommodate the 13-19 integrated services hub. The proposal is to locate the 13-19 ISH hub here initially while work is undertaken at the main hub site within the central area with a view to changing it's use to a 13-19 satellite hub. This will also allow the opportunity to pilot a 0-19 hub arrangement. Approval is being sought for the early release of the sum of £100,000 out of the £1,265,000 extended services capital fund towards the cost of the refurbishment required at Mayfield to incorporate the ISH requirements to enable the scheme to be progressed.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 In view of the time constraints placed on the authority by the conditions of the co-location fund, Cabinet is recommended to:

3.2 Agree the preferred options for each locality listed below, and allow further detailed feasibility study and costing work to be undertaken and receive a further report outlining this work and a detailed revenue strategy to support the capital developments in early 2010:

- **Central** **Hub:** Moat Community College
 Interim hub/Spoke: Mayfield Family Centre
- **East** **Hub:** Crown Hills
- **North** **Hub/Spokes:** St Marks Youth Centre
 Rushey Mead
- **North East** **Hub:** Hamilton Community College
 Spokes: Northfields Youth Centre/

Armadale Youth Centre

- **North West** **Hub:** Babington Community College
 Spoke: sites to be determined

- **South** Options appraisal to be completed – 3 sites being considered
 as hub and spoke sites:
 Samworth
 Kingfisher
 Magpie Youth centres

- **South West** **Hub:** Fullhurst
 Spoke: Braunstone Grove
 & Watershed youth centre

- **West** **Hub:** New Parks Youth Centre on New
 College site
 Spoke: Fosse Neighbourhood Centre/
 Woodgate Adventure playground
 currently being explored.

- 3.3 Confirm the urgent action of the Director –Learning Environment, taken in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Schools, to accept the offer of £3,210,000 co-location grant funding;
- 3.4 Approve the use of the £1,265,000 Extended Services Capital Funding as included in Block C of the CYPS Capital Programme approved by Council on the 26th March 2009 and £685,000 BSF capital to co-fund the 13-19 ISH programme.
- 3.5 To approve the principle that the allocation of funding across each of the neighbourhoods will be based upon the development needs of the ISH in each neighbourhood, (the combined funding streams will provide a total sum of £5,160,000 this provides an average of £645,000 per neighbourhood. However, it is likely that the distribution of funding will be based upon the level of development required across all the neighbourhoods. Once the locations of the hubs have been agreed, costings will need to be obtained and allocations from the total funds available made accordingly).
- 3.6 Approve the early release of £100,000 out of the £1,265,000 extended services capital funding towards the cost of developing an ISH within the Children’s Centre at Mayfield to enable the scheme to be progressed.

4. REPORT

Background

- 4.1 Cabinet received a report on the roll-out of integrated service hubs at its meeting on 8th June 2008. The report proposed a model of integrated services, based on the collocation and collaboration of staff working together for children (0-12) and young people (13-19). Each locality will have up to three children’s centres, around a cluster of primary provision and with at least one secondary school. Within each locality, it was also proposed that there would be at least two co-located teams making up the ISH; one based around a children’s centre for

children 0-12 and one based in or around a secondary school (depending on the views of the community and availability of suitable accommodation), serving the needs of those 13-19.

4.2 Among the resolutions made by Cabinet on 8 June 2008, was that Cabinet approves that a capital strategy be developed that gives consideration of the best location for 0-12 and 13-19+ phases and that this is included in plans for future phases of BSF.

4.3 Cabinet on 3 August 2009 approved the Phase 3 Children Centre Capital Report, which included the proposals for a children centre to be built on the Mayfield site.

The ISH Capital Strategy

4.4 The 0-12 Hubs are now in Phase 3 of implementation, with a total of 23 children's centres being developed across the city by 2011. Funding for these hubs has been secured through Sure Start capital funding streams.

4.5 The development of the 13-19 capital strategy allows us to also consider the use of existing youth provision across the city and maximise the capital spend available to increase the capacity and infrastructure of some of the proposed main youth (or Magnet) centres as part of this capital strategy proposal.

4.6 In developing a model for ISH's, the following principles were established:

- to develop a hub on the site of a National Challenge school where possible - *to help support raising the attainment of local pupils, recognising that our most challenging pupils will be in these schools.*
- integrate a range of services within a geographical area - *responding to local need for services to be delivered locally.*
- support collaboration between schools and other services providers in meeting the needs of all children and young people by locating hubs in schools where practical – *evidence from our local sure start programmes supports this model of service delivery to deliver on Every child Matters and putting schools at the heart of communities.*
- encourage community participation in the planning and delivery of services - *to ensure shared ownership of issues affecting the community, particularly outcomes for children and young people, are shared between service users and providers.*
- enable commissioning to be informed by local needs - *ensuring that all schools and service providers collaborate to deliver services together and thus reduce unnecessary competition and duplication.*
- provide a seamless service across universal, targeted and specialist services - *to ensure that children, young people and their families receive coordinated early intervention and prevention services.*

- enable deployment of resources based on neighbourhood need - *this will maximise the use of limited resources and ensure the resources are focused where needed.*

4.7 Alongside the ISH developments, the Council has also been successful in making a bid through MyPlace funding to develop a city centre youth hub as a meeting place for young people, a multi purpose facility for a full range of integrated youth focused services and activities and will be the centrepiece of a city wide approach to Targeted and Integrated Youth Support, promoting cohesion, cross communities working. It will operate on a hub and spoke basis with local youth centres across the neighbourhoods and will provide a link into the ISH hub.

Options Appraisal

4.8 In order to make an assessment against options for the location of the ISH hubs, the following criteria were developed with stakeholders, including young people. Site Options that met either all or a significant proportion of the criteria were selected, subject to approval by cabinet and further detailed feasibility study and costing exercise:

Criteria	Considerations
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • physical access both of the building and the office itself to service users • bus routes, near major routes • disabled access provision e.g. room to manoeuvre wheelchairs etc • A place where young people would want to go • Ability to “zone” the ISH
Community Cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a place that communities have indicated they will trust • no communities feel alienated • no perceived polarisation between communities
Visibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High degree of visibility to secure community engagement/access/ownership
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capable of operating as a full ISH or a Hub and spoke model • Sufficient capacity to accommodate the core team (3) and other partners /agencies to promote integrated working
ICT infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of ICT capability to facilitate integrated working practices • Able to put ICT infrastructure in place at minimum cost
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locations are cost effective to establish AND maintain • Longer term operating costs to be subsumed within the main provision
Links to integrated youth provision/ community access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to link hub to youth provision / community access and co-location that involves schools staff
Value for money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to other developments e.g. BSF/MAC/Main Youth (Magnet) centres

An exercise was undertaken to identify possible options for the location of ISHs within each of the eight neighbourhoods in the city. Discussion has been held with key internal Council partners and city-wide partners to ensure that this capital development is aligned with other capital programmes. This includes

Head of Community Services and Property and Asset Management, to maximise the use of existing Council facilities including schools.

A shortlist of preferred options has been drawn up using the criteria detailed above, and taking into account the principles to identify the viability of sites across each locality.

- 4.9 There is an assumption made that there will be a mixed model of provision to provide good access, with full co-located hubs in areas where appropriate facilities exist/can be developed and hub and spoke/satellite arrangements where this cannot be achieved.
- 4.10 It is recognised that once approval is given that further detailed costings will need to be undertaken.
- 4.11 **Co-Location Funding**
- 4.12 The DCSF announced in February of this year that a £200m fund was to be made available for local authorities and primary care trusts to bid for co-located facilities: services to be delivered by more than one agency from a front line service delivery point, e.g. school, health centre, etc.
- 4.13 The BSF contribution of £0.685 million is based on the area allowance previously agreed with Partnerships for Schools in the May 2005 Strategic Business Case. The Council is currently finalising its Strategy for Change which will be the basis for the revised funding envelope for the BSF Programme. PfS has not given the Council any indication that the previously agreed, modest allocation of 3 no. youth hubs within the secondary estate might be withdrawn. Each had an allowance of 60 sq.m
- 4.14 The DCSF have made extended services capital funding of £1,504,000 available through the Single Capital Pot as part of the Government's school building programme, to support primary schools only, since secondary schools benefit from the effect of the wider Schools Capital programme - in particular, Building Schools for the Future (BSF).
- 4.15 Councils Primary Capital Programme will secure investment for a significant number of primary schools across the city and the capital works will incorporate provision for delivery of extended services. A sum of £ 235,000 from the Extended Services capital pot has been set aside for any capital developments required within the primary sector.
- 4.16 It is proposed to utilise the balance of £1,265,000 for ISH developments with the requirement to seek to secure delivery space for extended services within each on the neighbourhoods that will be capable of being used across the 0-19 age range, thereby meeting the objectives of both extended and integrated service provision.
- 4.17 The bidding guidance stated that projects must be deliverable during the financial years 2009-10 and 2010-and co-located services should be in place by September 2011. It is likely that these constraints will be embodied in the conditions of grant. Some ISHs may be in Phase 2a of BSF, some in later

phases and some outside of BSF, if non secondary school locations are chosen. The programme implications are summarised below.

- 4.18 Projects in BSF Phase 2a. This comprises Crown Hills Community College and Rushey Mead School. These projects are due to commence on site in May 2010 and be completed September / October 2010, depending on Phasing.
- 4.19 Projects in later BSF Phases. The current proposal is that all remaining projects, with the possible exception of some new schools. These are due to commence on site around April 2011. The co-location fund requirements could be met by completing the work on ISH during the first six months, or by constructing stand alone ISH on school sites, using separate, early contracts.
- 4.20 Projects outside of BSF. Provided that locations are confirmed by the end of September 2009, design work could be completed by March 2010 and the centres complete by July 2011.
- 4.21 While the programme requirements are demanding, they will be possible to achieve with careful planning. The most difficult solutions are likely to be those in the schools in later phases of BSF but these could be free-standing centres close to the school.
- 4.22 It is proposed to deliver the 13-19 ISH programme alongside the main BSF Programme.
- 4.23 The combined funding streams will provide a total sum of £5,160,000. This provides an average of £645,000 per neighbourhood. However, it is likely that the distribution of funding will be based upon the level of development required across all the neighbourhoods. Once the locations of the hubs have been agreed, costings will need to be obtained and allocations from the total funds available made accordingly.
- 4.25 Members have agreed to proceed with the development of a children's centre on the site of the former Mayfield Family centre. There is sufficient capacity within the building to accommodate the 13-19 integrated services hub as well. The proposal is to locate the 13-19 ISH hub here initially while work is undertaken at the main hub site within the central area with a view to changing it's use to a 13-19 satellite hub. This will also allow the opportunity to pilot a 0-19 hub arrangement. Moat as the long term hub is in the early stages of development and subject to BSF timescales. It is therefore unlikely to be completed before Spring 2011 at the earliest. The schools Strategy for Change document needs to be submitted to Partnership for Schools in February 2010, this will confirm details. It is anticipated that the hub will be fully operational on the Moat site from Autumn 2012. Approval is being sought to release a sum of £100,000 to enable the development of Mayfield as described in section 1.5
- 4.26 In South locality, further work is to be completed on the options appraisal of these sites: Samworth Academy, Magpie Youth Centre and Kingfisher Youth Centre. On the basis of the principles and criteria established on deciding on appropriate sites for an Integrated Service Hub (ISH), specifically that funding follows need, Samworth Academy represents the preferred option for a hub in theory. In the event that this is not the most appropriate site on completion of the

options appraisal, a hub will be located at either Magpie or Kingfisher Youth Centres.

Conclusions

- 4.27 The development of the ISH capital strategy has presented the Council with a significant challenge. In order to use the Co-location fund and align this with other capital funds and maximise the funds available to the authority means that a decision to move forward with the strategy needs to be made by Cabinet at a number of stages, with proposals being seen within the wider context of 0-19 capital provision for children and young people which supports the delivery of the city-wide Integrated Services Strategy to improve outcomes for children and young people.
- 4.28 As the details of the costs and partners' contributions will vary from site to site, it is not possible to be specific about the revenue strategy until the sites are agreed and funding arrangements are discussed. However, the on-going financial viability will be established on a site-by-site basis before any capital works commence.

5. FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications

- 5.1 This report proposes capital expenditure of £5.16m on establishing Integrated Service Hubs across the City, and seeks Cabinet approval to the principles involved. This would be funded by the Government's Co-location funding of £3.21m; BSF funding of £0.685m; and £1.265m from Extended Schools [Extended Services] Grant 2008-11 within the Single Capital Pot.
- 5.2 It is proposed that £100,000 of the Extended Services grant be released immediately, to enable the provision of an ISH as part of the development of a new Children's Centre at the former Mayfield Children and Family Centre.
- 5.3 It should be noted that this programme was taking place under challenging financial situation.
- 5.4 There are a number of risks to which attention should be drawn. Firstly, the Co-location funds have to be spent by 31st August 2011, which is likely to present some challenges in the context of the BSF programme for secondary schools; secondly, the BSF funding is dependent upon BSF proceeding as planned and that if for any reason BSF does not proceed at any school with an ISH development, then the funding would have to be found from elsewhere as it would not be recovered from BSF funds; and thirdly that the Government's allocation of Extended Schools Grant is made to support primary schools only, although as part of the Single Capital Pot it may be spent at the Council's discretion (but recognising that the Council may be called upon to justify any alternate use).
- 5.5 Finally, it should be noted that once built, the hubs will be expected to operate within existing revenue budgets. As the details of the costs and partners' contributions will vary from site to site, it is not possible to be specific until the sites are agreed and funding arrangements are discussed. However, the on-

going financial viability should be established on a site-by-site basis before any capital works commence.

Colin Sharpe, Head of Finance and Efficiency, CYPS, ext. 29 7750.

Legal Implications

5.5 This report concerns the acceptance of and allocation of capital funding. The funding streams are as follows:-

Co-location Grant Funding	£3,210,000
Extended Services Capital Funding	£1,265,000 (of which early release of £100,000 is required towards refurbishment cost for the ISH at the Children's Centre at Mayfield)
BSF Capital Funding	£685,000

5.6 It is strongly recommended that a "business case" approach is adopted so that, in particular, operating and lifecycle costs can be assessed for viability.

5.7 Care needs to be taken to ensure that the conditions of funding, including any conditions precedent and any approvals are obtained and that, in particular, the BSF monies can be applied in this way.

5.8 The proposals on consultation are supported. The usual public law requirements on the consideration of representations received will apply. It is also recommended that an EIA be undertaken as the underlying model is a different form of service delivery.

5.9 The headline legal implications are otherwise related to the implementation of the project and can be summarised as follows and need to be planned into the projects:-

5.10 Land – a check needs to be undertaken before any commitments are entered into into the availability of the proposed sites, any site constraints any third party rights and any land or interests that may need to be acquired.

5.11 Alignment with other projects, such as BSF, Primary Capital Programme, Children's Centres where contracts may already be in place, contractors entitled to possession of the site or even where procurement is underway.

5.12 Procurement. The most appropriate procurement route needs to be determined and planned into the project plan. In particular construction to work and ICT installation need to align and the interface needs to be understood and responsibility allocated accordingly.

5.13 Governance and (possibly) school change and playing field issues where school sites are involved.

5.14 Possible workforce matters (the report does not indicate that staff transfer may take place) although there is a possibility that job particulars (e.g. place of

work) may change. I note that there is a possibility of collaborative working with other organisations. At this stage I have not interpreted this as involving any secondment type arrangements.

Joanna Bunting, Head of Commercial and Property Law

6. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	Paragraph References within Supporting information
Equal Opportunities	No	
Policy	No	
Sustainable and Environmental	No	
Crime and Disorder	No	
Human Rights Act	No	
Elderly/People on Low Income	No	

7. RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Risk	Likelihood L/M/H	Severity Impact L/M/H	Control Actions (if necessary/appropriate)
Failure to agree locations in time to meet co-location bid criteria	M	H	Project implementation plan developed
Failure to gain approval for use of extended services & BSF monies	M	H	Project cannot proceed without these additional funds being made available

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

9. CONSULTATIONS

- 9.1 A range of consultations have already been undertaken with the local communities, partner agencies and young people through some of the ISH Stakeholder Events held in schools. There has been specific work with young people through direct work in schools and through the WOT BOX group to help children and young people understand about what integrated services will mean for them and to seek their views on where a hub should be located and which services should be delivered in this way. A youth consultation resource has also been developed - IN2GR8 Leicester - further details are contained in the Leicester Integrated Youth Support Strategy report being presented to Cabinet on 5.10.09.

9.2 Further discussions are planned with key stakeholders to discuss the locations of the hubs and the services to be delivered from the hubs as part of the IYSS consultations from September 2009 onwards.

9.3 Ward member consultation is planned for October 2009.

10. REPORT AUTHORS

Vicky Wibberley
Head of Service Change for Children
Extn 39 4332

John Garratt
11-19 TLE Programme Manager, Extn 39 1654

Penny Hajek,
Divisional Director (Access, Inclusion & Participation)
Ext 29 7704

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)