

Locality Working
Mid-term Review

Sept 2011

Contents

Purpose of Review	2
Methodology	3
Background to locality working	4
Locality Working in Tamworth	6
Implementation of the Locality Working Model	7
Achievements and Outputs to Date	11
Perception Changes in Localities	14
Stakeholder's views	21
Findings and Recommendations	24

Purpose of Review

- To review progress against the original aims of Locality Working (LW)
- To reflect on activity to date, identifying motivators and barriers.
- To consider progress in light of present strategic partnership structures and priorities.
- To reflect on how the current model fits with central government priorities such as Big Society and Localism.
- To discuss with stakeholders, their understanding, experience and assessment of LW.
- To make recommendations to Tamworth Borough Councils (TBC) Cabinet and the Tamworth Strategic Partnership Board (TSP)

Methodology

Desk research

A range of existing papers and reports have been reviewed to provide a context for locality working, examples of activity and evidence of progress.

- L2D Report and updates
- Locality Working plans, Cabinet papers, updates and reports
- Locality Profiles
- Community Survey data 2009 & 2011
- Partner Buy-in Report Aug 2011
- Community Engagement Framework
- CSP Strategic Assessment
- Cohesion and Engagement Mapping work

Face to face Interviews.

An independent interviewer carried out face to face interviews with a range of key stakeholders. It was not possible to involve all partners but contributions came from across the spectrum of partners. Interviews were informal but followed an agreed topic guide with discussion allowed to flow from this start point.

The aim of the interview was to gain input from key stakeholders on progression of multi-agency working through discussion of: -

- Understanding of the concept
- Support for the approach
- Experience of implementation
- Strengths and weaknesses identified

Analysis and reporting

Analysis of available reports together with data on outputs and interview contents were reviewed to provide a background and context for present and planned activity. This information was analysed to produce findings and recommendations on issues raised, barriers encountered and potential mechanisms to maintain and develop progress.

Background to locality working

In 2007 GOWM offered Local Strategic Partnerships within its region the opportunity to be part of a small development programme “Learning 2 Deliver” (L2D) that would help to improve delivery of their Sustainable Community Strategies and Local Area Agreement outcomes.

The project was innovative in that the 8 districts within Staffordshire chose to work in partnership to collectively deliver the outcome ‘improved delivery of services and/or quality of life through better partnership working.’

The project identified some agreed key aims:

- Focus in one locality in each district to address issues of disadvantage
- Improved delivery of services and/or improved quality of life, through better partnership working
- Increased community involvement
- Identification of what factors make locality working more effective
- Identification of ‘disablers’ to effective partnership working

Pilot activity in Tamworth

In Tamworth the area chosen was Amington as this community was already the focus for a multi-agency approach by partners, following its identification as a designated area for action in response to concerns around community safety and other deprivation issues. There was an additional benefit in that a community development officer was in place to coordinate L2D activity and feed in to the County project.

The L2D pilot supported a widening recognition of the benefits of joint working and encouraged partners to engage. Colleagues from Police, Street Wardens, Homestart and other voluntary sector organisations began to look at focussing their efforts through a joint approach in the area. The outcome of the pilot, which was led by Tamworth Borough Council, was the development and agreement of Locality Working as the approach in the Town to close the gap between designated areas of disadvantage and the majority of our communities.

A set of agreed principles were agreed across the County and these became the starting point for locality working in Tamworth.

- A Clearly Defined Area
- Resident Involvement and Capacity Building Support
- Support and commitment from the Local Authority and the LSP
- Quality Information to identify Key Issues and measure Improvement
- Commitment of Service providers to deliver at local level

Locality Working in Tamworth

In simple terms, locality working has become the title given to neighbourhood level multi-agency activity where resources are focused upon a defined community in order to address issues of local need and disadvantage.

Here in Tamworth, locality working is a managed response to addressing

- The need for the better alignment of plans, policies and action;
- The need for partners to focus on shared priorities;
- The need for partners to make better use of diminishing resources.
- The effective sharing and use of data and knowledge to inform planning and resource allocation;

In order to strengthen the agreed approach, the opportunity was taken to establish a Community Development team, to build on the structure of the pilot and widen the focus of multi-agency work across localities. With the commitment of leaders within TBC and the LSP, Tamworth was able to expand the pilot and identify 4 areas of focus. TBC provided resource for 3 CDOs to coordinate activity within neighbourhoods with the fourth area following as soon as Local Public Service Agreement budget became available. A map of localities is attached at Appendix 1

Why Locality Working?

- A stronger understanding of localities
- A more effective and joined up response to people's needs
- A greater engagement with local communities and their representatives
- To focus on local solutions to local problems

The Tamworth Model

- An accessible facility in a central location in each priority locality. These are known locally as **ARCH** (Advice, Resource & Community Hub). This hub provides office space, meeting and training room together with private interview space for confidential services.
- A full-time Community Development Officer to co-ordinate and drive partnership activity, champion community engagement and act as primary contact for the locality.
- Access to existing and planned local services including the Police, PCSOs and Street Wardens, Health, Housing, Social Care & Health, Voluntary Sector and other services.
- A base for linking local people with elected Members and other community leaders.

- A developing range of service provision, delivered in response to local issues, identified by data and through engagement with residents
- Access for local people to plan and develop ideas for themselves and for other local people to participate in
- Neighbourhood Improvement Plans and localised delivery plans developed for each locality.
- Outcomes and overall performance monitored at locality level, at Management Team level and, by exception, at a strategic level via either the TSP or Borough Council Executive.

Variance across Staffordshire

The model adapted in Tamworth is based on the same principles as in other districts but there are various models in action in response to local structure, history, issues and levels of commitment from various partner agencies.

In Newcastle locality working is operated across the entire Town; in Cannock steering groups in 3 localities co-ordinate delivery of activity and a public services board is being established for the priority Blake community; in East Staffs Neighbourhood Forums, with resident volunteers as Chair, identify key areas with coordinators responsible for partners responses: In South Staffs, the LSP work alongside the existing parish structure and Area Forums; in Stafford 3 localities have Signpost Centres with a working group to implement initiatives; in Lichfield 1 locality has strong resident engagement and support from a broad range of partners; Staffordshire Moorlands covers the whole district with elected members taking a lead role in addressing ward specific circumstances.

Implementation of Locality Working Model to Date

An accessible facility in a central location in each priority locality to provide office space, meeting and training space together with private interview space for confidential services.

Four hubs are now in place in communities and are open and accessed on a weekly basis. Each hub contains a range of mixed and flexible space that can be utilised by service providers and the community. Hubs now have good recognition within their locality and their availability has contributed significantly to the project activity and service provision in each area.

The role of the hubs in providing space for community members to explore issues and develop their own activity has had a significant impact, with strong examples of local people participating not only as volunteers but leading on the development of projects. The availability of appropriate space for these activities in the future will be something that will be a challenge for partners but also for the residents as they become more empowered and independent within their own communities. Stakeholders feel that the hubs are a useful facility and serve to provide benefits to joint working and provide a vibrant centre for local people. They also feel they may be difficult to maintain in the future.

In the spirit of cooperation and best use of resources, alternative hub provision has been looked into. Within the localities there are a range of buildings that may serve to support joint working, with the benefit of shared expenses to partners providing potential sustainability. The Belgrave hub moved to the new fire station in September, with the Exley premises becoming the new base for Funkydys, an after school community group who were in urgent need of new premises. Discussions are underway with colleagues from Staffs County to look at the potential for the Kerria Youth Centre to change its role to act as a shared community hub in Amington.

A full-time Community Development Officer to co-ordinate and drive partnership activity, champion community engagement and act as primary contact for the locality.

Although the sometimes variable level of buy-in from partners (internal and external) has impacted on the ability to drive partnership activity in localities there have been a significant number of joint initiatives that have been enabled through the skills and capacity of the four Community Development Officers (CDOs). The majority of partners participating in locality working value the role of the CDOs in building links to new clients/customers and other agencies through their day-to-day work and they have become a key resource which links these neighbourhoods to public sector services. The development of additional locality forums in all localities during the next year may help formalise and support this role. Much effort has gone into attempts to engage a wide range of partners and a separate report on partner buy-in has been carried out.

Community engagement is evidenced throughout the projects delivered to date and is an effective way of working. Further to community involvement in projects there has been specific efforts to establish individuals and groups as volunteers to help support the hub. Alongside this there has been a growth in the number of local people who are beginning to establish themselves as independent groups or leaders of activity. During the period of locality working to date there has been a significant level of engagement going beyond the high quality consultation that has been a feature of many initiatives. Efforts to involve residents have become the norm for project activity involving the CDOs and progress in this area is widely recognised.

Feedback from the stakeholder survey provides a picture of the understanding of and perception about the key elements of this role.

The role of CDOs (extract from stakeholder interviews)

Feedback from the stakeholder interviews show there is majority support for the Community Development Officer (CDO) role, which is seen as separate from the actual physical hubs in which the CDOs are currently based.

However, in practice there were a number of different views.

- Those who supported the concept and had worked with the CDO.
- Those who supported the concept but found themselves too busy to liaise with the CDO.
- Those who did not support the CDO concept on the grounds that it duplicated their own work and that of others.

The view of CDOs about their own role and experience also reflected these different practices. The CDOs had more awareness than many other stakeholders of their role in encouraging multi agency working and building community capacity with many examples of work delivered to achieve this.

Access to existing and planned local services; including Police and Street Wardens, Health, Housing, Social Care & Health, Voluntary Sector and other services.

The aim of establishing more effective multi-agency working between agencies has generally been extremely positive. The different levels of joint/ partnership working have identified and addressed gaps and have created opportunities to make lasting differences within targeted communities.

A question raised through the partner buy-in report is whether we have reached a peak with the number of partners we are working with. In 2009 there were 30 partners that were contributing to the project. At present the number of partners we regard as regularly active is around the same spread throughout the 4 localities. From these, around 18 partners, (many of which are strategic or core voluntary and third sector groups), have been involved with locality working throughout. The rest are groups and agencies that have

come and gone for whatever reason, but it seems that despite the fluctuation the principal numbers have remained the same.

The process of gaining interest and buy-in from partners is a demanding task and has taken many hours of time from each of the development workers. In one recent month alone there were over 40 meetings and schedules made to bring potential partners into the hubs and the project.

None of the existing hubs are utilised to their capacity, which may indicate that the number of service providers that have changed the way they provide support to these neighbourhoods has not increased as expected. Certainly, there appears to be a widespread recognition by partners of a need to focus attention on these neighbourhoods and that organisations are supporting the aim of closing the gap through these efforts.

A base for linking local people with elected Members and other community leaders.

Both District and County Councillors have been active and contribute to locality working. Some utilise the hubs for regular surgeries or community meetings. Many support and contribute to individual projects and activities, such as Christmas events, supporting resident groups or the community cafe and others are supporting and leading the development of locality forum as a means to build new relationships and to drive activity in their communities. Through the work of CDOs, local people have become more aware of the role of elected members and how they can connect to this role.

A developing range of service provision, delivered in response to local issues, identified by data and through engagement with residents

Robust and up to date data and local information/intelligence is now certainly more readily available for the localities. Much of the data is available through reports commissioned by the project from the Staffordshire Observatory. Arising directly from the project is valuable information collected through formal community surveys and local intelligence gathered through better engagement and interaction with residents by partners.

Local issues such as litter, lack of services and facilities for children and young people are agreed by both service providers and residents alike but areas such as obesity, smoking, early death and mental health do not generally come from local people as a priority. Based on the strengthening relationships that are developing with local people, further engagement of residents by health professionals through locality working work can develop relationships that should enable these conversations to take place.

Access for local people to plan and develop ideas for themselves and for other local people to participate in

The work of the community development team and partners has led to the engagement of a number of active residents over the period and these local

people are involved in activity at a variety of levels. As volunteers at the hubs, supporting access, welcoming visitors and providing clerical support; as planners and participants in community projects, providing energy and enthusiasm that has helped to develop a range of well received events and project activity in all localities. A number of active citizens have also been able to bring forward their own ideas and receive support to investigate the potential to establish new groups that can move towards autonomous action in their own right.

Two examples are the Community Together events in localities, with over 1200 local people attending in 2010 and over 1400 in 2011, and the Participatory Budgeting pilots that have seen a significant level of engagement (550) from within these previously disengaged neighbourhoods in showing a desire to contribute to decision making in their community.

The growth in service provision at hubs has not increased at the level expected and buy-in has been irregular. The key information from a review of engagement activity carried out by the CD Team shows that a good deal of energy has been given to attempting to attract a range of service providers to deliver their service in localities. This activity, however, has not led to the expected level of increase in service provision by partners at a locality level

Neighbourhood Improvement Plans and localised delivery plans developed for each locality.

A draft locality profile was drawn up for each locality during the first year, which included available data alongside information on organisations and activity in the area. This profile is being redrawn in 2011 with refreshed data and information that will provide an updated snapshot of each area will also identify changes to the area, some of which will have been impacted on by joint working in the area.

A pilot piece of work using community led planning took place in Amington, which will be fed into the Local Development Plan and be replicated in the other localities over the next year. This method of consultation is an attempt to engage local people in thinking about their community in the long-term rather than the often short-term consultations that can have mixed responses due to local recent incidents or publicity. The plan is to work with colleagues from planning in an attempt to ensure that local people's views are fed into the long-term development plans for the town and that people recognise the need to think about the long-term and how they can help to shape and contribute to the vision of One Tamworth.

A key focus over the forthcoming years should be to explore and realise opportunities for sustainable development in these areas, including redevelopment of appropriate sites.

Outcomes and overall performance monitored at locality level, at Management Team level and, by exception, at a strategic level via either the TSP or Borough Council executive.

There has been ongoing management and monitoring provided by the Council and through partner agencies via first the LSP and now the TSP. This mid term review has been carried out to inform TBC cabinet and the TSP of progress to date and to make recommendations at strategic level to the policy makers. If locality working is to make an impact in the long-term then it will require the ongoing support of the strategic partnership to lead in driving change through this flexible approach.

Achievements and Outputs to Date

- Four locality Advice, Resource & Community Hubs (ARCH) are now open and in use by a range of partners.
- Community Development Officers are in place in each locality to lead, coordinate and champion community engagement and act as primary contact for the locality.
- Working in partnership with colleagues from Strategic Planning, third sector organisations and residents, Community Development Officers are piloting an approach to engaging the public in developing Neighbourhood Master Plans. Drawing on professional independent support from Planning Aid West Midlands will provide an opportunity to connect with the Local Development Framework and other strategic planning objectives with the potential for them to be taken forward as SPDs as appropriate.
- 30 partners are now active at varying levels within the project.
- A large scale community survey of 1000 residents was completed in 2009, providing valuable information around local priorities and local perceptions among residents. This information informed the priority setting of action for each locality and a second survey is underway to provide data and analysis of progress to date. A second survey took place in May 2011 to measure change and progress.
- Community Newsletters were produced for each locality in the past but following a review have been discontinued as they are time consuming and expensive to produce. Although they have provided an opportunity for locally focussed engagement and communications, alternative methods to achieve this are under discussion. The option to both join with and support other local newsletters or to focus on separate communication for specific activity will be used and reflected upon over this year.
- Residents are engaged in each locality to encourage and support their involvement and participation in addressing local issues. Formal volunteers have been recruited to support access to the hubs and a wider group of local people have participated at a number of levels across the localities.

- The establishment of a Stronger Communities Group within the LSP contributed to locality working through the engagement and involvement of partners on this group to address stronger community priorities. This group has moved to become a Task & Finish group under the new strategic structure, responding to calls for action in an effort to continue to support stronger community issues such as community cohesion and engagement.
- Pilot Participatory Budgeting has taken place in 3 localities with the 4th to follow in the summer 2011. Over 550 local people have participated so far voting to distribute almost £60,000 to 14 of 29 project applicants.
- Communities' Together events were held in all 4 localities in summer 2010 and despite poor weather at 3 events over 1,200 local people attended along with partner organisations. Events in 2011 during August attracted many more partner contributions with 30 agencies and teams attending alongside 1500 residents.
- Following over 15 years of trying to install facilities for young people in Amington, facing constant objections from the community, a project led by the CD team has delivered 2 facilities of a ball court and a meeting point that was a national finalist for engaging young people and is also a finalist for a RIBA design award and South Staffs Partnership design award.
- Within two localities there were issues of a run-down appearance of the local shopping area, with the situation in Amington that only 2 of 6 units were occupied. All units at both the Kerria and Exley shopping areas are now occupied.
- In Belgrave, as part of the hub moving to the new fire station, the CD team have been able to put in place a tenant, through working with Funkyds to provide them with much needed new premises. The added benefit of this is that we have maintained a connection to this part of the community.
- An intergenerational art project involved local people in designing and painting shutters in an attempt to brighten a local shopping area with designs agreed by the wider community.
- A fishing pilot has led to the SYPS looking to develop this activity as a positive diversionary activity for local young people.
- A Locality Forum for front line workers in Amington has provided the model to be rolled out in other areas during 2011/12.
- Colleagues from Next Steps (formerly Connexions) are providing a detached service to address worklessness at the Amington hub and have joined with an initiative led by Bromford Homes to develop a Work Club at Stonydelph. A wide range of partners have been invited to join this initiative from the outset and it will require contribution from a wide range of services if it is to develop and be sustained.

- Support from the CDO for Amington increased engagement activity in Amington, which contributed to Tamworth in Bloom in 2010, where TBC was awarded Gold.
- A cohesion baseline has been produced for the Borough providing a starting point to develop initiatives and actions to address issues at an early stage.
- A detailed mapping exercise has researched the various levels and types of structures and processes that can impact to support better engagement and cohesion in the Town. An event to disseminate the results of this work took place in June 2011.
- A report recording a year in locality working has been published and distributed.
- A DVD about locality working is nearing completion, which will be available to view through the TBC Website

Perception Changes in Localities

An initial community survey of 1000 residents was carried out in 2009 to determine issues and perceptions within localities and the rest of Tamworth. The aim was to identify key issues for local people and to provide a record of difference between the localities and the Borough that could be monitored over time. This survey has been repeated in 2011 and some of the key findings are summarised below.

The amount of detail contained within this report provides useful data to support individual project responses but will be viewed and analysed in its entirety to help shape the partnership approach to locality working.

Summary of Community Survey 2011

- Perceptions of problems associated with crime and anti-social behaviour continue to be greater in the locality working areas than in the Rest of Tamworth, particularly in Amington. Negative perceptions in the rest of Tamworth are getting better whilst in localities they are increasing, indicating an ongoing differential to be addressed.
- Most locality working areas have seen a decline in problems associated with rubbish/litter and teenagers hanging around, and especially the extent to which respondents say teenagers are a big problem. Facilities for children and young people and tidying up and addressing graffiti and litter remain the two key things which people would like to change but there are positive improvements in both these perceptions since the last survey.
- Whilst the proportion of respondents who feel they know people in their local area is falling in the Rest of Tamworth sample, it appears to be falling faster in Amington and Belgrave. Glascote is the exception to the rule, as many more respondents know people in the local area now compared to the baseline survey. The changes in these results do not seem to have had an impact on the extent to which people feel like they belong to their local area.
- Generally speaking respondents are becoming more positive about being able to influence decisions if they work together with other people in their local area. Agreement with this indicator is rising most rapidly in Stonydelph.
- Self reported health was good overall, although the survey has highlighted a gap in levels of self-reported health in the Locality Working areas compared to the Rest of Tamworth sample.
- To improve the health of the community as a whole, respondents were interested in having more access to leisure and play facilities and more structured sport sessions.
- Participation in sport and active recreation has increased significantly since the baseline, although this result is influenced by an increased recognition of what active participation includes in the 2011 survey. This question indicates how an increased awareness can impact and influence local perception.

- The survey also revealed that a significantly high percentage of residents do not think they require any support or help with health issues, which, given the data available elsewhere highlights the need for awareness-raising around health issues.
- Overall satisfaction with the locality areas as places to live has remained steady since the baseline survey in most areas, but continues to be below average for the Rest of Tamworth. Whilst the inequality gap between the locality working areas and the Rest of Tamworth has not widened and there are signs in some areas that the gap is closing, it is evident that multi-agency work has not yet had a big enough impact to influence and improve it in the short term.
- Agreement that respondents have the ability to influence decisions has fallen in Tamworth, following a trend seen nationally, although one locality working area (Glascote) has managed to buck this trend and have an unprecedented rise in agreement. Exploratory work to understand reasons for this has been carried out as an extension to research.
- Qualitative work in the form of in-depth interviews was commissioned to try and explain the reason behind the fall in agreement in three out of four of the Locality Working areas. The qualitative research showed that most respondents would like to be able to have a say about what goes on in their local area, and many felt it was their right to decide on things that happen in their neighbourhood. The sort of decisions people would like to get involved in are localised, affecting their everyday lives – rather than more strategic decisions which they feel may be more difficult for them to influence. The sort of decisions people would like to get involved in fell into three strands, which were;
 - Activities for children and young people
 - Tackling crime and anti social behaviour, and
 - Making sure the area is clean and tidy.

What is preventing residents from influencing decisions?

The research has not indicated that anything significant has changed since 2009 when the baseline survey was undertaken which has suddenly changed people's perceptions about whether they can influence decisions or not. However, there are some key personal and organisational barriers which appear to prevent people from getting involved.

A lack of time to participate in decision making, such as finding time to attend meetings or events, puts people off getting involved. A **lack of interest** and general apathy towards the local area and that some respondents were worried about **fear of reprisals** from other people in the local area and/or the organisation they were involved with, if they started to complain about certain things. In terms of organisational barriers, there appears to be a **lack of information** about how to get involved in decision making in the local area. Respondents also had a lack of **faith in the Council and its Partners** to act on their concerns, and to listen to

what they had to say. In many cases respondents had a 'why bother' attitude as they didn't think it would make any difference.

Respondents were however much more positive about their ability to influence decisions if they worked together with other people in their community. Agreement is highest in the Rest of Tamworth, due to a significant increase in agreement since the baseline survey (to 82%). However, agreement with this statement is also high in Amington and Belgrave (76% and 79% respectively). There is a gap in agreement between the Rest of Tamworth and Stonydelph and Glascote, although this is narrowing thanks to a significant boost in agreement in both Locality Working areas between 2009 and 2011. The signs here are positive and partners should focus on encouraging people to work together in the local area to get their voices heard and to make a difference.

What would residents like to be able to influence?

The research has shown that the majority of respondents would like to be able to have a say about what goes on in their local area, and many respondents feel it is their right to decide on things that happen in their neighbourhood. The sort of decisions people would like to get involved in are localised and the kind of things which affect their everyday lives – rather than bigger and more strategic decisions which they feel may be more difficult for them to influence. There are three strands of decision making which most residents would like to get involved with. First are activities **for children and young people**, providing both with facilities close by which will give them something to do and stop them from becoming bored. Second is **crime and anti social behaviour**; reducing problems associated with drugs, dogs (both dog mess and dangerous dogs) and anti-social behaviour such as vandalism, or people drinking on the streets. Respondents would also like to get involved in making sure the area where they live is **clean and tidy**, including street cleaning, keeping green areas tidy and managing unkempt bushes and trees.

Key results over time - A traffic light system has been used to indicate change

Similar	Improving	Declining
---------	-----------	-----------

Table 2.1 Key results over time (all respondents)

Ref	Measure	2009 (%)	2011 (%)	Change (+/- %pts)
Fig 4.2	Satisfied with local area as a place to live	82	81	-1
Fig 4.7	Know most/quite a lot of people in the local area	48	41	-7
Fig 4.9	Feel strongly belong to the local area	71	74	+3
Fig 4.11	Agree local area is a place where different people get on well together and respect one another	80 ¹	81*	
		72 ²		
Fig 5.5	Agree can influence decisions affecting local area	44	29	-15
Fig 5.7	Methods in helping to influence decisions are effective	38	49	+11
Fig 5.9	Agree people in the neighbourhood can influence decisions by working together	52	69	+17
Fig 5.1	Participated in sport or active recreation, at a moderate intensity, for at least 30 minutes, at least 3 times a week**	16	51	+35
Fig 5.3	Given unpaid help	9	11	+2
Fig 6.1	On the whole my health over the past 12 months has been good	-	78	

¹ In the 2009 survey respondents were asked 'To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?'

² In the 2009 survey respondents were asked 'In your local area, how much of a problem do you think there is with people not treating each other with respect and consideration? This figure shows the percentage of respondents stating 'not a very big problem' or not a problem at all'

* The two previous questions asked in 2009 were replaced by one question in 2011; 'To what extent do you agree or disagree that this a place where everyone gets on together and respects one another?'

** In 2011 respondents were given examples of active recreation as part of the question e.g. walking and gardening whereas they were not in the previous survey.

Table 2.2 Key results over time (all Amington respondents)

Ref	Measure	2009 (%)	2011 (%)	Change (+/- %pts)
Fig 4.2	Satisfied with local area as a place to live	79	80	+1
Fig 4.7	Know most/quite a lot of people in the local area	66	39	-27
Fig 4.9	Feel strongly belong to the local area	74	73	-1
Fig 4.11	Agree local area is a place where different people get on well together and respect one another	70	79	
		79		
Fig 5.5	Agree can influence decisions affecting local area	74	22	-53
Fig 5.7	Methods in helping to influence decisions are effective	58	36	-22
Fig 5.9	Agree people in the neighbourhood can influence decisions by working together	75	76	+1
Fig 5.1	Participated in sport or active recreation, at a moderate intensity, for at least 30 minutes, at least 3 times a week	10	54	+44
Fig 5.3	Given unpaid help	15	18	+3
Fig 6.1	On the whole my health over the past 12 months has been good	-	75	

Table 2.3 Key results over time (all Belgrave respondents)

Ref	Measure	2009 (%)	2011 (%)	Change (+/- %pts)
Fig 4.2	Satisfied with local area as a place to live	82	82	0
Fig 4.7	Know most/quite a lot of people in the local area	44	37	-7
Fig 4.9	Feel strongly belong to the local area	83	77	-6
Fig 4.11	Agree local area is a place where different people get on well together and respect one another	90	78	
		66		
Fig 5.5	Agree can influence decisions affecting local area	61	27	-34
Fig 5.7	Methods in helping to influence decisions are effective	44	46	+2
Fig 5.9	Agree people in the neighbourhood can influence decisions by working together	79	79	0
Fig 5.1	Participated in sport or active recreation, at a moderate intensity, for at least 30 minutes, at least 3 times a week	10	58	+48
Fig 5.3	Given unpaid help	9	9	0
Fig 6.1	On the whole my health over the past 12 months has been good	-	74	

Table 2.4 Key results over time (all Glasgote respondents)

Ref	Measure	2009 (%)	2011 (%)	Change (+/- %pts)
Fig 4.2	Satisfied with local area as a place to live	85	77	-8
Fig 4.7	Know most/quite a lot of people in the local area	46	52	+6
Fig 4.9	Feel strongly belong to the local area	64	70	+6
Fig 4.11	Agree local area is a place where different people get on well together and respect one another	84	86	
		78		
Fig 5.5	Agree can influence decisions affecting local area	18	44	+26
Fig 5.7	Methods in helping to influence decisions are effective	67	55	-12
Fig 5.9	Agree people in the neighbourhood can influence decisions by working together	39	62	+23
Fig 5.1	Participated in sport or active recreation, at a moderate intensity, for at least 30 minutes, at least 3 times a week	25	52	+27
Fig 5.3	Given unpaid help	8	10	+2
Fig 6.1	On the whole health over the past 12 months has been good	-	83	

Table 2.5 Key results over time (all Stonydelph respondents)

Ref	Measure	2009 (%)	2011 (%)	Change (+/- %pts)
Fig 4.2	Satisfied with local area as a place to live	71	74	+3
Fig 4.7	Know most/quite a lot of people in the local area	35	32	-3
Fig 4.9	Feel strongly belong to the local area	65	68	+3
Fig 4.11	Agree local area is a place where different people get on well together and respect one another	88	79	
		50		
Fig 5.5	Agree can influence decisions affecting local area	37	24	-13
Fig 5.7	Methods in helping to influence decisions are effective	7	52	+45
Fig 5.9	Agree people in the neighbourhood can influence decisions by working together	6	48	+42

Fig 5.1	Participated in sport or active recreation, at a moderate intensity, for at least 30 minutes, at least 3 times a week	4	32	+28
Fig 5.3	Given unpaid help	6	7	+1
Fig 6.1	On the whole health over the past 12 months has been good	-	74	

Table 2.6 Key results over time (all Rest of Tamworth respondents)

Ref	Measure	2009 (%)	2011 (%)	Change (+/- %pts)
Fig 4.2	Satisfied with local area as a place to live	92	92	0
Fig 4.7	Know most/quite a lot of people in the local area	50	44	-6
Fig 4.9	Feel strongly belong to the local area	69	82	+13
Fig 4.11	Agree local area is a place where different people get on well together and respect one another	69	84	
		87		
Fig 5.5	Agree can influence decisions affecting local area	30	30	0
Fig 5.7	Methods in helping to influence decisions are effective	46	64	+18
Fig 5.9	Agree people in the neighbourhood can influence decisions by working together	64	82	+18
Fig 5.1	Participated in sport or active recreation, at a moderate intensity, for at least 30 minutes, at least 3 times a week	32	61	+29
Fig 5.3	Given unpaid help	10	12	+2
Fig 6.1	On the whole health over the past 12 months has been good	-	85	

Changes since August 2008

The aim at the core of locality working is to close the gap between the designated areas and the majority of the Town. Evidence available from the community survey and through feedback from stakeholders and long-term partners appears to show that this concerted effort is beginning to have an impact. Perceptions of these areas by those who live outside, but more importantly among those who live in these neighbourhoods are showing signs of becoming more positive.

One of the most significant quotes recently came from a resident and gives much encouragement that locality working can have a long-term impact that local people will notice over time. "People in this area used to go about with their heads down and now they walk with their heads held up".

The table below contains a range of information around crime and ASB, in addition to other disadvantages that provide an indication of the positive direction of travel for LW but also provides evidence of the need for an ongoing focus on these areas.

Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour															
	Tamworth			Amington			Belgrave			Glascote			Stonydelph		
	2009/10	2010/11	Q1/2 2011/12	2009/10	2010/11	Q1/2 11/12	2009/10	2010/11	Q1/2 11/12	2009/10	2010/11	Q1/2 11/12	2009/10	2010/11	Q1/2 11/12
Violence with Injury															
Serious Violence	64	36	15	8	4	0	4	2	1	3	0	0	13	6	1
Less Serious Violence	697	585	229	84	63	18	48	53	14	54	51	29	75	80	21
Serious Acquisitive															
Burglary Dwelling	293	240	142	37	20	13	24	21	3	26	15	15	36	29	28
Business Robbery	7	9	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	2
Personal Robbery	65	40	15	7	1	0	3	3	1	10	8	1	8	7	1
Theft of Vehicle	142	85	38	27	15	5	11	12	6	20	9	3	16	7	2
Theft from Vehicle	310	224	87	38	21	8	36	21	6	23	12	6	41	23	8
Burglary Other	262	216	95	18	14	11	20	27	18	24	10	8	18	14	5
Criminal Damage (excl MV)	680	577	278	112	77	33	83	64	31	48	60	24	77	70	50
Criminal Damage to MV	563	447	163	84	47	14	63	43	19	50	45	22	61	59	28
Arson (Excl MV)	55	56	30	8	9	2	9	7	1	0	9	4	10	16	10
Anti Social Behaviour	3773	2869	1154	473	306	144	387	342	121	336	257	134	491	410	171

Worklessness and Benefits

The number of workless families in all localities except Belgrave has increased since 2005; however this rate is below the level across Tam worth and Staffordshire. Low income families also increased in all areas except Stonydelph but these increases are significantly less than the increase experienced across Tamworth (22.9%) and Staffordshire(21.2%).

Out of Work Families	Tamworth District	2005	2009		2005	2009		2005	2009		2005	2009	
	Up by 22.9%		245	285	+16.3%	175	160	-8.6%	290	335	+15.5%	205	235
Low Income Families	Tamworth District	2005	2009		2005	2009		2005	2009		2005	2009	
Up by 21.2%		545	590	+8.3%	335	360	+7.5%	595	665	+11.8%	450	450	Same

Three localities have seen % increases in benefits claimants below or in line with the Tamworth (13.8%) and Staffordshire (11.7%) level. Apart from Amington, the % increase in Job Seekers Allowance claimant level in each locality is below that for Tam worth (80.2%). DLA claimant levels have increased at % rates below that for Tamworth (17.4%) and Staffordshire (18.5%).

Benefit Claimants	Tamworth District	2005	2010		2005	2010		2005	2010		2005	2010	
	13.8% increase		1020	1155	+13.2%	485	520	+7.2%	1010	1055	+4.5%	615	655

Deprivation and Disadvantage

All locality areas have a higher percentage of students claiming free school meals than the District 18.5% and County 13% rate. In all areas this number has increased by over 25%

Free School Meals	Tamworth District	2007	2011		2007	2011		2007	2011		2007	2011	
	18.5% recipient rate		268	330	27.6%	155	193	27.1%	349	441	27.7%	152	195

In Amington, one of the six Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA) that make up the locality has dropped from 60 – 70% to 50 – 60% in the IMD.

In Belgrave two of the three LSOAs that make up the locality have climbed from 40 – 50% to 50 – 60% and from 10 – 20% to 20 – 30% in the IMD

In Stonydelph one of the three LSOAs that make up the locality has climbed from 50 – 60% to 60 – 70% in the IMD.

Glascote continues to have two of five LSOAs in the bottom 20 – 30% and one in the bottom 10 – 20% IMD

Key	GREEN Improving	AMBER Little Change	RED Worsening
-----	-----------------	---------------------	---------------

Stakeholder's Views

Introduction

An independent consultant was appointed to carry out detailed interviews with a range of 20 stakeholders from all sectors to better inform this review.

The brief given was to discuss with colleagues their: -

- Understanding of the concept
- Support for the approach
- Experience of implementation
- Positive and negative aspects

A summary of conclusions from these interviews is below.

Summary

LW represents a fundamental cultural change for many stakeholders and that it is early days to expect universal 'sign up' to the concept. Nevertheless there are signs that LW is becoming accepted and that it is changing working practices.

"To me the whole idea is having a local venue which local people start to see as the key one stop shop to all public sector services. That means that their problems can be seen in the round rather than separated out between different departments."

"We can't provide as good a service as we once did so locality working is a good way of reducing costs by partnership working."

"Our satisfaction surveys show high ratings for our record on serious crime but less on minor crime such as graffiti and vandalism. Yet we can't really do anything about these things, they are largely up to other services, so partnership working is essential."

There is support for multi agency working, although in practice not all service areas actually do work on this basis. Reasons are resource constraints, including lack of staff, departmental specific targets and in a few cases outright unwillingness to change.

"Partnership working pays off in the long run but it takes more time and resources at the beginning, and to be frank we don't have the staff to cover the extra meetings and travel."

"The growth in service provision at hubs has not increased at the level expected and buy-in has been irregular. A good deal of energy has been given to attract a range of service providers to deliver their service, but this activity has not led to the expected level of increase in service provision by partners at a locality level"

“There are a very wide range of activities which would not otherwise have occurred – examples are training for volunteering, murals and art projects with local youths, advice sessions, community tidy ups.”

There is acceptance that the ARCH venues are useful but not essential to deliver the locality working vision. In contrast the role of the CDO is widely accepted as beneficial and is seen as crucial in providing intelligence and links with the locality. Even those who advocate the provision of services in central Tamworth support the role of the CDOs in referring and encouraging people in the locality working areas to access their services.

Moving forward

Stakeholders understand and support the service delivery aspect of LW and agree that the four areas selected are appropriate in the light of levels of greatest deprivation. This is in itself a success but there is further to go to develop an awareness of the strategic importance of LW since there is still a significant proportion of stakeholders who see LW as largely a mechanism for service delivery and are less aware of the community capacity objectives.

Closely associated with this limitation is a lack of understanding of the important distinction between consultation and engagement with the community. Thus the incorporation of building community capacity as an essential element of public engagement is often missing from consultation activities carried out by Partners. Hence very few stakeholders referred to the “Stronger Together Community Engagement Framework” and there is clearly a need to publicise this along with a continued strong corporate message of commitment. Clearly there is also a training need involved in helping Partners to make this transition. It is apparent from the interviews that with notable exceptions, there is limited knowledge of practical techniques for public engagement. One idea to support this gap is for TBC to develop a toolkit to accompany the Engagement Framework. Another suggestion is to revisit job descriptions to check that the commitment to LW is incorporated.

There is acceptance that the ARCH venues are useful but not essential to deliver the LW vision. Indeed there are already discussions taking place to adopt a more flexible model for the use of premises, especially in relation to new buildings and changes of use which have occurred since LW was first set up.

The overall verdict

There is no doubt that awareness of the strategic aspect of LW is growing and that the legacy of the past two years of LW is beginning to 'bed in' with an increasing number of stakeholders now agreeing that there are more opportunities to engage with the public.

More fundamentally there is a growing understanding that Locality Working is of both practical and strategic importance if the deep seated problems of the areas are to be solved on a long-term and sustainable basis. Future examples to illustrate this point should be evaluated, supported and publicised by TBC at senior and corporate level. This will in turn encourage others to work in this different way and to expend the time and resources necessary for success.

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good track record of multi agency working and some significant achievements • Corporate 'sign in' for the concept • Strong majority support for the role of the CDOs • A growing number of community groups and a sense of 'neighbourliness' 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of understanding of the community capacity aspect of locality working with an associated need for training • Budgetary constraints and a view that (at least initially) locality working is more time consuming and resource intensive • Fear of change – 'silo' working • Demoralisation due to perceived lack of support by other stakeholders for those engaged in locality working
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement that the four locality working areas are well chosen as the most deprived and meriting special attention • Some good examples of locality working in building community capacity which could be evaluated to demonstrate positive outcomes. • Government support for the concept linking with 'The Big Society' and other community opportunities as set out in the Localism Bill 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of support from key service areas • Consultation duplication leading to fatigue • The effect of the recession in increasing social problems in the locality working areas

Findings & Recommendations

The Model

Through considering the information and analysis to date it is clear that Locality Working provides the greatest opportunity for partnership working to address specific areas of multiple disadvantage in Tamworth, that its implementation has provided many positive benefits to a wide range of residents and that it provides the catalyst for focusing service delivery and joint initiatives. It is also clear that it has helped to empower residents and communities to care and stand up for their area. There is widespread agreement that the 4 locality areas remain the priority for focussed multi-agency working.

Senior management and strategic leaders have led and championed locality working since its inception and this report provides confirmation that this has been an appropriate decision. The model remains the most appropriate to achieve the aims of strategic partners and evidence of positive progress is beginning to develop. This review has been carried out at a relatively early stage in the process and shows that the model is of value and direction of travel is correct and appropriate

The direction of travel is positive and supports the progress made against the initial set of agreed principles. However what we haven't seen is a step change in the way in which organisations are delivering services in Tamworth. Much of the changes to service delivery have come about through opportunism brought on by the CDOs and ARCH buildings being a quick route to deliver services to key client groups. The public sector as a whole has not yet taken Locality Working into account when designing or reshaping services.

The details of achievements and outputs to date show the sort of activity that is having an impact, which gives an indication of the potential for further impact over future years if this momentum can be maintained.

Survey data has provided information on progress and improving perceptions to date but also details the ongoing differences between the localities and rest of Tamworth highlighting the ongoing need to address and attempt to close these continuing gaps.

Key needs and priorities are now better understood by partners and it will be essential to maintain and build these relationships and to continue to listen and engage local people through ongoing dialogue, although it is also understood that this is more difficult for some partners due to their structure, resource or capacity for change.

As expected at the outset, locality working will take many years to show significant difference in terms of closing the gap between various neighbourhoods of the Town but has provided many examples of positive impact. Evidence from activities to date, community survey data, stakeholder

feedback and those at the core of locality working shows that progress is being made despite all the issues and outside influences that have impacted over the last two years.

Partner Buy-in

There has been a really good range of joint working and many examples of new relationships developed through locality working. The level of buy-in to date, although not as high as preferred, does indicate robust ongoing support from many key areas. The connections made through locality working have accomplished the establishment of new and stronger relationships that are providing joint work within localities and are moving forward independently of the LW hubs. It should also be noted that these relationships include connections between statutory agencies, agencies and voluntary community organisations and local groups and individuals.

There has been a significant level of buy-in at the strategic level but this message has sometimes not been understood or taken on board fully at other levels, which has led to a lack of clarity about the priority for joint working and a focus on these neighbourhoods. Sustained service has been maintained in all 4 localities but the level of this contribution is often not at the level able to achieve substantial progress.

There are a range of reasons given by partners for the lack of engagement and contribution, including lack of resources and capacity to commit at officer level in addition to a lack of belief in locality working from some as shown in the stakeholder interviews. Officers who would like to engage and contribute have sometimes felt that they are unable to take the decision to contribute to activity as they feel their role will not be backed up within their organisation or department. Buy-in to the model of locality working has also been impacted upon by a fear of change within some areas, where those who are used to present methods of working are reluctant to change or are comfortable with the way things are.

If this continues then the potential of one of the key aspects of the locality working initiative will not be realised, along with the benefits of the establishment of strong and coordinated partnerships that can have a long-term impact, benefitting other neighbourhoods across the Town.

ARCH Buildings / Community Hubs

It has never been the intention to establish buildings for their own sake, rather within the locality working model it was agreed that an accessible facility that served to support partnership work would be of benefit. The use of dedicated buildings as community hubs has required a significant amount of coordination and management and has not led to the hoped for development of significant multi-use premises. Locality hubs have provided the base for the great majority of activity carried out to date through locality working and have supported more effective and closer working between partners in localities. The availability of flexible use premises of the type envisaged is obviously a

benefit but many of these benefits could also be achieved through effective closer working with existing partners in localities, releasing staff to focus on partnership and joint working development.

The associated costs for TBC of specific buildings cannot be provided through existing funds over the long-term and the time that CDOs use to manage premises is impacting the capacity available for engaging partners and driving and coordinating activity. If joint use premises are supported through contribution from an extensive range of partners they could be open more regularly with a wider variety of services available, leading to new relationships between both partners and residents. This may also address a problem raised by a stakeholder of stigma or lack of confidentiality, as it would be difficult to know why people were visiting a building where a diverse range of support was available.

The costs of premises are certainly something to be addressed and activity to date has been resourced with external funds and if the partnership wishes to continue with this then alternative resource will be required. The external funding ended in 2010 and it is only through prudent budget management that sufficient funds for 2011/12 are in place. The move to different premises in Belgrave and possibly Amington may relieve some of the pressure on funds but the Stonydelph building and contribution to running costs will remain a need.

Future progress will require a balance to be made, where appropriate premises are utilised to their maximum by a wide range of partners, alongside effective joint working that focuses on achieving mutual aims through flexibility, silo-breaking and strong relationships. Certainly there is no lack of contribution to and support for joint work in the localities, with examples such as the Community Together events showing a significant increase in the number of partners attending and contributing to a more multi-agency initiative or the estate walkabouts, which are involving an increasing number of partners.

Community Development Officers

The presence of community development officers within the localities has provided the link between organisations and communities and has acted as the catalyst for much of the activity within locality working, identifying priorities, local issues and gaps to be addressed, assisting partners to make links with others to support their service aims and piloting initiatives on behalf of the strategic partnership.

The role of CDOs as a primary contact in the area varies dependent on the nature of the contact required but all perform a role of guardianship and stewardship within the area. Existing partners utilise the CDOs knowledge and strong links to the locality communities to contribute to their own work.

The role of the Community Development Officer within the localities is very widely supported but has also sometimes become seen as the locality

working project, rather than a role that supports effective engagement and facilitates partnership working. The role of the CDOs and how elements of their function are prioritised will be impacted on more significantly than for other partners by this review, which includes the issue of resource for continuation of this key coordinating function.

Backed up by the support of senior management and strategic champions, CDOs will continue to focus their efforts to co-ordinate and drive partnership activity, engaging with agencies and service providers in an effort to build and expand the expertise and services available through locality working.

Community Engagement and Empowerment

Despite much work by a wide range of people over the last two years including joint work to develop an engagement framework, the establishment of a Stronger Communities Group alongside producing Cohesion Baseline and detailed Engagement Mapping, there still seems to be a lack of understanding in some areas of the difference between effective community consultation and ongoing and focussed engagement.

The level of community engagement achieved has been a significant factor in the success so far of locality working. Initiatives such as Participatory Budgeting have drawn in many hundreds of residents to participate and have real influence in their neighbourhood. Community events and projects have always attracted involvement from local people and there is growing evidence from the community survey and also from feedback to the CDOs that a more positive atmosphere is beginning to inculcate these neighbourhoods.

The knowledge among residents of the nature and range of services in the Town and their willingness to contribute to activity has developed through volunteering, participation in projects and at events and through the information and advice role of the hubs.

Research has shown that residents would like to be able to have a say about what goes on in their local area and many respondents feel it is their right to decide on things that happen in their neighbourhood. Research has identified that there are a number of 'potential decision makers' within localities, who would like to get more involved in decision making but just need some more reassurance about doing so. These potential decision makers need some reassurance that giving up their limited time to take part in decision making is going to be a worthwhile exercise, and that their views will be listened to. Locality working partners should concentrate on engaging and nurturing this group together with other residents, and help them to progress to become willing volunteers. The council and its partners need to act on concerns and lead by example. There is a feeling that the council doesn't listen and nothing ever happens, so building trust in the local community is a must.

Elected Members

Elected members have been key supporters of Locality Working and play an important role as community leaders within neighbourhoods. With the introduction of localism, this connection between elected members and their community will help to maintain Tamworth's position as one where, through Locality Working, Big Society is in place and focussed neighbourhood work at a locality level can have significant impact.

Empowerment and engagement must be linked to key issues and appropriate service provision to address these issues. Addressing worklessness in the localities is a key issue where activity has only recently commenced on this important area of support for economic prosperity. Alongside the various components of disadvantage that are present within localities, it is a fact that for most families they will also be experiencing worklessness. Locality Working provides a flexible model that can support partners from statutory, business and third sectors to work together to respond more effectively together. Residents can be empowered and supported through effective multi-agency service provision to build their skills and confidence and contribute to counteracting this situation.

Locality Working to date has been around service provision and engagement of communities, drawing partners together to address issues of disadvantage and establishing relationships between partners and the target communities. There has not been a focus on physical regeneration aside from the community led planning work to consult residents and involve them in the LDF process to contribute input to long-term planning. This area of work, looking at long-term growth and prosperity, is another area of expertise and experience that partners have the potential to contribute to.

Locality Working has focussed on addressing a range of issues in response to both data and community consultation, which is appropriate. There remains a challenge for partners to address issues linked to health and lifestyle such as healthy eating, smoking and exercise, which are not often prioritised by residents and will require an initial focus on increasing awareness within disadvantaged neighbourhoods as a pre-requisite to offering service provision.

Conclusions

The report provides evidence that the core aim of targeted multi-agency working at a designated locality level should be continued, as it is having an impact on local issues, perceptions and engagement and should be endorsed as the approach used by the public sector as a whole. Locality working should become a core activity for partners, with recognition that this will require appropriate resource in terms of staff time and prioritisation.

To develop stronger buy-in, senior management and strategic leaders will need to re-emphasise their commitment to locality working. This message of encouraging partners to engage and bring their particular expertise to the

localities will increase its impact, if it is clearly passed down throughout their individual organisational structures and if there is clarity amongst officers of partner organisations at all levels, of the priority for joint working, a focus on localities and the need to change ways of working where necessary.

Service providers from across the public sector should be encouraged to contribute to Locality Working through engaging with local people and raising awareness and understanding of the issues impacting on their lives such as health, housing and exercise, with the aim of raising aspiration and more positive choices over the long-term. An increased knowledge of the issues impacting on people locally will support efforts by partners to engage and provide services to address these priority needs.

Following on from examples in Glascote and Belgrave and within present budget constraints, there will be a need to move towards utilising shared buildings across the localities with premises managed by partners best placed to do so in each area. This will provide a better use of diminishing resources, may release buildings for alternate use, will encourage buy-in from building owners and will provide a clearer focal and access point for local people.

If the present level of activity and progress across all four localities is to be maintained, it will be necessary to identify funding for continuation of the fourth CDO role funded to date from external sources. This should be included within the TBC budget review process, alongside a request to strategic partners to provide financial support to this key and widely supported position. The fourth CDO has been funded to date through LPSA funds until Oct 2011 and an extension to March 2012 has been provided by TBC.

If the CDOs are to make further progress to build partnership activity then it may be appropriate to review and prioritise aspects of their role and for them to be provided with the appropriate level of influence to support recognition of their role as neighbourhood champions and coordinators.

Locality Working can provide an excellent mechanism for partner agencies to engage and build relationships in these key communities for physical regeneration. It is possible that the 4 localities are identified as suitable SP5 regeneration areas, with the purpose of revitalising the housing areas and building cohesive and sustainable communities. It will be beneficial if the community has been consulted and supports this revitalisation and community planning is taking place as part of locality working. Some of the key issues that should be considered by any plans are

1. improving the quality of the existing housing stock,
2. enhancing the mix of housing within neighbourhoods;
3. enhancing and providing community facilities and services;
4. protecting and enhancing the network of open space,
5. supporting the vitality and viability of existing local and neighbourhood centres,
6. increasing integration of the localities with surrounding areas and
7. improving accessibility to employment, key services and the Town centre by walking, cycling and public transport.

The key matter of worklessness should be a focus of future joint activity, bringing economic benefit to these areas through service delivery from the range of expertise and skills of partner agencies. Working together can contribute to addressing this fundamental issue, as the knock on impact of getting people into employment will have wide ranging positive effect on families in these neighbourhoods.

Recommendations

1. *That the present model and locations identified for Locality Working are endorsed.*
2. *That Cabinet re-emphasise their commitment to Locality Working as the approach used by TBC and the public sector to address areas of identified need, encouraging TBC services and partner agencies to contribute to the Locality Working agenda*
3. *In recognition of a lack of long-term premises funding, that a move to shared use is prioritised, releasing TBC buildings for alternate use where possible.*
4. *That options for the continuation of the 4th CDO role are included within the TBC budget review process, alongside a request to strategic partners to provide financial support to this key and widely supported position.*
5. *That colleagues involved in physical regeneration initiatives link into Locality Working to engage and build relationships in these key communities.*
6. *That the key matter of worklessness and economic development be a focus of future joint activity,*