

Locality Working Premises Review

Client: Tamworth Borough Council

Contents

	Page
1. Purpose of the report	3
2. Background	3
3. Approach	4
4. Localities	
4.1 Amington	4
4.1.1 Specific local issues	4
4.1.2 Use of the hub/local networks	5
4.1.3 Other community-based premises	9
4.1.4 Current costs	10
4.1.5 Key options	10
4.2 Stonydelph	14
4.2.1 Specific local issues	14
4.2.2 Use of the hub/local networks	14
4.2.3 Other community-based premises	16
4.2.4 Current costs	17
4.2.5 Key options	18
4.3 Glascote and Belgrave	20
4.3.1 Use of the hub/local networks	20
4.3.2 Key options	20
5. Reflections on the importance of people and place	21
5.1 Is a physical hub necessary?	21

6. Issues to consider in each locality	24
6.1 Amington	24
6.1.1 Analysis	24
6.1.2 Key questions arising	26
6.2 Stonydelph	26
6.2.1 Analysis	26
6.2.2 Key questions arising	27
6.3 Glascote and Belgrave	27
6.3.1 Analysis	27
6.3.2 Key questions arising	28
7. Wider issues to consider	28
7.1 Analysis	28
7.2 Some key questions arising	29
Appendices	
Appendix 1 –List of interviewees	
Appendix 2 - Hub activities	
Appendix 3 – Potential funding sources	

Prepared by ***JoinedupConsulting Limited***

Joined up thinking
 Joined up solutions
 Joined up delivery

Author Simon Hobbs 07903 797486

1. Purpose

This report is designed to aid the decision-making process of the Locality Working Premises Review. Specifically, this work has:

- Mapped the current and potential usage of the existing hubs and other local premises by:
 - individual service providers,
 - partnership working activities, and
 - community use.
- Identified any under-occupation, future building plans and/or potential for development.
- Identified local premises which might be alternative venues for local delivery.
- Assessed suitability, cost effectiveness and potential funding available for each venue.
- Identified the potential options including to move premises, share premises, change management arrangements (including community-led approaches) or to remain at the present hubs.
- Posed some key questions which partners may need to consider.

2. Background

The primary reasons for the review are:

- Due to funding reductions, caused by the ending of external grants to support locality working, the Borough Council will no longer have funding available to provide support for the hubs.
- The increase in service provision by partners at or through hubs has not met expectations.
- To continue to promote effective partnership working and make best use of existing resources.

As part of the Locality Working (LW) model community hubs were established in four neighbourhoods with a particular emphasis on helping to close the gap between these communities and the rest of Tamworth, particularly around cohesion, community safety, employment, health outcomes, environmental issues and services for young people.

These hubs have evolved differently, based on local issues and availability of service provision but also in part due to their location and building type.

A wider LW Review has identified that local premises acting as hubs remain a useful element of the LW model but that the premises do not have to be a separate entity in order to fulfil their function to:

- a. Support multi-agency partnership working in targeted areas,

- b. Provide a gateway for the local communities to access services and to support effective signposting, and
- c. Encourage community engagement and effective participation in community activities and local projects.

The two localities with sole use buildings (Amington and Stonydelph) have been the key focus, but all Locality areas and key premises have been included in the work.

3. Approach

JoinedupConsulting has:

- Undertaken a desktop review of existing information provided.
- Identified gaps in information.
- Obtained missing information through discussions with key contacts, site-based research and interviews with partners.
- Captured the views of a selection of partners (2-3 other premises owners), providers (2-3 hub users from each area) and through discussions with user representatives. (A list of interviewees is included Appendix 1.)
- Assessed the information obtained against the key functions of the hubs (see a, b and c above) and the options to provide effective hubs.
- Produced this report summarising the information obtained, key options, potential sources of funding, etc.
- Identified some key questions which need to be explored before options considered further.

4. Localities

4.1 Amington

4.1.1 Specific local issues

The population of the Amington Locality is around 9,000. Within the locality area, the dominant ACORN Category is “Comfortably Off” (44% of the population). However, the [Locality Profile](#) flags issues such as:

- Increasing numbers of older people.
- Low levels of pupil attainment.
- High levels of Lifelong Limiting Illness in LSOA E01029845 and E01029824.
- Employment and skills.

- LSOA E01029845 has the highest income deprivation in the district and falls within the 0%-10% most deprived nationally, with around a third (32%) of the population classed as income deprived.

According to the MOSAIC analysis around 41% of residents of Amington solely prefer face to face contact as a way of accessing information and the overwhelming majority of these are located in the vicinity of the Kerria Centre.

Old Amington hosts a number of community facilities, but the area surrounding the Kerria Centre is less well provided for.

When the ARCH was first developed, only two shops within the Kerria Centre were in use. Until very recently 100% of the units were back in use, and the importance of this should not be understated.

4.1.2 Use of the ARCH/local network

a. **Supporting multi-agency partnership working**

The Amington ARCH provides a local presence which aims to provide an access and co-ordination point to bring local partners into the Kerria area in particular and provides a hub to better engage with the community and to support their aspirations.

The ARCH is the base for the local Community Development Officer (CDO) enabling him to undertake outreach work and allowing partners and the community to easily access him through the ARCH.

Partner engagement has not been as successful as originally intended and numbers of sessions delivered by partners through the ARCH appears not to have increased over a 3-5 year period. A core group of partners provides services and contributes to activity but this group evolves and changes rather than expands as originally hoped for; having said that, the hub does provide a key function, acting as a gateway between public services and the community. Regular partnership delivery activities include:

- Age Concern – Benefit Advice (Once a month)
- Home Start - Money Advice (Once a month)
- PACT (once every 2 months)

Future proposed developments include:

- Dyslexia group

The ARCH also acts as a hub for less frequent and ad hoc activities and provides a venue for internal partnership meetings.

The locality Partnership Forum has defined the following key issues in Amington:

- a) cost of access to buildings/facilities
- b) lack of community spirit/cohesion

- c) quality of housing
- d) debt issues
- e) educating the community about the role of the police
- f) handyman
- g) skips

Not every item on this list requires a physical hub to achieve, the ARCH currently does help address items (a),(b),(d) and (e).

It has proven difficult for the CDO to involve youth workers in the wider aspects of partnership and community engagement. This may be due to staff resources or perceptions about the limits of core activity. For example, whilst the youth workers have been engaged in the current diversionary project tackling ASB and relationship building between the police and residents, the project was initiated by the CDO and PCSO. This project has proven to be very successful and partners are hopeful of developing the pilot. However, other than this, links between the ARCH and the youth centre are limited.

A discussion Maggi Huckfield with the Staffordshire Young People’s Service led to the following comments:

- *“I strongly believe in the need to deliver youth work around the Kerria. This is important in maintaining a cohesive community and also brings intergenerational benefits...”*
- *We couldn’t use the ARCH as it’s too small and doesn’t have a great deal of storage...*
- *If the current Youth Centre could become the hub it would be more effective as a Youth and Community Centre... If we took the leap and developed more joined-up provision I am sure we wouldn’t struggle. There are currently no guides, scouts or cubs locally. Keep fit companies have approached us and there are also activities delivered by the third sector such as theatre and community dance.*
- *If we could meet the community’s needs it could be a really effective building, but it would need someone to act as the centre manager.”*

When the youth centre was closed due to building repair works, the Home Start service was relocated to the local primary school and they saw a dramatic drop-off in numbers of residents accessing the service. In order to get better engagement Sure Start also moved into the Youth Centre.

There is a Children’s Centre (CC) based at the Primary School that has had some issues in attracting attendance and links between Locality Working and the CC have been attempted through signposting. A review of CC provision has recently been completed.

There are some design constraints at the ARCH due to its configuration and so it is not suitable for all activities and storage is limited, although further storage is available at the former subway opposite. For example, the Community Café was first started at the ARCH, but quickly needed a more flexible venue at the Youth Centre.

However, due to on-going difficulties of flooding at the Youth Centre the ARCH provides a short-term resilience for some partners such as the Community Café

With regard to the Community Café, Lee Bates's observations are:

- *“The ARCHes are very good locations for providing activities and they are my first choice venue, although in some storage is a key issue. As a CIC you don't want to spend lots of time just getting set up every session....*
- *What's important is to have an accessible and welcoming place where the residents feel they can just walk in. The Kerria Youth centre works well for us and we leave the front door open and that normally works well as people just walk in.*
- *Having a joint hub with HomeStart and SureStart helps each organisation get the best out of its resources and helps the public access the right people. It also allows us to share relevant information and keep the public informed about what's going on.*
- *The CDOs link everything up and they help agencies share resources. The ARCHes always know what's going on so there is no duplication.”*

The Police find partnership working effective and valuable. Chief Inspector Ian Coxhead remarked:

- *“Everyone recognises the effectiveness of locality working and we are now creating some very worthwhile projects which are starting to deliver significant outcomes...*
- *The Kerria was a ghost town but now it is vibrant again. Whilst the other hubs do have an impact on the community - the one you wouldn't want to lose is Amington. That's the one I hear most about. ...*
- *The ARCHes show that the Borough Council have faith in the community and it is not walking away”*

Street Wardens were previously offered a base at the ARCH but they felt that hot-desking wasn't appropriate and so were based for a short time at the Youth Centre annex. This has led to a problem as it was not obvious to the community whether they were on duty there or out and about on the estate. The street warden service has since been reorganised and wardens now cover a larger area so it is not as easy to locate them at a defined local hub. They are regular visitors to the hub in order to build their local intelligence and to build links.

b. Providing a gateway for the community to access services and to support effective signposting

Community engagement has been difficult to build outside projects and events, which have always had strong attendance and contribution from local people, however the following regular activities occur:

- Arts and Craft (weekly)
- Borough Councillors Surgeries (monthly?)

Nevertheless, the ARCH is important as a base for more ad hoc activity and as a port of call for individual residents seeking information and support.

The number of people popping into the ARCH has continued to increase (from 850 in 2009/10 to 2100 in 2011/12) as word gets around and trust is built. Often individual engagement occurs when people find themselves at a crisis point.

Some partners who have offered services at the hub have not always received the numbers of residents they would like in a short space of time; those who have established themselves and have engaged local people over time such as Homestart and Staffordshire Police have found an increasing number of people do remain involved. It is the level and time invested that has shown results for these partners.

The hub plays a role in providing space for local partners to meet, build relationships and to develop joint work through discussion of local and organisational issues. The majority of joint activity developed over recent years has been planned and developed through discussion at the hub; Participatory Budgeting, Community Together Events, Seasonal social events, ASB, environmental and other projects.

Regular engagement has been developed through the arts and craft group which has developed beyond its original concept to be more of a self-help group which engages between 8 and 20 people. A discussion held with the group regarding the importance of the ARCH which brought the following comments:

- *"It provides a flexible and welcoming place for us to meet."*
- *"It helps me get up in the morning. It's something to look forward to." (Older resident)*
- *"It helps give you back a bit of sanity" (Carer)*
- *"Many residents have moved away or have died so there are social benefits to meeting up – it helps with the isolation." (Long term resident)*
- *"We can see people going by and they can see us, often we'll drag someone in off the street."*
- *"If someone has an issue they can find out who to speak to."*
- *"It's good having the police drop in as it feels more personal and I feel able to bring things up and the issue gets sorted. That gives me peace of mind – at home I wouldn't bother reporting because I'd expect that nothing would be done."*
- *"If we see someone dropping litter outside we'll take it up with them there and then. Since the ARCH opened the precinct has improved and people take more pride in the area."*
- *"It's nice to come in and talk, it breaks down the barriers and talking to each other we find out what's going on."*
- *The ARCH gets me out doing things." (Volunteer)*

c. **Encourage community engagement and effective participation in community activities and local projects**

It has proved difficult to engage with the community around the Kerria and work done previously to build community capacity through the Friends of the ARCH has not led to the development of sustainable capacity. There is, however, a successful parent support group for Amington Heath Primary school and the Arts and Crafts Club does support initiatives such as the Santa's Grotto at the Youth Centre.

This reflects the fact that, in more hard pressed communities, many residents need to focus their energy and resources into the day to day personal and family challenges they face rather than supporting community projects.

The ARCH is also available for ad hoc activities and acts as the base to organise broader community-based projects. Future developments include:

- Statue restoration
- Participatory Budgeting project activity
- Jubilee Event
- Santa's Grotto

The feedback from partners and the Arts and Crafts group is that the physical premises are very important as they provide a focal point which is perceived as "neutral ground". The premises are an enabler to the personal interactions which flow from it.

4.1.3 Other community based premises

In the table below a higher score indicates that the venue is suitable as a hub for the delivery of Locality Working.

It is not intended that the scores below be taken literally as they are by necessity subjective. However, they form a sufficiently robust diagnostic to identify which key options need to be explored in more detail, perhaps through a number of more detailed business cases.

Given the timescales it has not been possible to identify exact costs of running a hub in each location. This would depend on a variety of factors including lettings polices (which tend not in cater for daily occupation).

Premises	Location	Quality of facilities/ accessibility	Likely to promote part engagement	Likelihood of commu engagement	Investment already made/Costs of chang	Running costs	Level of Management required	Total
Current ARCH	5	4	3	4	5		3	24
Youth Centre	5	3	3	4	3		4*	21
Amington Heath Primary School	3	4	4	2	3		3	19
Landau Forte Academy	2	2	1	1	2		4	12
Church of Latter Day Saints	2	2	1	1	2		4	12
St Editha's Church - Cornerstone	1	3	1	1	2		4	12
Band Room	1	2	1	1	2		4	11

4.1.4 Current costs

The annual running costs of the Amington ARCH are currently around £5,000. The shop is provided rent free by the Borough Council Property Services. The bulk of the running costs are heating. There is no access to gas at the Kerria so relatively expensive storage heaters are used.

One option to save costs would be to restrict opening hours, but given the nature of storage heaters, this tactic is unlikely to reduce operating costs significantly. However, this would allow the CDO to operate from a broader range of alternate venues.

An alternative to saving running costs would be to scale back the hours of the CDOs themselves. A careful assessment of the implications of this on partnership working, the operation of the ARCH and HR issues would need to be carried out as partner and community feedback indicates that CDOs are at the centre of the local social networks.

4.1.5 Key options

a) **Maintain the ARCH at its current location**

Advantages

- Previous investment in the property is protected.
- Provides an accessible resource for services and community engagement.

- Due to its position the ARCH is a very visible sign of Borough Council and partner commitment.
- Given that there is a very limited, or non-existent, demand for shop units of that size, the ARCH knits the shopping centre together.

Disadvantages

- Cost of maintaining the building.
- CDO involved in premises management.
- The current ARCH does not have sufficient flexibility in its design to accommodate all partners and so this could constrain engagement and flexibility of services provided by partners.
- Service delivery is currently split across 3 sites, including the Youth Centre and the school. This means that opportunities to liaise and signpost services to the community may not be capitalised upon.
- Limited storage is a barrier to some partners who therefore prefer to operate from the Youth Centre (although further storage is available at the converted subway opposite).
- The ARCH is taking up two potentially valuable shopping units which could generate income. This is only relevant if a new tenant could be found. According to Property Services the current level of demand for units makes this unlikely, although innovations such as a start-up grant might encourage a letting.

b) Relocate the ARCH to the Youth Centre building

Advantages

- Would make the long-term future of the building more secure by concentrating all partnership activity in one place.
- Could improve partnership working by creating closer links with the youth workers.
- Could better enable joined up approaches such as inter-generational working.
- Would provide the capacity to relocate Children's Centre activities to a central and visible base.
- Would provide the opportunity to re-badge the youth centre as a community focussed building involving a wider range of residents and partners.
- Would demonstrate the need for improved community facilities should the Kerria Centre be redeveloped.
- Would create more community engagement and signposting opportunities due to the fact the centre is already used by Home Start and Sure Start in the daytime. Many vulnerable families could benefit from better links with the CDO.
- Could enable use of the youth centre for more broad-based community activities in the evenings and at weekends, thereby promoting better community cohesion.
- Would provide better storage facilities than are currently available at the current ARCH.
- Would bring in further income if the two shop units released could be let.

Disadvantages

- The Youth Centre building would be more costly to run and therefore is a challenge for the Borough Council and partners to find the necessary funding.
- The condition of the flat roof and drainage pipes lead to regular flooding which puts the facility out of action. (The current ARCH provides an emergency fall back for service providers).
- The centre is poorly insulated and therefore has poor energy efficiency. The electricity bills associated with running the premises full time need to be reviewed.
- The presence of the Borough Council and partners will be less visible to the community.
 - Current office spaces are on the wrong side of the building to advertise the ARCH's presence to the community.
 - It would not be clear to the public whether the ARCH is staffed unless building work can be undertaken to create a "shop window".
- Will incur additional costs should there be a need to create a new "shop window and/or convert the annex into an ARCH. Also there will be additional costs for ICT connections.
- If the two shop units could not be relet their closure will detract from the vibrancy of the shopping centre. (Mitigation could be possible by still utilising the shop windows for displays and publicity.)
- Neither the Staffordshire Young People's Service nor the Borough Council would be in a position to manage such a centre.

c) Embed the ARCH at the Youth Centre sharing the costs with a Community Interest Company with a training/skills perspective

Advantages

As option (b) above but with the added advantages that:

- Would bring in income to offset running costs.
- A focus by a CIC on employability and skills could unlock resources from the County Council which could pay for physical upgrades to the building (see disadvantages below).
- A wider range of innovative solutions can be developed by a CIC, which provide a "hook" to engage residents.
- CICs have their own approach to community engagement and will be able reinforce and build on the work already done by CDOs to signpost residents to other relevant services.
- Could increase footfall and utilisation of the ARCH.
- The CDO and other partners could build an enhanced relationship with the CIC and residents that they can engage.
- Could help grow longer term community capacity through confidence building initiatives.

- CDO could be released from premises responsibility to undertake additional community development work

Disadvantages

- As option (b)
- Would need substantial investment to ensure the building is watertight and does not become a burden to any CIC.
- Running costs, especially energy costs.
- The cost of reconfiguring the Youth Centre to be more welcoming to the community.
- Is there a CIC interested or capacity to develop one?

d) Relocate the ARCH to the corner of the Amington Heath Primary School site

Advantages

- Likely to save running costs (although not clear – much depends on heating and rental charges).
- Would make an underused school building more available to the community.
- CDO could be released to undertake community development work
- Should major redevelopment occur at the Kerria in due course then there would be minimal disturbance to the ARCH.
- Conversion costs likely to be less than those incurred by moving to the youth centre.

Disadvantages

- History of lack of engagement in this site will continue to be an issue
- Location is out of the main Kerria Centre, so not as visible.
- Number of passers-by will be small.
- Appears to be a cladded prefabricated building, so heating costs are likely to be high. (Needs investigation.)
- Additional costs for moving ICT.
- Cost of moving railings.
- Need to get school agreement to relocation of railings
- Community may still associate the building with school premises.

4.2 **Stonydelph**

4.2.1 **Specific local issues**

Stonydelph is a diverse neighbourhood with a population of approaching 5,000 (See [Locality Working profile](#)). The hub building is located within Glascoate ward but is included by the Borough Council within the broader Stonydelph Locality Working area. The ARCH's location is convenient for residents living in the Crowden Road area, although it is less convenient for those living towards the Ellerbeck Shopping Centre; having said that, as evidenced by the job club, the ARCH does attract residents from across the whole locality working area. However, the MOSAIC data shows the largest concentration of need is in the Crowden Road area of the locality.

The fact that the building used by the ARCH was formerly a community centre, some ten years ago, and then a housing office has brought the ARCH a degree of visibility, particularly with older residents. However, it may be harder for new residents to appreciate that it is there, although the internal layout is welcoming to residents who do engage. The footprint of the site is quite large and includes a car park and green spaces.

In addition to the ARCH, Stonydelph has a number of community assets including St Martin's church, the Stonydelph Health Centre and Stonydelph primary school. The community centre at Pennymore lies just outside the key priority neighbourhood and does not attract the residents which the Borough Council most aims to engage with. This is partly due to its location but also a perception that it would not be welcoming.

The locality profile has defined the following issues

- A significant increase in the numbers of 16-29 age group and older people
- Low pupil attainment levels
- Community safety issues, especially ASB
- Employment and skills
- Two LSOAs in top 10%-20% nationally for index of multiple deprivation

Within the Stonydelph locality area, the dominant ACORN Category is Hard Pressed (65% of the population). This category contains the poorest people in the country. Unemployment tends to be well above average, levels of qualifications are low, household incomes are low and there are high levels of long-term illness in some areas. The MOSAIC data suggests that the majority of Stonydelph's population are most receptive to face-face contact.

4.2.2 **Use of the ARCH/local network**

a. Supporting multi-agency partnership working

Partner and community engagement has been positive, as reflected in a diverse weekly schedule of events which include:

- Job Club
- Stay and Play
- Wardens surgery
- Day centre.

In particular the job club has been successful in attracting residents into the ARCH, and has especially provided space for residents to develop local project work. The ARCH facility has also enabled a local resident to start a bereavement counselling support group.

“The Stonydelph ARCH is an ideal base and is particularly useful to me as I get a lot of referrals from the CDOs as they are out and about in the community.”
“The personal networking promoted by the ARCH (is vital). Whilst connections between individuals are more important than the building itself, the building then becomes useful as a flexible base to engage from.”

Steve Stokes, Coalfields Regeneration Trust.

b. Providing a gateway for the local community to access services and to support effective signposting.

The ARCH has had good engagement from the community, receiving around 50 people visits per week. The current configuration of the ARCH is beneficial as it provides a variety of meeting rooms, which allow concurrent activities to be carried out.

The geography of Stonydelph is an issue in as far as the main road and underpass between the hub and the main shopping area at Ellerbeck forms a barrier for some residents, although partners report that if residents are aware of something specific such as the job club they are willing to engage with the ARCH.

c. Encouraging community engagement and effective participation in community activities and local projects

Prior to the creation of the ARCH there was little or no organised community activity in this particular part of Stonydelph. The building is now accessed regularly by between 10 and 12 residents, in particular the Stonydelph Action Group which utilises the building to carry out planning processes for community events, such as the forthcoming Jubilee event. Recent community events have been very successful, attracting 260, 800 and 1100 residents. It is felt that the ARCH has provided crucial capacity to enable organisation for these events to take place.

The group values the building as a key resource, and the support given to them by the CDO. The initial enthusiasm on the part of community activists for change which was brought out through the presence of the CDO has led to a significant amount of involvement. However, as often happens in working to establish new groups, tensions have developed between some individuals over priorities, ways of working and this appears to have led to conflict between some of the personalities and the formation of factions.

The Stonydelph Community Group has more recently tended to use St Martin's Church rather than the ARCH and they did not choose to contribute to this review within the

timescales given. The tensions between the two community groups are well known to officers and are a cause for concern,

There is also an on-going issue regarding community aspirations to have the building available in the evenings and at weekends for broader community-based activity. This causes an issue for the Borough Council which provides the hub for specific purposes related to Locality Working and, as the owner, has the responsibility of premises management via the CDO. This tension reflects the building's previous history as an area housing office and, before that, as a community centre.

The Stonydelph Action Group comprises of a core of around 10-12 community activists who have a range of technical and transferrable skills. Detailed discussions about this review were undertaken with 3 activists from the group and this has identified that:

- There is an aspiration to run the building as a more flexible community centre.
- That this would take time but is feasible within a 12 to 24 month timescale. It is felt that on-going support from a CDO and other partners such as the Tamworth CVS would be vital to that process.
- A number of potential uses have already been defined including facilities for older and younger people; and as a base for volunteering and possibly the development of micro-businesses.
- Skills development and entrepreneurialism are laudable aims, but the centre would need to define which micro-businesses would benefit the community most and it would need to develop these in a fully transparent process.
- Services such as the Job Club and Step by Step bereavement support group are life-changing for the people they serve.
- The community could be empowered to develop its own solutions and develop the necessary cash flow.
- It has also been identified that an agreement could be reached to embed the ARCH within the building, still securing its current facilities and function.
- There is also an aspiration to make bids for funding to undertake capital works to develop the outside space, rearrange the internal structure and develop a modern catering type kitchen which would support new uses such as day-care and children's parties.

4.2.3 Other community-based premises

Community facilities are located at Ellerbeck, Pennymore and Wilnecote, the latter two areas being too distant for easy access.

St Martin's Church is located next to the Ellerbeck shopping centre and was specifically built as a church and community centre. It provides a wide range of daytime and evening activities. These include sporting activities, a daytime cafe, a nursery, Stay and Play, Starfish counselling and a range of activities for children, Mothers Union, bingo and also hosts PACT meetings. The church would be willing in principle to accommodate the ARCH, although physical design of the church would mean that a variety of rooms would need to be used for specific purposes.

Whilst the church does offer a wide range of activities it is struggling to attract the engagement of sufficient residents to ensure that many activities are sustainable, although they do believe that there is potential for the future.

The Stonydelph Health Centre is also located at the Ellerbeck shopping centre. Initial discussions with the Staffordshire & Stoke on Trent NHS Partnership Trust have identified a willingness to consider whether the Arch could be hosted within the existing building or whether the building can be extended to accommodate this. Given time constraints it has not been possible to explore this possibility in detail so further work needs to be done to establish whether this option is feasible.

Stonydelph Primary school is located on the edge of the area, however many residents find difficulty engaging with activities delivered through school settings.

In this assessment a score of 5 is ideal and 1 is unacceptable. This assessment is by necessity simplistic but it is suggested that it provides, at this stage, a sufficiently robust diagnostic assessment to define the most likely possibilities. This table is subject to the same caveats described at section 4.1.3 above.

Premises	Location	Quality of facilities/ accessibility	Likely to promote partner engagement	Likelihood of community engagement	Investment already made/Costs of change	Running costs	Level of Management required	Total
ARCH	4	5	3	4	3		3	22
St Martins Church and Community Centre	4	4	3	3	4		4	19
Primary School	2	2	1	1	2		3	11
Health Centre	4	tbc	tbc	3	tbc		4	tbc

4.2.4 Current costs

The current cost of running the ARCH is in the order of £8,000 per annum. The building is provided rent free by the Borough Council Property Services. The bulk of the running costs are heating and utilities in addition to security.

One option to save costs would be to restrict opening hours but this tactic is unlikely to reduce operating costs significantly. However, this would allow the CDO to operate from a broader range of alternate venues.

An alternative to saving running costs would be to scale back the hours of the CDOs themselves. A careful assessment of the implications of this on partnership working, the

operation of the ARCH and HR issues would need to be carried out as partner and community feedback indicates that CDOs are at the centre of the local social networks.

4.2.5 Key options

a) Maintain the ARCH at its current location

Advantages

- Previous investment in the property protected.
- It is an accessible resource for services and community engagement.

Disadvantages

- Cost of running and maintaining the building.
- CDO involved in premises management.
- Query whether whole community would engage due to location.
- Residents have identified a need for a broader offer of community centre facilities, but the Community Development Team cannot respond as the ARCH is intended to fulfil the locality working function.

b. Maintain the ARCH at its current location within a broader based community run building.

Advantages

- Previous investment in the property protected.
- ARCH could be embedded within facilities.
- The CDO would no longer be involved in premises management and could add further value supporting community capacity and improving signposting to services across the locality.
- Community could develop new innovative opportunities based on a close discussion with the community itself.
- Community could utilise outside space more effectively.
- Would help build on-going community capacity and cohesion.
- A community-run facility could perhaps offer support /gain income from premises management expertise should the Amington ARCH be relocated.
- A community led approach could attract new types of capital and revenue funding which is unavailable to public sector partners.

Disadvantages

- Would need to be sure that community capacity is sufficient
- Would need to ensure and the business case is robust.

- Community activists are currently divided across two resident groups and this could be a barrier to full community buy-in, as well as diluting the skills needed.
- Danger of competition with St Martin's community centre.
- There is a query whether the whole locality community would engage at existing site due to its location. A facility that is not accessible to and engaged with all residents of the locality would not support the Borough's Locality Working aims.
- Likely to require internal modifications e.g. layout changes, kitchen upgrade.
- If a community-led approach failed over time, the community would lose an important resource and it may feel that the Borough Council has stepped back too far (NB history of community centre/housing office). However, this effect could be mitigated by effective communication and the delivery of agreed actions within the locality.

c. Relocate ARCH services to St Martin's Church

Advantages

- ARCH could be embedded within good quality facilities.
- Would provide a central location near to other facilities and would support encouragement of access to the wider locality
- Contribution to overheads may be more manageable within existing budgets
- Location more central to many client groups who may find access to the current ARCH difficult.
- Many partners are used to engaging with the Church already.
- CDO would no longer involved in premises management and could add further value supporting community capacity and improving signposting to services across the locality.
- The existing hub site could be made available for redevelopment.

Disadvantages

- Query whether whole community would engage due to location and religious connotations. Again the impact of a facility that is not accessible to and engaged with all residents of the locality would not support the Borough's wider Locality Working aims.
- Would send a signal to the residents in the Crowden Road area that the Borough Council has new priorities.
- Possibly a reduced community engagement from the Crowden Road area
- Eyesore of a boarded up ARCH building/cost of maintenance/graffiti
- Demolition cost for the current ARCH

d. Relocate ARCH services to the Stonydelph Health Centre

Advantages

- As option c. above
- A central location near to other facilities would encourage access for the wider locality
- Could facilitate better community engagement around wider health and well-being issues.

Disadvantages

- Query whether whole community would engage due to location.
- Would send a signal to the residents around Crowden Road that the Borough Council has new priorities.
- Likely to be the most expensive option if any new build is required.
- Rent could be significant.
- Eyesore of a boarded up ARCH building/cost of maintenance/graffiti.
- Demolition cost for the current ARCH.

4.3 Glascote and Belgrave

4.3.1 Use of the ARCH/local network

These ARCHes are co-located at the Glascote Library and the Belgrave Community Fire Station respectively. Accordingly detailed investigations as to alternative venues have not been undertaken at this stage.

Information has, however, been obtained about the workings of these ARCHes and this has been useful in comparing the approach undertaken with the other two ARCHes.

It is fair to say that it is still early days at the Fire Station and there have been some teething problems with bookings and some concerns about privacy. The lack of passing footfall is noticeable and so signposting activity is more difficult to achieve. However there are promising signs of improved engagement. The CDOs in these two localities have less premises management responsibility and therefore have increased capacity to focus on partner and community engagement activity.

In Glascote, where there have historically been higher levels of investment, there is a much broader range of community and partner services so the ARCH operates successfully as part of a wider virtual hub. The down side is that the actual ARCH is not very visible, although good signposting is undertaken by local partners. The building is physically accessible and well-signed but is impacted by the fact that it is seen as a library setting, which may be off-putting to some residents.

The County Council charges the Borough Council a rent of £1,000 per annum for space in the library. Yet, because suitable ICT connections cannot be installed, the Borough Council in turn bills the County Council for over £700 a year, the net charge at the end of the day being less than £300 plus associated administration resource costs. This also

raises the question of partners taking a more joined-up view of the costs of maintaining a suitable partnership infrastructure in priority localities.

4.3.2 Key options

Discussions with partners have surfaced a couple of possibilities, but these would need further exploration before they can be properly assessed:

- Firstly there could be an option to locate at St Peter's church however we again come up against the fact that not everyone will be comfortable accessing that facility. Furthermore, access to church buildings is very much down to the discretion of the vicar. The attitude of the previous vicar was not supportive, but the new vicar is, however this could change again with a change of personnel.
- Secondly, there could be space at the Children's Centres on Hawksworth and at the Exley Centre. This would need to be confirmed, and would need to be linked into a review of Children's Centres accommodation which is currently under way, although it is early days. This review needs to report by the end of August 2012.
- In the above case consideration would need to be given to whether co-location in a Children's Centre would lose the branding the ARCH has already established or whether a broader hub could be created.

5. Reflections on the importance of people and place

5.1 Is a physical hub necessary?

Whilst most partners said that, in theory, it would be possible to work from any suitable premises they did stress that the most important way of moving issues forward is through the linkages between people.

However, it is true to say that the expected level of local service delivery by partners has not materialised. The reasons for this were explored in the previous review of Locality Working published in September 2011. This raises the question as to whether a physical hub is required.

Partners interviewed valued the ARCHes as a gateway to make community engagement easier and more effective for them and as a venue to have a joined up discussion about service design and other key local issues. They value the CDO role as a trusted broker, catalyst and intermediary.

From a community perspective the physical nature of an ARCH is more important as an outward and visible sign of Borough Council and partner commitment to the neighbourhood. The ARCHes operate as a non-formal gateway to access services and the CDO easily. They also act a hub to bring activists together to plan events. A physical hub is also a means to reduce cultural barriers to engagement by building trust and confidence that notice will be taken of problems/ views and feedback can be better given.

In Amington in particular a physical presence in the shopping centre is important to the community's perceptions about the viability of the Kerria Centre itself. In Stonydelph the physical ARCH has broader connotations linked to its history.

a. Advantages of having a physical hub

- Provides an accessible office space which is very useful for the CDO, outreach delivery by partners and a resource for community activists.
- Provides an element of control for room bookings and so acts a catalyst to bring both partners and the community together without worrying about the venue.
- Reduces the barriers to joined up working e.g. No politics regarding the need to charge rent presently, a mix of facilities including ICT connections
- Having a physical hub helps promotes sharing of information and ideas and to capitalise on opportunities.
- Having a physical hub helps provide a clear focus/gateway for the local community.
- Passing footfall does encourage residents to drop in. This benefit is likely to be increased significantly if appropriate and diverse services and facilities are offered.
- Does provide residents who have a crisis to seek support.
- Having a CDO on-site provides an accessible and trusted route to services and to information about what's going on. The community is also able to easily find the CDO and share local intelligence.
- CDOs are the key node within the local network of partners and the community and it helps if people are clear where to find them.
- Provides opportunity for effective signposting.
- Encourages partners to drop in / utilise for meetings/ one to one sessions in a cost free environment.
- Provides a visible, accessible and welcoming space for the community to drop in.
- Provides infrastructure and resources to enable discussions and activity.
- Is seen as "neutral" ground.
- Is seen as a resource centre for the community.
- Acts as a focus that helps bring community activists together.
- Provides access to a single point of contact to help resolve personal or community issues.
- The Borough Council is the broker and has the democratic legitimacy to pull things together.

b. Disadvantages

- Costs to run dedicated centres.
- Resource to provide premises management

- Lack of clarity around building purpose and functions
- Lack of alternative hub space provided by partners?
- The presence of hubs has not led to the expected level of partner buy-in and contribution and its existence may have become a project in itself.
- In Amington with three separate buildings there has been a level of competition to attract users, which should be noted for the future in Stonydelph.
- Partners are happy to use the facilities and allow the Borough Council to absorb the running costs.
- CDO time can be taken up with issues relating to the running and maintenance of the building/ ICT issues/ alarms, etc.
- If ownership of the building lies with the Borough Council it means that uses the building can be put to are constrained by the Council's operating hours and the limited capacity and workload of CDOs.

Some relevant observations by partners are included below:

“The ARCHes give the community a boost as people appreciate the fact that they are being considered”. The ARCHes are great as they enable partners to be together in one place which is very good for communications ... A lot of knowledge is developed when people are able to drop in and just chat. Agencies need a central person as a gateway into the community and the community needs a person to link up with partners. Otherwise everything would just go off at a tangent... I think that if people were based across a number of buildings it could still work but it's important to have a point of contact which encourages people to get involved. It's no use just expecting the network to happen, if there is no focus for purpose people don't belong and things get fragmented. ”

“The ARCHes are very good locations for providing activities and they are my first choice venue, although in some storage is a key issue. As a CIC you don't want to spend lots of time just getting set up every session....what's important is to have an accessible and welcoming place where the residents feel they can just walk in. The Kerria Youth centre works well for us and we leave the front door open and that normally works well as people just walk in. Having a joint hub with HomeStart and SureStart helps each organisation get the best out of its resources and helps the public access the right people. It also allows us to share relevant information and keep the public informed about what's going on. The CDOs link everything up and they help agencies share resources. The ARCHes always know what's going on so there is no duplication.”

“The Stonydelph ARCH is an ideal base and is particularly useful to me as I get a lot of referrals from the CDOs as they are out and about in the community. The personal networking promoted by the ARCH (is vital). Whilst connections between individuals are more important than the building itself, the building then becomes useful as a flexible base to engage from.”

“It's better to get out and see people in their own areas rather than expect them to come into town ... a preventative approach is ideal before problems get worse. Community events are vital in bringing communities together and it is especially important to have good partner engagement at these...it is particularly important for the community to have

a place to meet and discuss issues... Faith based groups are also important although it can be a challenge to relate to them as they are not always receptive to multiple uses of their premises... If we are co-located this has positive spins offs for partners such as the Library service at Glascote and the new Fire Station venue is settling down and has been a catalyst to help move things on there.

The shop at Amington doesn't shout out "Tamworth BC" and it's not a community centre, but it provides a focus for relating to the community.

The general view emerging from discussion with partners is that whilst physical premises are not absolutely vital to undertake outreach or Community Development activity; the need for the community and partners to see an outward and visible sign of commitment still means that a physical hub is justified to promote effective Locality Working within the four priority neighbourhoods.

A recognised hub is useful to partners undertaking outreach activity in the locality as they benefit from the signposting and connections made at the hub.

From the interviews undertaken there is still substantial support from partners and community activists for the concept of the ARCH.

There are a number of options to put the ARCHes on a solid financial footing and to further grow service delivery and community engagement. These need to be explored in more detail by the partnership in order to establish feasibility.

6. Issues to consider in each locality

To help focus the discussions the following section draws together the key messages and poses a series of questions which need to be answered before further progress can be made

6.1 Amington

6.1.1 Analysis

- If the option to develop a community run solution is chosen, a careful assessment of the skills and experience within the community and its support needs would need to be undertaken.
- Much of the community capacity regarding premises falls within old Amington and other public sector and church owned facilities would not provide the flexibility and accessibility needed to maximise the already limited amount of community engagement.
- The current Youth Centre is owned by the Borough Council and is currently let on a full repairing and insuring lease. However, the County Council proposes to exit this lease in July 2012. This leaves the Borough Council with a difficult set of choices – on the one hand it cannot afford the full costs of ownership and sessional lettings charges will not be sufficient to justify the costs involved.

However, if the Youth Centre building is mothballed it adds to the run down look of the area which the ARCH has helped turn around.

- Given the lack of suitable facilities and community groups in the Kerria area it would be a difficult challenge for the County Council to ensure adequate provision to support young people in the area through a range of services and interventions if they vacated their present location.
- This approach would also be likely to reduce the effectiveness of HomeStart and SureStart as their current base would be taken away. Community engagement at the primary school site has not been promising so this would represent a step backwards.
- We understand that the Community Development service have no intention to take on the additional costs of this building and do not wish to tie up the CDO further in running a larger premises. One possibility is to seek a partner from the third sector, for example a Community Interest Company, which might operate from (and run) the building. (No CICs come to notice during this investigation, but that is not to say that this route would not be possible.)
- To attract the level of resource needed it is likely that either a CIC with a specific focus on employment and skills would be needed or one which is linked to the reprovision of older peoples' services. It could be possible to put together a package including partnership funds plus income from one or two core lettings
- The ARCH itself is a visible and accessible gateway for the community. It also is a statement that the Borough Council wishes to have a local presence and engage with the community with the minimum of barriers. It is currently strategically placed at the heart of the shopping centre and its design provides two sets of windows which act as an advertisement to the community that the partners have a focus on the Kerria.
- Feedback from partners and the arts and crafts group has shown that the presence of the ARCH has been a very positive addition to the area. It shows the community and outward and visible sign of the Borough Council's commitment to the shopping centre and to the community at large. It has also helped give local residents confidence to use the shopping centre.
- The open aspect of the ARCH also allows residents to see whether anyone is working there and that helps encourage them to drop in. The ARCH is literally a shop window for partnership working.
- Currently the community can see whether anyone is operating at the ARCH and can read the information placed in the shop windows. If the ARCH was to move into the Youth Centre, without any adaptations taking place, it would no longer be a visible presence within the Kerria Centre. This is likely to have adverse consequences as there would no longer be an outward and visible signal to the community. One way around this would be to create a new shop front by reconfiguring the current storeroom at the Youth Centre.
- Over the past five years the County Council has invested significantly in community-based facilities on school sites for example at Amington Heath primary school a Children's Centre and a community room have been created.

- It is safe to say that community engagement at the school has been disappointing and both Home Start and Sure Start which operate out of the youth centre in the Kerria shopping centre tend to enjoy higher levels of engagement.
- However, the facilities at the community room could be adequate to physically house the ARCH. If a way could be found to separate the community room from the school site, for example by relocating the railings so they run between the community room and school, and it may be possible to encourage greater community engagement.
- Having said that, we need to come back to a central question - if the ARCH was to be removed from its prime location in the shopping centre, with this detract from the good work done in regenerating the Kerria?
- However, there is a lack of community-based organisations within the neighbourhood and so there is no obvious route, at this time, to self-management by the community.
- A further complication/opportunity is the proposed longer term strategic review of the Kerria Estate to be undertaken by the Borough's housing and planning functions. This may provide an opportunity to rethink the configuration entirely but the timescales involved take it beyond the remit of this review.

6.1.2 Key questions arising

1. *In principle would it make sense to cluster all service delivery at a single hub, i.e. the Youth Centre or the school?*
2. *How important is it to have a shop window in the Kerria? What would be the impact of moving the ARCH? Can this be explained to the community easily and how can they be encouraged to access it?*
3. *The Kerria area has no access to health facilities, the nearest GP service being in the Florendine area. Could the development of Clinical Commissioning Groups provide an opportunity for recommissioning of services "closer to home"?*
4. *Could income be generated at the Youth Centre more effectively (say through a link with a CIC) as it is larger and more flexible space?*
5. *Can a strategic view be taken about the optimum use of all publicly owned properties in the area?*
6. *What joint possibilities arise from the potential redevelopment of the Kerria?*

6.2 Stonydelph

6.2.1 Analysis

- In the light of the significant activities already offered at St Martin's church a preliminary investigation of the viability/sustainability of a community run centre would also need to be undertaken prior to any decision by the Borough Council. A careful and realistic business planning process would need to be in place.

- If the option to locate the ARCH at either St Martins Church or the Health Centre is considered, then there is a high risk that residents around the Crowden Road area will feel the Borough Council has abandoned them. Given the history of the current hub building and the community aspirations it is important that the community feels that there is a sustained and continuous commitment by the Borough and partners to the area.
- Conversely, if the hub in its present location is handed over to a local community group, there is a possibility that rather than continue to serve the whole locality area, it may become a community venue benefitting primarily residents of the Crowden Road area.
- The current tensions between community groups could stop a community centre being developed to its full potential and fragments the knowledge and expertise available to the community.
- If the option to develop a community run solution is chosen, a careful assessment of the skills and experience within the community and its support needs would need to be undertaken.
- Similarly a careful assessment of the longer term state of repair of the premises and the on-going cost of running a community based centre would need to be made.
- There is also a danger that the work needed by the community to undertake premises management and to fund raise to keep the premises running would detract from their ability to develop community based services and projects. The group could become inwardly focused on the building as an end in itself.
- On the other hand, community ownership can promote and release new sources of innovation and committed engagement from within the community itself; as well as helping to develop the confidence and abilities of the people involved.
- It is also worth reflecting that Tamworth, as an urban and non-parished area, does not have the kind of network of “village halls” that are often “standard” in rural communities. Tamworth residents wishing to take control of community assets could, in principle, access monies for refurbishment managed by the Community Council for Staffordshire (Village Halls Fund). There is a wealth of information at <http://locality.org.uk/assets/support/> on the question of asset transfer.
- Further detailed work is needed to establish the potential of the Health Centre.

6.2.2 Key questions arising

1. *How far is the key focus of locality working around the Crowden Road area?*
2. *Would the ARCH be better placed for the whole community around the Ellerbeck centre?*
3. *If so how will the Borough Council and partners visibly address the needs of residents from the Crowden Road area?*

4. *Would a community centre at Crowden compete with other facilities?*
5. *Can the two community groups find common ground?*
6. *What process would be appropriate to establish whether there is sufficient appetite, capacity and skills from the community to take over the building?*
7. *How would the proposed usage of a community centre and a business plan emerge?*
8. *Who would provide the support on skills development and business planning to enable a viable alternative to emerge?*
9. *Are there any hidden costs or commitments which the community would need to take responsibility for?*
10. *Could the Borough Council provide any on-going support or an endowment towards the running costs of a community based hub?*

6.3 **Glascote and Belgrave**

6.3.1 **Analysis**

- There may be other options to optimise location, but these would only make sense if they would increase community engagement.

6.3.2 **Key questions arising**

1. *Are the locations of the two ARCHes optimal already?*
2. *What further synergies with partners might be beneficial?*
3. *Is change a priority right now?*

7. **Wider issues to consider**

7.1 **Analysis**

- It is clear that the current ARCHes are valuable and have some visibility within the neighbourhood. However, use by internal and external partners for delivery of services is still low.
- In the scheme of things the running costs do not appear to be large. The problem appears to be that the Community Development team's budget is under pressure. The population of the Amington locality working area is quoted at 9,145 so the running costs of the current ARCH account for 54 pence per year per head of population.
- If we take ASB as an example, then the key costs accrue to two partners who are current beneficiaries of the hub - the Police and Housing managers. A 2003 study on the true cost of crime estimated the cost to all agencies involved of an individual single ASB case leading to eviction was £20,942¹: If we look at

¹ See pages 32 and 50 of

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100405140447/http://asb.homeoffice.gov.uk/uploadedFiles/Members_site/Documents_and_images/About_ASB_general/EconSocialCostASB_0142.pdf 4

criminal/damage/vandalism the figure quoted per incident ranged from £510 to £890.

- Beyond the individual incident the impact of the “Broken window syndrome” is well documented, i.e. that one incident leads to further incidents as it becomes more acceptable, even the norm.
- It is worth considering who the main beneficiaries of the ARCH are:
 - Tamworth Borough Property Services
 - The shopkeepers
 - Tamworth Borough Housing
 - Bromford Housing and other providers
 - Tamworth Borough Revenues team
 - Tamworth Borough– Stay and Play
 - Staffordshire County Council – educational attainment, aspiration, Youth services, Children's Services, Older People's Services, Public Health
 - The Police
 - Residents of the Kerria
 - The wider community
 - Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
 - Central government
- It is clear that the benefits that partners and the community obtain from the ARCHes do not accrue directly to the budget holders, the Community Development team. This team has a relatively small budget, one which has been developed through one off windfalls which will not be repeated. It therefore does not have the flexibility to innovate or to grow income that many other budget holders have.

7.2 Some key questions arising

1. *Should the current policy of the ARCH being a cost free space for partners and the community continue?*
2. *Should the cost of running the ARCH be treated as an organisational priority of the Borough Council, not as the responsibility of a single service area?*
3. *Could the Borough Council recognise the wider corporate benefits of having an ARCH? Could it explore the possibility of joining up contributions from other existing budgets into a package to support the creation of a sustainable ARCH with a longer term view to developing sufficient community capacity for other alternatives to emerge?*
4. *Should the cost of running the ARCH be treated as a partnership issue, not as the responsibility of a single partner?*
 - a. *Which services benefit most from the ARCH?*
 - b. *If other services benefit most from the ARCH, should they make a contribution?*
 - c. *Should the funding be taken out of contention by the partnership investing in the infrastructure to deliver locality working?*

- d. If Locality Working is recognised as “the way we do business here” – who are “we”?*
 - e. Could the £5,000 pa be found from a partnership pot, not the Community Development Team’s budget?*
 - f. Could sustainable money be found to support the ARCH infrastructure by reinvesting some of the savings from the service redesign (e.g. social care, children’s services, housing) and /or strategic property reviews which are due to be undertaken?*
- 5. What would the impact on key outcomes be if the ARCH could not be funded?*
- a. What additional costs would accrue to partners if the ARCH was no longer effective?*
 - b. How would partners come together to develop joint activity?*
 - c. Where would partners deliver services from?*
 - d. What would happen to those local residents presently accessing the hub?*
- 6. Could Borough Council and partner commissioning procedures for services such as estate maintenance/redevelopment provide a fruitful opportunity to build in community benefits into contracts to enable apprenticeships and training / skills development opportunities?*

Appendix 1 – List of Interviewees

(T) = by telephone

Pete Smith Yasser Din Neil Mushrow Mark Aston (T) Stuart Etheridge	Tamworth Borough Council
Cllr M Greatorex	Cabinet Member, Tamworth Borough Council
Lee Bates (T)	Community Cafe
Ian Coxhead (T)	Staffordshire Police
Michael Pritchard (T)	Bromford Housing
Tim Leese	Staffordshire County Council
Pam Dhanda (T)	Staffordshire County Council
Paul Woodcock (T)	Staffordshire County Council
Nigel Ford (T)	Shropshire & Staffordshire Partnership Trust
Maggi Huckfield (T) Mark Matthews	Staffordshire Young People's Service, SCC
Nicky Burns (T)	Tamworth CVS
Leigh Brown	St Martins Church
Arts and Crafts Club	Amington Hub
Michelle Morgan Chris Cook Matt Brown	Stonydelph Action Group

Appendix 2 - Next Steps

Premises Review – Moving Forward on Options

The Role of a Locality Hub

It may be appropriate to take this opportunity to look at the role that hubs have played in supporting locality working. The initial model developed through the cross Staffordshire pilot included a central “community anchor”, a visible building that could serve as a place from where services could be delivered and would be a sign of partners desire to support the community.

As papers noted in establishing Locality Working:-

A Core base or hub will be available in each area to act as a delivery point for joint services or to act as a focus to develop partnership actions. This hub will be established to provide a range of facilities to support partner needs.

Locality Working bases will act as hubs for the delivery of local services. Since many services will have a base in one building, it will be easier to make contact with local people and will encourage people and organisations to work together.

In the pilot, a hub was in part developed as there was a dearth of available community buildings and also in response to the poor state and underused nature of local commercial premises. When LW was rolled out to four neighbourhoods this element was included due to the success of the pilot hub. Successes included the commencement of service delivery, community engagement and the development of various joint projects from this hub. This in turn led to the design of the LW model and the building of support from strategic and other partners to move from pilot to an agreed way of working.

Since the initial model was established the level of service delivery has not increased significantly at individual hubs (around 10 at each)

The locality hubs have evolved since their start with the Glascote hub based in the local library and the Belgrave hub recently moved to the community fire station. Hubs have certainly played a key and positive role in establishing and nurturing better relationships between partners and between agencies and local people. Hubs have enabled discussions to take place that have led to development of various joint activities as detailed within the Locality Review.

A key benefit of the hubs has been to engage and support local people to participate in a wide range of activity and to develop projects and activity of their own. Many residents have used the hubs to explore ideas to make new contacts and become active in positive ways. It is possible that some activities would not have developed without the hubs but this is difficult to assess. In all localities, there are probably more activities, initiatives and projects that happen outside the hub than within but the hub is where the majority are born.

A linked issue that will impact on future premises use is the fact that, at present funding for the fourth CDO post will cease in March 2013 and provision to support four neighbourhoods with 3 CDOs will need to be planned. The role of hubs will need to be included in this as it will be an increased pressure for CDOs to manage hubs. The benefits of removing responsibility for premises from CDOs may be an important factor in focussing on driving an increase in appropriate service provision within localities and on developing joint activity.

An additional option to the list below may be to cease to have separate hubs for locality working and focus on utilising existing premises for CDOs to use as connection points in the localities. The CDOs would continue to drive and facilitate joint working work, which could be more difficult without having the offer of a base of operations, which has been an attraction for some partner service providers.

The key negative impact could be for existing service providers who may not find suitable alternatives to operate from and may decide to cease work in the localities.

Another potentially damaging impact could be through removing a support structure from local people if they are not involved at the level they are used to, if alternative accommodation for them to participate from is not available.

Addressing and responding to these potentially negative impacts will be a role for CDOs to lead on and action should commence immediately any change is agreed. The identification of alternative premises or management structures if identified may offset these impacts; rather a new structure may encourage new partners and a different but wider involvement among local people.

It is clear that each locality will have to be looked at individually with various solutions possible for each neighbourhood. Changes will be more noticeable in Amington and Stonydelph with less visible change in Belgrave and Glascote.

Premises Change Options

Any option below will only achieve further successful multi-agency working with a significant level of commitment to joint resourcing and delivery from partners. There has always been a stated appetite at senior level for partnership working but this has not materialised at service delivery level on an ongoing basis to build on the wide variety of exciting and successful projects and initiatives that have been delivered across localities by those groups and agencies that have participated. It has been important and understood that agencies should continue to provide services for all residents of the Town but the expected additional focus on these localities as a means of closing the gap has not come to fruition from as diverse a range of providers as envisaged.

A couple of questions that will need to be explored for each option if we are to move to a more embedded method of joint working are –

How will partnership working benefit or be increased through this option?

What is the tangible added value that this option will bring to joint work?

Stronger working relationships will be required at locality level to achieve an increase in joint benefit to partners and residents, with the aim of bringing much needed services to these areas, which remain the priority.

Amington

Option A - Maintain the ARCH at its current location

The pros and cons within the Premises Review balance closely.

This is a manageable option within existing budgets; giving some time to identify potential joint working and possible contribution from partners.

This option can be delivered with existing levels of support from partners and maintaining the current structure and set up at the hub. This would not allow such an extensive range of activity as some below but the hub continues to have much underused capacity across parts of the week.

The Amington regeneration budget, presently aimed at supporting activity would need to be re-designated to support overheads.

Option B - Relocate the ARCH to the Youth Centre building

Although the Review pros and cons balance closely for this option, the lack of funding and management capacity, which are essential, make this an option that cannot be achieved by TBC alone.

This would be a strong option and links well with the aims of LW but without significant support from partners, especially SCC, who manage the building at present; this will not be a manageable piece of work at this time.

Looking at the number of partners who actually use the hub at present (9) a question raised is: - will a move attract more partners to contribute and develop a more active hub? There are 29 partners working in the area and therefore joint work is happening outside the hub, although much of this has been developed through discussion and planning work the hub. This option therefore becomes an aspiration for joint work that is impacted upon by the separate actions of partners.

If the lack of available funding is an essential element then despite the score, financial implications will dictate that this cannot be achieved without a financial and resource commitment from strategic partners.

There would be a cost of moving equipment, IT and staff to another premise and perhaps for building alterations around office layout, reception and entrance refurbishment. A budget for this would need to be identified or attracted from a range of partners.

Option C - Embed the ARCH at the Youth Centre sharing the costs with a Community Interest Company with a training/skills perspective

Again pros and cons balance closely for this option, the same issues and barriers as Option B apply.

There would be much potential added value in the long-term through the establishment of a CIC that can provide some sustainability around community involvement activity. Unfortunately there is no community group in the locality despite much effort by the CD Team, which means that this option is not possible at this time.

In the long-term, this option could provide a valuable model, building on better joint work, engagement of the community and a potential sustainable model within Amington that would provide a local legacy.

Option D - Relocate the ARCH to the annex of the Amington Heath Primary School site

This option gives a quite negative balance of pros and cons and is therefore not a strong option at this time.

If a decision is taken by SCC to move both youth and children's centre activities to this site, this option may be revisited.

Recommendation

With the present information and level of resource and support in place from partners it is recommended that Option A is pursued. The option is manageable within TBC budgets, is a continuation of the present situation and will cause no disruption to the highly successful activity that has taken place to date. Given the low level of engagement and commitment from SCC for co-location it is the option that allows LW to continue but enables us to respond to a change in stance.

The options of B or C are aspirational within present support and commitment available and will be worked towards if the situation changes. A range of discussions and negotiations are ongoing with SCC and other partners to explore this possibility but a pragmatic approach is the only one within the control of TBC at this time.

Stonydelph

Option A - Maintain the Hub at its current location

A slight negative balance in the pros and cons in the Review, however, as the lack of available funding is an essential element then despite the score, financial implications will dictate that this cannot be achieved by TBC alone.

Issues around this option are similar to Amington in that the level of partner service delivery from the hub is not as high as originally hoped for. Looking at the number of partners who actually use the hub at present (9) the question raised is: - what option will attract more partners to contribute and develop a more active hub? There are 14 partners working in the area and therefore we see that joint work is happening outside the hub, although again much of this has been developed through conversation in the hub. Will this change in the near future to make the building more active in supporting service delivery?

The key impact remains the lack of funding to sustain the building and CDO at this site, which will negate other efforts. An alternative source of funding will need to be sought for any option in Stonydelph.

Option B - Maintain the ARCH at its current location within a broader based community run building.

A positive balance of pros and cons but unfortunately, again a lack of identified funds will mean that this option cannot be achieved.

This is a positive option, providing much potential added value over the long-term through the establishment of a local group that can provide sustainability around community involvement and activity. There is mention in the report of new sources of potential funding being drawn in through a CIC and this will need to be explored further to see what level of potential is achievable.

There are a number of active residents and emerging community groups in the locality, building on work by the CDO. It appears, from some initial informal discussion, that there is a level of interest among these in taking on a building, as part of their future development plans. The sustainability of this group will be key to achieving this option, building on and challenging this initial interest to explore and develop the group's capacity to make this option a reality.

If an appropriate group can be identified, a significant amount of development and capacity work would have to be undertaken to identify and engage additional residents and establish a strong and sustainable group. CVS and other support structures have agreed to be involved in supporting this option. There is a need to look at the potential agencies and organisations that could be engaged to support development of this option.

Option C - Relocate ARCH services to St Martin's Church

A good positive balance of pros and cons within the Review indicates that St. Martins does have some strong benefits given its position and existing activity, countered by its faith status and unknown potential for flexible use.

This option has an added benefit in that it may be achieved with a minimal level of funding through a contribution to building overheads. The potential to use St. Martins was looked into at the outset of locality working in Stonydelph with the Craven site chosen due to its immediate availability, rather than the faith based St. Martin's which may have been off-putting to some local people.

Option D - Relocate ARCH services to the Stonydelph Health Centre

Again a positive pros and cons score without the unknown element of financial cost included. This would be a positive move if it led to a strong engagement of preventative health services in locality working.

This appears to be another expensive option given present information but initial contact has been made with the NHS Partnership Trust requesting a meeting to explore this option. No response has been received to date to this invitation.

If the lack of available funding is an essential element then despite the score, financial implications will dictate that this cannot be achieved by TBC alone.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Option B is pursued. If the interested community group identified cannot achieve sufficient sustainability and capacity to take on and support the premises it is further recommended that a transition away from the present hub be taken as no other option can be achieved at present.

The group will be supported to build capacity to take on building management with appropriate support from infrastructure and business support agencies.

It is recommended that the CDO works with available support agencies to investigate this option over the next few months. During the period remaining of the availability of a fourth CDO it will be important to build up the capacity of possible alternative hub provision and to maintain confidence among residents that provision will continue to be provided within this locality.

Without future funding and associated costs for a fourth CDO, a change to the structure of CD support to Locality Working in all localities will be worked up. This will involve planning to provide appropriate levels of support, prioritising tasks and time management in order to move to a situation that provides support to all four localities with three CDOs.

The geographical links that have characterised work to date will not be possible at the present level. However, three CDOs could continue to provide a significant level of service, with options for cover being investigated.

This page is intentionally left blank