

**Report of East North East Area Leader**

**Report to Inner East Area Committee**

**Date: 18th October 2012**

**Subject: Future Approaches to Priority Neighbourhoods**

Are specific electoral Wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Gipton & Harehills Killingbeck & Seacroft		
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:		

**Summary of main issues**

This report considers the progress made in relation to the priority neighbourhoods in the Inner East area since the introduction of Neighbourhood Managers. It highlights key achievements, challenges and focus. The report seeks Area Committee approval to extend the two Neighbourhood Manager posts in the area for a further 2 years using Wellbeing funds from 2013/14 and 2014/15, subject to the availability of funds. It also asks the Area Committee to consider additional funding for a third Neighbourhood Manager for Inner East.

**Recommendations**

1. Note the content of this report and the achievements made in the priority neighbourhoods in Inner East.
2. Approve the Wellbeing revenue funding to extend the contract of the Neighbourhood Managers for a further two years from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015, subject to availability of funds, with a report provided at December Area Committee with cost implications for the Well-being Fund if supported.
3. Give consideration to which priority neighbourhoods within Inner East should benefit from a Neighbourhood Manager resource from March 2013.
4. Consider allocating funding for an additional Neighbourhood Manager, with an area specific focus to be agreed at a later date, but taking into account the indices of deprivation across the priority neighbourhoods within Inner East.

## **1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 This report seeks to extend the Area Committee funding for the Neighbourhood Manager roles within the Inner East area for a further two years from April 2013 when the current funding approval and contracts expire.
- 1.2 The report also highlights the key achievements and successes that have been seen in the priority neighbourhoods of Burmantofts and Richmond Hill and Gipton and Seacroft, since the Area Committee began funding the posts in 2010.
- 1.3 The report asks the Area Committee to consider funding for a third Neighbourhood Manager and to consider the future geographical focus of a Neighbourhood Management resource, including Harehills, which does not currently benefit from a Neighbourhood Manager.

## **2 Background information**

- 2.1 A report was presented to the Area Committee in October 2009 setting out the vision for the future direction and focus for priority neighbourhoods and seeking funding for two Neighbourhood Managers for three years following the end of the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund budget. The Area Committee agreed at that time to fund two Neighbourhood Manager posts for three years with an annual review and subject to funding.
- 2.2 The aspiration was to embed a jointly owned and coordinated neighbourhood management service in our most deprived neighbourhoods and for the Neighbourhood Manager to lead a 'team neighbourhood' approach and the introduction of Community Leadership Teams (CLTs).
- 2.3 The key objective of the approaches to neighbourhood management in ENE has been to improve neighbourhoods across a range of priorities, build sustainable communities and enable residents to take responsibility for improving the quality of life in their local area.
- 2.4 The current funding period ends on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 so it is now appropriate to consider future approaches, priority neighbourhoods and funding.

## **3 Main issues**

- 3.4 The principles of the Area Committees neighbourhood management approach are to:
  - Strengthen the role of the Area Committee in overseeing progress made in each priority neighbourhood against the agreed key deprivation indicators and the link with the Community Charter
  - Establish a setting for managers of local service providers to meet, take responsibility for developing partnership working and activities that tackle the agreed key Neighbourhood Improvement Plan (NIP) priorities
  - Establish a clear role for representatives of the community in overseeing the development of the NIP action plan and assessing the effectiveness of actions in delivering improvements to the key priority indicators approved by Area Committee; including effective community engagement

- Support the role of Elected Members in leading neighbourhood improvement and community engagement
- Support the civic role of residents and the development of their capacity to inform decisions relating to the most effective use of local resources
- Improve the accountability of local partnership working

- 3.5 Significant progress has been made in Burmantofts and Richmond Hill and Gipton and Seacroft areas since 2010, following the end of SSCF funding. Regular reports have been provided to the Area Committee outlining priorities and achievements of the Neighbourhood Managers and some of the highlights are set out below.
- 3.6 Local Management Teams (LMTs) have been established for each priority neighbourhood, bringing together local service managers who work across each area.
- 3.7 Within each priority neighbourhood, the Neighbourhood Managers have also developed a NIP through collaborative working with partners. The NIP provides an overview of the most recently available statistical information and an action plan resulting from consideration of the data and local intelligence provided through partnership working. The NIPs are presented annually to the Area Committee for their comment and subsequent endorsement and 6 monthly review reports are also submitted to the Area Committee.
- 3.8 The Neighbourhood Managers have recently established CLTs within their areas to further the 'Team Neighbourhood' agenda. The main aim of the CLT is to strengthen community engagement and community involvement with the Neighbourhood Improvement Plan process in the area. It is also hoped that the CLT will improve dialogue between community members and strengthen opportunities for partnership working. The CLT brings together local people with active roles in their communities, who will influence and direct the Neighbourhood Improvement Plans.
- 3.9 Each of the priority neighbourhoods are at varying positions of the 'Team Neighbourhood' spectrum. Neighbourhood Management and the Team Neighbourhood approach are now firmly established in Seacroft and delivering successful projects through collaborative working. In the Gipton priority neighbourhood, initial progress was made but community engagement to support the CLT model has tailed off and this now requires re-invigorating to ensure local and responsive service improvements. Much positive work has taken place in Burmantofts and Richmond Hill and recently a Neighbourhood Improvement Board has been established for part of the area, chaired by Cllr Peter Gruen, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods Planning and Support Services. This brings together a wide range of agencies along with local residents to intensively tackle priority issues in the area over the next 6-9 months.
- 3.10 Within Harehills, positive interventions have taken place and are referred to later in this report. However, these have been achieved through mainstream Area Support Team and partner resources rather than the specific input of a dedicated Neighbourhood Manager.
- 3.11 The two Neighbourhood Managers within Inner East have made significant progress against indicators across the domains such as environment, community safety, housing and worklessness. Specific interventions and successes have

been reported regularly to Area Committees over the lifetime of the funding to date. Some highlights are set out below:

#### Burmantofts and Richmond Hill

- 3.12 Significant work has taken place in Burmantofts and Richmond Hill to improve the local environment for example through a number of community clean-ups, installation of new litter bins and through intensive enforcement and education action within the Environmental Improvement Zones, including the Nowells area.
- 3.13 Work has also taken place to reduce levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. A burglary reduction Outcomes Based Accountability Action Plan was developed for the ward earlier this year and fortnightly afternoons of action are continuing to take place, targeting the burglary hotspots across the ward. This work has utilised £15,000 funding from Safer Leeds and Inner East Area Panel. Since April this year, over 700 properties have been visited and provided with burglary reduction advice. Levels of crime reduced significantly across Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward when comparing March 2011 with the same time the previous year. The overall levels of crime reduced by 26%.
- 3.14 Actions to tackle worklessness and numbers of young people who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) have also been a key priority for the area. A computer suite has been installed at Richmond Hill Community Centre which will be used by training providers to deliver courses and be used as an outreach base to assist local people getting back into employment. Recently a 'Steps to Work' course was delivered at this facility.
- 3.15 A number of actions have taken place to improve physical health and emotional well-being in the area, for example work is underway to support Ebor Gardens Advice Centre to establish a debt forum. Earlier this year a 'Got a cough, get a check' campaign operated across the area, to encourage people who had a cough for over three weeks to get a chest x-ray. The referral rate for chest x-rays following this campaign increased by 55%.
- 3.16 Significant work has been undertaken to increase levels of community confidence across Burmantofts and Richmond Hill, for example support for major community events and establishment of a Community First Panel which has to date allocated £40,000 of central government funding to local projects. In September, the first meeting of the Burmantofts and Richmond Hill Community Leadership Team (CLT) took place. This will inform the development of the Neighbourhood Improvement Plan for 2013/14.
- 3.17 The Neighbourhood Index shows that the four Middle Super Output Areas (MSOAs) for the Burmantofts and Richmond Hill ward are still amongst the most deprived in the city. However, the ranking for economic activity in Lincoln Green and Ebor Gardens has improved slightly between 2010 and 2011, down two places from 2<sup>nd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup>. Economic activity has also improved in Cross Green, Richmond Hill and East End Park, down one place to 12<sup>th</sup> in Leeds.
- 3.18 Within Lincoln Green and Ebor Gardens, the housing ranking has improved by five rank places. This measure includes rates of housing turnover and empty properties. However, within the other MSOAs the housing situation has not improved and within Osmondthorpe and East End Park has in fact worsened.

- 3.19 Health deprivation statistics show that the situation has improved in Lincoln Green & Ebor Gardens by nine places and in Cross Green, Richmond Park and East End Park by six places. However the situation has worsened in the Comptons / Sutherlands / Nowells and Osmondthorpe / East End Park.
- 3.20 The environment is still a significant area for concern with no demonstrable improvement in the neighbourhood index rankings. However, Environmental Improvement Zones have now been introduced to try and focus enforcement and education action.
- 3.21 Performance within the education domain has improved significantly in Osmondthorpe / East End Park (by 11 rank places) and also within Cross Green / Richmond Hill / East End Park by three places. However, persistent absenteeism, educational attainment and levels of young people who are NEET continue to be a problem across the area.
- 3.22 In community safety terms, Burmantofts and Richmond Hill is still prone to significant problems such as crimes against individuals and acquisitive crime. However, within Cross Green / Richmond Hill / East End Park there has been improvement, particularly in a reduction of community disorders, acquisitive crime and environmental crime.
- 3.23 As stated above, a number of initiatives have been introduced to improve performance across all the domains within the area. However, it is likely that their impact will be realised in the longer term.

#### Gipton

- 3.24 To improve perceptions of community safety, earlier this year, resident-led 'Operation Champions' were carried out in two areas where confidence was low, with Police, housing, ASB and the Youth Service working collaboratively. More recently, further operations have tackled potential hate crime and a burglary reduction open day was held at Henry Barren Community Centre.
- 3.25 Environmental work has included alley-gating to reduce fly-tipping and initiatives to improve the environment around Wykebeck Valley and increase residents' awareness of recreational activities in and access to this area.
- 3.26 A particular focus has been to reduce levels of worklessness and numbers of young people who are NEET, for example ENEHL ran an Apprenticeship open day which over 60 young people attended, regular NEET sweeps supported by a range of partners and the establishment of a Guidance and Support group to tackle persistent absenteeism.
- 3.27 Levels of community confidence have increased, for example through the establishment of a Community First Panel which has so far allocated over £13,000 to local groups as well as support for successful community events. In addition the new Dame Fanny Waterman Community Centre was officially opened with a very successful open day on 22<sup>nd</sup> September.
- 3.28 The Neighbourhood Index shows that the Gipton South MSOA has improved its rank position from 14 to 17. The performance across several domains has improved including economic activity, low income, housing, environment and community safety. Improvement within the environment domain has been

particularly notable as has community safety. However, the situation has worsened across the health and education domains. The NIP will ensure that these areas are tackled over the coming months.

- 3.29 The deprivation statistics for Gipton North show that the MSOA was ranked overall one place higher in 2011, compared with 2010. However, there was some significant improvement in health (down by 11 rank places), environment and also significant improvement in community safety (down by 10 rank places). There were particular reductions in acquisitive crime and significant improvements in environmental crimes and community disorders. In addition, there was a reduction in the number of liability orders issued for non-payment of Council Tax.

### Seacroft

- 3.30 Within Seacroft, the Team Neighbourhood approach is well established and informed by an active Community Leadership Team. This governance infrastructure has delivered a range of improvements including a 59% reduction in burglaries since September last year. This significant improvement has been encouraged by a burglary reduction initiative, CCTV and detached youth work to address anti-social behaviour.
- 3.31 Environmental improvements have included tackling untidy gardens and supporting the enforcement and education work in the Environmental Improvement Zones around Black Shops, Boggart Hill shop, Monkswood Hill shops and Dib Lane.
- 3.32 A number of initiatives have been established to address persistent absenteeism and high numbers of young people who are NEET, including a £75,000 Opportunities in Inspirational Learning project.
- 3.33 A Community First Panel is now well established and has awarded over £17,000 funding to local groups. Work has taken place to increase usage of community centres to improve the offer of positive opportunities and increase the sustainability of the centres.
- 3.34 The Neighbourhood Index information highlights significant improvements in the environment domain within Seacroft North by 15 rank places. Within Seacroft South there have been minor improvements in economic activity and low income and more significant improvements across the housing domain. However there are still challenges across all domains and particularly education, health and community safety. Overall, the rank positions of both Seacroft North and South have worsened slightly.

### Harehills

- 3.35 Much work has been undertaken to address priority issues within Harehills, such as establishment of a Designated Public Places Order, partnership work to address anti-social behaviour across the area and measures to support the recently established Environmental Improvement Zones such as bin yard improvements and education and enforcement action to improve the area.
- 3.36 The Chapeltown and Harehills forum established earlier this year will support the work underway in Harehills, but there is a need to maintain the momentum built

and drive things ensuring that community representatives take responsibility and support the cohesion agenda.

- 3.37 However, this work has been achieved through mainstream Area Support Team resources, in the absence of a dedicated Neighbourhood Manager. Whilst much positive partnership work has been achieved, the deprivation indicators across all domains do suggest that intensive interventions through a dedicated Neighbourhood Manager would be welcomed. This could possibly be achieved through the introduction of an additional Neighbourhood Manager or through the re-alignment of the level Neighbourhood Manager resource funded currently and hopefully for a further two years by the Area Committee.
- 3.38 The Harehills priority neighbourhood is made up of two MSOAs: Harehills Triangle and Harehills. The rankings of these MSOAs for 2011 were respectively 11 (up from 13) and 7 (up from 10). Within Inner East, these two MSOAs are ranked 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> worst.
- 3.39 The following table demonstrates the 2011 Neighbourhood Index rankings of the MSOAs within Inner East. It should be noted that the 2012 figures are due to be available imminently and will be presented to the Area Committee once available. It is suggested that the 2012 figures should be considered before a final decision is taken on the allocation of the neighbourhood management resource across Inner East:

<b>Inner East rank</b>	<b>MSOA</b>	<b>2010 position</b>	<b>2011 position</b>	<b>change</b>	<b>Ward</b>
1	Harehills – Comptons, Sutherlands, Nowells	5	1	⊕ (-4)	BRH
2	Cross Green, Richmond Hill, East End Park	2	3	∅ (+1)	BRH
3	Lincoln Green / Ebor Gardens	7	4	⊕ (+3)	BRH
4	Harehills	10	7	⊕ (-3)	G&H
5	Harehills Triangle	13	11	⊕ (-2)	G&H
6	Seacroft South	16	13	⊕ (-3)	K&S
7	Gipton South	14	17	∅ (+3)	G&H
8	Gipton North	20	19	⊕ (-1)	G&H
9	Fearnville, Hollin Park, Beechwood, Brooklands	21	21	⊕	G&H
10	Seacroft North	23	22	⊕ (-1)	K&S
11	Osmondthorpe, East End Park	27	26	⊕ (-1)	BRH
12	Crossgates and Killingbeck	36	38	∅ (+2)	K&S

## **Future allocation of a Neighbourhood Manager resource**

- 3.40 It is suggested that for the coming two years the focus of the priority neighbourhoods within Inner East are reviewed and a shift is made to begin to create a neighbourhood management infrastructure that will allow improvement to continue within mainstream budgets.
- 3.41 Information has been provided in this report, summarising positive interventions within the priority neighbourhoods across Inner East. Previous reports submitted to the Area Committee have provided further information on the vast range of intensive work that has taken place. The report has also set out a significant range of challenges highlighted through the Neighbourhood Index.
- 3.42 In response, it is suggested that the Area Committee should consider continuation funding for the two existing Neighbourhood Manager posts to build on the good work already taking place. In addition, it is suggested that the Area Committee consider funding a third Neighbourhood Manager post to significantly boost the resource and allow intensive interventions in Harehills.
- 3.43 It is timely to consider the neighbourhood management approaches and ensure that sustainable solutions are implemented within all of the priority neighbourhoods given the current challenging economic situation where there is an increasing need to do more for less. Through the approaches that have been utilised by the 'team neighbourhood' approach progress is being seen in the priority neighbourhoods.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 The Area Committee agreed its Community Engagement Strategy as an integral part of its Business Plan for 2012/13 in March this year. Consultation and engagement for neighbourhood management is undertaken through the Community Leadership Teams.
- 4.1.2 The focus of structured engagement work is anticipated through the new Chapeltown and Harehills Forum and opportunities to link this more directly with the NIP are being investigated at this time pending consultation with elected Members and the Forum itself.

### **4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

- 4.2.1 Equality and diversity are monitored through the NIPs and in identifying inequalities and seeking to address these.

### **4.3 Council policies and City Priorities**

- 4.3.1 The work within the priority neighbourhoods links directly to the priorities set out in the Vision for Leeds and the City Business Plan and City Priorities Plan.

### **4.4 Resources and value for money**

- 4.4.1 The neighbourhood manager programme seeks to better integrate and streamline existing resources, creating an integrated approach to issues with associated improvements in value for money. The programme aims to tackle fundamental



problems in priority neighbourhoods, thereby reducing the number and overall cost of interventions.

- **Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

4.4.1 There are no specific implications.

#### **4.5 Risk Management**

4.5.1 The aim of the Neighbourhood Management posts is to improve the performance of the priority neighbourhoods within Inner East, compared with Leeds as a whole. If continuation funding for these posts and an additional post for Harehills is not secured there is the potential for the required intensive interventions to fail to take place.

### **5 Conclusions**

5.6 Information has been provided in this report to summarise the positive interventions made within the priority neighbourhoods across Inner East. Previous reports submitted to the Area Committee have provided further information on the vast range of intensive work that has taken place led by the Neighbourhood Managers. The report has also set out a significant range of deprivation challenges highlighted through the Neighbourhood Index.

5.1 In response, it is suggested that the Area Committee consider continuation funding for the two existing Neighbourhood Manager posts to build on the good work already taking place. In addition, it is suggested that the Area Committee consider funding for a third Neighbourhood Manager post to significantly boost the resource and allow intensive interventions in Harehills.

### **6 Recommendations**

- (i) Note the content of this report and the achievements made in the priority neighbourhoods in Inner East.
- (ii) Approve the Wellbeing revenue funding to extend the contract of the Neighbourhood Managers for a further two years from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015, subject to availability of funds, with a report provided at December Area Committee with cost implications for the Well-being Fund if supported.
- (iii) Give consideration to which priority neighbourhoods within Inner East should benefit from a Neighbourhood Manager resource from March 2013.
- (iii) Consider allocating funding for an additional Neighbourhood Manager, with an area specific focus to be agreed at a later date, but taking into account the indices of deprivation across the priority neighbourhoods within Inner East.

## 7 Background documents<sup>1</sup>

None

---

<sup>1</sup> The background documents listed in this section are available for inspection on request for a period of four years following the date of the relevant meeting. Accordingly this list does not include documents containing exempt or confidential information, or any published works. Requests to inspect any background documents should be submitted to the report author.