

**Glasgow Community Planning Partnership****Calton Area Partnership****Report by Executive Director of Corporate Services****Contact: Judith Hunter      Ext: 0141 276 9860****AREA PARTNERSHIPS AND NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT****Purpose of Report:**

To clarify what the Neighbourhood Management responsibilities mean in practice and to help the Area Partnership understand their role.

**Recommendation(s):**

The Area Partnership is asked to agree that the local Partnership and Development team prepare a report for a future meeting

- (a) incorporating ward level data on neighbourhood management (including community safety) issues provided by
- the 2010/11 Neighbourhood Management survey
  - relevant community planning partners, local structures and other sources as outlined in sections 2 and 3 of this report;
- (b) outlining how the existing operational structures work together and share information;
- (c) identifying potential priorities for the Calton Ward Neighbourhood Management Action Plan; and
- (d) following discussions with partners, proposing a framework for reporting to the Area Partnership on Neighbourhood Management.

Ward No(s): 9

Citywide:

Local member(s) advised: Yes  No  consulted: Yes  No

## **1. Introduction**

1.1 Under the review of Community Planning structures in Glasgow, among others, the following responsibilities are included in the new Area Partnerships' terms of reference:

1. To co-ordinate the development and implementation of electoral ward level Neighbourhood Management action plans which respond to local needs and opportunities.
2. To provide opportunities for communities to engage with the local community planning process.

1.2 The purpose of this paper is to start a dialogue with the Area Partnerships, in order to clarify what these responsibilities mean in practice and to help them understand their role.

## **2. What is Neighbourhood Management?**

2.1 Neighbourhood Management (NM) is a process that enables local communities and service providers to work together to improve and join up services. The key principle is that it enables service providers to respond to local need. It was introduced in Glasgow in 2007 and was underpinned by robust evidence gathered from a large resident's survey. The survey asked questions relating to overall satisfaction and feeling of safety within neighbourhoods based on:

- Attractive environment
- Parks/open spaces
- Children's play areas
- Street drinking
- Vandalism/graffiti
- Road safety
- Street litter
- Fly tipping/dumping
- Rubbish collection
- Policing
- Youth/Leisure services

2.2 These service areas are often referred to as the Crime and Grime agenda; however NM can encompass a wider range of issues, depending on what local residents see as important. Outcomes should be focused on additional investment in key priorities (where possible) and can consider the re-alignment of some local services to meet local need and demand.

2.3 A subsequent survey was carried out in 2010/11 in partnership with Glasgow Housing Association (GHA), and while there were still a number of concerns in relation to the above areas, there was generally an improvement in Glasgow residents' overall satisfaction with their neighbourhoods, across the city.

### **3. Current structures that can deliver Neighbourhood Management.**

3.1 The main vehicle originally set up for the delivery of NM outcomes was the Local Operational Working Groups (LOWGs). These groups met regularly on a six week cycle, were chaired by Land and Environmental Services (LES) and included operations managers from Community Safety Glasgow (CSG), Police, Fire and Rescue Service and GHA or other Housing Providers.

3.2 Moving forward to 2013, the majority of the LOWGs still meet and deal with issues relating the Crime and Grime agenda, such as fly tipping, community clean ups and removal of local drinking dens. However, with the previous survey two years out of date, they predominantly focus on issues identified by officers or reported informally by community residents. Although they do not have any formal links with partnership planning or development structures they do undertake a wide range of engagement with a range of other partners - this assists and informs the work plan of each LOWG.

3.3 In addition, there are two other relevant operational planning and delivery structures dealing with the same issues as the NM process.

- Neighbourhood Improvement Teams in Community Safety Glasgow (CSG), formerly known as ECAT (Environmental Community Action Teams). These can carry out actions within communities, often involving community residents e.g. local clean ups. They could be the operational arm of any commitments CSG make to delivery as part of the LOWG.
- Community Improvement Partnership (CIP). This partnership involves GHA, Police Scotland and Scottish Fire and Rescue Services, who identified that anti-social behaviour was an increasing problem for GHA tenants. Senior Police and Fire officers were seconded to a city wide team to look at solutions. After a successful test in three pilot areas, the partnership approach has been rolled out across the city. Local housing managers hold tasking meetings, and concrete actions are developed as a result. Whilst this approach deals solely with GHA properties and has a wider ranging remit, there is some duplication with the work of the LOWG.

### **4. The Role of Area Partnerships in Neighbourhood Management**

4.1 The Area Partnerships have a key role in the development of NM action plans. This needs to be considered within the context of a community engagement process and wider information about the ward. At this point,

discussions are still underway regarding the delivery of a further Neighbourhood Management survey during 2014. It is possible that another survey will be conducted within the next 12 months, but to carry out the survey and complete ward level analysis could take longer; therefore the Area Partnership needs to consider what information could inform the development of a workplan in the meantime. The starting point should be the previous NM survey; however, relevant data could come from a variety of sources. For example:

- SIMD
- Health and well being survey
- Ward profiles (compiled by DRS)
- Data gathered by CSG (including hotspot reporting, info reported to CSPOs etc)
- Intelligence gathered by Police and Fire and Rescue Services, including their own Ward level surveys.

In addition, there may be additional, relevant information gathered during the Listening Exercise phase of the Neighbourhood Implementation phase of the SOA which could add value, or information gained from specifically targeted engagement exercises.

- 4.2 The Area Partnership and the local Partnership and Development team need to be proactive in the gathering of ward level data, which will help the Partnership prioritise issues for the neighbourhood management action plan. This should come from all the relevant partners: elected members, Police, Fire and CHP. Further data will need to be gathered from LES, Community Safety Glasgow, housing providers in the area and community networks. Consideration needs to be given to the role of community representatives, especially community councils. While it is clear that they should have a role in disseminating information coming from the Area Partnership and facilitating consultation, they may also have a role in gathering the view of residents to establish priorities. This would not be at the level of the NM survey, but it should be possible to develop a targeted approach to community engagement (e.g. the establishment of focus groups) with the support of the Partnership and Development team and the central community engagement team.
- 4.3 Once the Area Partnership has identified specific areas that need further engagement, there are a number of methods that could be used:
- **Social media & interactive technology.** Much has been written of the popularity of Facebook and Twitter in particular, but as far as Councils and Partners are concerned, this is a predominantly untapped resource. The strength of Facebook is the vast demographic of its users and their interest in engaging in discussion threads of interest. Currently, it could be argued that there is a gap for Glaswegian Facebook users to debate the issues of importance to them.

- There is a risk element for partners engaging using this medium; tales of extreme “trolling” and “cyber bullying” are currently much in evidence in the wider media, but the pros may outweigh the cons given the genuine engagement possibilities on offer.
- There are also other emerging technologies such as the Open Data Platform of the Future Cities Programme – this will consolidate a number of information streams from bin collection to traffic and flood alerts, making interactive information available from a smartphone. There are real opportunities for Area Partnerships to be involved at an early stage in discussions around how we might make better use of this technology.
- **Targeted focus groups.** Given the relative ease with which Area Partnerships can engage with Community Councils and other formal community structures, it would make sense to engage directly with under represented groups, either through the use of social media, or within the organisations that they engage in. The key here is to establish which particular groups need to be targeted and then proceed from there.
- It is far more cost effective and productive for example, to hold a small group session with students already attending college, or parents already attending Bounce and Rhyme sessions at the local library. Partners and the Third Sector can also assist in providing access to various groups and service users, or via their own specialist community engagement structures.
- **Communities of interest.** It is particularly worth mentioning specific communities here, such as BME or LGBT communities. In addition to many of the typical urban problems highlighted by many Glaswegians, they can also be victims of Hate Crime and therefore be more frequent ‘service users’ of the emergency services, with useful perspectives on community life. Again, engagement via partners, the Third Sector, and the business community would be advantageous. This could also be a task for the Community Planning Equalities Working Group to consider.
- **Online survey tools.** There may still be a need to demonstrate that the Area Partnership has engaged with large scale numbers of people. The most simple and effective way to do this is via simple, short online surveys like Survey Monkey. Targeting this through large organisations should be very effective e.g. on the Connect pages of Glasgow City Council, or the staff pages of the Community Health Partnership there is instant access to thousands of people who live in the city. Add to this, direct to the public surveys via Facebook, Twitter, and all Partner websites, including the Third Sector, and this is a potentially huge list. Small prizes are always a good incentive to encourage people to complete them; further discussion will take place later regarding budgets for community engagement activity.

## **5. The Neighbourhood Management Action Plans**

- 5.1 Once the key issues and priorities have been identified by partners and the community, it is recommended that the Area Partnership agrees the action plan for Neighbourhood Management at a ward level. The workplans should be outcome focused and based on SMART targets. The Partnership and Development team will collate this action plan and monitor delivery by partners – which is likely to be predominantly via the Local Operational Working Group.
- 5.2 The LOWG could potentially co-ordinate actions either directly by officers or by directing actions to the Community Improvement Partnership (CIP) or Neighbourhood Improvement teams where appropriate. However, the key reporting relationship should be between the LOWG and the Area Partnership.
- 5.3 Further discussion needs to take place, but one option is that the LOWG could feed back to the Area Partnership on progress on a regular basis. This would enable the Area Partnership to gather information that can be fed back to communities where appropriate. Where at all possible, this should be done by the community representatives on the Partnership.
- 5.4 As outlined earlier, the focus of NM should be on the delivery of outcomes using the current resources of service providers. However, where additional resources may be required to deliver a piece of work, there will be the option to utilise the Area Partnership Grants budget more explicitly for the NM workplan.

## **6. The Role of Area Partnerships in the wider Community Safety Agenda**

- 6.1 The Area Partnerships could be the key structure to co-ordinate this agenda at local level. The Partnership could receive feedback and reports from partners relating to what is being delivered within the ward and provide direction on what is needed within the ward. In this case, the Area Partnerships would be the key route for partners to engage with both Elected Members and community representatives and to create further engagement strategies where needed. Developing a strong community safety identity for the Area Partnerships would also bring clarity to the role of the Health partners, enabling them to focus on alcohol and drugs, as well as the Violence against Women (VAW) agenda - the locality VAW Implementation Groups are chaired by Senior Health Promotion staff.
- 6.2 Generally, there should be clearly defined roles for partners. If the workplan is structured in a way that partners need to report on what has been achieved, then this could encourage them to participate more fully and they should be encouraged to provide reports on items contained within the action plan.

## 7. Next Steps

7.1 Further discussion needs to take place with the following partners regarding the reporting structures and accountability:

- Land & Environmental Services
- Community Safety Glasgow
- Glasgow Housing Association
- Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (in relation to CIP)
- Police Scotland (in relation to CIP)

7.2 In the meantime, the immediate priorities for the Area Partnerships should be data gathering for the profiles at ward level, the collation of community led information about priorities, followed by further discussion at the Area Partnership and initial development of the NM action plans.

## 8. Council Strategic Plan Implications

*Economic Impact:* None

*Sustainability:* None

*Financial:* n/a

*Legal:* None

*Personnel:* None

*Sustainable Procurement and Article 19:* None

## 9. Recommendations

9.1 The Area Partnership is asked to agree that the local Partnership and Development team prepare a report for a future meeting

- (a) incorporating ward level data on neighbourhood management (including community safety) issues provided by
  - the 2010/11 Neighbourhood Management survey
  - relevant community planning partners, local structures and other sources as outlined in sections 2 and 3 of this report;
- (b) outlining how the existing operational structures work together and share information;
- (c) identifying potential priorities for the Calton Ward Neighbourhood Management Action Plan; and

- (d) following discussions with partners, proposing a framework for reporting to the Area Partnership on Neighbourhood Management.