



REPORT TO: COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD 19 JUNE 2019

SUBJECT: NEXT STAGES OF LOCALITY PLANNING IN MORAY

BY: CORPORATE DIRECTOR (CORPORATE SERVICES)

1. REASON FOR REPORT

- 1.1. To invite Board to consider and agree to progress development work on two further Locality Plans as highlighted in the Local Outcome Improvement Plan (LOIP): Moray 10 Year Plan report to the Board on the 13 February 2018.
- 1.2. To ask the Board to consider for Keith and Forres as the next areas for development of locality plans and to determine whether work begins on developing the two new Locality Plans starting in Autumn 2019.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 It is recommended that the Board:

- i) **considers endorsing the development of a further two Locality Plans in Keith and Fife Keith and Forres South West & Mannachie, as highlighted in the Local Outcome Improvement Plan (LOIP): Moray 10 Year Plan report to the Board on the 13 February 2018;**
- ii) **subject to agreement of 2.1 above, it is recommended that the Board:**
 - a. **agree that staff of the Community Support Unit begin the preparation to implement their facilitation role in developing two Locality Plans, starting in September 2019 utilising the 10 Step Engagement Plan, as used in the development of Buckie Central East and New Elgin East Locality Plans; and**
 - b. **approves the 12 month extension of the temporary post of Community Support Officer on 24 hours per week.**

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1. The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 places specific duties on Community Planning Partnerships around locality planning to improve outcomes to reduce inequalities in areas showing greatest inequality of outcomes. Based on assessment of the data about the communities in Moray and the consultation and engagement work done by the Partnership, seven areas were identified for specific locality based work as part of the Local Outcomes Improvement Plan.
- 3.2. At the meeting of 26 September 2017, the board noted seven areas in Moray experiencing inequalities of outcomes for consideration for locality plans. The areas were New Elgin East, Elgin Cathedral to Ashgrove and Pinefield, Buckie Central East, Forres South West and Mannachie, Elgin Bishopmill and Ladyhill, Keith and Fife Keith and Forres Central East Seaward. These seven areas were based on intermediate data zones evidence showing areas of greatest inequality in Moray.
- 3.3. Following the work on two pilot plans in New Elgin East and Buckie Central East, the Council's Community Support Unit were asked to consider identification of the next two areas for the development of Locality Plans.
- 3.4. Whilst in terms of the data used Elgin Cathedral to Ashgrove and Pinefield, and Elgin Bishopmill East and Ladyhill are regarded as the two next most vulnerable communities after New Elgin East, it was felt that locality plan work to tackle inequality of outcomes should be targeted across Moray in a range of communities and addressing a range of outcome inequalities.
- 3.5. In terms of maximising the impact of work, it is also considered that there are likely to be lessons to be learned and work that could be expanded within Elgin communities as the New Elgin plan proceeds through implementation. Therefore, it may be better to time further work in Elgin for future years in order to capitalise on the experience in New Elgin once it has progressed to further stages.
- 3.6. In order to determine whether the seven areas originally identified were still appropriate, reference has been made to the latest release of combined community planning partnership data prepared by a Research and Information Officer in April 2019. This confirms that the two areas showing greatest inequality of outcomes outside Elgin, are Forres South West and Mannachie and Keith and Fife Keith. (See Moray Locality Plans: Information to assist with selection of communities requiring Locality Plans, April 2019 in the LOiP). This data identifies the localities and issues set out below.

3.7. Targeted Locality Plan Work- greatest inequalities:

Forres South West & Mannachie:

- (a) Child Poverty- No.1 in Moray
- (b) Attainment- No. 1 in Moray
- (c) Numbers on out of work benefits- No. 4 in Moray

3.8. Targeted Locality Plan Work- greatest inequalities:

Keith and Fife Keith:

- (a) Attainment- No. 4 in Moray
- (b) Positive destinations- No. 4 in Moray
- (c) Numbers on out of work benefits, Crime & Early Mortality (equal third; No. 5 in Moray)

3.9 Taking account of the above, it is recommended that the next two out of Elgin areas are selected for the development of locality plans.

3.10 Alongside this, it is proposed to continue support to New Elgin East and Buckie Central East as they move into an implementation phase. The aim is to assist communities to build capacity and resilience that gradually requires less support as the communities become more self-sufficient. This is shown on the attached plan as moving from dark coloured intensive support to lighted shaded less intensive facilitation work and should enable the development of work into new areas so that the areas of greatest inequality can be addressed over time.

3.11 The issue of resourcing this work over the next 12 months is raised in the implications section below. However, the CPB budget will be exhausted by the end of that 12 month period and consideration will have to be given to how the work is resourced thereafter from within current resources.

4. SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS

4.1. In May 2019, SCDC submitted an interim report on the development of the locality plans in Moray so far. Whilst the report was positive overall, it is worth highlighting three key learning themes from the report:

- The continuity of involvement of participants in the process is important. This drives ownership at a community level and so buy-in and on-going resourcing from CP partners is needed.
- There needs to be sufficient time and resources to support inclusion and to conduct robust engagement. It is important to recognise that robust engagement processes cannot be rushed and are highly dependent on relationship building.

- Flexibility of approach is fundamental to supporting an inclusive engagement process. It is important to be able to adapt methods, change venues, and adjust meeting times to suit participants.
- 4.2. Partners involved in the Buckie Central East and New Elgin East pilots committed resources e.g. staff time. Commitment to the continuation of support is required moving forward. However, it is also noted that tsi Moray has been successful in securing funding for community workers and that this could provide further capacity to the partnership and reduce the emphasis on existing resources. Discussions on this area are scheduled and an update will be provided at the meeting of the Board. The partnership support from community planning partners' operational teams was invaluable to the engagement process and relationship building work in the two pilot areas and will be a key component moving forward.
- 4.3. The delivery of outcomes identified by the Locality Plans is resource dependent. In particular staff support to local working groups to both deliver community projects as part of the plan and to monitor and evaluate the Locality Plan work. The development of two new locality plan areas will be happening in tandem with ongoing support to the existing two areas in Buckie Central East and New Elgin East. This has resource implications for the Community Support Unit. Therefore, the continuation of the temporary Community Support Officer based in the CSU requires to be considered. It is proposed that the post is extended for 12 months (previously the Board agreed a 6 month extension pending this report. A total period of 12 months is being requested).
- 4.4 For ease of reference, costs of the 12 month post are noted below and the partnership budget is £31,850.

<u>24 hours (6 months)</u>	<u>24 hours (12 months)</u>
£15940	£31880

- 4.5 Consideration of the learning points highlighted in The Scottish Community Development Centre's (SCDC) Interim Report requires to be considered. (**APPENDIX 1**).

5. CONSULTATION AND PARTNER VIEWS

- 5.1 The Community Planning Officer Group (CPOG) considered the points raised in this paper and while there was support for the proposals, some representatives expressed concern about their ability to support the implementation of the first two plans in parallel with the development of new plans. There were also views expressed that a pause might be appropriate to consolidate experience and develop confidence that results can be delivered from the plans. Counter to these views was a desire to build on the momentum created and not to

lose the experience gained from the success of the initial work. There was a degree of confidence from the CSU that they could accommodate the work and that the process being used is entirely consistent with community work that seeks to build community capacity and self-sufficiency, reducing reliance on agencies over time.

5.2 CPOG agreed to reflect on the merits and risks of proceeding with a further 2 areas and to feedback on whether to:

- i) Proceed with 2 more areas in September
- ii) Phase one in September, and one in 6 months
- iii) Proceed with one in the next 12 months or
- iv) Hold any further development pending progress in first 2 plans

Considerations included maximising the use of the budget available; using learning from the first 2 plans; resourcing the development of the plans; resourcing delivery of plans; developing confidence from experience of delivering first 2 plans and seeing progress on the implementation and outcomes (although the latter may take more time).

5.3 Four responses were received:

- two indicating support for proceeding with the 2 proposed areas in September (the Council would also support to this position);
- one preferring to select one new area in the next 12 months so as to ensure that adequate support is maintained to support implementation of the first 2 plans; and
- one view that any further development should be put on hold pending progress in first 2 plans until a point where evidence of beneficial outcomes can be demonstrated, particularly given the pressure on partner resources.

The point was also made in feedback that it would be reasonable to consider the resources available across the partnership for each phase of work so that while the contribution from each partner may not be the same for each project or as each other partner, the question should be whether overall the partnership can resource the work. The new posts available through tsi Moray were noted as adding capacity to the system which may assist.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 It is important to build on the work in the first two localities and utilise the experience gained. Areas in Keith and Forres have been identified as the next highest priorities for locality planning. The Community Support Unit can lead and resource this development work with the continuation of the temporary CSO post. However, some partners have expressed concerns about adding new locality planning areas and this needs to be taken into account in terms of the overall resources available to the partnership and the pros and cons of a delay

in proceeding. The Board is asked to determine how to proceed with locality planning.

Author of Report: Ian Todd/Denise Whitworth

Background Papers:

Ref: