

Hastings Borough Council

# Neighbourhood Renewal Impact Assessment

Hastings, East Sussex

## APPENDIX A

### Current arrangements review

Commissioned by the  
Neighbourhood Renewal Team, Hastings Borough Council

Undertaken by  
Clive Jacotine & Associates Limited  
and Nick Wates Associates

August 2004

## APPENDIX A: Current arrangements review

### CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Local Strategic Partnership role	3
3.	NRF support to themes	5
4.	Local management boards	7
5.	Local community structures (forums)	9
6.	Voluntary sector engagement	12
7.	Engaging hard to reach groups	15
8.	Neighbourhood Renewal team	19
9.	Service planning (LAPs)	20
10.	Local Learning Plans	21
11.	Task Force and Sea Space	22
12.	Neighbourhood Renewal Funding breakdown	24
13.	A note on floor targets, service agreements and stretch targets	25
14.	A note on the local learning plan	25
15.	A note on the NRF Health Programme	27
16.	Crime statistics	29

---

# 1 Introduction

1.1 This section examines the effectiveness of the current arrangements for delivering neighbourhood renewal as viewed by those involved or affected. Ten aspects are covered (as required in the brief) as follows:

- Local Strategic Partnership role
- Thematic support
- Local management boards
- Local community structures
- Voluntary sector engagement
- Engaging hard to reach groups
- Neighbourhood Renewal team
- Service planning (LAPs)
- Local Learning Plans
- Task Force and Sea Space

1.2 For each of these aspects, the current arrangements are briefly summarised. This is followed by listing for each, perceived:

- Positive features
- Shortcomings
- Suggestions for improvement

It should be stressed that the views listed are of those interviewed (Appendix C.2) and are not necessarily endorsed by the consultants.

1.3 A breakdown of NRF to date is included at the end of this appendix.

---

## 2. Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) role

### 2.1 Present arrangements - decisions on the allocation of Neighbourhood Renewal Funding (NRF)

The Neighbourhood Renewal Team prepares a draft programme under the direction of the NRF Funding Group. The Funding Group consists of representatives of:

- The three local Forums and Greater Hollington (only these representatives have a vote)
- Education Action Zone
- Hastings Voluntary Action
- Community Safety
- Primary Care Trust
- East Sussex County Council

The draft programme is then recommended to the LSP for approval, subject to the advice of the Accountable Body which is Hastings Borough Council.

At present NRF funding is only definitely available until 2005/06, so it has been proposed that the amount of NRF funding received by public agencies will be tapered by 50% in 2005/06, in order to encourage mainstreaming and clarify sustainability.

### 2.1 Positive features (perceived)

- a) Clear, simple and transparent process, with community representatives making key recommendations with expert advice.
- b) Good NRF budget setting meetings.
- c) Good review process in 2003 – an exciting piece of networking (e.g. Hastings College of Art & Technology talking to local people).
- d) NRF funding used wisely.
- e) Funding targeted on priority wards.
- f) Many of the activities funded came from community, e.g. lighting, alley-gates, wardens.
- g) Limited number of themes prioritised in order to achieve impact.
- h) Decisions endorsed by LSP. Originally the Officers Support Group to the LSP was key, but Local Management Boards (LMBs) now becoming important.
- i) LSP endorses decisions on NRF but does not get bogged down in details. Relies on officer team and Funding Group to work out programme.
- j) Move away from a 'bidding' approach for funding towards a 'commissioning' approach with the focus on the three key themes (health, education, crime).

- 
- k) Sea Space attends the LSP and, although it is not part of the LSP, some of the Task Force members are. Cornerstones of Sea Space's work are the Community Strategy and the Business Plan, reflecting the physical and economic aspects. It recognises the importance of local employment opportunities.

## 2.2 Shortcomings (perceived)

- a) Strategic approach not taken by LSP as it only rubber-stamps recommendations, generally does not debate and avoids difficult issues.
- b) The LSP's approach is a mixture of strategic and responding to community views, which determines the detail.
- c) There is a lack of a clear shared understanding of NR approach across Hastings. Challenge of reconciling separate services with cross-thematic plans.
- d) Many parties do not have a clear picture of how the whole process works and fits together.
- e) Too much emphasis on projects put forward by service providers.
- f) Lack of effective exchange or learning between Greater Hollington and the other priority wards, possibly aggravated by ineffective communication links.
- g) Despite successful national profile, Greater Hollington not engaged locally outside own area.
- h) LSP over-concerned about size of reports rather than quality (it objects to long reports).
- i) Initial decisions on NRF were made hurriedly by 2-3 people to achieve spend, with usual suspects making bids (due to tight timetable – no one's fault). This was before Forums were set up although attempts were made to engage the embryonic Neighbourhood Forums by presenting initial proposals for comment and using the results of that to inform the decision making group. Much of second and third years' funding programme broadly maintained first year's because of staff contracts, etc (difficult to turn round the juggernaut) although the process was better. Question is whether projects chosen were the right ones in the first place, although some have made an impact.
- j) Whole process too complicated ('a nightmare').
- k) The review programme is too complicated.
- l) Too much emphasis on monitoring targets and not enough on making things work better.
- m) Disparity of spend between wards.
- n) Should not just focus on priority wards because solutions to some things are in other wards. Could have included next 6 wards as well. This is down to the interpretation of NRU programme guidance which made many people assume that it was funding "for" the wards rather than initiatives which impact on them.

---

## 2.3 Suggestions for improvement (perceived)

- a) LSP needs to look at how agencies are using their budgets and organising themselves. This is very challenging but now ready for it.
- b) LSP still has a long way to go to develop key role of joining up delivery of Sea Space plan and Community Strategy.
- c) New deprivation measures likely to change future arrangements, so priority areas should be reviewed.
- d) Produce a clear summary with good diagrams and graphics of how the whole process works (HVA's Hastings Community Network publication a very good start).
- e) Clearer guidance from NR Team.
- f) Clearer, systemised approach, with stronger lead by NR Team and stronger thematic links.
- g) Need to use the Officers' Support Group to the LSP (OSG) more and engage the thematic chairs, to move to a more commissioning approach (outcome driven), linked to sustainability.
- h) If no NRF after 2005/06, HBC can't sustain all projects, so will have to look to other major agencies (who may be financially challenged) and at how major capital projects can contribute. Community Safety will be a political priority, but in any case there will have to be a more rigorous approach to evaluating projects and the value of their outcomes.
- i) Need to embrace other funding streams which impact on the work of NRF projects as well as the NR projects themselves.
- j) Greater Hollington also needs Sea Space engagement because of Innovation Centre.
- k) LSP needs to clarify its role – is it a coordinating body or a decision-making body to achieve targets whilst leaving agencies to get on and deliver?
- l) LSP is there to challenge Sea Space, which should take account of the LSP, but not be directed by it.

## 3. NRF support to themes

### 3.1 Present arrangements – support for themes

The seven themes identified in the Community Strategy are:

- 1 Community Safety (a safer town)
- 2 Economy (an economically successful town)
- 3 Education (a learning town)
- 4 Equal opportunity (an inclusive town)
- 5 Health (a healthier town)

- 
- 6 Housing (a town with a decent home for everyone)
  - 7 Environment (a town that's good to live in)

From these seven themes, three priorities were selected by the LSP for Neighbourhood Renewal Funding:

1. Community Safety
2. Education
3. Health

Support to these three themes within priority wards is provided by

- a) **Support for thematic meetings.**  
Held in November 2003, one for each theme brought together forum members from the 3 priority wards with service providers to firm up the local action plans for 2004/05. This approach was a change from the previous year when only Forum officers were present.
- b) **Support for the forum's special interest groups.**  
(e.g.: Crime reduction officer working closely with the forums' Special Interest Groups and liaising with service providers to tackle priorities.
- c) **Support for thematic partnership bodies**  
(e.g. Healthier Hastings Partnership)

### 3.2 **Positive features** (perceived)

- a) Theme groups represented on Officers Support Group.

### 3.3 **Shortcomings** (perceived)

- a) Concern that employment was not one of themes seen as a priority and supported.
- b) Social inclusion and equalities targets do not have a natural partnership responsible for them. The LSP Equalities Group have identified this as part of their remit but too early to say how this will work. Equalities and Social Inclusion runs across all themes, but if there is no formal lead it is easy for them to get lost.
- c) Public agencies seeking NRF both via the LSP and the Forums for the same projects.

### 3.4 **Suggestions for improvement** (perceived)

- a) Provide support for employment projects in the final year.

---

## 4. Local Management Boards

### 4.1 Present arrangements - how local management boards work.

The purpose of the local management boards (LMBs) is to oversee and monitor the delivery of the Local Plans on behalf of the Local Strategic Partnership. There is one in each of the priority wards. Membership varies depending on local circumstances, but includes:

- Forum members
- Local councillors
- Key service managers
- Representatives of other key stakeholders (e.g. Surestart, 1066 Housing Association, Sea Space and Hastings Voluntary Action). These vary according to the area.

The local management boards were set up in the spring of 2003 and now meet quarterly.

### 4.2 Positive features (perceived)

- a) Considered very worthwhile by all participants. Gathering momentum.
- b) Following teething problems they are now working better. Initial tension between some community representatives and councillors has calmed down. Castle and Ore LMBs working very comfortably, G&CStL less so.
- c) HBC now supports LMBs at both senior management (implemented in April 2004) and member levels.
- d) Economic development now contributing.
- e) Sea Space now beginning to engage and contributing well.
- f) Good support from 1066 Housing Association.
- g) Police very enthusiastic.
- h) Traffic lights system is good.
- i) Meetings have become quite business-like and focused, lasting 1.5 hours.
- j) Service providers beginning to understand they are full members. Improved relationship with police in particular.
- k) Service providers starting to accept they have remit for the area beyond their own service.
- l) Generated skills and better understanding of services. A core of people now engaged.
- m) Sea Space needs a stronger presence on the LMB in key development areas.



---

#### 4.3 Shortcomings (perceived)

- a) Environmental health not making enforcement a priority.
- b) Recognition of the need to engage not there from Social Services.
- c) Education enthusiastic but do not participate.
- d) County Council representative not at right level.
- e) Inadequate attendance from some members (e.g. social services). Some agencies absent all the time. (Attendance improved after letter from the Leader.)
- f) Lack of exit strategy in many areas.
- g) Too much paperwork. Tendency to keep creating new documents rather than updating existing ones.
- h) Not clear to some service providers who should be servicing the meetings.
- i) Lack of feedback from project reports submitted is dispiriting .
- j) 'Most stressful 2 hours of my life' (Gensing LMB). Ore works better because people are used to working together.
- k) Lack of uniform templates for service providers to report progress (until recently).
- l) Under pressure, with agencies finding it difficult to meet the needs, so some absences.
- m) Still some concern about the boundaries between LMBs and the Forums.
- n) Lack of understanding about membership and attendance.
- o) HBC 'champions' not yet all fully functioning.
- p) No delivery accountability to G&CSL LMB by Housing Renewal team.
- q) Tension with LMBs not looking outwards, too focussed on own area. LMBs obviously focus on their own specific area, whereas Sea Space remit takes account of Hastings-wide and part of Rother issues, therefore their approach is inevitably more strategic, and economic activity has to reflect the wider sub-regional picture. Improving local areas may come about through opportunities happening elsewhere. Also changes in the local areas may serve a wider purpose (e.g. new station).
- r) LMBs wanting officers (particularly ESCC) to attend all meetings over minor matters, when a single enquiry or imaginative use of the internet would achieve the result better.
- s) Sea Space has few core staff, mainly employs project managers, so difficult to resource consultation, but some attendance now at LMBs (Alan Blackwell and James Saunders).

#### 4.4 Suggestions for improvement (perceived)

- a) Greater willingness of partners to engage.
- b) Case needs to be made for why there is a need to focus on priority wards.
- c) Need to emphasise exception monitoring role (ie not pouring over the detail of what is working well or already improving, but concentrating effort and time on what needs sorting out).

- 
- d) Standardise format of action plans and monitoring reports (preferably in a single updatable document) and train all those who need to use it in how to do so.
  - e) Develop simple and effective common formats for service providers to report on progress in meeting targets to LMBs and Forums. This needs to be led by service providers.
  - f) HBC champions' LMB role to be part of their performance management targets.
  - g) More of a team-working approach (ie combining learning and knowledge to help each other, and speaking with one voice if the matter is appropriate).
  - h) Look at how new post of Neighbourhood Manager at G&CStL reports to LMB, and how it reflects wider Neighbourhood Management role in Greater Hollington (i.e. sort out the relationship/accountability with the LMB – who gives the local direction?)
  - i) Sea Space needs to establish credibility about its engagement with the community and with local initiatives.
  - j) Need balance between delivery and consultation.

## 5. Local community structures (Forums)

### 5.1 Present arrangements - how community forums work

In each priority ward a neighbourhood forum has been established. Gensing and Central St Leonards have combined. The forums include members from cross section of local interest and have a constitution devised by Hastings Voluntary Action.

All forums have set up Special Interest Groups (SIGs) which deal with the at least some of the 7 themes of the Community Strategy (Community Safety, Economy, Education, Equal opportunity, Health, Housing and Environment) and other themes as desired. This means people can focus on what they like to do.

Hollington has been designated a neighbourhood pathfinder by the government and works differently. There is a partnership Board (similar to a Local Management Board) with a separate meeting of community reps (like a forum) which decides on funding. It is one of 20 similar government pathfinders so gets extra money. GOSE has to approve their programme rather than the LSP.

---

## 5.2 Positive features (perceived)

- a) Huge amount of commitment and pride in what is being achieved.
- b) True view of community is hard to find but the forums do it pretty well.
- c) Generally work well, but biggest problem is wider community participation.
- d) Forums not fully representative but do give flavour of local views; they cannot directly represent the broad community, after all these are activists. Nonetheless they are a useful way of tapping into local views.
- e) The three forums are very different. Ore mainly working class, Castle mainly middle class. G&CSL a mixture. Castle works well, good inter-generational relationships. G&CSL may become too bureaucratic. Ore Valley really feels like a community (consequence of isolation).
- f) Pose challenges to service providers which are surmountable if there is a willingness to change working practices.
- g) Generally good relationships with local councillors.
- h) Castle forum's decision over Forum money was good group process.
- i) Large part of Forum funding used for support (a reflection possibly of the general need for resources to enable community engagement).
- j) G&CSL forum gets public agencies to communicate by e-mail to all its key officers, not just the Chair.
- k) Forums have been able to make use of the BME Newsletter.
- l) Forums use NRF allocations appropriately.
- m) Forums are trying to be more strategic about their use of NRF money.
- n) Good websites (e.g. Castle).
- o) 'Warrior' newsletter good.
- p) SIGs being used in G&CSL to encourage public participation.
- q) Community engagement methods used in Hollington, e.g. dog shows, giving away televisions.
- r) Hollington: less burn out, main players still engaged.
- s) Hollington: Neighbourhood manager able to shake up service providers on behalf of residents (e.g. bus services) because of the nature of the role and existence of funding.
- t) Sea Space now beginning to take a more pro-active role in community engagement.

## 5.3 Shortcomings (perceived)

- a) Hollington not used enough as an exemplar locally due to way individuals work and difficulty of rolling out programmes elsewhere because not enough extra money to do it.
- b) Hollington reluctant to engage. Do not respond to emails.
- c) Although SIGs developed as community engagement tool, and some deal with real issues, they are difficult to support. (The model varies but generally they are open meetings focusing on specific types of issues, so broader community engagement is more easily achieved. However it all

- 
- adds up to more meetings for everyone, including staff, which have to be resourced.)
- d) Agencies spend an excessive amount of time reporting to Forums and Forum SIGs (often with poor attendance).
  - e) High turnover of local representatives (due to frustration and burn out).
  - f) Too many demands on too few people (particularly with SIGs) creates stress.
  - g) Forums created by government agenda, not 'natural' community organisations.
  - h) Absence of young people on forums and therefore the voice of youth.
  - i) G&CSL had some personnel problems over some allocation decisions, perhaps because of insufficient guidance (some members felt they were having decisions imposed on them by the Council).
  - j) Forums not learning sufficiently from each other because little structured opportunity.
  - k) Tendency for public agencies to put everything through Forum Chairs, so overloading the individuals. Also not selective enough about inviting them to meetings.
  - l) Confusion about how best Forum representatives should work with councillors.
  - m) Tremendous pressure on the key Forum officers who are being exhausted. Difficulty of finding new active volunteers.
  - n) Serious internal problems may help Forums grow, but are exhausting.
  - o) Little direct support from NRF-funded BME worker.
  - p) Sea Space has not been responsive generally, but some signs of improvement with Alan Blackwell's work.
  - q) Unsustainability of local newsletters.
  - r) Very difficult to get more volunteers actively involved.
  - s) Lack of community venue in Castle ward.
  - t) All Forums have difficulty in expanding base of activists, and activists are probably too busy. SIGs probably putting too much strain on people and putting off potential activists. Meetings not always achieving.

#### 5.4 **Suggestions for improvement** (perceived)

- a) More induction training for new members.
- b) Develop forums into community engagement structures post-NRF (ie When there is no NRF money, what are the structures going to be and how will they be supported?).
- c) Explore whether main services and partnerships (including Sea Space) can help support the Forums post-NRF?
- d) Hold a conference on the options for neighbourhood management in the town. Then map out a future strategy. Should discuss various options, for instance: big ideas of community ownership (like the Eldonians in Liverpool): rolling out the Hollington model; tinkering with the Forums.

- e) Roll out the Hollington model: local champion with budget and strength.
- f) Need to encourage Forums to develop their own agendas and direction, if possible becoming less dependent on NR funding.
- g) Forums need to offer different sorts of opportunity for individuals – not just attending meetings.
- h) Forum members to set agendas and pursue interesting issues, officers to follow up (e.g. Forum members should not have to attend lots of meetings to discuss rubbish removal once the issue has been flagged up).
- i) Encourage younger people to take part.
- j) HVA to use its NRF funded posts to target support for Forum volunteers and help them recruit more.
- k) Need to clarify what HVA's role is.
- l) Use Greater Hollington's handbook as a basis for own.
- m) Remove unnecessary burdens on Forum key officers (management of staff, organising printing etc.)
- n) Look at how agencies can support future community engagement funding through their core work and major capital projects.
- o) Sea Space to review longer-term framework for engaging community.
- p) Possible help to focus on relationships rather than services (ie if the relationships between the community and organisations are working well, then they can influence services. If not, then very difficult to get change.)
- q) Castle ward needs involvement of local business community.
- r) Need to be careful not to over-stimulate local communities (i.e. place demands and encourage expectations which cannot be met or supported).

## 6 Voluntary sector engagement

### 6.1 Present arrangements – support for voluntary sector engagement

Support for voluntary sector is primarily through funding posts at Hastings Voluntary Action (HVA) and Hastings Trust (HT) as follows:

Org	Post	Post holder	Details
HVA	BME worker	Lorraine Palmer	Full time
HVA	Community Network Development Officer	Fran McKeown	Full time Sept 03 to March 05
HVA	Health and Social Care worker	Melanie Rycroft	Full time
HT	Ore Valley Coordinator	Joy Collins	03/04 salary paid in part. 04/05 paid in full.

HVA and HT also administer funding schemes as follows:

Org	Fund	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	Total	Details
HT	Community Chest	120k	120k	120k	?	?	5k grants max
HVA	Community Empowerment Fund	111k	111k	111k	?	?	5k grants max. (40k) and HCN support
HT	Community Learning Chest	120k	27k	27k	?	?	5k grants max

Allocation of grants is now made by the local Community Empowerment Network - Hastings Community Network (HCN).

Key aspects of the funds are as follows:

#### **Community Chest**

Supports community activity, Borough wide, targeted at priority groups not priority wards. This strategy agreed by GOSE. In practice most goes to the priority wards.

#### **Community Empowerment Fund**

To strengthen participation in Hastings Community Network and the LSP. Borough wide.

#### **Community Learning Chest**

To pay for training to participate in neighbourhood forums and professional development. Priority wards only.

## 6.2 **Positive features** (perceived)

- a) Creation or revitalisation and support of active new networks and forums e.g. Arts Forum, Hastings Environment Network, Churches together, Disability Forum.
- b) Community Network beginning to have an impact.
- c) Organisations beginning to talk to each other.
- d) Community Network represents quite a broad range, and now more organised. Represents various voices – it cannot just be a single collective voice.
- e) Community Network succeeded in increasing representation on the LSP and achieving smooth transition to take on Chair of the LSP.
- f) The protocol between Community Network and the LSP identified as a model of good practice nationally.

---

### 6.3 Shortcomings (perceived)

- a) Shortage of community development capacity.
- b) Five years too short – longer timescale needed to build capacity and assess results.
- c) Difficulty of focussing on priority wards because many members' needs relate to Hastings wide issues. The Community Network aims to deal with both geographical communities and communities of interest. This is not necessarily a problem in itself but makes monitoring difficult.
- d) Community Network took a dreadfully long time to build.
- e) Tension between various parties over who should be on the Community Network.
- f) Greater Hollington has little to do with Hastings Voluntary Action, and other voluntary organisation involvement in the area is minimal.
- g) Priority wards unable to easily access funds like Community Learning Chest.
- h) Hastings Community Network meetings are too long, and during the day which makes it difficult for volunteers to attend.
- i) Tension between Hastings Trust and BME. Capacity issue, e.g. HVA programme management. Does HBC need to be more supportive?
- j) The funding to engage BME is under HVA but it is not happening in the priority wards.
- k) Tensions between NR team and HVA, it seems they don't share the same agendas. (The main issue seems to be the extent to which NR funded activity is targeted at priority wards).
- l) NR team aim to deliver on NR objectives while HVA has another agenda.
- m) Public sector workers including NR team members are barred from Community Network meetings. (Others argue that the terms of reference for the Community Networks *across the country* is that they are for the voluntary and community sector).

### 6.4 Suggestions for improvement (perceived)

- a) Closer liaison between voluntary sector posts and NR Team whilst recognising the very different roles involved.
- b) Closer working between NR team and HVA, agree common aims and a joint strategy for supporting and increasing active volunteers on the Forums.
- c) NR team needs to be strengthened with 'volunteer support worker'.
- d) Need to link c above to other issues around volunteering such as the Volunteer Bureau and the work of the volunteers together network.
- e) HVA to work with forums to develop a clear framework for the BME worker to support and advise the priority wards.
- f) Review the way Hastings Community Network meetings are run to be more efficient and accessible to volunteers.

---

## 7. Engaging hard to reach groups

### 7.1 Present arrangements

- a) Engaging hard to reach groups relies largely on the voluntary sector (see section 6 above) in particular Hastings Voluntary Action and its various Forums e.g. the Disability Forum, the BME Forum. Engagement of young people has been primarily through the Youth Council and the various young people's initiatives, funded and supported from a number of sources.
- b) HBC's Community Partnership Team works specifically with the BME community on a borough wide basis and provides developmental expertise, grant aid and support to help BME organisations strengthen their structures, governance and service delivery capacity. HBC has now engaged a BME worker.
- c) The Disability Forum is active and has supported its members to participate in the priority wards via its Neighbourhood Forums. For example, Castle Forum has used disabled members to address access issues; Gensing and Central St Leonards Forum has 3-4 people with disabilities participating in the Community Safety Special Interest Group and the Chair of the Disability Forum is a member of Gensing Forum. The Disability Forum is a member of the Community Network and its Chair is a representative on the LSP Board.

### 7.2 Positive features

- a) Greater Hollington does well, using variety of techniques (fun days, dog shows, BME directory with 80 names), but no asylum seekers in the area. Good youth engagement with Youth Panel.
- b) Castle has been able to make use of the BME Newsletter.
- c) LSP Equalities Sub-Group which Leslie Brissett chairs, is developing Equalities Plan.
- d) Large number of methods being used by Forums, but need more HVA support targeted at priority wards via the BME Project.



- 
- e) The BME Forum is now active, has gained credibility with a number of statutory agencies and generally, the BME community.
  - f) The Disability Forum has managed to encourage some of its members to participate in the Neighbour Forums, a number of SIGs and generally address physical access issues locally.
  - g) The Disability Forum has good connections with the Access Officer from Rother.
  - h) Silchester Mews has offered good support and facilities for a number of 'hard to reach groups' e.g. KAMMs and disability groups, to meet and carry out their activities.
  - i) The NRF funded BME project has achieved a significant amount since it was 'revived' (see project sheet in Appendix B2), with its new worker focusing on building up the BME Forum, increasing outreach and communication work (in particular launching its website and regular newsletters) and supporting individuals and organisations to participate in the work of the BME Forum. The BME Forum has looked at issues which significantly affect the BME community such as the Reporting Racial Incident Scheme (RRI) and how it could be improved and how the BME Forum can contribute to the LSP's Equalities sub-group.
  - j) G&CStL Neighbourhood has supported the development of a local Muslim's women's group (KAMMs - Kids and Muslim Mums) by offering its main community centre, Silchester Mews, a space for the organisation to carry out its activities up to four times a week, including Saturdays. This is very much welcomed by KAMMs. Key members of KAMMs attributed its growth and stability to this opportunity as previously they had no venue to use before Silchester Mews was refurbished and open as a much needed, local community centre. KAMMs is also a member of the BME Forum.
  - k) It would appear that disability work with disabled people is well developed. This has been largely due to a number of active, relatively high profile individuals in the Disability Forum who have engaged in the priority wards structures.
  - l) G&CStL Forum received funding from NRF to audit its physical environment in relation to disability and some improvements have been made as a result.

---

### 7.3 Shortcomings

- a) The resources required for engaging hard to reach groups are inadequate. For example, the Council's Community Partnership Team only has half a worker dedicated to supporting the BME community. The BME Forum has only one worker in HVA. Therefore, these individuals are phoned about everything.
- b) Certain disabled groups remain disengaged from the NR processes and structures e.g. mental health and learning disabilities groups and individuals.
- c) Little direct support to forums from the NRF-funded BME worker.
- d) No engagement of refugee and asylum seekers in G&CSL.
- e) The wider social and economic needs of the refugee and asylum seeker community (largely based in Warrior Square) are still not met.
- f) Direct, active participation by BME organisations and individuals in the individual Neighbourhood Forums and Local Management Boards and the local action planning process is still weak.

### 7.4 Suggestions for improvement

- a) Agencies need to look realistically at their own practices to tackle exclusion.
- b) Specific objectives and targets which meet the needs of hard to reach groups e.g. BME, disabled people, refugee and asylum seekers and young people need to be set in the local action plans in the priority wards.
- c) HBC, HVA and other statutory agencies such as ESCC, the Police, the PCT etc need to explore and define the synergy of work and activity with hard to reach groups.
- d) The partners in the LSP need to coordinate their community development work and to seek added value with each other and avoid duplication.
- e) The Community Network needs to clarify its relationship with the Neighbourhood Forums and define how it can support the Neighbourhood Forums to engage hard to reach groups in the NR processes and structures at all levels.

- 
- f) In order to assess future impact of NR on hard to reach groups, better baseline information needs to be gathered and a more robust system of collection of quantitative and qualitative evidence need to put in place with providers as part of the LSP's performance management framework.
  - g) A NR impact assessment workshop needs to be carried out by the BME Project with the BME community.
  - h) Objectives and targets, pertinent to the needs of this community, need to be set in the next set of Local Action Plans and be monitored by the LMBs.
  - i) Further consultation with disabled people needs to be made by the Council's Access Officer.
  - j) More disabled people need to be involved in the review and evaluation of services at the local level and good practices in one locality needs to be disseminated across all the priority wards. Certain disability groups need to be more involved e.g. people with mental health problems and people with learning disabilities.
  - k) The capacity building work carried out in 2002 with local people as community consultants (24 community consultants, from hard to reach groups, were trained) during the consultation process of the Community Strategy needs to be followed up and followed through by the Officer Support Group. This local resource can be used in a number of ways to deepen engagement and involvement in NR processes and structures.
  - l) The training of neighbourhood forum members and street wardens in 2002/3 on community cohesion and good practice in working with HTR groups needs to be built upon and mainstreamed into local NR structures and future local action plans by the public service organisations.
  - m) The new HBC BME worker needs to explore synergy with the HVA BME Project worker and be clear on how more focused work can be achieved in the priority wards and how these activities are integrated into the NR processes and the local performance management framework of LMBs.
  - n) More work needs to be carried out with other disabled organisations e.g. mental health and learning disabilities and their issues addressed at the Neighbourhood Forum level and in the Local Action Plans.
  - o) The LSP via its Officer Support Group needs to look at ways on how to use the community consultants to reach out to the hard to reach communities and to further support the development of these community consultants in promoting NR in the priority wards.

---

## 8. Neighbourhood Renewal team

### 8.1 Present arrangements

The Neighbourhood Renewal team comprises the following NR funded posts:

- a) Neighbourhood Partnership Manager
- b) Three Neighbourhood Coordinators
- c) Three Forum Support Workers (part-time)
- d) Policing Priority Area Coordinator
- e) Neighbourhood Renewal Team Clerk
- f) Graduate trainee

### 8.2 Positive features (perceived)

- a) NRF budget setting meetings in Oct/Nov took a partnership approach.
- b) Forums acknowledge support by team members.
- c) Supporting and coordinating input to LMBs
- d) A more consistent approach being taken to LAPS
- e) NRF budget spent, and largely targeted on priority wards

### 8.3 Shortcomings (perceived)

- a) Lack of clarity over roles of NRF team.
- b) Lack of collaborative working with voluntary sector posts.
- c) Lack of knowledge by NR team about what is happening in Hollington.
- d) Little involvement with Greater Hollington.
- e) Castle admin worker too isolated in a lonely office.
- f) No sense of a cross-Hastings approach.
- g) Poor internet access at G&CSL.
- h) Some confusion over Officers' Support Group and NR Team roles.
- i) Hard to engage HVA and Hastings Trust, with aspects of tension/competition.

### 8.4 Suggestions for improvement (perceived)

- a) Clarify roles of NRF team members.
- b) Need community development work on the ground.
- c) NR team in wrong HBC department. Should move from Community Services to Environment and Community Safety which is patch based.
- d) Learning events by Greater Hollington for other priority wards.

---

## 9. Service planning (Local Action Plans)

### 9.1 Present arrangements

The first set of Local Action Plans was produced with independent brokering between the Neighbourhood Forums and public agencies. As the arrangements have matured, a different approach has evolved, which appears to vary between areas, with varying degrees of success.

### 9.2 Positive features (perceived)

- a) Effective in galvanising and promoting community activism.
- b) Effective in bringing forward community priorities.
- c) Process good because it makes different agencies engage. LSP has not heard of any problems in this round.
- d) Consultative only.
- e) Progress made on quarterly reporting.
- f) Some wards (e.g. C&CSL) reaching a critical mass of activity.
- g) LAPs agreed between community and statutory agencies, have to be deliverable. Help drive NRF strategy. NR team presents report, LSP doesn't discuss a lot. Not aware issues.
- h) Targets becoming SMARTER.

### 9.3 Shortcomings (perceived)

- a) Still difficulties on housing front.
- b) Agencies not sufficiently involved in developing LAPs.
- c) LAPs lack integration into wider priorities of agencies.
- d) Work not sufficiently centralised. e.g. LAPs not in same format electronically which wastes a great deal of time.
- e) Local forum members do not always understand issues (particularly complex long term health issues).
- f) Long-winded, hard work and lack of clear structured approach.
- g) Exhaustive and exhausting process, could be simpler. Services find it onerous. Restatement of responsibilities may be required.
- h) Reluctance to do them again each year, just revise them.
- i) Service providers not clear when they are making a real commitment.
- j) SMART targets for this year not yet agreed.
- k) Lack of information about local spending by service providers makes it difficult to bend mainstream funding.
- l) Disparity of understanding across priority wards causing difficulties in sharing learning. This is an evolving process, but still not got

---

planning/delivery cycles right yet. Need to do this as part of an integrated approach to service planning and consultation.

- m) Gensing ward very much a poor relation in the Gensing and Central St Leonards forum, despite high deprivation. Does it need some separate arrangements?

#### 9.4 **Suggestions for improvement** (perceived)

- a) Agencies to be more involved in working with Forums in production of LAPs.
- b) Meeting in Autumn 04 where LMBs and Forum work together.
- c) LAPs should be reviewed and revised each year, not started again from scratch.
- d) Review process, to increase efficiency, e.g. integrated with timetable for service planning and consultation processes, to simplify and clarify roles.
- e) Allow more local flexibility, e.g. to develop the LMB in G&CSL as a neighbourhood management body.
- f) Consider whether LMBs could take on a wider area remit.

## 10. Local Learning Plans

### 10.1 **Present arrangements** (perceived)

A learning plan, drawn up in January 2003 (see HBC website and Appendix A 13) provided a menu of possible capacity building and training activity. Some of this has been undertaken. The NR Team has evolved the menu subsequently in the light of feedback from those involved and from consultants on what the most urgent needs are.

### 10.2 **Positive features** (perceived)

- a) Good at residents' and junior officers' level. Has given a broader understanding of NR.
- b) Local champions – if it works (ie HBC have agreed service champions but in process of being implemented so cannot yet judge results).
- c) Useful document. Practical tool.
- d) New initiatives involving making laptop computers available to forum members and using virtual class room technology for training.
- e) Community reps and councillors have benefited.
- f) An integrated approach with the Community Learning Chest and other wider initiatives.

---

### 10.3 Shortcomings (perceived)

- a) Tried but difficult to achieve – senior officers are not supporting.
- b) Not used strategically.
- c) Has not addressed the needs of service providers and LSP members.
- d) Forums don't get access to the Community Learning Chest.
- e) Little joint learning between community and other groups like service providers.
- f) Not enough joint learning events with other areas.
- g) LAPs do not contain a learning element.

### 10.4 Suggestions for improvement (perceived)

- a) Local learning plan needs to bed itself into the LSP core business - different elements in the local learning agenda need to be brought together for LSP overview. (Improvement outcomes have not been linked to learning needs as yet. The Annual Review with GOSE should throw up the questions, "so what do we need to do to improve" and "what learning needs does this highlight" - which should lead into the Learning Plan review process.

## 11. Task Force/Sea Space

### 11.1 Present arrangements

The Task Force and SEEDA do not have any direct responsibility for Neighbourhood Renewal. The remit of SEEDA and Sea Space is led by an economic and employment agenda, but the Regional Economic Strategy has several references to social inclusion within it. The 5 Point Plan has a strategy 'Excellence in Education' with a key component providing educational opportunities for local people with a view to up-skilling them to take advantage of potential employment opportunities. Part of the Task Force Steering Group's philosophy is to bring a level of design quality to regeneration and in this, encourage the regeneration process itself. The main purpose is to provide a critical mass of educational, business and commercial space to effectively regenerate the town centres following the principles set out in the MBM Masterplan that received widespread support during the public consultation process in 2002.

---

11.2 **Positive features** (perceived)

- a) Ore Valley Forum has 3 seats on Millennium Community Steering Group. Good working relationship.
- b) The Brownfield Land Acquisition Trust .
- c) The work of the Task Force supporting Council's Housing Renewal Area.
- d) Sea Space operates a local procurement policy and will continue to create the climate for increasing local job opportunities.
- e) Alan Blackwell appointment providing linkage with HBC experience.

11.3 **Shortcomings** (perceived)

- a) SEEDA never deals with any social problems behind regeneration. The AIF agenda is very narrow compared to the Neighbourhood Renewal agenda. No contact between SEEDA and wider regeneration.
- b) Spending fortune on very expensive buildings.
- c) Sea Space agenda very different from Home Office agenda.
- d) SEEDA outputs are too narrowly focussed on economic development whilst the LNRS and Community Strategy are more holistic in terms of social and economic inclusion. This faultline will impact on funding of the process around the end of SRB and the beginning of the "Single Pot".

11.4 **Suggestions for improvement** (perceived)

- a) Worth exploring whether English Partnerships can put any resources into forums (they could).



## 12 Neighbourhood Renewal Funding breakdown

	Year 1 2001/02	Year 2 2002/03	Year 3 2003/04	Total	Year 4 budget	
<b>Neighbourhood Infrastructure</b>						
Neighbourhood Renewal Support		220	226	546	136	
Neighbourhood Forum Budget	100	125	250	375	150	Forums
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>345</i>	<i>476</i>	<i>921</i>	<i>286</i>	
<b>Crime Reduction</b>						
Street Lighting	50	0	0	50		E.S.C.C.
Physical Schemes	20	0	0	20		H.B.C.
Street Drinking	16	17	18	51		CAT.
Mobile CCTV	100	0	0	100		Police
Diversionary Activity	95	0	0	95		C.D.RP.
New Diversionary Programme	0	120	150	270	130	C.D.RP.
Distraction Burglary	5	15	0	20		1066 Ent
Street Wardens	0	95	101	196	161	HBC
Anti Burglary/Target Hardening	0	87	86	173	86	HBC
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>286</i>	<i>334</i>	<i>355</i>	<i>975</i>	<i>377</i>	
<b>Business Broker Project</b>	<i>0</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>15</i>	
<b>Health Projects</b>						
Healthy Living Centre (Capital)	0	20	80	100	86	P.CT
Healthy Living Centre (Revenue)	0	22	23	45	9	P.C.T.
Alcohol Strategic Worker	0	20	35	55	35	P .CT
Healthy Eating/5 a day project	0	40	60	100	60	P.CT.
Other health projects					53	
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>198</i>	<i>300</i>	<i>243</i>	
<b>Education</b>						
Commit/Online	70	0	0	70		ESCC
Multi Agency Support Team	46	98	50	194	46	ESCC/EAZ
Laptops to Primary Schools	26	0	0	26		ESCC
Family Learning/Parent Involvement	0	132	196	328	182	EAZ
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>230</i>	<i>246</i>	<i>618</i>	<i>228</i>	
<b>Other</b>						
Robsack Community Centre	25	30	20	75		ESCC
Ethnic Minority Support	23	40	40	103	40	HVA
Research/Development	25	20	25	70	25	LSP
Unallocated	0	2	0	2		
Other - various					160	
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>92</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>225</i>	
Minimum "rollover"	(87)	87	0			
<b>Original Budget</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>1031</b>	<b>1375</b>		<b>1,374</b>	
<b>ADJUSTED SPEND BY YEAR</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>1118</b>	<b>1375</b>			

---

## 13 A note on floor targets, service agreements and stretch targets

- 12.1 'Floor Target' is a term that was used in the Spending Review (SR) 2000 to describe targets that set a minimum standard for disadvantaged groups or areas, or a narrowing of the gap between them and the rest of the country. These targets were revised and new targets introduced in SR2002.
- 12.2 The Floor Targets reflect national priorities, and provide direction as to the pace of improvement needed to reduce disadvantage in deprived neighbourhoods. LSPs need to be able to relate national floor targets to targets that service providers have adopted locally as their contribution to national targets.
- 12.3 Agreements between individual local authorities and the Government, setting out the authority's commitment to deliver specific improvements in performance above those that would normally be achieved within a specific timescale and the Government's commitment to reward the local authority for achieving these stretching targets. The agreement also records what the Government will do in terms of additional finance and operational flexibilities to help the authority achieve the improved performance.
- 12.4 Local targets and milestones should aim to 'stretch' but also be realistic and achievable, with final rewards dependant on and related to the level of improvements achieved by the end of the agreement.

## 14 A note on the local learning plan

supplied by HVA

- 14.1 The Local Learning Plan for Neighbourhood Renewal was developed through a Neighbourhood learning partnership consisting of HCAT, HVA, EAZ and HBC. This partnership also oversaw use of NRF via the Learning and Skills Council to support Neighbourhood Learning in Priority wards. This funding was to:
- Encourage innovative, accessible first step learning opportunities in local communities
  - Encourage the acquisition of neighbourhood renewal skills, knowledge and behaviour by residents and voluntary/community groups
  - Deliver, as needed, literacy and basic IT skills
  - Provide staff and management training for voluntary and community organisations

- 
- Provide awareness raising training for practitioners and professionals engaged in service delivery in the priority areas
  - Refurbish and enhance existing premises to provide an attractive environment for adult learning.
- 14.2 This programme has been running for the past two years and is about to start its third. Activities supported include:
- Funding Neighbourhood Forums training activities e.g. Ore Valley mapping programme and Special interest forums e.g. BME forum visioning day.
  - Local conferences and seminars to share good practice and raise awareness of policy issues e.g. Community strategy consultation events.
  - Exchange study visit to Brighton EB4U for Neighbourhood Forum and Community Network reps.
  - HBC interagency workshops e.g. partnership working, engaging marginalised groups.
  - Outreach support for basic skills and introductory learning via Horizons.
  - EAZ learning support and master classes for young people at risk of exclusion in Hollington and Ore Valley.
  - HBC's 'virtual classroom' programme for forum members.
  - Joint Neighbourhood Forums events.
  - A mapping exercise to identify entry points and pathways that lead to non accredited training, recognised qualifications and opportunities for further progression in the field of neighbourhood renewal and community regeneration.
- 14.3 Out of this work several other initiatives have been developed including:
- Further development of 'committee conundrum' training programme to increase management skills and build capacity of voluntary and community groups. ESF3.
  - Pilot Voluntary sector Management NVQ for community activists under Community Empowerment programme
  - WICO Advanced Diploma in Community Work for frontline workers and community activists. ESF3. To be piloted locally starting September.
- 14.4 Other recommendations have been identified through the mapping exercise and these are forming the basis of some of the activities to be supported in the next funding round alongside activities supported through other funding pots. (See *Hastings Voluntary Action – Supporting a Local Learning Plan of Neighbourhood Renewal and Community Regeneration.*)

---

## 15 A note on the NRF Health Programme

### supplied by the Primary Care Trust

- 15.1 The consequences of socio economic deprivation in our priority wards are high levels of individual risk factors for poor health such as smoking, physical inactivity, poor nutrition, drug and alcohol misuse and low rates of breastfeeding. This creates huge pressures on the NHS to meet the needs of those who are ill from cancer, circulatory disease, respiratory disease and mental illness. These are all diseases that may be preventable. The strategic emphasis needs to be on preventing people from becoming ill in the first place. The Pulse Healthy Living centre programme, part funded by NRF, tackles all these issues in an accessible way for the 16 to 25 year old age group in the priority wards. Our Five A day programmes funded by NRF across the five priority ward areas are evidenced based programmes that seek to encourage access to and the increased the consumption of fruit and vegetables. Increasing the levels of fruit and vegetable consumption will reduce the risk factors for CHD and cancers. Our NRF alcohol work is focussed on developing programmes in partnership which reduce the rates of alcohol related violence and support families to better address alcohol issues, enabling them to seek treatment and advice when they need to.
- 15.2 The greatest inequalities in health are in the most deprived areas in Hastings and St Leonards. 28% of the population of Hastings and St Leonards live in wards that are amongst the 10% most deprived wards in the country according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation and have the greatest proportion of children living in poverty. They are Broomgrove (now replaced by Baird and Tressell wards), Castle, Central St Leonards, Gensing and Hollington. It is in these wards where the greatest challenge lies to improve health and prevent disease.
- 15.3 The health programmes work in partnership with public and voluntary sectors and the people of Hastings and St Leonards. We are seeking to create a culture that minimises individual risk factors and supports:
- Active Living**
  - Mental Wellbeing**
  - Eating Well**
  - Stopping Smoking**
- People with existing ill health will also benefit as much as those who are well from being more active, living in a better environment, eating more nutritious food and stopping smoking.
- 15.4 Improving the health of the population in these wards will allow people to achieve their true potential without suffering from premature and preventable illness. It will stimulate the economy and limit the demands on health, social services and the voluntary sector. It

---

will be difficult to track direct outcomes from the NRF funded programmes but working within an evidenced based environment we can demonstrate that programmes of this nature improve the likelihood of us achieving the key Community Strategy targets set out below:

15.5 Hastings and St Leonards Community Strategy Health Targets:

- Reduce death rates from CHD /Stroke in People under 75 by at least 40% by 2014 (1996 Baseline).  
Progress: - 2003/4 down by 25%, 2007/8 down 30%, 2012 /13 down 40%
- Reduce death rates from Cancer in People under 75 by at least 20% by 2014 (1996 Baseline).  
Progress: 2004/5 12% down, 2007/8 15% down, 2012/13 20% down
- Reduce the under 18 conception rate by 50% by 2013.  
Progress by 2004/5 reduce by 15%, by 2007/8 -25%, 2012/13 - 50%.
- Reduce Drug Related Deaths by 10% by 2005 and by 20% by 2013.  
Progress by 2004/5 reduce by 10%, by 2007/8 -15%, 2012/13 - 20%.
- Ensure parenting support services are available to everybody. Progress by 2004/5 parenting support available to all in top 5 priority wards, by 2007/8 six wards in top 20% nationally, and all wards by 2012/13.

## 16 Crime statistics

Areas: (Neighbourhood Renewal Wards highlighted)	Population (/1000)	Vehicle Crime			Domestic Burglary			Violence in a Public Place		
		01/02	02/03	03/04	01/02	02/03	03/04	01/02	02/03	03/04
ASHDOWN	5.158	20	13	21	4	4	5	6	4	4
BAIRD	5.243	23	25	19	8	13	12	9	12	13
BRAYBROOKE	5.178	28	28	28	15	17	15	10	14	14
CASTLE	6.091	49	57	53	23	35	27	85	87	77
CENTRAL St LEONARDS	5.775	46	54	44	36	23	24	43	44	45
CONQUEST	4.985	9	9	9	4	3	4	11	6	3
GENSING	5.808	41	44	33	20	14	14	31	22	24
HOLLINGTON	6.347	22	18	23	6	6	7	18	15	15
MAZE HILL	5.069	33	27	24	17	16	5	5	7	6
OLD HASTINGS	5.812	35	30	28	11	10	11	21	28	23
ORE	5.117	24	23	20	11	10	8	13	16	15
SILVERHILL	4.666	30	24	16	6	9	5	8	8	8
St HELENS	4.943	21	16	14	8	6	8	6	5	4
TRESSELL	4.975	25	16	17	11	15	17	9	15	18
WEST St LEONARDS	4.907	24	22	19	6	6	4	14	11	9
WISHING TREE	4.955	22	15	15	6	4	4	9	7	9
<b>HASTINGS (ALL)</b>	<b>85.029</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Renewal Areas (6 wards)</b>	<b>34.239</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Reduction (Hastings)</b>		<b>15%</b>			<b>12%</b>			<b>3%</b>		
<b>Reduction (Renewal Area)</b>		<b>8%</b>			<b>4%</b>			<b>2%</b>		

Note: This table uses data provided to the CADDIE project by Sussex Police. Although this is a true reflection of the Sussex Police Crime Database at the time of each (monthly) download, it is not subject to the updating of the live system. For instance: when an offence may be subject to reclassification.

- All figures (unless stated) are “rates per 1000 residents”.
- The periods for which data has been collected are performance years.
- These figures may differ slightly from the official, Home Office figures. They can only be used as an indication of performance.
- The “Reduction” lines at the bottom of the table are the most important. Crime has reduced in three main crime categories in the priority wards between 2001/02 and 2003/04, but the reduction in the priority wards was less than in Hastings generally. Hence the disparity with the priority wards has increased.

Population figures: Census 2001

Data supplied by Mike Forster, CADDIE Project, Hastings Borough Council, 26 July 2004, MForster@hastings.gov.uk

### **Neighbourhood Renewal Team**

Hastings Borough Council  
4 Robertson Terrace  
Hastings TN34 1JE  
01424 781339  
Email: [neighbourhoodrenewal@hastings.gov.uk](mailto:neighbourhoodrenewal@hastings.gov.uk)  
[www.hastings.gov.uk](http://www.hastings.gov.uk)

### **Clive Jacotine & Associates Limited**

Regeneration and Management Consultancy  
54 Arbery Road, London E3 5DD  
Tel: 020 8980 0798  
Email: [clivejacotine@btinternet.com](mailto:clivejacotine@btinternet.com)

### **Nick Wates Associates**

Community Planning Specialists  
7 Tackleway, Hastings TN34 3DE  
Tel: 01424 447888  
Email: [nick@wates.demon.co.uk](mailto:nick@wates.demon.co.uk)  
[www.wates.demon.co.uk](http://www.wates.demon.co.uk)