

Closing the Inequalities Gap in Torbay: Peer Review

October 2010

**Government Office for the South West, working
with the University of Plymouth and Devonport
Regeneration Community Partnership**

Summary of recommendations

1.1 There is a strong commitment across the agencies in Torbay at all levels to closing the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of the Bay. The Closing the Gap Project Board isn't complacent. In commissioning this Peer Review it was looking for evidence of what was working well and what wasn't, and to improve its understanding of what more could be done to address the barriers to progress.

1.2 Torbay has achieved a fair amount over the last 12 to 18 months. For example there are more young people in education, training and employment and people generally feel safer. We would encourage the Project Board to celebrate and publicise more deliberately and confidently where agencies, working in partnership, have made a difference and some of the strengths of the current approach (particularly the Hele Neighbourhood Management Project).

1.3 Like other areas, Torbay faces a number of real challenges over the next few years, including a significant reduction in public spending and responding to the Coalition Government's agenda. The Project Board is keen to respond to new opportunities. In particular increased local freedoms and accountability (which could help to streamline performance management arrangements), and the ambition for a 'Big Society' which could strengthen the relationship between public bodies and the wider population of the Bay. The Project Board will also need to consider the changing landscape, for example the role GP commissioning and local health boards could play in reducing inequalities. The short period before the Comprehensive Spending Review works through and local budgets are set provides a good opportunity for the Project Board to reflect, learn from its own success and from other areas to help refine its overall approach.

1.4 In summary, the Review Team found that to make progress in closing the gap the Project Board must focus on the three to five actions of most importance. We found the strategy was trying to achieve too much in one go. This has resulted in partners becoming less able to focus limited resource on those actions or services that will have the biggest impact, a lack of clarity among officers and frontline staff about how actions were making a difference and an increased risk of duplicating service provision.

1.5 We found a strong case for providing targeted support for those out of work living in the most deprived areas to improve employability and access to existing jobs. There is strong evidence to suggest the regeneration and renewal of deprived neighbourhoods is closely linked to increasing the proportion of the working age population who are in work and, in doing so, overcoming the various barriers to remaining in the labour market. We recommend the Project Board should invest further in supporting people within a particular place to secure employment.

1.6 A number of studies have demonstrated that low education attainment among young people translated into poor social and economic opportunities later in life, resulting in a higher risk of economic and social disadvantage. Not only is the lack of qualifications an obstacle to employment, but there is strong evidence that not being in school, college or engaged in other meaningful activities or groups can act as a physical and psychological barrier to obtaining work later on. We heard strong support, particularly among officers, for a greater emphasis on raising educational attainment through targeted interventions aimed at supporting vulnerable young people and their families.

1.7 It will be important for the Project Board to balance the priorities of individual agencies with what residents have said they want. We picked up a strong message from residents that reducing anti-social behaviour and improving the quality of the local environment (building on what has been achieved in Hele so far) remain important issues to them.

1.8 The Project Board will need to be alert to the potential risk that as residents within some of the more deprived areas move into employment and their disposable income increases they may decide to move to other parts of the Bay or elsewhere. There is the potential for the gap left behind to be replaced by other issues, problems and burdens on services. Although we did not find evidence that this was the case in Hele, or other parts of the Bay where interventions had happened it is, non-the-less a risk to the longer-term success of the strategy.

1.9 Findings from the review suggest that for the Project Board to effect change it will need to consider a number of delivery challenges:

- a) Simplify and refine the overall strategic approach to closing the gap. The strategy should be based on achieving a small number of outcomes which are supported by a limited set of indicators and targets.
- b) Go even further with resident consultation, providing regular feedback and ensuring residents are involved in designing and shaping local provision.
- c) Strengthen the role of the Project Board and local governance arrangements in Hele to ensure the strategy moves to the next stage and that key people are involved to help unblock problems.
- d) Better cross-agency communication to help avoid duplication; developing a culture of innovation and involvement to facilitate new ideas.
- e) Create a more sophisticated dialogue with residents across the whole of Torbay to bring about a better understanding of the scale and nature of the challenge.

- f) Utilise Torbay's many assets (including well established social and business networks) to help close the gap.

1.10 The Review Team found a strong conviction within Torbay that the principles of Neighbourhood Management were the right ones to follow. The elected members, officers, frontline staff and residents we spoke to said future policy interventions need to be responsive to and rooted within an understanding of the disparities that exist within Torbay.

1.11 The Hele Project is still in its infancy. There are a number of issues that need to be worked through before a similar model is replicated elsewhere. We would encourage the Project Board to explore further which services are best targeted at neighbourhood level and where a universal approach is the best option; and, how to combine mainstream (national and local) with area-based responses.

1.12 The absence of clear evidence as to the effectiveness and outcomes of a neighbourhood approach is common across the country. This is a result of constraints in evaluating such interventions, for example the complex interaction of a variety of interventions and the difficulty in identifying causal relationships. However, to ensure elected members and the wider electorate are bought into this approach the Project Board will need introduce a simple way to demonstrate added value and how money is being saved. In conclusion, the Project Board is responding well to what is a difficult and deep rooted issue in Torbay but needs to focus its approach and be able to demonstrate how actions are making a difference.

Background

2.1 Despite an image of prosperity Torbay has some of the most deprived areas within the South West and is ranked the 71st most deprived area out of 354 in England. The Bay has the lowest Gross Value Added per Head of any top tier Local Authority area in the South West.

2.2 The Comprehensive Area Assessment of Torbay (published December 2009) highlighted significant concern that not enough had been done to help the worst off in the Bay. In particular, plans to tackle inequalities were not coordinated and the key agencies had not set targets and milestones to measure progress. In September 2009, the Torbay Strategic Partnership endorsed a strategy to close the gap between the most and least disadvantaged communities. A key element of the strategy was to establish a Neighbourhood Management Project in Hele to bring residents and service providers together to ensure services are responsive to the needs of residents and ultimately improve the quality of life for people living in the area.

2.3 The Torbay Closing the Gap Project Board invited Government Office for the South West to undertake a review of Torbay's approach to reducing inequalities. A peer review is designed to help an area assess its current achievements and its capacity to improve performance and meet future challenges. The peer review is not an inspection. Instead it offers a supportive approach to help identify current strengths, as much as what needs to improve.

2.4 The review was based on addressing a simple set of key questions which helped the review team to explore what was currently working well, what the barriers were in Torbay to making further progress and what the opportunities were going forward. Turning the Curve or Results Based Accounting was used to help test the principles that underpin the current strategy. See www.resultsaccountability.com for more information.

2.5 Members of the review team were:

- Paul Shand – GOSW Relationship Manager for Torbay
- Mike Ashworth – GOSW lead on child poverty
- Richard Stephenson, Dean and Pro Vice-Chancellor Faculty of Health, Plymouth University
- Kevin Tinsley - GOSW Relationship Manager for Bristol and the West of England
- Sandra Armstrong - GOSW lead on vulnerable adults and worklessness
- Jayne Erskine – GOSW, local improvement lead
- Teresa Lakeman - Devonport NDC
- Virginia McCririck – adult social care lead, Department for Health SW
- Ian Morris - GOSW economy and regeneration lead for the SW peninsula
- Jon Bright – GOSW, Director
- Peter McNamara – Devonport NDC

2.6 The team spent two days in Torbay: 8th and 11th October. The programme for the visit was organised in advance by Torbay's Closing the Gap Project Manager in consultation with Government Office for the South West. Our activities included:

- Interviews with officers and elected members
- Interviews with a range of lead agencies
- A 'Turning the Curve' (Results Based Accounting) exercise with the Closing the Gap Project Board.
- Two focus groups with residents, frontline staff and coordinators
- Reading documents provided by the Closing the Gap Project Board

2.7 The review team would like to thank the Closing the Gap Project Manager and Project Lead for their support during the two days. We would also like to thank interviewees and those that participated in the focus groups for their time and for their open and honest responses.

Delivering outcomes

Strengths

- Outward looking and open to exploring new approaches

Areas for consideration

- Focus on the three to five actions that are most important
- Targeted support to improve employability
- Getting a balance between interventions to address individual needs and those that enable communities to thrive
- Increase peer support/befriending services and harnessing social capital and philanthropy
- Further research into what works best at local level and what should be delivered universally across the Bay

3.1 To have maximum impact on the most deprived neighbourhoods the Project Board will need to focus its attention on the top priorities. We recommend that the Board will need to invest resource in 3 to 5 actions that will have greatest impact. Perhaps the clearest message the Review Team picked up was that limited resource had been spread too thinly across a number of actions and localities, and it wasn't always clear how some interventions were helping to close the gap. As one interviewee commented:

“we don't have the money or the ability to do everything; we should get behind the projects that will make a real difference to people”.

3.2 The following section about strategy and performance management suggests ways in which the Project Board could identify those actions and modify its approach to help drive deliver.

3.3 During the two days the Review Team spent in Torbay we picked up a number of messages about these areas of focus and the opportunities to improve performance which the Project Board will need to consider. Tackling worklessness was the top priority for most interviewees in helping to close the gap. The Council, through the Torbay Development Agency had put a lot of energy into the regeneration of the Bay. There is considerable work going into encouraging inward investment and supporting Torbay's businesses to grow. However the Project Board will need to focus on the supply-side as well as demand-side of the local labour market. One interviewee said:

“employers in Torbay are not interested in recruiting those that have been out of work for some time, potentially with multi problems and skills gaps”

3.4 In this context attracting new high end businesses will have a limited impact on reducing the inequalities gap. The Project Board will need to consider whether enough is being done to support those out of work living in the most deprived areas to improve their employability and access to existing jobs.

3.5 For many the link between improving educational attainment and closing the inequalities gap was obvious and there was a consistent message that it should be a high priority. To ensure the Project is successful over the longer-term the Project Board will need to consider what more could be done to improve attainment. We did not hear, however, a consistent message about how attainment should be addressed: either through an area based approach or through targeted mainstream provision. Approaches that have had notable impact elsewhere that the Project Board may wish to consider include: providing out reach activities, personalised and holistic approaches and greater involvement of employers.

3.6 The quality of housing and the over-reliance on the private rental sector is regarded as a key barrier to improving some people's standard of living. The Review Team did not identify specific actions that should be addressed, nor did we find examples of activity that were ineffective or inefficient. We did, however, pick up messages that more work was needed in this area to ensure that when services were commissioned they were joined-up and met the needs of the end users. The Turning the Cure exercise began to unearth some interesting and radical solutions to the housing problems in Torbay. The Project Board will need to support officers and frontline staff to consider the 'bigger picture across the Bay and what more could be done.

3.7 The Project Board will need to consider, as part of its overall strategy, how to ensure the benefits of any intervention are not lost as the number of people entering employment increases, income levels go up and therefore the opportunity to move out of a particular area increases. The gap left behind by individuals and families can easily be replaced by other issues, problems and burdens on services. The strategy will need to get the right balance between pursuing targeted support to address individual needs and creating the right environment for the whole community of Torbay to flourish.

3.8 The Review Team picked up a strong appetite among residents and officers for greater peer support or befriending services to help individuals or families with complex needs. It was suggested this approach would succeed where frontline staff had not been able to build trust and gain acceptance. Befriending services can increase the opportunities for social interaction and help create a sense of being part of the community. Evidence suggests that peer support can play a critical role in breaking down the barriers that prevent an individual or family make the changes that could improve their life. There's a wealth of research the Project Board may wish to explore further, for example Joseph Rowntree Foundation:

<http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/role-and-impact-befriending> the Mentoring and Befriending Foundation, and Building Community Capacity toolkit – www.puttingpeoplefirst.org.uk. The return on social investment in befriending is currently being calculated by the London School of Economics. There is also a wealth of information on the value that a User Led Organisation can offer with peer support for disabled people available at www.scie.org.uk and www.ncil.org.uk

3.9 The Hele Project is starting to increase social cohesion and provide a way for a number of residents to personally invest in their community. We heard from several interviewees about the potential to use more social networks to close the gap. Strengthening community governance and ensuring residents are involved in the design of services will help to harness social capital from within specific areas.

3.10 The Project Board will also need to look at how networks could be fostered across ward boundaries, in particular looking at ways for more affluent areas to support the more deprived. The Project Board may wish to consider how to involve individuals or personalities and businesses that have a strong association with Torbay. This should be seen as not just a philanthropic gesture, but also an investment in something that will have a positive impact on the whole of Torbay.

3.11 The Review Team was asked to reflect on whether there is a strong case for greater locality working within Torbay. Although for some the Hele Project had not delivered as quickly as hoped (which reflects the level of enthusiasm to work quickly to make a difference) there was very strong commitment to following an approach that involves focusing effort from a range of agencies on a particular locality. Before moving to the next stage we would encourage the Project Board to work through a number of issues around community engagement and empowerment, strengthening governance and leadership and simplifying the overall approach, which are explored in the following sections.

3.12 Deprived neighbourhoods differ significantly in terms of a range of human, cultural, social and economic factors. Therefore, the response to other areas will need to be different. Before embarking on the next phase of locality working, we would encourage the Project Board to clarify what is possible at neighbourhood level and what is most effectively delivered across the Bay, but with a mind on reducing overlaps in provision. To help with this we would encourage the Project Board to keep an eye on what is happening elsewhere in the country and develop stronger networks with areas facing similar challenges.

Strategy and performance management

Strengths

- A well established evidence base

Areas for consideration

- The need for a simplified set of key outcomes supported by an indicator and a small number of performance measures
- Moving to a much simpler and fit for purpose approach to performance management
- Simplifying the collection and presentation of data
- The need to demonstrate how actions are saving costs
- Developing communication tools to help staff and residents identify the outcomes they are working towards and to understand how projects and programmes fit together
- Reducing and refining paper work

4.1 We found that many interviewees thought the strategy, although comprehensive and very detailed, was hard to infiltrate. This view was supported by the quantity and content of paper work presented to the Review Team. Officers and frontline staff had difficulty in clearly identifying and expressing the priorities and vision for reducing inequalities. Many were able to identify particular projects or strands of activity but were less clear about how they all fitted together.

4.2 Given the number of underlying issues associated with inequality it is common, and a perfectly natural starting point to produce an all encompassing strategy. However, overall the Project Board may wish to consider whether the strategy reflects a focused enough approach to identifying what is really important in order to make significant progress to close the gap. This will be particularly important over the coming months and years as the pressure on public finances increases.

“Torbay should focus on the key deliverables rather than trying to do and measure too much”

4.3 The Project Board, therefore, will need to engage agencies and residents further to draw out the top three or four priority outcomes that will help to close the gap. Not only will this ensure finite resources are focused behind the actions that will have the greatest impact, but it will create a sense of common purpose for individuals and for agencies and for planning future interventions. The evaluation of New Deal for Communities and Neighbourhood Management programmes suggests for an area to manage intervention to have maximum impact requires a more focused and simplified approach. The Turning the Curve exercise provided an example of one methodology that could help with this. There are, however, a range of other tools and techniques which could be used.

4.4 The refresh of Torbay's Community Plan is an important opportunity to bring greater focus to the Project. The Community Plan will no doubt play a key role in explaining how actions fit together and contribute to the high level outcomes the Strategic Partnership wants to achieve. It's also vital in bringing agencies together at a senior level to ensure effort is focused on the most important areas.

4.5 We found the current strategy was based on a large number of measures (often disaggregated or broken down into further measures) which were not clearly linked to outcomes. Therefore, for each high-level outcome we would encourage the Project Board to identify one indicator to help quantify progress and a small number of performance measures. We would also encourage the Project Board to explore a concise, simple and accessible way to report and present progress.

4.6 The Project Board had worked hard to establish rigorous objective evidence. This had resulted in a good understanding of what caused the inequalities to exist and what the needs were of groups of residents living in specific places. The Project Board, working with the range of partners, will need to ensure that time and energy is invested in collecting the right data against each outcome so that progress is effectively monitored. The Project Board will also need to ensure data is represented in a way that is both meaningful to the end users and supports elected members and officers understand whether actions are making a difference. Consideration should also be given to data sets that no longer need to be monitored as part of the strategy.

4.7 The principles of performance management had been embedded across all agencies and were helping to monitor many interventions. The Project Board will need to explore what the opportunities are to improve local arrangements following the reduction in external performance assessments. The Project Board will need to reflect on what realistically can be achieved and therefore measured at a local level. A key finding from the National Evaluation of New Deal for Communities was that local areas should focus on measuring the impact of local activity and not waste time and effort measuring external factors, for example national policy.

4.8 Delivering services depend on a limited supply of resource. Being able to demonstrate value for money and effectiveness will be vital if elected members and the wider electorate are to remain committed to the strategy. The Project Board will need to find a way to demonstrate, through a simple process, how actions save costs. In the longer-term this should help to gain a commitment to shifting some of the emphasis from 'heavy-end' higher-cost services that currently absorb most resource.

4.9 We heard from several interviewees that they wanted a short summary of the overall vision, the key priorities and metrics. A short summary was seen as a useful communication tool and a good way to identify how individuals, specific projects or the wider work of agencies was helping to make a difference.

4.10 In conclusion, a simplified strategy will help officers and frontline staff to identify how actions are helping to close the gap. It will also set a coherent framework for commissioning future activities across a number of organisations. To ensure on going commitment to the strategy, and in particular preventative services, the Project Board will need to adopt a simple method of demonstrating how actions are making a difference and saving money over the longer-term.

Engaging with communities and partners

Strengths

- Residents in Hele had been consulted; the Neighbourhood Management Project is responding to locally identified priorities
- The Project Board has an open and inclusive approach
- Good awareness of the opportunities presented by the Government's localism and big society agendas

Areas for consideration

- Shift the focus from community consultation to involving residents in designing services
- Improve communication channels across agencies and frontline staff
- Empower officers, frontline staff and residents to develop new ways of delivering services
- Introduce feedback loops for residents
- Promote greater understanding of inequalities within Torbay
- Celebrate what has been achieved so far
- The need for a communication plan

5.1 We did not find evidence that a variety of interests, including front line staff and residents had been involved in designing or shaping the strategy. This was in part due to the pace at which the strategy was developed. The Neighbourhood Management Project was clearly driven by the priorities put forward by residents. But there was little evidence to suggest they had been actively involved in the design of service provision.

5.2 The Board will need to consider how to move to a phase of deeper and more deliberative engagement with residents. This will require additional investment. However, there was strong evidence from the national evaluation of Neighbourhood Management and New Deal for Communities that such an investment will lead to improvements in the way services are coordinated and delivered to meet end user needs.

5.3 The Review Team was encouraged to hear how officers were keen to embrace the Coalition Government's policy direction on devolved decision making and involving more people in how their community is run. Torbay Council in particular is keen to pilot new initiatives and wants to be at the forefront of changes to public policy. The work the Council is leading to tackle child poverty is good example of how officers were keen to try out new and potentially transformational approaches.

5.4 There was a lot of activity happening across the Bay, which was aimed at, or contributes towards helping those most in need. This had led to some duplication in provision. Several interviewees referred to occasions where the same individual had been offered the same support by two or more organisations. The current exercise to map service provision will be an important step to minimise duplication.

5.5 The Project Board will also need to consider how to improve communication between officers and frontline staff so there is a greater understanding of what is happening in different areas, both thematically and geographically.

“we seem to have the right structures but not sure we have the right communication between them”

5.6 The Project Board will need to consider how to encourage new ideas from staff and residents. Developing a culture of innovation and learning from others (inside and outside of the Bay), and acknowledging where ideas have come from would help maintain the Project’s momentum. It is likely creative solutions will be needed more and more to address any future funding gaps.

5.7 Perhaps the clearest message that came from residents in Hele was the need for better communication. Although residents recognised the effort that had gone into consultations, they were less positive about steps taken to provide feedback on how their concerns and suggestions were being taken forward. The Project Board may wish to develop ‘feedback loops’ with frontline staff, but probably more importantly residents in those areas where inequalities are greatest. Having a Project Manager on the ground and strengthening the governance arrangements at neighbourhood level and higher up will go some way to help residents to escalate issues and for agencies to provide feedback.

5.8 The Review Team found a disconnect between what residents in Hele said were the top issues in their area and what officers believe were the issues, that if tackled, would have the biggest impact on closing the inequalities gap. For example, some residents said that improving the local environment and reducing anti-social behaviour continue to be their top priorities despite the notable improvements over the last year. Officers, on the other hand, were surprised that improving education attainment and health were not given the same level of importance. This suggests a more sophisticated dialogue between agencies and residents will be necessary to ensure a better understanding of the evidence and what could be done at a local level to reduce inequalities.

5.9 Many interviewees highlighted the adverse media interest and the sometimes negative response from within the Bay to some actions taken to reduce inequalities. This can have a detrimental impact on the reputation of the agencies involved and on staff morale. Several people we spoke to advocated a more proactive approach to celebrating the outcomes that had been achieved so far. This isn’t to say that the Board and other groups, such as the Strategic Partnership, hadn’t recognised success. It does suggest that more could be done to explain to the wider population of Torbay how actions have started to make a difference and what the scale of the challenge is going forward. This could involve talking to the media about the basis of the strategy and the reasons for particular decision. It could include producing pen pictures or case studies of individuals who had gone through a particular

service and as a result their quality of life, health, employment prospects etc. had improved.

5.10 Improving communication across agencies and with residents was highlighted as a particularly important issue that needs to change. Given the complexity of communication channels and the diverse range of interests the Project Board may wish to consider developing a (simple) communication plan as a way to bring about improvements and encourage agencies to sign up to particular actions.

5.11 To conclude this section, investing in communication is essential to the strategy and the neighbourhood management model being perceived as successful. The general public and service users will need to be more involved in the design, development and delivery of services. By involving people in a consistent, robust and above all meaningful way will help the Project Board to achieve its longer term goals.

Leadership and governance

Strengths

- Evidence that actions are starting to make a difference
- A strong partnership of agencies and staff dedicated to making a difference
- Good understanding among elected members, officers and frontline staff of the issues and the need for action to reduce inequalities
- Recognition and support for the potential to do more
- Strong community leadership within Hele
- Open and positive approach to improvement

Areas for consideration

- Clarify and strengthen the role of the Closing the Gap Project Board
- Ensure government arrangements empowers community engagement and localised decision-making
- Increase leadership capacity within the community so that the Hele Project is not reliant on one or two key individuals

6.1 The agencies in Torbay have built a strong culture of partnership working which was evident in how well the Strategic Partnership (TSP) had been regarded locally and regionally. A strong partnership is supported by staff working across a number of agencies that were clearly committed to helping the worst off.

6.2 The TSP acted quickly to the red flag given in the 2009 area assessment. By the time the findings were published the partnership had already developed a comprehensive strategy. A Project Board, chaired by the Council's Deputy Chief Executive was put in place soon after.

6.3 The Review Team found that it was not entirely clear who was driving which part of the strategy and how decisions would be taken to move the strategy onto the next stage. The Project Board will need to clarify its relationship with the Strategic Partnership and other groupings that play a role in reducing inequalities. Not only will these groups, through strong leadership, energy and commitment act as the catalyst to stimulate action, it is important that they take responsibility for empowering engagement. Although the Review Team did not find evidence that a commitment to engage was absent from the current arrangements there was some evidence of reliance on centralised decision making which has the potential to slow the resolution of issues rather than liberating people to act swiftly.

6.4 We heard concerns that although individual Board members were committed to the overall project, that commitment was not always matched by their own organisation. The difficulty of aligning or pooling funding for key projects was raised on several occasions as an example of how commitment was limited. The Project Board would benefit from drawing up terms of reference to clarify expectations and joint aspirations.

6.5 The Review Team was impressed by the strong community leadership within Hele. It was clear, however, that this leadership came from a small number of committed residents and the project has struggled to reach beyond a committed core group. The Project Board (and the Community Board in Hele) will need to explore how to attract more residents to play a community leadership and management role over the Project's lifetime. There were a lot of positive activities happening in Hele which the Project will need to build on to encourage others to get involved.

6.6 To maintain and improve community leadership the Hele project will need sustained involvement from all agencies. Residents said a strong culture and consistency of engagement will bring about trust and ensure things get done. The Review Team picked up a degree of frustration that, so far, not all promises made by the agencies involved had been acted upon. Agencies on the whole had been slow to respond to suggestions put forward by residents. The Project Board may wish to consider the need for a senior level group, chaired by a chief officer, which can commission activity in or for the neighbourhood and help unblock problems more generally. This group could also oversee similar activity in other disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

6.7 Whether the Project Board decides to adopt this recommendation or not it will need to examine the relationship between the Community Board in Hele and the Project Board. To ensure the Hele project can proceed to the next stage these two groups will need to be well connected and give sufficient support at senior officer level.

6.8 In conclusion, governance arrangements at a Torbay wide level and at a neighbourhood level are at an early stage. There will be a degree of natural evolution, but the Project Board will need to clarify accountabilities at the various levels and ensure arrangements are in place to involve and empower decision-making at a level closest to the neighbourhood.

Annex A

The following reports where the output from the Turning the Curve exercise which was run with the Review Team and the Project Board.

Health

Outcome: cancer deaths in deprived areas

Baseline indicator: all-age/all sex smoking prevalence

Causes:

1. Beliefs/attitudes (self-esteem, compensation, boredom)
2. Environment (Family/friends/peers/marketing/availability); age-specific 'issues' i.e. young people's risky behaviour and middle-aged 'nihilistic' culture

What works/action:

1. Positive activities for young people in groups led by adult with active interest/care
2. Credit union with good interest on money saved by people stopping smoking; linked to
3. Matched funding from public health for credit union savings, to re-invest in community activities

Worklessness

Ultimate aspiration: increase in sustainable jobs for people from the deprived areas

Outcome: Employment rate of people from these deprived areas

Story/baseline:

1. Multiple deprivation (unchanging picture where the top 5 most deprived areas have always been like that)
2. Historically jobs in Torbay have been lower skilled jobs
3. Low skilled jobs are matched by low personal aspirations
4. Small scale self employment and small businesses. Business start up rates and survival rates have been poor
5. No 'weighty' employers in Torbay which can help regenerate an area
6. Historic investment in specific thematic areas i.e. skills and education
7. The Bay's strategic approach has not specifically addressed underlying causes
8. Some sense of community across Torbay

Data

There's lots of information and data about Torbay. Perhaps area that is lacking is around personal debt.

What works/action

1. Set up sponsored apprentice scheme to encourage self employment and enterprise
2. Provide more personal support. This could be volunteers or local mentors (community champions) to provide after support
3. Less top down provision – residents playing a role in designing provision and identifying solutions
4. Incentives to poach or attract employers into the area
5. Adapt social worker and care provision to support people moving into work

Housing/environment

Outcome: better quality of housing

Story/baseline:

1. Large private sector rental market
2. Large number of low quality temporary accommodation which is matched by a high demand
3. Transient population sometimes with multiple needs.
4. Those with the most needs tend to live near services e.g. Torquay town centre

Data: more information needed on where individuals go, particularly those that place high demands on services

What works:

1. Develop rights and responsibilities of private landlords
2. Bring the social housing back within LA control
3. Dispersed housing provision and personalised services to avoid neighbourhoods being characterised by particular issues
4. Community and peer support to help individuals and families improve living standards
5. Creative use of the planning system to reduce the quantity of low quality rental housing