



Office of the
Deputy Prime Minister

Creating sustainable communities

Research Report 27

Alternative Approaches to Neighbourhood Management

7 Case Study Summaries and Analysis

National Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Management
Pathfinder Programme



Neighbourhood
Renewal Unit



Office of the
Deputy Prime Minister

Creating sustainable communities

Research Report 27

Alternative Approaches to Neighbourhood Management

7 Case Study Summaries and Analysis

National Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Management
Pathfinder Programme



Neighbourhood
Renewal Unit

March 2006

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister: London

National Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme

The National Evaluation of the Pathfinder Programme is being undertaken by a consortium of organisations, led by SQW Ltd:

- SQW Ltd
- GFA Consulting
- European Institute for Urban Affairs, Liverpool John Moores University
- Cities Research Centre, University of West of England, Bristol
- Cambridge Economic Associates
- Local Government Centre, Warwick Business School, Warwick University
- Ipsos-MORI
- Gfk-NOP

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU
Telephone 020 7944 4400

Web site www.odpm.gov.uk

© Crown Copyright 2006

Queen's Printer and Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 2006

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This report has been produced by SQW as part of a contract by ODPM. Any views in it are not necessarily those of the department.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a click-use licence for core material at www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/plogin.asp, or by writing to The Office of Public Sector Information Information Policy Team St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail: HMSOlicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk

Publications in alternative formats are available from:

ODPM Publications
PO Box 236
Wetherby
West Yorkshire
LS23 7NB
Tel: 0870 1226 236
Fax: 0870 1226 237
Textphone: 0870 120 7405
E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net
or via www.odpm.gov.uk

Printed in the UK on material containing no less than 75% post-consumer waste.

March 2006

Product Code: 05NRRU03763

Contents

	Page
Section 1	
Introduction	5
Section 2	
Overview analysis	6
Section 3	
7 Case Study Summaries	18
A	
Poplar Harca: Managing housing and neighbourhoods <i>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</i>	18
B	
Neighbourhood management in a reviving housing market <i>North Benwell, Newcastle upon Tyne</i>	22
C	
Area and neighbourhood working to improve services <i>Gateshead</i>	26
D	
Neighbourhood management and service delivery <i>Doncaster</i>	30
E	
Neighbourhood managers: enablers and brokers <i>London Borough of Haringey</i>	35
F	
Neighbourhood management: co-ordinating services, improving accountability <i>City of Salford</i>	39
G	
Rolling out neighbourhood management <i>City of Wolverhampton</i>	43

Introduction

This report presents the summary findings of seven case studies, each exploring a different approach to neighbourhood management in England. The case studies were undertaken in the summer and autumn of 2005 by SQW and its partners in the team undertaking the national evaluation of the ODPM's Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders Programme.

This report summarises each case study and provides an overview analysis which compares and contrasts the different approaches. It has been prepared to illustrate the different types of approach being piloted and stimulate discussion about how and where neighbourhood management can contribute to making public services more responsive to local communities and improving outcomes in deprived areas.

The full case studies have been published separately by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, ODPM. The full Wolverhampton case study was published in the autumn of 2005. The remaining six case studies are being published together in tandem with this report.

Our research

Neighbourhood management is a growing area of interest for policymakers in England, and is being piloted and adopted by a growing number of local authorities and local partnerships. The case studies were selected to illustrate a range of different approaches to neighbourhood management, from different regions and in differing contexts. The core selection criteria for the case studies included a requirement that each initiative was:

- operating at neighbourhood level;
- has involvement from several service providers, not just the council or housing provider;
- has at least some community involvement;
- has a dedicated manager, co-ordinator or team; and
- has been delivering activities/interventions for at least a year.

The inclusion of a case study does not necessarily imply recommendation as 'good practice' in all respects, although each example offers valuable lessons.

The case studies were undertaken by different members of the national evaluation team. In each case, original research was undertaken by the evaluator, including interviews with key stakeholders. Existing research and documentary evidence was also reviewed. The draft case study reports were also discussed with each participating case study to ensure accuracy.

We would like to thank all of the participating case study authorities and partnerships for their willingness to take part and their co-operation. We would also like to acknowledge the financial contributions of Wolverhampton City Council and GO-WM to enable a more extensive case study of the initiative in Wolverhampton. The rest of the research for this report was funded by the ODPM as part of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme national evaluation.

Overview analysis

This section provides a brief comparison and analysis of the different approaches to neighbourhood management and how they compare to the Pathfinder model being tested through the NRU's Pathfinder Programme. The **key features** of all 7 initiatives are summarised for easy reference in the table (Figure 2) at the end of this section.

The Pathfinder model

Firstly, it is worth outlining the model of neighbourhood management being tested by the NRU's Pathfinder Programme, to help understand the similarities and differences with the other approaches described in this report. It is based on the model put forward in the SEU Policy Action Team 4 Report on Neighbourhood Management in 2000. Its key features include the following:

- A dedicated full time Neighbourhood Manager with support team, based in the neighbourhood;
- A clearly defined target neighbourhood, with an average population of 10,500 (with a maximum of c.20,000);
- A multi-sector partnership, including local community representation, to hold the Neighbourhood Manager to account and steer the initiative;
- Financial, employment and legal support provided by a local 'accountable body', usually the local authority;
- Core funding to support the team and provide a project fund; and
- A clear focus on influencing mainstream public services to make them more responsive to local needs, rather than delivering services themselves.

The 20 Round 1 Pathfinders were established in 2001 and the 15 Round 2 Pathfinders were established in 2004, with the intention that Pathfinders would be supported by the NRU for 7 years. Most use their local authority as their accountable body, although some are using a local RSL or community trust for this purpose. The key difference between the Round 1 and Round 2 Pathfinders is that the amount of their core funding differs. Round 1 Pathfinders have been receiving support from NRU of an average of £500,000 per year (including support for running costs and funding local projects) and Round 2 Pathfinders are receiving £350,000 per year, to test the difference that this might make.

A fuller account of the Pathfinder model and experience can be found in separately published research reports by the national evaluation team, available from NRU or the national evaluation team (www.sqw.co.uk/nme/).

Understanding the differences

At the outset it should be noted that each initiative considered here is still developing and evolving each year, and some are even now in transition to new stages. The analysis here is therefore a 'snapshot' of what we can learn today. The evaluation

team hopes to track each initiative over the next few years to understand how they are changing.

There are some important differences in the way that the case study initiatives operate, as discussed below and as summarised in Figure 1 overleaf:

- **Rationale and target areas**

Some of the initiatives are specifically focused on deprived areas – Poplar Harca, North Benwell, Haringey and most of the Wolverhampton neighbourhoods – but the rest operate across the whole of their local authority areas, including both affluent and deprived areas – as in Salford, Gateshead, Doncaster. The ‘deprived area’ initiatives are explicitly seeking to promote neighbourhood renewal in their target areas and narrow the gap between deprived and affluent neighbourhoods. This is the same purpose as the Pathfinder model. The authority-wide initiatives all include neighbourhood renewal within their objectives, but only as part of a broader purpose to improve services and improve the responsiveness of services to local people (in all areas).

- **Nature of approach to services**

The initiatives differ significantly in the nature of their approach to services. They fall broadly into two categories. The first group are ‘*influencers*’ who see their role as influencing mainstream service providers and bringing them together with the community, but not providing services directly (excluding the development and implementation of small-scale local projects). This is the same approach that the Pathfinders are pursuing. This group includes North Benwell, Gateshead, Haringey and Wolverhampton. The second group of initiatives are ‘*neighbourhood service providers*’ and are actually seeking to organise and deliver services on an area or neighbourhood basis directly. Two of the initiatives fall into this category, making it the less typical approach. Poplar Harca is a social housing provider which is expanding the range of services it provides locally beyond housing, as well as delivering many short-term projects. In Doncaster, the council has restructured to provide a wide range of its own services on a neighbourhood basis. The Police are also co-ordinating their delivery closely with this approach.

Salford’s approach is actually a mix of the two, with teams of co-located service provider representatives for each area providing at least some services in the area, although the overall approach is still more one of influencing.

- **Range of mainstream services engaged**

The range of mainstream service providers who are closely involved does vary between the initiatives, for different reasons. Doncaster MBC has focused on restructuring its own services and has also co-ordinated this with the Police, but close co-ordination with other services at neighbourhood level has not been sought as yet, not least as the initiative is still at a relatively early stage. The ‘influencing’ initiatives have tended to approach a wide range of service providers, with differing priorities and a range of responses in each area. One obvious common thread, however, is the close co-operation from the Police being secured in most areas. More unusually, Haringey has also secured a good level of involvement from local private traders in its Green Lanes neighbourhood management initiative, where retail vitality is a major issue.

- **Nature of community engagement**

The initiatives also differ in the nature and extent of community engagement that they support. The more targeted initiatives – Poplar Harca, North Benwell, Haringey, Wolverhampton – generally have established area-based partnerships in which local residents are involved and meet together with at least some service provider representatives. Salford also has a network of community committees in every area. The remaining two initiatives, both authority-wide, in Gateshead and Doncaster also involve community involvement but on a less systematic or comprehensive basis. Not every area or neighbourhood has a partnership promoting full resident involvement, and in Gateshead, residents and service providers meet separately.

- **Size of areas and unit costs**

The third key difference between the initiatives relates to the geographical scale at which they seek to operate. Figure 1 summarises the size of areas relevant to each initiative. As can be seen, the four initiatives that are largely focused on deprived areas operate at a neighbourhood level, working with areas ranging in size from approx 4,000 people up to about 20,000 people, with the most typical size being approx 10,000 people. The other three authority-wide initiatives generally work with larger geographical areas from 10,000 up to 45,000 people.

This has an obvious impact on unit costs, if we consider the main running costs of these initiatives. The running costs (teams and overheads but excluding project funds) per head of local population for four of the initiatives targeted at deprived areas, including the Pathfinders, are relatively well aligned around **£19-27 per head per year**, with the most typical cost being about **£23 per head**. Haringey is the exception to this with a much lower cost of **£2-3 per head**, reflecting the fact that their neighbourhood managers do not (presently) have teams or direct support and therefore work alone across large neighbourhoods.

Both of the authority-wide initiatives for which we have data (Gateshead and Salford) have low unit costs at **£2-5 per head per year**.

Figure 1: Summary of key differences

NM Initiative	Type of areas targeted	Main approach	Approx population of target neighbourhoods/ areas	Approx running cost of initiative per head of population
Poplar Harca, Tower Hamlets	Deprived	Providing services	c.10,000	£24
North Benwell, Newcastle upon Tyne	Deprived	Influencing services	3,750	£27 (£65 including project fund)
Gateshead	All areas	Influencing services	33,000-45,000	£2
Doncaster	All areas	Providing services	10,000 – 28,000	No information
London Borough of Haringey	Mainly deprived	Influencing services	c. 20,000	£2-3 (£3-4 including project fund)
City of Salford	All areas	Influencing & providing some services	14,000 – 39,000	£5 (£7 including devolved budget fund)
City of Wolverhampton	Deprived	Influencing services	c.5,000 – 12,000	£19 (£22 including project fund)
Pathfinder model (Round 1 areas)	Deprived	Influencing services	Average 10,500 (range 4,400 – 20,500)	Average £23 (range £12-£43) (Average £63 including project fund)

There are also some important similarities across the various initiatives:

- **‘Customer focused’ service improvement process**

Most of the initiatives that are primarily council-led include an explicit recognition in their founding rationale that neighbourhood management is a tool to promote public service improvement. In particular, some councils have recognised a special role that it can play in helping to shift service providers to a more ‘customer focused’ mentality. A key feature of all the neighbourhood managers and co-ordinators is that they do not belong to any particular service provider ‘silo’ and are therefore free to explore and identify issues in any service, as prompted by the identification of local needs.

- **Flexibility within uniformity**

All the initiatives recognise that the needs of areas, whether deprived or not, vary in their nature and intensity. All have therefore sought to build in some degree of flexibility into their approaches to allow different interventions and strategies to be pursued in different areas. However, it is worth noting that this flexibility is usually pursued through the same basic *organisational structures* in each constituent area/neighbourhood – responding to different needs does not necessarily imply the need for different structures.

- **Neighbourhood Renewal Funds (NRF) support**

Many of the initiatives have used, and some still rely on, NRF monies to fully or partly support the development of their initiatives. However, the two initiatives that are more focused on service delivery (Poplar Harca and Doncaster) have been less reliant on such funding for supporting the core running costs of neighbourhood management.

- **Providing benefits**

All the case study initiatives provide evidence of benefits being provided through neighbourhood management, although the nature and balance of benefits varies. The summaries later in this report give greater detail on the nature of these benefits. However, the most typical benefits include:

- community development and capacity building;
- the stronger co-ordination of services; and
- the brokering of resolutions to specific local issues.

Most of the initiatives have sought to engage with a range of mainstream services or deliver services in a range of policy areas. However, evidence about the extent to which different services have responded with changed behaviour and about impacts upon the neighbourhoods themselves, at this stage is relatively weak. Few of the initiatives presently have robust or comprehensive evaluation or performance management systems in place. Future evaluation by the national evaluation team where possible will seek to collate more data.

Lessons, issues and implications

Consideration of the different approaches suggests a number of observations, which we highlight here to stimulate thought and discussion about the nature of neighbourhood management and its proper role within local governance and neighbourhood renewal:

- **Delivering but not influencing?**

There is a clear difference between an organisation delivering mainstream funded services or other projects and that organisation seeking to influence the way that other bodies deliver their mainstream services. Experience from the case studies suggests that it is difficult for an organisation to do both simultaneously. Those organisations or partnerships that are focused on delivering services themselves, whether mainstream or short-term regeneration-funded projects may have good relationships with mainstream service providers but tend to be less effective at influencing those mainstream partners. Those organisations or partnerships that focus on an influencing role tend to be more effective at it.

It may well be that the skills required for service delivery and for influencing or co-ordinating a range of services are quite different. The scale of project funds available to neighbourhood management initiatives also does not appear to be a decisive factor in their ability to deliver change locally by influencing mainstream services. Some neighbourhood managers have few funds of their own, but have proved adept at facilitating and brokering discussions and agreements with partners, and the local community.

- **Focus on deprivation?**

Whilst four of the seven case study initiatives focus mainly on deprived neighbourhoods, it is not clear to what extent the other authority-wide initiatives are contributing to narrowing the gap between deprived and affluent areas, given that they appear to have similar structures and core funding in all areas, regardless of levels of deprivation. Whilst such initiatives may well provide benefits in relation to improved services and even community engagement, there is not always an obvious 'bias' in this towards 'narrowing the gap' for deprived areas.

- **Size matters!**

Some initiatives have sought to engage with larger areas up to 45,000 people. These are 'areas' not 'neighbourhoods' and it is clear that community engagement cannot be conducted in the same way for such large areas. We suggest that the threshold beyond which the nature of community engagement changes quite significantly is beyond approximately 15,000 people, based on observation of the kinds of community engagement employed by the different neighbourhood management initiatives. For large areas, a clear local connection between structures and local people is harder to secure. 'Neighbourhood management' initiatives that are being delivered in neighbourhoods of 5,000-10,000 people cannot therefore be considered the same kind of initiative as those being delivered in areas of up to 45,000 people. However, some initiatives also include working at both areas and neighbourhoods, with different activities undertaken at different levels. Our key point here is that geographical scale matters and influences what can be effectively achieved at each level.

- **Partnerships can transcend organisational boundaries**

There are a number of examples of different organisations providing members of their staff to be co-located with or even line managed by other organisations, in the interests of providing a more joined up approach to service delivery. In these cases, the shared aims and the trust between organisations allows them to overcome many employment, ownership and 'boundary' issues.

- **Strengthening democracy?**

In some areas, neighbourhood managers work closely with local ward councillors (such as in Haringey) and they appear to strengthen each other's work. The managers are able to bring stakeholders together and promote local discussions, with councillors providing an important link to the council and its decision-making capacity.

Figure 2: 7 neighbourhood management initiatives: summary of key features

Initiative	Area	Partnership	Delivery vehicle & core team	Main activities	Costs
<p>(1) Poplar HARCA London Borough of Tower Hamlets Start: 1997</p>	<p>Poplar consists of 4 wards, population of 46,700 with 60%+ housing being social rented.</p>	<p>Poplar Area Neighbourhood Partnership (of which Poplar HARCA is a partner) covers the whole of Poplar, with 5 neighbourhoods. The LSP has also set up 2 Local Area Partnerships to cover the same area, as part of the 8 that cover all of Tower Hamlets. These drive neighbourhood renewal.</p>	<p>Lead organisation is Poplar HARCA, a local housing company, owning social housing stock of 5,500 in the area. Poplar HARCA employs 5 Neighbourhood Directors, one for each neighbourhood, each supported by a small team. They are largely funded by the LSP (through NRF) and report to an overall Director within Poplar HARCA itself and also the Area Directors of each of the 2 Local Area Partnerships.</p>	<p>Poplar HARCA is a social landlord that provides housing and estate management services for its own housing stock. It has contact with its tenants through 10 local centres, through which other services are also delivered, either directly by Poplar HARCA (e.g. training and employment advice) or other service providers. It also seeks funding/contracts to provide other services (e.g. youth services) within the area. The 5 Neighbourhood Directors (and teams) work closely with other service providers through the local partnerships to co-ordinate activities and services in their neighbourhoods and develop new initiatives.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Directors are embedded within a service provider (HARCA) that undertakes many activities, so being precise about NM costs is difficult. An estimate for 2003/4 for the core running costs of the 5 Directors and their teams, offices and related senior management time within HARCA was £1,090,000, (or £24 per head of population per year, or £220,000 per neighbourhood).</p>
<p>(2) North Benwell NM Initiative Newcastle upon Tyne Start: 2003</p>	<p>Population of 3,750. Large rented housing sector.</p>	<p>A Partnership Board oversees the initiative, which includes residents, councillors and representatives of various local agencies. It works closely with, and is largely funded by the wider Newcastle/Gateshead Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.</p>	<p>The accountable body is Newcastle City Council, but the main delivery body is Home Group Ltd, a housing association, which employs the Neighbourhood Manager and team. There are 4.5 FTE staff in the core team, including the Neighbourhood Manager. There are also 4 street wardens in addition.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Manager and team work with local service providers to improve co-ordination and networking locally, they develop and deliver small-scale initiatives with their own funding, and they work with local residents and community groups to get them involved with service providers and to support their self-organisation. Their work with service providers has also helped to influence the delivery of some local services, although this is helped by the presence of significant funding from the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.</p>	<p>Core costs include the employment of 4.5 FTE in the NM team plus a budget of £150,000 for projects, etc. Home Group Ltd also provides in-kind support as the employer. (Estimated total cost is c.£250,000, giving c.£65 per head of population per year, or £27 per head, excluding the project fund). The Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder provides significant funding for local projects and programmes in the area.</p>

Figure 2: 7 neighbourhood management initiatives: summary of key features (continued)

Initiative	Area	Partnership	Delivery vehicle & core team	Main activities	Costs
<p>(3) Gateshead Start: 2002</p>	<p>Covers whole borough, with 190,000 population. Borough divided into 5 areas. The population of each area varies between 33-45,000.</p>	<p>The Borough is divided into 5 areas, each of which has an Area Executive Forum that prepares an Action Plan. Each Forum includes the main public service providers. They are an integral part of the LSP. There are also multi-agency area problem solving groups on specific topics (e.g. crime, health) and more time-limited task groups to address particular issues. The borough also has 85 identified neighbourhoods, some of which are preparing neighbourhood action plans (on a rolling basis every year) and some of which have existing partnerships.</p>	<p>There is a core team employed and based within Gateshead Council, comprising 5 area coordinators, 5 community partnership officers and one team manager (11 staff). They are largely funded by NRF. The team work across a large number of neighbourhoods around the borough and each team member spreads their time over a number of neighbourhoods and issues.</p>	<p>The NM team undertake community engagement at neighbourhood level (not area level) through existing partnerships and groups, or in relation to specific issues. Few new structures or partnerships have been established, and not all neighbourhoods presently have structures. The NM team aim to support the community to express their views on particular issues, and in some neighbourhoods to develop neighbourhood plans to record the key local issues more comprehensively. The main engagement with service providers is undertaken separately through the Area Executive Forums, which the NM team facilitate and where the co-ordination of services is discussed. A number of service providers are re-aligning their service planning boundaries to fit these areas. The NM team aim to influence mainstream services and assist them in working together more effectively, as well as ensuring they respond more effectively to identified problems within specific areas.</p>	<p>Core costs are mainly for the 11 strong core team, with a cost of over £350,000 per year (some in-kind contributions are not costed). (This is approx £2 per head of population).</p>

Figure 2: 7 neighbourhood management initiatives: summary of key features (continued)

Initiative	Area	Partnership	Delivery vehicle & core team	Main activities	Costs
<p>(4) Doncaster Start: 2003</p>	<p>The borough has a population of 285,000. The NM arrangements apply across the whole borough.</p>	<p>The new neighbourhood management structures have been driven by the council's internal restructuring. Multi-agency working is done through the Doncaster Strategic Partnership and its constituent thematic partnerships.</p> <p>The development of new initiatives and consultation is largely led by neighbourhood managers, using local partnerships where they exist, although only some areas have them. Community forums also exist across the borough and these are also consulted.</p>	<p>The council has re-arranged the way that it delivers a lot of its own services. The borough is now divided into 5 areas, each of which has an Area Director and a support team, and below these areas are 15 neighbourhoods (plus the town centre), each with a Neighbourhood Manager and service delivery team. Neighbourhoods have populations from 10,000-28,000.</p> <p>The neighbourhood managers are chief officer level managers who are responsible for multi-service delivery teams (up to 250 people) who deliver a range of council services in their areas, and who are the main point of contact for residents for all other council services. This is now how many council services are now delivered.</p>	<p>The council has undertaken a major restructuring of most of its services to focus on areas and neighbourhoods to provide a joined up 'customer first' approach. Some other service providers are also seeking to co-ordinate their services with this structure.</p> <p>The neighbourhood managers, with support from area managers, are developing plans for each service and for each neighbourhood, involving resident consultation. Efforts are being made to co-ordinate resident consultation between partners also.</p> <p>The main role of the neighbourhood managers is to provide joined up council services in their neighbourhood, which they either provide directly through their own neighbourhood service delivery team, or which they have responsibility for ensuring is delivered by other teams in the council.</p> <p>The Police have also structured their safer neighbourhoods policing teams to fit the area/neighbourhood boundaries of the council.</p>	<p>It has not been possible at present to identify the additional costs (if any) of moving to the new structure, as the NM approach is so embedded within mainstream council activities.</p>

Figure 2: 7 neighbourhood management initiatives: summary of key features (continued)

Initiative	Area	Partnership	Delivery vehicle & core team	Main activities	Costs
(5) London Borough of Haringey Start: 2002	The borough has a population of 224,000. Each of the 8 present NM areas has a population of up to c.30,000.	The LSP has overall responsibility although is not directly involved in NM on an operational basis. Each NM area has its own partnership or steering group to guide the neighbourhood manager, including community, public and private sector representatives. There are also 7 Area Assemblies that cover the whole borough and each neighbourhood manager also reports to (and supports) their local Area Assembly.	Haringey Council employs a neighbourhood management coordinator, and there is a neighbourhood manager in each of the 8 areas (although one manager was covering 2 areas). Each area also has a £22k per year project fund. This is largely funded by NRF, although some mainstream council funds contribute in some areas.	Each neighbourhood manager works with the partnership/steering group to prepare an action plan for the area, which reflects local priorities. They then work with the community and relevant local service providers to influence services and bring stakeholders together. The role is primarily one of co-ordination and facilitation. No service delivery is undertaken by the neighbourhood managers. They are based locally. Each neighbourhood manager also facilitates one of the 7 Area Assemblies that covers the borough (2-4 wards per area) and which are a focus for consultation with local people by the council. The intention is that neighbourhood management will be extended in 2006/7 and neighbourhood managers will be responsible for each of the 7 Areas (approx 30,000 people), and will have larger teams, including some co-located workers from other council services (e.g. youth service) and a larger budget.	At present the cost per neighbourhood is approx £70k, including the neighbourhood manager, the £22k project fund and part of the central co-ordination cost. (Assuming an estimated average neighbourhood size of 20,000, the unit cost is £3-4 per head of population per year, or £2-3 excluding the project fund.)

Figure 2: 7 neighbourhood management initiatives: summary of key features (continued)

Initiative	Area	Partnership	Delivery vehicle & core team	Main activities	Costs
(6) Salford City Start: 2004	Salford has a population of 216,000. The borough is divided into 8 Community Committee Areas varying in size from 14,000 to 39,000 people covering deprived and affluent areas.	Each Community Committee Area covers 2-3 wards. In each area, there is a Community Committee that meets every 2 months, comprising community and voluntary sector representatives and ward councillors (with sub-groups to spend devolved budgets and solve problems). There is also an Executive Group of service provider representatives in each area that meets quarterly and a Political Executive of the ward councillors to ratify spending decisions. Salford has a number of regeneration initiatives operating, including NRF, a URC in the city centre and the Manchester Salford Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.	The council employs a neighbourhood management co-ordinator, who supports each of the 8 neighbourhood managers, and reports to an Assistant Director for NM within the Council. All meet together fortnightly and they also report on a quarterly basis to a multi-agency NM Implementation Group. Each area also has a chief officer (from different council departments) who acts as an 'area co-ordinator' or champion to provide strategic support for 'their' area. In each area, the city council employs a neighbourhood manager, a community development worker and an administrative support officer. Staff are also seconded to the teams by each key service provider in each area. There are up to 30 staff in total in each area team from different council departments, the police, the PCT and others.	The Community Committee in each area prepares an annual Action Plan and has a devolved budget of £2.20 per head to spend each year. The neighbourhood management team support the Committee and also the Political Executive, Executive Group and sub-groups in preparing the action plan, working together and delivering actions. Local councillors are involved in all aspects of neighbourhood management and it is seen as an important part of their relationship to the council and residents. An important strand of work is community engagement. Teams also work with and support specific neighbourhood groups and partnerships where relevant, and some community engagement is done at this level, although not all neighbourhoods have partnerships. Many service providers have arranged their administrative boundaries to match the 8 NM areas. Services are also working together more obviously in each area and have stronger links to the community. Services that have been most responsive are the police, PCT public health improvement and environmental services.	The core cost of the NM function (at 2005/6) was £1.5m per year, which includes nearly £450k for the devolved budgets, the 8 core area teams (neighbourhood manager, admin officer and community worker) and the NM co-ordinator. This is approx £190,000 per area per year. Some of this is funded from NRF, the rest is from the Council. (This gives a unit cost of approximately £7 per head of population per year, or £5 per head excluding the devolved budgets.)

Figure 2: 7 neighbourhood management initiatives: summary of key features (continued)

Initiative	Area	Partnership	Delivery vehicle & core team	Main activities	Costs
(7) City of Wolverhampton Start: 2002	The city has a population of c.240,000. The 7 NM pilots were operating in 7 different neighbourhoods, with most, but not all, deprived and with populations varying from 5,000 – 12,000. The 7 pilot neighbourhoods covered 24% of all households in the city (c.50,250 pop).	The initiative has been driven by the Wolverhampton Strategic Partnership (the LSP). In most of the pilot neighbourhoods there is also a local partnership or steering group that includes local residents and councillors and representatives of at least some service providers.	A central neighbourhood management co-ordinator, with an administrative officer, works to the Chief Neighbourhood Renewal Officer in the City Council and provides support to the teams in the neighbourhoods. Each of the 7 neighbourhoods has a neighbourhood manager, a partnership support officer and an administrative officer. Most officers are directly employed by the City Council, although each team is based in a local office. They each have a budget of £20,000 to fund local projects. Each Manager/team is also supported or hosted by a different Managing Agent – an RSL or voluntary sector body or public body – who acts as an accountable body for the local partnership and provides wider support.	The neighbourhood managers have worked with their partnerships, local communities and local service providers to build up local community capacity, to develop local projects addressing local needs and to influence local mainstream services. 'Quick wins' have also been delivered in each area to raise the profile of the work and meet immediate needs. As well as working separately in their neighbourhoods, the neighbourhood managers also meet together each month and each take the lead on developing and lobbying for strategic city-wide issues that often affect numerous neighbourhoods. From 1 April 2006, the neighbourhood management initiative has been extended to cover 15 neighbourhoods with a similar model and to provide a 'lighter touch' approach in the rest of the city.	The core cost of the NM initiative in 2005/6 was £1.1 million for all 7 neighbourhoods and the central co-ordination. The overall cost per neighbourhood was therefore c.£150,000 per neighbourhood. (This is approx £22 per head of local population per year, or £19 per head excluding the project fund.)

7 Case Study Summaries

Case Study A:

Poplar HARCA: Managing housing and neighbourhoods London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Aims, Objectives and Rationale

Poplar HARCA (an acronym for Housing And Regeneration Community Association) was established in 1997 as the first local housing company in the country. After a series of stock transfers, it now manages some 5,500 homes. It is principally a social landlord, though from the start its perception of its landlord's role included a strong neighbourhood focus. It recognised that a fuller approach was necessary in order to overcome the isolation that characterised the area, and the challenge of making links with disengaged communities. This developed to become a more formal neighbourhood management approach from 2001 onwards, when Poplar HARCA secured SRB and then NRF funds. The new funds allowed the introduction of neighbourhood management across Poplar.

Poplar HARCA aims are to:

- promote a resident-led organisation;
- continue to develop partnership working;
- deliver a responsive and efficient housing service;
- lead the regeneration of Poplar through neighbourhood management;
- invest in and support their staff; and
- manage Poplar HARCA to the highest requirements of business excellence.

The Neighbourhood

The neighbourhood management initiative covers four wards in the east of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets: Mile End East, Bromley-by-Bow, Limehouse and East India and Lansbury. The combined population of these four wards was approximately 46,700 in 2001, of whom about 26% were under 15, and 33% Bangladeshi. Of the 18,000 households in the area, over 60% are in the social rented sector and 22% live in owner occupied housing.

Poplar has long been one of the most neglected parts of the borough with some of the worst housing. It is physically isolated, cut off by a triangle of the A12 and the A13 dual carriageways and the River Lea. A combination of high levels of worklessness and low pay for a substantial proportion of the population mean that the area is dominated by poverty. A recent funding bid prepared by the HARCA suggested that more than 75% of children in the area are eligible for free school meals. The area also suffers from high levels of burglary and low levels of educational attainment.

Poplar does, however, sit on the edge of one of the most buoyant labour markets in Europe: All Saints Docklands Light Railway station (opposite the HARCA offices) is three stops away from Canary Wharf and five from the City of London. Of the nearly 33,000 people aged 16-74 in Poplar, around a third are 'professional, employers, managers'.

The Delivery Process

The HARCA is a registered social landlord and is overseen by a board that comprises seven residents, including the chair, five councillors and six independent directors, drawn from the private and local community sector. It is the biggest partner in the Poplar Area Neighbourhoods (PAN) Partnership which has the formal responsibility for neighbourhood management delivery across the four wards of Poplar. The other key partners include Tower Hamlets College, Leaside Regeneration, Bromley-by-Bow Centre, and SPLASH.

Poplar is also covered by two Local Area Partnerships (out of a total of eight across the Borough) that are part of the Tower Hamlets Partnership and which are responsible for preparing local neighbourhood renewal strategies. The full partnership meetings are open to all residents and local stakeholders, but each also has a steering group, formally composed of residents, councillors and a representative of the voluntary and community sector as well as key service providers and, in the case of the two Poplar partnerships, the Neighbourhood Directors, employed by the HARCA.

Poplar HARCA's delivery of neighbourhood management has four key dimensions:

- The HARCA employs five Neighbourhood Directors, one for each of the five neighbourhoods that cover Poplar. Each neighbourhood also has a partnership group. The Directors are formally seconded to Tower Hamlets Partnership (the LSP), who pay for 80% of their costs from NRF, but the directors operate within the HARCA structure. They each have twin reporting relationships to the HARCA Director of Community Regeneration, and also to one of two Area Directors; Poplar is covered by two Area Partnerships that are part of the LSP structure. Each Neighbourhood Director is also supported by a small neighbourhood team employed by the HARCA.
- The HARCA also owns and manages 10 neighbourhood centres. These centres are at the heart of the approach to neighbourhood management. Each centre accommodates the HARCA's housing officers (though they are called neighbourhood officers) and a range of other services, including those delivered directly by the HARCA but also by other agencies.
- The third aspect of delivery, which sets Poplar HARCA apart from many other neighbourhood management models, is its role as direct provider of services. Most obviously this includes the services it provides as landlord – housing management, estate maintenance and cleaning. However, in addition, it also now delivers the statutory youth services in Poplar on behalf of the Council, and runs training and employment access services from some of the neighbourhood centres.
- The final aspect of delivery is fund raising. Since the contract with the Tower Hamlets Partnership only supports a portion of the Neighbourhood Directors' time, the HARCA has to raise funds to support the other neighbourhood-based work.

Through applications to SRB, NRF, other central government grant programmes as well as charitable sources, the HARCA has extended its range of youth provision, (roughly doubling the value of the contract from the council), supported a range of environmental initiatives, and increased the number of projects run from the neighbourhood centres.

The structures may appear complex – HARCA's own structures include the Poplar Area Neighbourhoods Partnership, five neighbourhoods with Neighbourhood Directors (and teams) and seven estates, each with an estate board, and these mesh with the Tower Hamlets Partnership and its two Local Area Partnerships covering Poplar, each with an Area Director. Despite the complexity the operations work in a relatively seamless fashion in practice.

It is, however, very difficult to assess the costs of the neighbourhood management activity as it is deeply embedded in all the work of the HARCA. An estimate of the 2003/2004 costs suggested that the core running costs of neighbourhood management were approximately £1,090,000, including the Neighbourhood Directors, their support teams and offices and some senior management time from the HARCA. This amounts to approximately £220,000 per team/neighbourhood.

The HARCA supports a wide range of activities across the area, either by direct provision or in partnership with others, much supported through various regeneration funds. Examples of recent activities include:

- the recruitment of eight Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) in partnership with the Metropolitan Police and the PAN partnership;
- healthy food co-ops at two of the neighbourhood centres where healthy produce is purchased from Spitalfields market and sold at cost;
- a not for profit social business that trains, employs and develops local people who are then helped into mainstream employment; and
- a youth inclusion project.

Evidence of Results

Since the start, community development and capacity building have been at the heart of the HARCA approach. Much of the activity in neighbourhood centres is undertaken through local community organisations: it is critical to the HARCA approach that regeneration activity is carried out and managed by local people. There are structures in place from estate, through neighbourhood, Local Area Partnerships and up to the HARCA, that bring local people into contact with all the key service providers. There are also examples where the HARCA or its partners in neighbourhood management have helped local community organisations to deliver services which include community cafes, an estate-based hairdressing salon, youth summer schemes, sports training and breakfast clubs.

There are numerous examples of local mainstream services being influenced and becoming better co-ordinated over the last few years as a result of the many regeneration activities in Poplar. How far these are attributable explicitly to

neighbourhood management is harder to say due to the scale and complexity of local activities. Nevertheless, there are various examples of where neighbourhood management has influenced local services including:

- The youth service is co-located with housing officers, and can therefore develop intimate knowledge of local people and families so it is easier to convene multi-disciplinary teams if a specific issue arises, for example in connection with anti-social behaviour;
- Use of neighbourhood centres for employment surgeries improves access for hard-to-reach groups;
- Neighbourhood Directors' links with the PCT influenced the location of the Health Centre;
- As result of the Employment Providers' meeting, the Bangladeshi voluntary organisation was introduced to Jobcentre Plus, who now provide outreach services in their centre; and
- Providing access to the local community when Sure Start arrived – taking space in a neighbourhood centre – enabled it to exploit local HARCA contacts. Co-location assisted intelligence sharing so when an instance of domestic violence arises it is easier to co-ordinate a variety of services.

More generally, the idea of neighbourhood management is now enshrined in the Community Strategy, and Local Area Partnerships now operate throughout the borough, providing a structure within which service provision is expected to become more responsive to residents' priorities. Two other neighbourhood management initiatives have also been launched in Tower Hamlets – one funded by the NDC Partnership on the Ocean Estate and one in Bethnal Green led by the Council.

The HARCA is still exploring ways to fully assess its impact: internal monitoring focuses on process milestones or outputs, and some stakeholders had difficulty thinking about outcomes. However, developing a credible evaluation framework through which to assess outcome change that plausibly relates to HARCA actions is a key priority.

Conclusions

Local organisations and partners all speak highly of the HARCA's contribution to the development of partnerships and partnership working in Poplar. Its contribution to regeneration activities, explicitly embracing the concept of neighbourhood management, has been substantial, in terms of leadership, fundraising, staff resources and capacity building. There is support for the notion that localised service delivery with substantial resident involvement makes a difference, though it is hard to measure that difference. This study suggests that localised and co-located service delivery makes services more accessible to the most vulnerable groups; it is clear that they are designed and delivered in ways that are more user-friendly; and there are partners who now work together in ways that did not happen previously. What is important now is to find ways to show that all this leads to improved local outcomes.

Case Study B:

Neighbourhood management in a reviving housing market North Benwell, Newcastle upon Tyne

Aims, Objectives and Rationale

In 2002 Newcastle/Gateshead was selected as one of nine Housing Market Renewal (HMR) Pathfinders across the north of England. As a result, the area has received £73 million up to March 2006, with further funding to come to tackle the problems caused by unpopular and abandoned housing and the effect it has on local communities. The North Benwell neighbourhood management initiative is one of around 100 separate projects funded by the HMR Pathfinder (known as *Bridging Newcastle-Gateshead*).

The Neighbourhood Management Initiative (NMI) in North Benwell was set up in September 2003 in response to long-standing problems in the neighbourhood relating to low demand for housing. In order to address these issues the aims of the initiative were to:

- Ensure a healthy mixed-tenure housing market
- Narrow the gap between this area and those that are better off
- Create a cohesive, sustainable community
- Reduce crime to the national average
- Create a local partnership that monitors and has direct influence over the range of improving and responsive services in the area

In order to achieve these aims the initiative developed a number of more specific objectives to tackle empty homes, deal with environmental issues, reduce crime and develop community involvement. These objectives were then added to during the second year of activity to include: increasing owner occupation, encouraging health organisations to increase their work in the area and working with education providers.

The Neighbourhood

The initiative is situated in North Benwell, west of Newcastle city centre and covers the three areas of Elswick, Gill Street and High Cross. The area currently comprises 2,067 households with a total population of approximately 3,750, 20% of whom are from black and minority ethnic groups.

The area, which is dominated by two-storey Victorian terraces, is characterised by low levels of owner occupation and housing demand, high turnover of residents, an increasing amount of private landlord activity and poorly maintained houses. It also has high levels of unemployment (almost twice the Newcastle average), low levels of pay, high crime rates and a poor physical environment. The area does however benefit from having relatively good access to services. A wide range of shops and facilities are in close proximity including a hospital, police station and school.

The Delivery Process

There are a number of different organisations involved in the various processes of the initiative's delivery. The accountable body for the initiative is Newcastle City Council, However, staff are employed, and delivery is led, by the Registered Social Landlord (RSL) Home Group Limited.

The initiative has a core staff team of 4.5 (FTE) employees: a manager, an assistant, (both employed by Home Group Ltd) a community development worker (seconded from the City Council), a trainee on a Wise Group intermediate labour market project to provide administrative support and a part time assistant (paid for by the City Council). The wider team also includes four street wardens, employed by the City Council. All of the staff, regardless of who they are employed by, report directly to the Neighbourhood Manager. The team works from an office located directly within the terraces of North Benwell.

When the initiative was established in 2003 the Neighbourhood Manager took the decision not to set up a Partnership Board straightaway. Rather, the priority was seen to be the need to start delivering change and 'quick wins' immediately. In these early stages, therefore, the initiative was led by a Steering Group comprising five organisations: Newcastle City Council (8 representatives), Northumbria Police (2 representatives), *Bridging Newcastle-Gateshead* (1 representative), Home Group Ltd (1 representative) and Your Homes Newcastle (1 representative).

Below the steering group three working groups were also set up, each with a specific thematic focus: housing and environment; development of a youth strategy; and community safety. It was through these groups that local residents are engaged and involved.

This simple but practical structure has allowed staff to establish the initiative and concentrate on service improvement and community engagement rather than developing and managing the initiative's supporting structures. However, it was clear that over the longer term the initiative would require a more representative and inclusive structure involving a wider range of interests. Therefore, after the first year of operation they began the process of setting up a partnership to lead the initiative, to involve residents and community groups as well as service providers and funders.

In July 2005 a partnership board, consisting of 24 members, was formally established. In addition to the organisations represented on the steering group members also include various local residents' associations and community groups, SureStart, Your Homes Newcastle (the organisation responsible for managing the Council's housing stock), local voluntary organisations and local councillors. Of the 24 seats 21 are currently filled. At the time of writing, the initiative had not engaged with the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). However, there is a strong awareness within the North Benwell team that the new Board needs to engage with organisations (such as the LSP) to give it credibility, and the strategic and operational support it needs to sustain itself.

In addition to staff and administrative costs, which are covered by the HMR Pathfinder and the City Council, the initiative has an annual budget of £150,000 which has been used to fund a variety of different activities. To date the initiative's activities can be categorised under the following headings: quick wins; research and development; pilot/demonstration projects; and community involvement.

Perhaps the best example of a quick win in the North Benwell area has been the 'decorated board' scheme by which the windows of empty properties are covered not by metal shutters or wooden boards, but by brightly painted panels. Other quick wins have also included two 'Clean Sweep' weeks which have encouraged local people to come out into the streets to take part in improving their area, and community safety initiatives including the distribution of free car security locks, mobile CCTV and surveillance and the installation of window and door alarms to all properties.

Activity under the 'research and development' heading has included a Living Streets Audit to ascertain what investment was needed in the area's streets and green spaces. Research was also commissioned to explore residents' perceptions of North Benwell in terms of the environment, community safety, service provision, community facilities and general quality of life. This research was undertaken by Newcastle City Council's Neighbourhood services directorate and included 200 structured interviews with residents.

The key 'pilot/demonstration project' has been the renovation and conversion of 20 long-term empty flats into 10 private houses, a project that is hoped will result in the successful sale of new properties and will act as a catalyst for an upturn in levels of private owner-occupation in the area.

The final broad area of activity has been community engagement. This has included several cross-cultural community involvement events that have been held in order to engage the multicultural community that live within the area. The 'Benfest' community festival was coordinated by the initiative and proved very successful in providing the opportunity for residents to get to know each other and to fundraise for local causes. Other activities have included engaging residents in the planning, consultation and design processes for the development of a community garden and improvements to a local park.

Evidence of Results

In addition to funding various different activities the initiative has also made good progress in engaging service providers and encouraging them to work jointly at the local level. The initiative has been seeking to help reshape and join up mainstream services. Examples of particular progress include:

- The initiative has worked with the Police to support them to work at the local level, within a tightly defined number of streets to tackle specific problems as they arise. The approach has been so successful that it is now being replicated elsewhere by Northumbria Police.
- The initiative has worked to reduce the number of empty homes in the area. As lead delivery agent, Home Group Ltd has worked with the Newcastle Private Rented Project, Housing Associations and several City Council departments (Neighbourhood Services, Environmental Health) to target landlords with low management standards whose properties are in a state of disrepair, exert pressure on landlords and anti-social tenants to reduce anti-social activities; and provide advice and support to landlords who feel isolated and unable to deal with their anti-social tenants.

- The Neighbourhood Services directorate of Newcastle City Council has signed up to a Service Level Agreement for street cleansing and ground maintenance in North Benwell.

These activities have begun to have a number of tangible impacts and benefits within the neighbourhood, supported by the wider work of the HMR Pathfinder:

- 18% of the housing stock is owner-occupied in April 2005 (up from 16% in 2003-04);
- The number of empty properties fell by 26% from 121 in December 2004 to 89 in September 2005;
- 2 properties have been accredited under the Landlord Accreditation Scheme, with a further 8 properties pending as at August 2005; and
- In August 2003 Envirocall took 40 calls requesting action on abandoned cars, litter and graffiti, in August 2005 this had fallen to 19 calls.

There has also been a significant reduction in crime in the area which reduced by 30% in the first year of the initiative and then by a further 15% in the following year, although this is largely due to the extra resources of 11 officers and four Police Community Support Officers that work specifically within North Benwell, jointly funded by the HMR Pathfinder and Northumbria Police.

Conclusions

Local organisations believe that neighbourhood management in North Benwell has resulted in a faster and smarter way of addressing local problems. It has made good progress in getting agencies and service providers to work jointly at a local level and has been the catalyst for much of the networking which has taken place, and has added value to the wider work of the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.

Case Study C:

Area and neighbourhood working to improve services Gateshead

Aims, Objectives and Rationale

Neighbourhood management was first developed and implemented as an approach in Gateshead in 2002 and was adopted into the Council's Improvement Plan as one of six medium term objectives following its Comprehensive Performance Assessment by the Audit Commission. The decision was taken to implement neighbourhood management across the whole Borough, rather than just in some areas, because of the number of important issues that affected the Borough as a whole. Five neighbourhood management areas were therefore identified: West; Inner West; Central; East; and South. Each covers an area of 33-45,000 people.

Neighbourhood management is at the centre of Gateshead Council's improvement agenda and is considered to play a key role in the renewal of deprived areas within the Borough. The main aim is for services to be responsive to community needs by bringing service providers together, developing greater co-ordination and joining up of service provision at area and neighbourhood levels, and for services to be accountable to local priorities. Neighbourhood management arrangements seek to change or realign local services and create structures to shape future service delivery.

The neighbourhood management team are therefore responsible for influencing and co-ordinating the delivery of local services, rather than direct management. They also aim develop the capacity for communities to engage and influence service delivery.

The Neighbourhood

Gateshead covers a large area of 55 square miles, with a population of approximately 190,000, covering both rural and urban areas. Fifty percent of Gateshead's population falls within the 20% most deprived areas in England and nine of the 22 wards in the Borough are within the 10% most deprived areas. The deprivation issues facing such a large area vary between the five neighbourhood management areas. However, there are also common issues which include high levels of crime and anti-social behaviour, environmental issues, high levels of unemployment, low owner occupation, health issues and a lack of access to services.

The Delivery Process

The initiative has a "neighbourhood management team" based within Gateshead Council that includes a team manager, five area co-ordinators and five community partnership officers. The majority of funding for the team comes from the Neighbourhood renewal Fund (NRF), which had a £354,000 allocation for 2006-07. Some further support is also provided through Gateshead Council and the Housing Market Renewal (HMR) pathfinder fund.

Each of the five areas has an area executive forum with membership drawn from the main public sector agencies in Gateshead. The intention of the forums is to bring together senior managers that have the ability to change services. They are an integral part of Gateshead's LSP. The forums meet bi-monthly and currently include strong involvement from the Police, PCT and Gateshead Housing Company. The voluntary and community sectors are not represented on these forums.

The forums are required to develop 'area plans' that should inform the delivery of services within each area. The plans seek to connect opportunities in the area with neighbourhoods in need, identify whether existing services are addressing community strategy outcomes and community needs, and also identify what further improvements need to be undertaken.

Below the area forums a number of multi-agency operational tasking and co-ordination groups have, or are being, developed in each area for: crime, health, children and young people and housing market renewal. The aim of these is to address particular issues and ensure that local priorities are represented in neighbourhood, area and service delivery plans.

Despite not being represented on the area forums, strong community infrastructure is regarded as important element of the neighbourhood management arrangements. It was felt, by the council, that community involvement would be difficult to achieve at the area level, so instead the emphasis has been placed on supporting the community infrastructure at the neighbourhood level. Some 85 neighbourhoods have been identified within Gateshead through the 'Vitality Index' which draws on a range of local indicators.

The neighbourhood management team seeks to work through existing community structures, such as SRB partnerships and other community groups, and uses various consultation mechanisms to engage with a broad range of residents. However, many neighbourhoods do not presently have partnerships or structures in place. The aim is to develop 'neighbourhood plans' in each neighbourhood, to identify local issues and priorities, although this is a time consuming process and as yet only a few neighbourhoods have such plans in place.

In order to monitor progress towards delivering outcomes a neighbourhood information system is in the process of being developed. The aim of the system is to provide baselines, profile service delivery in neighbourhoods and evaluate the impact of area plans at a local level.

Activities

Since its inception the neighbourhood management team has been involved in a large number of tangible and tacit activities that focus on influencing mainstream services and providers, rather than directly providing services. These activities have mainly concentrated on community consultation, and tackling local environmental issues, crime and anti-social behaviour.

Community consultation has been one of the central functions of the team. It has occurred through a variety of mechanisms. Community consultation activities have included working with and helping to build the capacity of the Borough's tenant and resident organisations; neighbourhood planning in schools; community events and the establishment of a community infrastructure database. Much consultation has been focused on specific issues or events.

Much of the work around the environment, crime and anti-social behaviour has focused on improving the relationship between the local community and the service providers, thereby increasing the likelihood of incidents being reported and therefore solutions being identified, a process to which the neighbourhood management team have been integral.

Evidence of Results

The team have the operational capacity to influence and coordinate the activities of mainstream service departments, but do not manage or deliver services. At a strategic level there have been changes to corporate polices. The Police, PCT and Gateshead Housing Company have all set up area structures to mirror the neighbourhood management area structures. The children and young people's service also has an area structure, and parts of environmental services are working through these arrangements. Thematic plans are also being made more area orientated at the LSP level.

At the operational level, the primary changes have involved the joining up of services. The neighbourhood management team have been pivotal in developing this, the main attributes of which involve "getting people round the table", sharing information, identifying common, interrelated issues, agreeing priorities for neighbourhoods and joining up individual action, as part of a service remit, to address particular issues. These types of joining up have been most evident in services around crime, anti-social behaviour and environmental issues. Whilst there are numerous examples of benefits arising from these activities in particular neighbourhoods and areas, there is no more comprehensive data presently available, however, on the impact of neighbourhood management on the five areas.

The neighbourhood management team have also undertaken a considerable amount of work to engage communities, community bodies and the voluntary sector. However, there is no significant evidence to date to indicate improvements in the overall capacity of residents to hold service providers accountable, a factor that is exacerbated by the lack of resident representation at area forums.

Conclusions

Gateshead's Council and LSP are committed to moving from a borough-wide approach to an area based approach. The area executive forums, and the related tasking and co-ordination groups, have helped to promote stronger partnership working and a more joined up approach by service providers to a number of issues. The NM team have had a key role in facilitating and supporting this process, and a number of providers have re-aligned service planning boundaries to fit these structures. Benefits so far have been in relation to a more joined up response to local problems, although not a major reshaping of services. Changes to services have been at the operational level rather than the strategic level.

The NM team do not manage or deliver services but seek to influence them. They have also undertaken a lot of community consultation, in different areas and on different issues, and this has helped to identify and improve understanding of local issues. However, whilst there are neighbourhood structures in some areas Gateshead does not have consistent or comprehensive structures covering every neighbourhood. The preparation of neighbourhood plans is progressing, but only slowly so far and only in some neighbourhoods, given the limited capacity of the central NM team. The community and voluntary sector are also not represented on the area executive forums, so engagement with providers and communities is largely conducted separately.

The present arrangements in Gateshead are perhaps closer to 'area co-ordination' than the model of 'neighbourhood management' that it is currently being practised elsewhere, although the approach is evolving and a stronger neighbourhood focus is under discussion.

Case Study D:

Neighbourhood management and service delivery Doncaster

Aims, Objectives and Rationale

The development and implementation of neighbourhood management arrangements in Doncaster was prompted by a White Paper issued by the Mayor, after extensive local consultation, in 2002. Neighbourhood management was identified as a means of bringing residents and statutory service providers together to improve services and also as a key tool to deliver the Borough's Community Strategy and achieve 'transformation' in every neighbourhood.

The Borough's Community Strategy, LAA and the Council's corporate strategy have all been important driving forces in establishing and shaping the Borough's neighbourhood management arrangements. In particular, the Community Strategy identifies the importance of translating strategic themes into services and activities that can meet the specific needs of each area, and of involving the community more clearly in decision-making.

The structure of the LAA, with its three themes of 'strong, safe sustainable communities', 'children, young people and schools' and 'healthier communities and vulnerable people' has been used as an organising principle for the development of service and neighbourhood plans across the Borough.

The Area

Doncaster has a total population of 285,000 and comprises an urban conurbation surrounded by more rural areas. Doncaster includes both affluent and very deprived areas. Deprived areas within the borough face similar issues of crime, anti-social behaviour and environmental issues, along with poor health and worklessness. Certain communities also have serious drugs problems, while other neighbourhoods face problems around excluded pupils from schools, social exclusion, and transport. In the most deprived areas there are also major issues around access to services.

The Delivery Process

The development and implementation of neighbourhood management arrangements in Doncaster has occurred over a relatively short period of time. The commitment to joining-up services in the Mayor's White Paper led to the creation of 'Community First' later in 2003. This is the Council's operational mechanism for delivering a range of services within neighbourhoods, mainly to provide 'cleaner streets and safer neighbourhoods' including such services as grounds maintenance, park management, waste collection, street cleansing and community safety.

NRF was used to fund projects in three neighbourhoods to pilot this approach. This was followed from the beginning of 2005 by a substantial restructuring within the Council to a more neighbourhood management-oriented structure. The intention is that this will assist the Council in becoming more clearly customer focused, by

delivering more joined up services that are more responsive to local concerns. An increasing range of services are delivered through area and neighbourhood arrangements.

The restructured council now has six main directorates as follows, with the Neighbourhoods, Communities and Children's Services (NCCS) directorate being the one largely responsible for the delivery of services on an area basis. Within the NCCS directorate there are five '*area managers*', each responsible for one of five areas that cover the whole borough. Above these managers are three '*Community Directors*' who have a matrix of responsibilities. Each one is responsible for two areas (including the town centre). Each community director is also responsible for one of the three LAA themes (at time of writing) across the borough at a strategic level.

Within each of the five areas, there are also a number of neighbourhoods (usually up to three), with each having a *neighbourhood manager and a neighbourhood delivery team*. There is a total of 15 neighbourhoods, plus the town centre. The identification of these neighbourhoods is based on "natural communities", along with consideration of other forms of intelligence, such as the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004.

Each neighbourhood manager is responsible for the delivery of all council services within that neighbourhood, whether their team provides it directly (the 'community first' services) or whether it is a borough-wide service. The neighbourhood manager is therefore the "hub for all activity within that community". They can also seek support from other neighbourhood managers in the area if they have little expertise around a particular issue (e.g. a manager with responsibility for environmental services can seek support from a manager with youth service responsibilities when dealing with youth issues).

Neighbourhood managers also each have borough-wide responsibility for leading one policy activity within the LAA thematic blocks, including horticulture, community safety, and youth services. There is an expectation that neighbourhood managers will develop actions for their particular theme in those neighbourhoods that are affected by certain issues, and in consultation with the neighbourhood managers responsible for those areas. This is part of the matrix management approach being developed in the Council.

Neighbourhood managers meet together through area meetings and more broadly across the borough for their particular thematic responsibility. Local Service Delivery Teams are in place for all service providers to meet around operational and problem solving issues, while other mechanisms such as joint action groups (for Police activity) are in place. These bodies are providing formalised contexts in which greater joining-up is developing.

The Council is at an early stage in this process. The next stage for the Council is to restructure to the neighbourhood those services that have not yet been affected, such as highways. Performance management monitoring and reporting has now been centralised. The corporate centre (in this case the Policy, Partnerships and Governance Directorate) is working with area teams to develop new monitoring arrangements that suit local issues, rather than being imposed on area teams.

Given that neighbourhood management in Doncaster involves a number of mainstream service departments, working through structures that are relatively new, it is very difficult to provide a total **operating cost**, or to separate out the additional cost of moving to a neighbourhood management structure.

Engagement of partners

There are a broad number of **partners** involved with neighbourhood management in Doncaster, although partners tend to vary in the degree to which they are involved. Engagement occurs at the strategic level through the area service planning process and at an operational level through various mechanisms (such as local service teams, which have thematic groups below them).

The South Yorkshire Police are the most significant partners through their new neighbourhood policing approach and are working closely with the council to roll out this approach. The Police have Safer Neighbourhood Teams located in each area and have responsibility for reducing crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour, whilst at the same time helping to develop community ownership of issues and capacity to address these issues. Their teams are co-located with the council's area teams.

Direct involvement from other service providers in the borough has been less significant to date. The Doncaster Strategic Partnership provides the overarching strategic context for partnership working in the area. Thematic partnerships work below this body. This provides a mechanism for the Council to engage other bodies, such as the LSC and Job Centre Plus, although they have much lower levels of participation in neighbourhood management arrangements.

Neighbourhood management activities

Neighbourhood management at Doncaster MBC involves considerable devolution of activity and decision-making powers to areas and neighbourhoods, and stronger links between the council's different services. This covers important policy areas such as community safety, environment, children, young people and health. During 2005 there was a period of bedding-down of structures, systems and procedures, alongside extensive delivery of services and greater joining-up at the neighbourhood scale but it must also be remembered that certain services have only recently reconfigured to neighbourhood management arrangements.

There has also been extensive consultation with communities. NM teams use a variety of mechanisms in which to consult the community, such as attending community meetings, inviting community bodies to meetings, surveys and focus groups. Area support teams are being located in every area office with the purpose of assisting in the process of community and service provider engagement. Their work will assist in the neighbourhood planning process. Present engagement is occurring as NM teams develop service and neighbourhood plans. Community forums have been in place for some time and are consulted as part of the neighbourhood management process. The focus in some areas has therefore been on building upon, rather than replicating previous consultations. However, there is recognition of the need to move beyond community forums, as these can be constituted by the 'usual suspects'. New structures and partnerships have generally not been established thus far, with an emphasis on working with existing groups. Not all areas have partnerships.

Some areas are working towards developing joint arrangements with other partners around community consultation to ensure there is not duplication and a consistent approach can be developed. This is a taking place between the council and the Police's Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

Evidence of Results

Neighbourhood management structures now provide a mechanism in which officers on the ground are better able to engage communities and act upon their priorities. The new arrangements are efforts to develop the capacity of communities to influence service providers. They are at the beginning of this process as communities are consulted for the service and neighbourhood plans, and efforts are made to develop the capacity of communities. Service plans will reflect community priorities and be robust in terms of being plans for tackling these priorities. Efforts will continue to strengthen the capacity of local communities to express their views.

The work being undertaken by neighbourhood managers is also leading to far greater engagement and involvement of councillors in the development of service and neighbourhood plans.

In terms of changes to mainstream services, a significant range of services now work through neighbourhood management arrangements. There has been a redeployment of services, resources and decision-making powers to the "frontline", with "better links between all services" which mean that neighbourhood managers are better placed to address local issues. Already at this early stage the re-alignment of services and budgets is believed to be creating greater flexibility in which to address local issues.

With the exception of the Police, no other partners at this time are significantly re-allocating and re-shaping services to neighbourhood management, but they are displaying greater sensitivity to the neighbourhood management arrangements of the Council. The Police have a commitment to neighbourhood policing. The Safer Neighbourhood teams have restructured so that they match neighbourhood management boundaries and are co-located with the council's area teams.

There are many instances of greater joining-up of services, mainly at an operational level. Evidence for strategic-level joining-up at area levels is less clear. The close relationship developing between Doncaster MBC and the Police is evident in a number of ways. They have tended not to charge each other for particular services, such as the use of council buildings by the Police or council officers attending Police problem solving meetings. These close relations through day-to-day interactions mean that it is possible to quickly address local issues. A multi-agency approach through the Safer Neighbourhood Teams has been successful in tackling anti-social behaviour in the central area, along with undertaking extensive consultation with local communities around what action is to be undertaken and what diversionary activity is to be put in place.

Conclusions

The transition to new neighbourhood management arrangements involves a considerable range of services at Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council. This represents a sizeable devolution of decision-making powers, competencies and resources to the area and neighbourhood scales, over a relatively short period of

time. Indeed, the bedding down of neighbourhood management structures, systems and procedures are still taking place and, as such, it is too early to fully judge the effectiveness of present arrangements in achieving objectives, particularly with respect to outcomes.

The Council is more directly responsive and accountable to communities in Doncaster. The matrix neighbourhood management model provides greater flexibility for area and neighbourhood managers to address local concerns, particularly compared with the constraints of the previous 'silo' system, where all services were managed separately.

The restructuring process to date is proceeding without major difficulties. There is the potential for issues to arise in the future as implementation progresses. There remains the challenge of securing closer joint working with other service providers (such as the PCTs, Job Centre Plus and LSC) and also strengthening the community and voluntary sector input to the process. The effectiveness of the matrix organisational arrangements also remains to be tested over time, given the complexity of multiple lines of responsibility, disparate decision-making centres and the pressures placed on personnel working through complicated arrangements.

Case Study E:

Neighbourhood managers: enablers and brokers London Borough of Haringey

Aims, Objectives and Rationale

Neighbourhood management has been operating in the London Borough of Haringey since 2002. The rationale behind its introduction was that it would create a borough-wide infrastructure that would help to coordinate and manage the separate projects funded through Neighbourhood Renewal Funds across the borough, the New Deal for Communities (NDC) programme in Seven Sisters and the two SRB projects in Northumberland Park and West Green.

More specifically the aims of neighbourhood management were to provide a service that was driven by local needs, to build trust with residents and work with other organisations in providing services locally. Through dedicated neighbourhood managers, acting as 'enablers and brokers' the objective was to bring services and residents together to drive change at the local level.

The Neighbourhood

Haringey is an outer London borough with levels of deprivation that are the 10th most extensive in England. It has a population of approximately 224,300, almost half of whom are from black and minority ethnic communities. Haringey has the highest 'other white' population in the UK with many refugees and asylum seekers and an estimated 193 languages are spoken across the Borough. The housing tenure is predominantly privately owned, with a high proportion of private rented accommodation especially Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

This case study focuses in particular on one neighbourhood management area in Green Lanes, which has an estimated population of up to 30,000 people. The area centres on Green Lanes itself, a long busy shopping street that is the hub of local life and which is dominated by Greek and Turkish traders. It is not a priority deprived area within Haringey and does not receive special funding. The area has experienced economic decline in the past. The issues of greatest concern when neighbourhood management was introduced to this area in early 2003 were trade waste, traffic, violent crime, licensing of clubs and drugs-related crime. The area was also struggling with a poor image, and was perceived as dirty and dangerous because of these crime and grime issues. Local public services were not sufficiently joined-up, and residents complained of a lack of response from the council to the issues they raised.

The Delivery Process

Neighbourhood management operates in eight neighbourhoods, which were identified as priority areas for Neighbourhood Renewal Funding: Broadwater Farm, Bruce Grove, Green Lanes, Noel Park, Northumberland Park, Seven Sisters (New Deal for Communities Programme), West Green, and White Hart Lane. It was initially operated out of the Environmental Services directorate at the Council, which was appropriate given the focus on physical/visible improvements in the neighbourhood. However, it has now moved into the Chief Executive's Service to provide a more corporate focus.

There is a central neighbourhood management co-ordinator, based at the Council and neighbourhood managers for each of the 8 neighbourhoods (although one has been covering two areas). Each neighbourhood has a budget of £22,000 to spend each year. Neighbourhood management in Haringey has therefore functioned on modest funding, mainly from Neighbourhood Renewal Funds and depends almost entirely on influence and negotiation with key service providers.

The neighbourhood managers are also responsible for supporting the borough's seven Area Assemblies (each covering 2-4 wards and with a population of up to 30,000 people). These are an important forum for local discussion.

Neighbourhood management arrangements have evolved in different areas in different ways, according to local processes and the different configurations of stakeholders, priorities and existing funding sources. This case study focuses on how the processes have evolved in the Green Lanes neighbourhood.

Green Lanes

In Green Lanes, the introduction of neighbourhood management can be traced back to an incident in November 2002 of gang-related violence stemming from a shooting in a social club, which resulted in the death of an innocent bystander, and a street battle between rival gang members. This incident led to a local outcry about the lack of effective policing and regulation of private clubs in Green Lanes. Haringey Council and the Metropolitan Police held two public meetings to discuss the event and other local concerns. More than 80 people, including local residents and their representatives, traders and voluntary groups, attended these meetings. This subsequently led to a more permanent arrangement. In November 2003, a working group was set up to bring together key stakeholders in the area, i.e. police, local ward councillors, local traders, local representatives from residents' associations and officers from the council departments to work together to develop a strategy for the Green Lanes area. Two executive members from the Council with portfolios of Crime and Community Safety and Social Services and Health, were delegated to lead the process, and the MP for Tottenham gave his endorsement.

The working group then formally became the Green Lanes Strategy Group (GLSG), chaired by the Executive Member for Crime and Community Safety. The group agreed to focus on a range of environmental safety and planning issues: licensing, planning, environmental health and housing, waste management, traffic management, grime and crime, consultation and resources. In the early stages when the group was being set up, meetings were attended by directors of council departments, and by the Police Commander. Currently, the group is regularly attended by area-level service providers, and on average 3-4 of the six ward councillors, including the Chair.

The GLSG works to an action plan which is organised under headings which reflect their agreed focus and objectives. GLSG activities and issues raised are fed into the local Area Assembly – in this case the St Ann's and Haringey Area Assembly which covers 2 wards.

In Green Lanes a lot of the activities supported by neighbourhood management are quick wins, to demonstrate that neighbourhood management and the Council are listening to local concerns, and as a quick injection of local pride in the neighbourhood. This included hanging baskets, Christmas lights and other physical improvements to the Green Lanes Railway Bridge and Haringey Passage.

Another activity undertaken within Green Lanes has been the implementation of pilot/demonstration projects to improve local services. Possibly the best example of this type of activity has been the negotiation of a new approach to trade waste collection. In 2003 through negotiations with Haringey Council and the refuse collection contractors, a twice-daily waste collection service for businesses and flats above shops was piloted. The GLSG insisted that the new approach had to be communicated to traders and residents in Turkish, Kurdish and Greek. The pilot was extremely successful and as a result, has now been rolled out in the Borough.

The final broad area of activity with in Green Lanes has been community engagement. The GLSG has sought to reconnect the community with service providers and has been very effective at involving and retaining the participation of residents' associations, local traders and other voluntary groups. It has also been successful at bringing different ethnic communities together to discuss issues.

Evidence of Results

Within Green Lanes, these activities have impacted on both the local community capacity and the behaviour of mainstream service providers.

Neighbourhood management in Green Lanes has been community driven from the outset and the participation of representatives of Residents Associations, traders and voluntary organisations in the GLSG is very strong, it is in fact these representatives that set the GLSG agenda and not the neighbourhood manager or the Council. The priority of the neighbourhood manager, in regards to the community, has not been capacity building, as there was already significant local organisational capacity. Rather, it has been to find ways to tap into this strength, and channel it. However, in other areas of the Borough, there is a greater need for capacity building, which is reflected in the different priorities and activities of the other neighbourhood managers.

Neighbourhood management has influenced the behaviour of local mainstream service providers in a number of different ways:

- Corporate policies and practices have been changed: as a result of working with the GLSG, the Police have set up a surgery for Turkish and Kurdish residents with Turkish and Kurdish police officers.
- Mainstream services have been reshaped: waste collection in Green Lanes was changed from an inadequate wheellie bin service to a twice daily timed collection, with a tangible impact on the local environment.
- Services have been joined up: the GLSG is about a holistic and inclusive approach where residents and traders sit alongside service providers.

Neighbourhood management has contributed to improvements that have made the area cleaner and safer, which in turn has impacted upon the local economy.

From April 2006, the LSP have decided to extend neighbourhood management in the borough. Each of the seven areas that cover the borough (each 2-4 wards, up to approx 30,000 people) will have a neighbourhood manager and a community/project worker, depending on local priorities. It is expected that the Council will also assign existing area project officers from youth services, employment and environment to work at this level (according to local needs and priorities) under the neighbourhood managers, resulting in combined area teams from different disciplines, joining up plans and resources at the area level from their council departments, along with the partner agencies.

Conclusions

Neighbourhood management in Green Lanes has been successful in achieving its short and mid-term objectives. Both the neighbourhood manager and the Chair have played a crucial role in brokering relationships between traders, residents and service providers. Getting these groups together is seen as a huge achievement, particularly since it has been sustained over 3 years now.

For Haringey more generally, neighbourhood management is being rolled out borough-wide and has been recognised as an important ingredient in how the Council works with local communities. The proposed areas for neighbourhood management are generally larger than at present; they will match the seven areas of the Assemblies which cover 3-4. As each area differs, there are therefore different expectations for each area, especially as they do not begin neighbourhood management at the same starting point, but with different community capacities and local needs.

Case Study F:

Neighbourhood management: co-ordinating services, improving accountability City of Salford

Aims, Objectives and Rationale

Salford's model for neighbourhood management was developed city-wide in early 2004. The rationale for the model was political recognition of the need to join-up service delivery through partnership working at area/neighbourhood levels. More specifically it aims to:

- engage effectively with local communities;
- meet the needs of communities and improve neighbourhoods; and
- close the gap between the best and worst performing areas.

The Neighbourhood

Salford's neighbourhood management model is a city-wide initiative that covers eight Community Committee areas that are combinations of either two or three wards and range in population size from 14,000 (Worsley and Boothstown) to nearly 39,000 (Swinton).

The Community Committee areas vary economically and socially from prosperous suburban areas (Worsley and Boothstown and Swinton South) to disadvantaged inner-city (Ordsall and Langworthy and parts of Salford East) and outer areas (Little Hulton). The Eccles area contains a significant proportion of the city's Black and Minority Ethnic population, especially of Yemeni origin and the Broughton Park area in Kersal, East Salford houses the largest Orthodox Jewish community outside London.

The Delivery Process

Neighbourhood management in Salford is local authority led under the guidance of Partners IN Salford, the city's Local Strategic Partnership. It is a model based on strong political leadership from the City Council with a Lead Member having joint responsibility for Service Development and Neighbourhood Management and chairing a Cabinet sub-committee to oversee activity. It is also a federal model, coordinated centrally and delivered. Its operation is guided by a set of protocols that clearly set out the roles of the different elements of the overall structure and also what is expected of the different managers involved.

Central coordination is provided by a small team based in the Council's Community Services Directorate. The team is led by the Assistant Director of Community Services (with joint responsibility for Neighbourhood Management and Cohesion) who is supported by the Neighbourhood Management Coordinator. The Assistant Director is responsible for translating strategic-level commitment to neighbourhood management

into activity on the ground, and has direct access to other senior officers across the City Council's Directorates and senior politicians. The Neighbourhood Management Coordinator coordinates activity across the neighbourhood management areas, a role that involves building relationships between council service departments and partner agencies, providing training for the neighbourhood management teams and supporting the neighbourhood managers and youth, health and community development workers and others involved in the programme.

The Assistant Director and Neighbourhood Management Coordinator meet fortnightly with the neighbourhood managers to discuss progress and any issues arising. They report to a Neighbourhood Management Implementation Group. This group meets quarterly and currently comprises senior-level representatives from the City Council, two Registered Social Landlords (RSL), Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Services, Greater Manchester Police, the Council's housing ALMO (Arms Length Management Organisation), Salford Community Leisure, Salford PCT, and Urban Vision. The purpose of this group is to monitor the delivery of neighbourhood management across the city.

Each of the eight neighbourhood management areas has the same basic structure, which comprises:

- A **Community Committee** which meets every 2 months and is made up of representatives from local voluntary and community organisations and ward councillors. Its purpose is to act as a forum for local people, to discuss local concerns and issues and to scrutinise local services. It has a small devolved budget, currently set at £2.20 per head of population to spend and is responsible for producing annual Community Action Plans;
- A **Political Executive** that is made up of the councillors representing the wards that make up the neighbourhood management area. This group provides political leadership for the Community Committee and represents the community views and interests in the City Council. They also agree the Community Committee spending decisions as well as promoting partnership working and facilitating solutions to problems;
- An **Executive Group** which comprises senior officers from the Council, the PCT, police and other key service providers alongside a nominated councillor and representatives of the Community Committee. The group meets quarterly and aims to provide interdepartmental and interagency leadership in delivering local services, and to ensure that there is an overall plan for the area and to monitor the delivery of local services;
- A **neighbourhood management team** made up of staff nominated by the Council and other key service providers. The full-time core staff includes a neighbourhood manager, an administrative officer and a community development worker. The team supports the Committee and Executives, ensures production, monitoring and implementation of the Community Action Plan for their area, and lead and coordinate the work of the officers nominated by partner agencies. Each team has autonomy in deciding how they operate. Teams can include up to 30 people, with many service providers providing staff to deliver services and act as links. The neighbourhood manager co-ordinates their work but does not line manage them;

- An **Area Coordinator** supports the neighbourhood managers at a more senior level in the shape of Chief Officers, deputy Chief Officers, or Heads of Service from across the Council's Directorates. They are expected to support the neighbourhood managers and neighbourhood management team in their area and to give strategic leadership to the Community Committee and Executive Group. They are also expected to work with their counterparts in partner agencies to promote neighbourhood management and to tackle issues that hinder neighbourhood management and community engagement within the City Council.

Not taking into account the costs incurred by the mainstream Council staff or partner agencies, neighbourhood management currently costs the Council approximately £1.5 million annually (including the devolved area budgets of £2.20 per head of population accounting for just under a third of the total). In the current financial year, £115,000 comes from NRF funding. The core cost is approx £190,000 per area.

The last two years have been taken up with getting the new structures in place, training and development, producing two rounds of Community Action Plans and project activity on the ground. The central team has also been involved in an ongoing 'marketing' programme, 'selling' the new model and arrangements to politicians and to service providers both inside and outside the Council. Getting some of the new elements of the structure and notably the Executive Groups fully up and running took time and took longer in some areas than others.

A number of different activities have been pursued across the neighbourhood management areas. They cover all themes but, reflecting local priorities, have more emphasis on crime and community safety, community engagement, health and general liveability issues than economic development.

Evidence of Results

The neighbourhood management process appears to have made a significant contribution to developing community capacity through its community engagement structures and activity. Support for existing community groups has been secured through the Community Action Plans and new groups, including groups representing BME and faith communities, have been formed. The structures – notably in the Community Committees and Executive Groups and links between them – do appear to have improved the capacity of community groups to hold service providers to account through both consultation and involvement in deliberative decision-making.

There is also some evidence of the way in which key service providers are changing their behaviour as a result of their involvement in neighbourhood management:

- Greater Manchester Police changed its operational structure in the spring of 2004 with the force's twelve divisions moving to a 'unitary structure' in which existing sub-divisions were replaced by neighbourhood-based 'Areas' with Neighbourhood Inspectors responsible for policing within them. The Salford division has five areas. Two of these each cover one Neighbourhood Management Area and the other three each cover two areas;
- Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue has restructured its operations, moving from three Territorial Commands to eleven smaller Borough Commands that align with

Greater Manchester's ten local authorities Salford is one such Command with five fire stations. Officers from these stations are attached to individual Neighbourhood Management Areas and teams; and

- Salford has a single PCT serving it, which is divided into four operational areas, each taking in roughly two Neighbourhood Management Areas. PCT involvement in Neighbourhood Management is principally through its four Health Improvement Teams. Three of these teams are allocated to the three Neighbourhood Management Areas with the greatest health inequalities and needs (Salford East, Odsall and Langworthy and Claremont and Weaste) and the fourth team covers the other five Neighbourhood Management Areas.

The Council has also changed the way in which it works to reflect the shift to Neighbourhood Management, which has resulted in the creation of a new Children's Services Directorate, the amalgamation of Housing and Planning into a new Directorate and the creation of a Community, Health and Social Care Directorate.

It is, however, difficult to measure the impact of neighbourhood management across the areas because of a lack of available data and the short time that the initiative has been fully operating. The City Council does have a relatively sophisticated Neighbourhood Information Management System and it is hoped that data will become available in due course.

Conclusions

Salford's neighbourhood management initiative appears to be heading in the right direction: the neighbourhood management structures have been put in place, key partner agencies are all coming on board and there is growing evidence that key service providers are adapting their behaviour to neighbourhood management. Neighbourhood management represents a significant change in the way that councillors, residents and service providers relate to each other in the city and has the potential to have a more significant impact on the city in the future, as it develops.

Case Study G:

Rolling out neighbourhood management City of Wolverhampton

Aims, Objectives and Rationale

In 2002, Wolverhampton City Council and its partners established a pilot programme of neighbourhood management across a number of deprived areas in the city.

Neighbourhood management was identified as a key plank of the city's first neighbourhood renewal strategy in 2002. The Wolverhampton Strategic Partnership (WSP) agreed to pilot neighbourhood management in six different parts of the city from 2002, using the model set out in the Social Exclusion Unit's Policy Action Team 4 Report, but allowing for some variation in approach between areas. A seventh pilot area was added in 2003. The flexibility of NRF funding has been useful in allowing experimentation with different approaches; the Pilots have evolved over time.

The seven pilot areas cover 22,337 households, which is 24% of all households in the city and includes approximately half of the city's identified deprived neighbourhoods. A number of the pilots also included some less deprived neighbourhoods, to test the approach in different types of area.

The Neighbourhoods

Wolverhampton has a population of about 240,000, including 20% in minority ethnic communities, is one of the 88 most deprived local authority areas in England and has been in receipt of Neighbourhood Renewal Funds since 2002. The seven neighbourhood management pilot areas all have between 2500 – 4100 households (up to c.12,000 population maximum) but differ from each other in a number of respects:

- Dovecotes and Pendeford Park – on the north west edge of the city, including both a deprived neighbourhood and a more affluent area;
- Wednesfield – an area north east of the city centre, consisting of five different neighbourhoods stretching from the inner city to the outer suburbs and largely deprived;
- St. Anne's, Rakegate, Wobaston, Three Tons – on the northern edge of the city, with a deprived neighbourhood adjacent to some more mixed areas including pockets of deprivation;
- Penn Fields and Merridale/Chapel Ash – a densely populated and ethnically diverse area to the west of the city centre and part of the inner city;
- Eastfield, East Park and Stowheath – deprived neighbourhoods to the east of the city centre;

- Millfields, Ettingshall and Stowlawn – a largely deprived area to the south east of the city centre and adjacent to Bilston Town Centre; and
- Dunstall and Whitmore Reans – the seventh pilot added in 2003, to the north west of the city centre and one of the most deprived parts of the city.

The Delivery Process

The main common features of the model being employed by the seven Neighbourhood Management Pilots are as follows:

- There is a full-time Neighbourhood Manager, supported by a Partnership officer (whose main role is community involvement) and an Administrative officer in each area. In most Pilots team members are directly employed by the City Council;
- The teams are based in their neighbourhoods, sometimes co-located with other projects or partnerships;
- The Pilots each have a £20,000 budget to spend each year on 'quick wins' and projects, together with a budget to run the office;
- Each Pilot has a Managing Agent, which is an organisation that provides practical and professional support to the Neighbourhood Manager and team. The role varies in practice, but generally a representative of the Agent will meet with the Neighbourhood Manager on a regular basis to discuss progress, and provide some oversight of their work. The Managing Agent also usually provides an 'accountable body' function for the Pilot's expenditure;
- Most Pilots are led by a neighbourhood partnership, including local residents and representatives of local service providers. The nature and organisation of these partnerships varies between areas, as they have developed in different ways;
- All Pilots prepared wide ranging neighbourhood action plans in 2002/2003, some of which have been reviewed and updated since. Each Manager also submits a written report to the central Neighbourhood Management Co-ordinator and their Managing Agent each quarter, reporting on progress against key actions; and
- The total direct cost of the neighbourhood management programme (including the cost of the 7 Pilots and the central co-ordination) is £1.1million per year, funded mainly from NRF (up until 2005/6), equating to approximately £150,000 per neighbourhood per year.

In addition to the activities in each neighbourhood, the Managers and their teams meet together every month and work together on issues in common. Each Manager leads on a key issue.

The Neighbourhood Managers have engaged in a wide variety of activities in the last three years. Most of their activities have fallen into the following categories:

- **Neighbourhood partnership development** – Neighbourhood Managers and their teams have invested time in building up community involvement and service provider involvement in the Pilots, through setting up and operating

neighbourhoods boards or similar (in most cases) and undertaking a range of other local consultation exercises;

- **Community capacity building** – In addition to this, there has been some work to build the capacity of some individual groups and local community assets, including refurbishment of community centres and other facilities, together with support for the better networking of local groups;
- **Quick wins** – all Pilots have delivered a range of small, local, one-off ‘quick wins’ to raise their profile and provide particular benefits locally;
- **Local project development/management** – some Managers have worked to initiate or develop specific local projects that will address a local issue or need. These are not always about improving services per se, but can be significant attempts to solve local problems and bring new funds into the neighbourhood;
- **Mainstream service improvement** – all Pilots have worked with a range of mainstream service providers, both in their neighbourhoods and working together across neighbourhoods, to improve those services in some way, to make them more accessible or more effective in addressing identified local needs.

Key Factors

Although each Pilot has been different, and the programme is a complex one, some common factors can be identified as of particular relevance and significance in shaping its progress. Some of the supporting factors include:

- The city has a good history of partnership working and this has provided a positive and collaborative atmosphere within which the Pilots have been able to work. The approach of most Neighbourhood Managers towards service providers has generally not been confrontational, but collaborative.
- Within the Council, there has been clear support for neighbourhood management from the leadership, councillors and senior officers. The Wolverhampton Strategic Partnership (the LSP) has also been very supportive at a strategic level.
- The use of relatively small areas made up of ‘natural’ neighbourhoods has been helpful in ensuring that the pilot areas make sense to local people. Those areas that have been less geographically coherent have been harder to manage.
- Being council employees has given the Neighbourhood Managers credibility with service heads in the council, and meant that they often know who to talk to about different problems. The relationship with Managing Agents, and having a base within the Pilot areas, has also allowed them to present themselves to residents as not just typical council employees. The arrangement has worked to their advantage.
- Having several Neighbourhood Managers/pilot areas has allowed collaboration and collective working between areas on strategic issues that has reinforced messages and strengthened the case for change at both city-wide level and in individual neighbourhoods.

Some other factors have been less helpful:

- Those Pilot areas that have not had a history of partnership working or do not have very coherent areas have struggled to deliver coherent local decision-making structures. The crossing of ward boundaries, requiring consultation with more councillors and forums, has compounded these difficulties.
- The failure to act on a limited set of priorities each year has led most Pilots to work in a less focused way to some extent, reducing their impact. A more regular annual action planning process in each area, with clear priorities, would provide greater focus.
- The level of community involvement achieved overall has generally been good, but there is a need to broaden out involvement, and improve their representativeness of local partnerships.
- The role of Managing Agents would benefit from being more clearly defined, and more effort made to enable them to add value to initiatives. Neighbourhood Managers should have clearer line management (and professional support/training) arrangements.

Evidence of Results

In three years, the Neighbourhood Managers and their teams have built up a network of active neighbourhood partnerships capable of making a difference, and have established their own credibility and profile as practical and capable operators in the city. We found a remarkable degree of support from most stakeholders for the Managers and their teams, signalling a clear sense of momentum.

The Managers have worked with a wide range of service providers and have succeeded in delivering a range of tangible local benefits in each pilot area, as well as some significant city-wide benefits. These have included changes to mainstream services, including greater joint working and the better targeting of services on local needs in particular. Most progress has been achieved in relation to improved environmental services, and in improving community safety. Progress has also been made in strengthening local community capacity.

Evidence to date suggests that local impacts include the following:

- There is evidence that Pilot areas are generally cleaner and enjoy faster rubbish removal than previously due to improved local environmental services;
- Some neighbourhoods have experienced a reduction in some types of crime – e.g. burglary – as a result of specific environmental improvements and other projects;
- Specific sites and facilities have been improved and refurbished, providing visible tangible benefits to local users of those facilities;

It cannot be said that neighbourhood management, in three years, has transformed the neighbourhoods in which it has been operating, nor that it is now the main force for service improvement in the city. However, it has certainly made a unique and valuable contribution, delivering a number of mainstream service improvements and local projects that are unlikely to have been achieved any other way. The Neighbourhood Managers have been able to add value to the work of service providers and community networks, helping them to get more from their own programmes.

Summary of benefits

From our research we would summarise the key benefits of neighbourhood management as delivered in Wolverhampton as follows:

- **Listening – responsive to local concerns** – Neighbourhood Managers provide an open, accessible point where local people and groups and agencies can express their concerns. They provide a ‘one-stop-shop for local problems’. Neighbourhood Managers are amongst the few professionals in the city who do not belong to any particular service provider ‘silo’ and can identify ‘joined up problems’ and pursue solutions with whoever they need to;
- **Connectivity – promoting neighbourhood networking** – the Pilots have all strengthened and deepened the networks within their neighbourhoods, putting service providers and community groups in touch with each other, encouraging partnership working and increasing information sharing and signposting;
- **Advocacy – acting as a neighbourhood advocate** – the Neighbourhood Managers can bid for funds for their areas and lobby service providers to take account of local needs, as well as take on local ‘cases’ to trouble-shoot local problems;
- **Improvement – a force for service improvement and problem solving** – The Managers are outcome-focused, not service-focused or organisation-focused. They provide a unique source of information and energy for service improvement in the city at city-wide and neighbourhood levels;
- **Catalyst – a ‘task force’ approach** – the Neighbourhood Managers also have the flexibility and capacity to take on the development and management of some local solutions themselves, bringing together a local ‘task force’ to fix a problem, improve an area, bid for funding, etc.
- **Consultation – facilitating community-provider links** – Managers can use the neighbourhood networks and partnerships that they have brought together, to facilitate community consultation exercises for local service providers.

The benefits have accrued in each Pilot neighbourhood, but also been strengthened by the ‘group effect’ of having a network of pilots, often reinforcing each other’s work. This has boosted the strategic impact of the programme.

Conclusions

The Neighbourhood Management Pilots have demonstrated added value to the city's neighbourhood renewal process. This was confirmed in early 2006 by the decision of the WSP to roll-out neighbourhood management structures across the city, with neighbourhood management being extended in full from 7 pilot areas to 15 neighbourhoods, with the rest of the city's more affluent neighbourhoods benefiting from a 'lighter touch' community development approach. Some changes are also likely to the approach being taken, drawing on the lessons learned thus far in the process.