

**The Highland Council**  
**City of Inverness Committee – 2 June 2016**

Agenda Item	<b>6</b>
Report No	<b>CIA/ 22/16</b>

**Taking Forward Local Community Planning**

**Report by Acting Head of Policy**

**Summary**

This report considers the discussions held to date around developing local community planning arrangements within the context of the new duties contained within the Empowerment Act but also other local planning responsibilities contained within the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act 2014 and the Requirements for Community Learning and Development (Scotland) Regulations 2013. It outlines the options for local partnership geography for Inverness and asks Members to confirm the views of the City Committee on the preferred local partnership geography for the City of Inverness area.

**1. Background**

- 1.1 Part 2 of the Community Empowerment Act sets out new duties for Community Planning. This report considers the discussions held to date around developing local community planning arrangements within the context of the new duties contained within the Empowerment Act but also other local planning responsibilities contained within the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act 2014 and the Requirements for Community Learning and Development (Scotland) Regulations 2013.
- 1.2 Following discussion at Communities and Partnerships Committee in March, it was requested that a report be taken to the City of Inverness Committee to consider potential options for taking forward local community planning for the Inverness area.

**2. Community Planning Duties**

- 2.1 Part 2 of the Community Empowerment Act sets out new duties for Community Planning at a pan-Highland and local level. As outlined above, the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act 2014 and the Requirements for Community Learning and Development (Scotland) Regulations 2013 also establishes new duties for community planning for named partners for children, adults and community learning and development at a local level. An attempt to illustrate these responsibilities can be found at Appendix 1. A summary of these new duties is outlined below:

## 2.2 *Community Planning duties through the Community Empowerment Act:*

- 2.2.1 Who should be involved in community planning – in Highland there are 15 public bodies to be involved and that would form the Community Planning Partnership. The Partnership will agree how partners contribute e.g. taking part in a particular outcome or across them all. The listed bodies must work together and work with any community body who wishes to take part.
- 2.2.2 Who leads community planning – this is now a shared duty between 5 public bodies – the Council; NHS Highland, HIE, Police Scotland and Scottish Fire and Rescue Service.
- 2.2.3 What the CPP needs to do – the CPP must act to reduce inequalities of outcome resulting from socio-economic disadvantage. It must produce a Local Outcome Improvement Plan and also Locality Plans.

Local Outcome Improvement Plan (LOIP) – will replace the SOA and needs to demonstrate how the Partnership will respond to national outcomes. The LOIP needs to outline key local priorities but also to reflect improving outcomes and tackling inequalities. The plan must be evidence based and be developed involving communities. Statutory partners are responsible for delivering the aims however other local bodies may also be included. The first plan is due in October 2017.

Locality Plans – at a local level in order for partners to tackle inequalities for communities facing disadvantage and make it easier for community bodies to be involved. The plans should be evidence based. The statutory guidance notes that the CPP should use its “understanding of local needs, circumstances and opportunities to identify those localities for which it should undertake locality planning.” The geography for these Locality plans is for the CPP to decide but it is expected that they reflect natural communities. It is proposed to use a combination of the Socio Economic Performance Index (SEP – identifying rural communities) and SIMD, to identify the communities on which the Partnership initially completes Locality Plans for. The first Locality Plans are expected by October 2017.

- 2.2.4 Supporting community bodies to participate – is a key component of the Empowerment Act in general and specifically in relation to Community Planning. The Partnership will have a duty to support community bodies to participate at all levels therefore it is particularly important for new local arrangements for community planning to be established as organising such involvement at a Highland level would not be feasible as most community bodies, volunteering and community action are local.

## 2.3 *Community Planning duties through Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act 2014 and the Requirements for Community Learning and Development (Scotland) Regulations 2013.*

- 2.3.1 The Public Bodies legislation establishes the new arrangements for the

integration of health and social care services. It includes the requirement for each partnership to have a strategic plan, and in Highland this includes local plans at an area level.

2.3.2 The Community Learning and Development regulations, made under the powers of the 1980 Education (Scotland) Act, require the local authority to work with partners to develop local CLD plans that target individuals and groups with greatest needs. The Highland CPP has determined this should be undertaken for localities and it is anticipated that Locality and CLD plans are likely to be one and the same given their focus on inequality and the most vulnerable.

2.4 The CPP Board has agreed that one of the partnership's agreed priorities is to engage in dialogue with communities in order to empower them to participate in service planning and delivery. The next section of the paper considers the discussions and developments to date on taking forward community planning locally.

### **3. Planning at a local level**

3.1 Discussions have been ongoing in recent months within ward business meetings, member briefings and between local partners to consider how best to take forward community planning at a local level. In some parts of Highland local partnership arrangements have been established for some significant time and operating well. Elsewhere, there are currently no arrangements in place and whilst it would be preferable to enable partnerships to grow organically, the joint responsibilities that local partners now have mean that there is a requirement to establish a framework at an area level across Highland to deliver on the joint responsibilities contained within the Community Empowerment and Public Bodies (Joint Working) Acts.

3.2 Through discussions held, the potential to use the **geography** currently in place for district partnerships has gained support. This approach would also see incorporating the existing District Partnerships into the new partnership arrangements, with some proposed amendments around certain boundaries such as Assynt and Fort Augustus. The benefits of this approach include providing a focus for partnership activity locally, avoiding multiple meetings and alignment with operational geographies for Council and NHS children and adult services to support operations and service delivery.

3.3 However, whilst the alignment with Local Committee geography in some areas of Highland makes utilising the district geography for developing local partnerships more straight forward, it has been raised whether this would best support the development of local partnerships for the Inverness area. Four potential options for this have emerged and these, along with the benefits and challenges are set out below. The views of the 5 statutory partners are included given that the responsibility for making a decision on local partnership arrangements rests with the Community Planning Board and that all 5 partners are now responsible for taking these forward.

#### **3.4 Option 1 – Utilising district partnership geography**

- Would create 2 local partnerships for the Inverness area based on

current district partnership geography

#### 3.4.1 Benefits of Option 1

- Co-terminus with NHS and Council operational structures therefore supporting the partnerships and reducing duplication in meeting attendance.
- Support across most Partners for this geography and being able to make this work locally.
- Avoids duplication of local meetings by incorporating District Partnerships into Local Partnerships

#### 3.4.2 Challenges of Option 1

- Ensuring that the geography is suited to the needs of local communities.

### 3.5 **Option 2 – Dividing Inverness by urban and rural**

- Create 2 local partnerships; one for urban Inverness and one for rural Inverness  
Urban – wards 14,15,16,17 and part of 18 and 20  
Rural – wards 13 and part of 18 and 20

#### 3.5.1 Benefits of Option 2

- Separating urban/rural Inverness would result in the partnerships being able to focus on issues that suit the needs of urban and rural communities.
- Greater synergy between the communities within the Partnerships
- Police, Fire and HIE – indicate they could support this model if this was the preferred approach.

#### 3.5.2 Challenges of Option 2

- It would be challenging to bring together the rural communities of east and west Inverness.
- It would result in significant challenges for NHS and Highland Council to support as it doesn't marry with current children and adult operational structures. It may require changes to operational structures if this model was preferred.

### 3.6 **Option 3 - Dividing Inverness by east/west and urban/rural**

- To create 4 local partnerships within Inverness – East Rural, East Urban, West Rural, West Urban

#### 3.6.1 Benefits of Option 3

- Combines the benefits of both Option 1 and 2 – separates out urban and rural communities whilst retaining the link with current operational NHS and HC structures.
- Makes planning more local to communities

#### 3.6.2 Challenges of Option 3

- Creates an additional 2 partnerships for partners to support, bringing the total to 12.

- May be seen as overly complex. HIE and Fire have expressed concerns regarding this.

### 3.7 **Option 4 – Using the City of Inverness Geography**

- A local partnership is developed for the whole City Committee area.

#### 3.7.1 Benefits of Option 4

- For many partners this would be their second choice. For HIE this would be the preference given resourcing challenges.
- More feasible from an NHS and Highland Council operational perspective than options 2 and 3.

#### 3.7.2 Challenges of Option 4

- Would create a very large and potentially unwieldy partnership.
- Could be more distant from communities
- May make it difficult for communities to engage

## 4. **Next Steps**

4.1 There are challenges around all the options proposed and no one option fulfils the needs of all 5 statutory partners. Whatever option is selected, there will be challenges and it will be critical that this is reviewed after 12 months to establish its effectiveness and amend if necessary.

4.2 Discussions with partners, at the Chief Officer's Group, decided that it would be helpful if they could come to a consensual view on the preferred option, and although it was not everyone's first choice, they did agree that option 1 should be recommended as the preferred option for the partnership. It was acknowledged that whilst the district partnership geography is not ideal, it does provide a useful starting point for local partnerships and that it supports operational arrangements for Highland Council and NHS Highland in relation to adult and children's service. It is important to note that Locality Plans, which will focus on communities facing the greatest inequality as a result of socio-economic disadvantage, will be based on smaller natural communities and not the geography proposed for local partnerships. The Chief Officers Group has considered this and all partners have agreed the approach outlined at 2.2.3 which will be considered by the Community Planning Board in June.

4.3 Members are asked to consider the options outlined in section 3 and confirm the views of the City Committee on the preferred local partnership geography for the City of Inverness area. These views will be considered by the Community Planning Partnership Board when it meets to agree local partnership arrangements on 30 June. There will be a further opportunity for Members to discuss local planning arrangements at the Communities and Partnerships Committee on 9 June.

## **5. Recommendation**

Members are asked to:

- Note the new duties for community planning contained within the Empowerment Act but also other local planning responsibilities contained within the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act 2014 and the Requirements for Community Learning and Development (Scotland) Regulations 2013.
- Consider the options for local partnership geography for Inverness outlined in section 3, and
- Confirm the views of the City Committee on the preferred local partnership geography for the City of Inverness area.

Date: 23.5.16

Author: Alison Clark, Acting Head of Policy Tel (01463) 702512

Appendix 1: Highland Levels of Community Planning

Highland Levels of Community Planning

