



POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Area Co-ordination

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The success of the Neighbourhood Renewal (NR) programme - which led to the establishment of the Forums and Local Management Boards - in bringing residents and service deliverers together to tackle disadvantage and provide quality services, has been significant.
- 1.2 The work of NR on narrowing the gap between the most deprived areas in the town and the rest of Hastings¹, and that of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder in Greater Hollington, brought into focus the visible gaps in public services in these parts of the town
- 1.3 It was clear that the Hastings Community Strategy targets could only be achieved if the most poorly performing areas were able to achieve the town average. The Forums and Local Management Boards monitored significant changes in service delivery, and measurable improvements in crime, environmental and health indicators were delivered.
- 1.4 One of the achievements of NR was to bring residents and service delivery agencies together to develop co-ordinated ways of addressing failures or deficiencies in service through partnership working.
- 1.5 Building on this achievement, the Council introduced a policy of Area Co-ordination to ensure that the whole town could benefit from the successful partnership working of residents, elected members and service deliverers. Area Co-ordination further develops the good practice established through the Local Management Boards and is also a response to the central government agenda of localism.
- 1.6 The process was begun through establishing four areas across the town and setting up Area Management Boards (AMBs) in each which have now been meeting, on a quarterly basis, for just over a year. The AMBs currently oversee the annual Area Delivery Plans² which represent the shared position statements of providers, working to meet the needs of residents.
- 1.7 Membership of the AMBs is made up of local residents, elected members, service providers and Area Champions (Corporate Directors of Hastings Borough Council).
- 1.8 To achieve close partnership working and enhanced service delivery in response to the needs of communities on a more operational basis, Multi Agency Tasking Teams (MATTs) were established. Relating to each of the four areas, they are made up of a range of partners and meet monthly to address the concerns of neighbourhoods such as anti social behaviour, families in crisis, street drinking and environmental issues. Their task is not only to ensure that services meet the needs of communities but also to tackle anti social behaviour through sanctions and support.
- 1.9 AMBs and MATTs are essential and key components of Area Co-ordination. However, residents and communities need to have the capacity and

¹ These neighbourhoods are also some of the most disadvantaged in the country

² The Area Deliver Plans are outline the aims for each area and provide a framework for activities and interventions

opportunity to move from being service consumers to becoming active service shapers.

2.0 Scope of the Project

2.1 The Council always planned to review Area Co-ordination after the AMBs had been in operation for a year. Clive Jacotine Associates were commissioned to carry out a review of the AMBs³. In addition, the Overview & Scrutiny (Resources) Committee Project Panel has been meeting to examine the progress of Area Co-ordination to date

2.2 The Terms of Reference of the Project Panel of the Overview & Scrutiny (Resources) Committee were to consider:

- Development of Area Co-ordination policy
- Effectiveness of Area Co-ordination
- Benefits of mainstreaming Area Co-ordination in Hastings beyond 2008
- Processes to ensure policy is fit for purpose in delivering the following objectives:
Improvement of the delivery of public services
Effective community engagement in planning and reviewing service delivery
Delivery of Local Area Agreement Outcome 23

2.3 The Project Panel was composed of:

- Cllr Silverson (Chair),
- Cllr Tucker (part)
- Cllr Fawthrop (part)
- Cllr Armstrong (part)
- Cllr Stevens (part)
- Don Katuawawala, Neighbourhood Renewal Manager (part)
- Mary Denning (Interim Head of Community Services) (part)
- Joy Collins (Area Co-ordinator) (part)

2.4 In addition to interviewing members of the AMBs, Chairs of the MATT teams, and attending AMBs, the draft Jacotine Report also informed the Project Panel process.

2.5 The work of the Project Panel also complemented the findings of the Jacotine Report

2.6 Set out below, under each of the Terms of Reference, are the findings of the Project Panel. An Action Plan fully to implement Area Co-ordination and to correct any identified weaknesses in the current structure is appended to this report. The actions or recommendations are “flagged up” through the body of this report

3.0 Development of Area Co-ordination Policy

3.1 The Project Panel concluded that a sound start had been made on rolling Area Co-ordination out across the town, using the AMBs and the MATTs.

³ For Brief to Clive Jacotine Associates, see Appendix A

While the structure and agendas of the AMBs required some refinement, the principle was sound, and a firm foundation had been built.

- 3.2 It was necessary to establish and maintain a high level of community engagement, capacity building and training to continue in each area if residents were to gain the requisite expertise to become service shapers. However, the needs of disadvantaged areas with residents who found meaningful engagement more difficult to achieve had to be balanced with more prosperous areas. Here, engagement levels also may not be high partly because the level of residents concern was less.
- 3.3 The support of service delivery organisations was perceived as strong, and over time, the shaping of that delivery with residents could be developed with their support.
- 3.4 The structures of the AMBs and the MATTs were also seen as robust, but it was felt that there was a risk that these could be viewed as isolated or “free floating”. There was no formal connection with the Borough or County Councils or with the Hastings LSP.
- 3.5 **Recommendation 1⁴:** Reports are taken to Cabinet, the Hastings LSP and the AMBs which look at the relationships between the Council, LSP and AMBs. The report should recommend ways of ensuring that there are effective and demonstrable connections between the AMBs and the LSP as well as between the AMBs and the Cabinet.
- 3.6 Central government policy directly encourages districts and boroughs to work much more closely with County Councils, through the LAA, and any future planning of Area Co-ordination must therefore take this into account.
- 3.7 **Recommendation 2:** Discussions with East Sussex County Council are entered into to look at:
 - Ways in which ESCC might support Area Co-ordination
 - Co-ordination with the County, so that ESCC can look at solutions to local issues being practised at neighbourhood level
 - How the AMBs can help to deliver LAA targets and outcomes locally
- 3.8 Future government guidance will refine the “place shaping” role of Area Co-ordination, and this must form part of any refinement of Area Co-ordination delivery
- 3.9 **Recommendation 3:** When it becomes available, central government guidance on place shaping should be discussed at AMBs to develop and deliver this agenda
- 3.10 There must be a more structured relationship with the LSP. Currently, the two bodies exist side by side with minimal correlation. This prevents the identification and discussion of common issues across the town and effectively excludes communities of interest from influencing service delivery across the town. This could result in a potentially adverse impact on, for example, a refreshed Community Cohesion Plan. Community cohesion relates, by its very nature, more to communities of interest such as BME

⁴ Recommendations are also appended to this report in the Action Plan Appendix

groups, older people, the young and faith groups. Any refreshed Community Cohesion Plan thus may be “owned” by the LSP but would have very little resonance at AMBs and at neighbourhood level.

- 3.11 **Recommendation 4:** The refresh of the Community Cohesion Plan should show how communities of interest, through the LSP, could shape services in similar ways to geographically based communities within the town
- 3.12 It is therefore imperative that the AMBs and LSP (where the communities of interest should be represented) have a genuine and practical connection and relationship to one another. **See Recommendation 1**
- 3.13 In addition, the response of service providers must become ever more sophisticated and sensitive to increasingly knowledgeable and empowered residents. Area Co-ordination structures and operations must both reflect and lead this progression

4.0 Benefits of mainstreaming Area Co-ordination in Hastings beyond 2008

- 4.1 Fundamental to the mainstreaming of Area Co-ordination in Hastings post 2007-08, is the future shape of Area Co-ordination and available resources. Central Government has made it clear that Neighbourhood Renewal and Economic Development must move more closely together. This accords with the Hastings vision. Residents and service deliverers have already worked increasingly well together to tackle issues of crime, anti social behaviour and environmental problems. However, if long term regeneration of the town is to be achieved, other issues such as poverty, low aspirations, employment opportunities and skills levels must also be tackled. Everyone in the town, without exception, must become a community stakeholder or the same challenges will remain, no matter how well co-ordinated the services.
- 4.2 There was support from the Project Panel for the reinstatement of the “Together Action Line” which had originally been set up in 2004. The line was set up so that residents had one number to call about anti social behaviour, fly-tipping, littering, dog fouling, noise nuisance or other problems in their area. The purpose of the line was to ensure that concerns could be recorded and disseminated to the relevant Council department and then actioned.
- 4.3 **Recommendation 5:** The Together Action Line be reinstated for the benefit of residents. Its reinstatement should also have a performance management element so that it is clear how the Line is being used by residents and how the Council is responding to those concerns
- 4.4 Hastings Borough Council has now been awarded £1.8 million Working Neighbourhoods Fund⁵ next year. There will be LEGI⁶ funding totalling £1,509,000 and £413,000 Neighbourhood Element (NE) will also remain in place.

⁵ This is the successor to NRF/AIF and is intended to ensure that the emphasis in neighbourhoods is on raising economic activity levels

⁶ Local Enterprise Growth Initiative

- 4.5 Theoretically the Council could utilise WNF in any way. Nevertheless, central government has made it clear that levels of worklessness are a concern, particularly in disadvantaged areas, and it will be expected that local authorities will reduce these levels. In a climate of potential economic downturn, it will be challenging to increase the size of the workforce, and so it would be prudent to direct spend towards training and employment outputs as well as the stimulation of business prosperity.
- 4.6 The government has also made it plain that the engagement and participation of the community plays a very significant part in this new policy direction.
- 4.7 The community is expected to help identify gaps in existing provision and barriers to participation in training and employment in local areas so that future interventions will be effective. Because of the Area Co-ordination initiative, begun under NRF, Hastings Borough Council, in partnership with the community, is poised to respond positively and efficiently to the central government agenda
- 4.8 However, the current structure of the Council's Regeneration and Community Services functions are not fit to meet this challenge, and therefore, the Council is integrating these functions
- 4.9 It is important to look at the resource implications of enhancing Area Co-ordination and embedding it as crucial element of the work with communities and in areas where combating disadvantage and worklessness remain priorities. However, with economic development being integrated with social and economic inclusion, it is not possible to split out individual costs. There is sufficient funding, however, over the next 3 years to deliver enhanced Area Co-ordination, work with communities and to implement a refreshed Community Cohesion Plan.
- 4.10 This will also provide some efficiency savings at a time of significant financial constraints.
- 4.11 It is therefore necessary for Hastings Borough Council to work with partner organisations and residents in order to utilise resources effectively. Economic and social inclusion will only be achieved in the Borough through strong Area Co-ordination with the full engagement of the community and service deliverers. The Borough Council must lead locally, but must be able to demonstrate community support, and it is through Area Co-ordination that this can be achieved.
- 4.12 A debate should be had about the most effective delivery vehicle for Working Neighbourhoods, and, by association, Area Co-ordination. The AMBs are widely regarded by the community as effective in principle – although some work needs to go on to make them genuinely fit for purpose. However, the existing Commissioning Group for NRF effectively divorced the LSP and AMBs from the resources agenda.
- 4.13 There are possible alternatives. The Executive Delivery Group of the LSP could act as a commissioning body, or the Hastings & Bexhill Economic Alliance Executive could adopt the same role as with the LEGI allocations that it considers. There are advantages and disbenefits to either course of action.

- 4.14 **Recommendation 6:** An officer led HBC working group consult with the community and partner organisations to look at the impact of Working Neighbourhoods funding on the Area Co-ordination process; at how the commissioning process should be developed and at the potential responsibilities of existing partnerships. The full roll-out of Area Co-ordination should also be discussed and proposals brought forward for implementation. The working group should then report to Cabinet, the LSP and to the HBEA with its conclusions for comment and discussions.
- 4.15 The development of the “virtual team⁷” approach to working should be enhanced so that problems can be solved through cross agency working and communication. This way of working must be embedded within process and become the only way of working in future. The key to this approach is the monthly MATT meetings which can be used as a basis for solving ever more complex problems and involving an ever widening range of agencies and service deliverers. Service delivery agencies can identify what can be achieved alone, any “quick wins” which will help to build the confidence of the community in the process, and what needs to be addressed through the “virtual team” using a multi agency approach. Monitoring would take place through the ADPs, but also through the comments and satisfaction levels of residents.
- 4.16 **Recommendation 7:** The development of the “virtual team” approach to cross agency working should be enhanced so that problems can be solved through inter agency functioning and communication. There is funding for a Local Learning Plan, for example, to train communities and agencies to work together to address issues of local concern effectively
- 4.17 The Area Co-ordinators would be central to the success of this approach. They would have the overview and would ensure that each issue was dealt with and complex challenges were fully met. They manage, operationally, the Priority Area Project Officers (PAPOs) in co-ordinating the work of a multiplicity of agencies and service providers. The PAPOs, under the management of the Area Co-ordinators and using their knowledge and strategic overview, would also look at the needs of the communities of interest and ensure that, on an area by area basis, their concerns and needs were being met.⁸
- 4.18 One of the advantages of this approach, for service providers, is the economies of scale resulting in efficiency savings through cross-agency problem solving leading to sustainable and long term solutions to complex issues.
- 4.19 **Recommendation 8:** Ensure that socio economic development and inclusion are central to the future priorities and structure of the AMBs and LSP, and that Hastings Borough Council integrates Area Co-ordination and its economic development and inclusion function.

⁷ A “virtual team” would involve staff from, potentially, a range of organisations and across HBC, working together to solve specific problems or issues. If they met together it would only be for the specific problem solving period

⁸ There is a proposed new structure for enhanced delivery of Area Co-ordination combined with economic development and inclusion. At the time of writing this structure had not been fully approved or implemented, but nothing in this report runs counter to the proposals

5.0 Effectiveness of Area Co-ordination

- 5.1 The Jacotine Report examined the effectiveness of the AMBs and MATTs. It did not look at the future of Area Co-ordination.
- 5.2 The Report looked at the current operation of AMBs and MATTs, addressing, up to a point, the relationship with regional and sub regional structures. However, the emphasis of the report is on the way that AMBs had worked during their first year and how the MATTs complemented that work.
- 5.3 In general, the AMBs and MATTs are seen by the report as positive. Community representatives, elected members and service providers have been able to draw closer. Elected members are also able to examine residents' major concerns and look at ways in which those issues can be resolved.
- 5.4 AMBs are also valued by service providers (eg the Police and Health) because of the information exchanged and the discussion of any perceived barriers to community access of services.
- 5.5 Jacotine suggests there should be a more focussed role for AMBs:
- Develop a local voice to influence key services and local decisions
 - Influence the local LAA to reflect local needs (which should be reflected in the ADP)
 - Monitor the delivery of the ADP and performance against the local outcomes in the LAA
 - Identify local operational issues
- 5.6 However, there are a number of recommendations which address perceived shortcomings, and which can ensure that residents and service deliverers can work more closely together.
- 5.7 **Recommendation 9:** Recommendations of the Jacotine Report concerning the future structure and enhanced effectiveness of AMB meetings to be considered by AMBs and adopted as appropriate
- 5.8 There are criticisms of the way that agendas have been structured and information presented. Agendas have been too long and with too many presentations involving detailed statistical analysis. This leaves very little time for discussion and almost none for decision making. This results in very few actions arising directly from the AMBs which drive change. However, these weaknesses are not considered to be challenging to tackle and there are a number of recommendations in the report to address them.
- 5.9 A simplification, overall summary of the information giving function, with more emphasis on discussion and decision making, is encouraged in the Jacotine recommendations.
- 5.10 **Recommendation 10:** Terms of Reference of the AMBs should be reviewed by each AMB and then they should each look at the provision of a simplified, overall summary of information with discussion points on implementation of any actions, leading to appropriate decisions.

- 5.11 The strong and continuing support of elected members and officers of partner organisations must be retained. Elected members provide knowledge, guidance and policy which can support the aspirations of local people. The AMBs can provide a helpful additional insight for elected members into the priorities of neighbourhoods. Residents benefit in turn from the support of elected members. AMBs also provide a unique opportunity to reinforce the relevance of the democratic process.
- 5.12 The Local Learning Plan will be helpful in enabling newly elected members to be given training, thus helping to embed support for the AMBs from the outset.
- 5.13 Advance notice of meetings so that they can be entered into diaries plays a part in gaining that support
- 5.14 **Recommendation 11:** Include the diarising of quarterly AMBs in the Council Schedule of Meetings and provide training for newly elected members of the Council
- 5.15 The Jacotine Reports shows that *“there is widespread agreement that the MATTS are very successful at dealing with operational issues, particularly “crime and grime”, and also the co-ordination of joint interventions for young people “at risk”.*”
- 5.16 The report notes that the PAPOs, under the direction of the Area Co-ordinators, are not merely reactive to the concerns of residents, but also proactive where Area Co-ordinators are aware that residents are either not organised into Associations or where there may be other barriers to a high level and quality of service in a given area.
- 5.17 Jacotine makes some recommendations for improvement, but does not look at the front line role that the PAPOs would have in the future extension of Area Co-ordination. This is addressed in the section of this report dealing with the development of, and future for, Area Co-ordination
- 5.18 The Jacotine Report does look in some detail at improving community engagement and capacity, but this is dealt with below in the appropriate section of the report.
- 6.0 Processes to ensure policy is fit for purpose in delivering the following objectives:**
- 6.1 Improvement of the delivery of public services**
- 6.1.1 Satisfaction levels of residents, particularly in the most disadvantaged areas, with the standard of public services, has risen. The inception of the AMBs has assisted with this process, and the activities of the MATT meetings have built on this satisfaction level throughout the town.
- 6.1.2 The continued roll-out of Area Co-ordination can only be positive in this context, although the level of community engagement and capacity must be maintained. Engagement with communities of interest must be far more

successful than previously if the Area Co-ordination process is to retain credibility

- 6.1.3 The role of enhanced “virtual teams” and their relationship to the ADPs, Area Co-ordinators and PAPOs is dealt with above, but is crucial to the improvement of the delivery of public services.
- 6.1.4 Through enhanced community capacity building and training, local residents can comment authoritatively on the effectiveness and quality of services. Residents could then move towards shaping those services with the support of service providers. This would ensure that residents who would have a greater understanding of how the service was provided on an operational basis viewed the level and quality of service as positive. Service providers would benefit from cost efficiencies
- 6.1.5 **Recommendation 12:** Community members to receive training and support so that they can work with service providers to shape as well as comment on the level and quality of services received in the area
- 6.1.6 **Recommendation 13:** Include delivery of training for officers and elected members in the functions and responsibilities regarding AMBs. The Local Learning Plan should also include this aspect

6.2 Effective community engagement in planning and reviewing service delivery

- 6.2.1 Some elements of this section have been addressed above, but not the mechanics of maintaining community engagement and ensuring that the community is able to shape services from an informed position.
- 6.2.2 Central government requires evidence of effective community involvement in developing the Sustainable Community Strategy and the LAA. Delivering some outcomes of the LAA (eg health and community safety) is only achievable with the active participation of communities.
- 6.2.3 The Jacotine Report provides some helpful guidance for this element of the terms of reference and also makes useful recommendations.
- 6.2.4 Jacotine is complimentary about the level of community engagement and understanding in the priority areas, but points out that these arrangements need regularly to be refreshed. The ending of NRF funding, he points out, places the community involvement at potential risk. However, with the advent of WNF, these concerns are now, happily, without foundation.
- 6.2.5 However, he also points out that elected members play a very important part in ensuring that local communities are supported and informed. Through enhanced Area Co-ordination, elected members will have a central role in nurturing and supporting their communities. There is also the crucial role for elected members, working with communities, to enhance the local democratic process.
- 6.2.6 It is essential that the community representatives sitting on the AMBs have the confidence of the community. The Jacotine Report recommends that the

current arrangements for selecting community representatives on the AMBs be reviewed

- 6.2.7 AMB members appear to agree that single issue groups should not have a place on the AMBs as they do not represent a wider constituency within the locality.
- 6.2.8 One very controversial element of the report concerns the relationship of AMBs and the Hastings LSP. It is clear that as the AMBs are geographically based, it would be difficult to include communities of interest within their membership⁹. It would seem to follow that communities of interest should be specifically identified in representation on the LSP and thus be able to shape services and comment on effectiveness of delivery through the LSP
- 6.2.9 However, Jacotine received some adverse comments from those interviewed concerning the process of selecting community representatives on the LSP. While it is understood that a new election process is now being undertaken for the Community Empowerment Network seats, it is important that the four geographically based AMB seats are maintained. The processes by which community members sit on the LSP or an AMB need to be equally transparent and robust if a constructive relationship is to be developed between communities of interest and geography.
- 6.2.10 **Recommendation 14:** The AMBs and the LSP to discuss representation of communities of interest and community cohesion issues in light of the comments of the Jacotine Report on LSP representation. When the AMBs review their Terms of Reference, they should also look at transparent and accountable selection processes to determine the community membership of the AMBs
- 6.2.11 Communication is the lifeblood of community engagement. Jacotine recommends that a simple communications Action Plan be drawn up to ensure that there is adequate exchange of information between AMBs, but also with the LSP and its Theme Groups.
- 6.2.12 **Recommendation 15:** A simple marketing and communications Action Plan be drawn up with the help of the Council's Marketing Department, and implemented as above
- 6.2.13 If communities are to have the experience and understanding to help shape services in the future, there has to be a rolling training programme and support for communities. This will be implemented through the Local Learning Plan

6.3 Delivery of Local Area Agreement Outcome 23

- 6.3.1 Since the Terms of Reference for the Project Panel were developed, it has become apparent that LAA Outcome 23 will no longer continue in the LAA in its present form. Instead, those indicators relating specifically to Hastings will occur throughout the LAA document.

⁹ See section above on Development of Area Co-ordination in respect of Community Cohesion

- 6.3.2 It is nevertheless important to look at the part Area Co-ordination and AMBs currently play in monitoring and delivering LAA targets and how this might be developed in the future
- 6.3.3 LAAs will still be the key delivery plan agreed between local areas and central government. The Jacotine Report looks at two primary ways in which AMBs and Area Co-ordination can play a part in the LAA process:
- Influence the local LAA to reflect local needs (which in turn should be reflected in the ADPs)
 - Monitor the delivery of the ADP and performance against the local outcomes in the LAA
- 6.3.4 The Jacotine Report feels the current performance management arrangements are powerful and provide useful information, they need to be simplified in future
- 6.3.5 **Recommendation 16:** Simplification of the current performance management arrangements as reported to the AMBs while retaining their power and meaning. A “menu” of proposed planned changes could be provided to the AMBs and elements reflecting local needs could be selected by each AMB
- 6.3.6 It is here that the current lack of a **formal** relationship with the Hastings LSP, Hastings Borough Council and with the County Council may be significant and deleterious to the development of Area Co-ordination. The AMBs need to be informed by the work of the LSP and its Theme Groups in order to understand the effect of work across the town to address critical problems and issues. It is then necessary for AMBs to be able to determine whether Hastings is drifting further away from key county LAA targets or genuinely narrowing the gap. The Jacotine Report points out that many of the same organisations serve on the LSP and on AMBs, but the formal connection is absent, however cordial the individual relationships See Recommendations 1&2
- 6.3.7 The relationship with the Borough Council structures is tangential at best, and both the AMBs and the Council must address this. The recommendations in the Jacotine Report are that the Cabinet should receive minutes of the AMBs. While this would superficially appear attractive, there is a danger that the true import of those minutes may get overlooked.
- 6.3.8 Another suggestion of the Jacotine Report is that the Area Champions bring reports on particular issues to Cabinet. These may not require decisions, and Cabinet is essentially a decision making body. Consultation with the AMBs and Council on this issue needs to take place so that a more effective solution can come out of those discussions
- 6.3.9 Being able to work with the County Council as a valued partner is crucial. However, the AMBs and HBC cannot unilaterally impose a solution onto County structures. Instead, serious discussions should take place about how those links can be made effective and binding in future
- 6.3.10 The Jacotine Report makes scant reference to central government’s policy to encourage local government to stimulate economic development and inclusion at neighbourhood level. Jacotine makes no recommendation on how this should be applied to the AMB and Area Co-ordination structures.

- 6.3.11 Currently, economic development and inclusion, as delivered by the Council and its partners, have their own structure in the Hastings & Bexhill Economic Alliance. This Board and its associated Working Groups have become a strong and effective voice at a local and regional level over the past few years. Despite the cessation of AIF¹⁰ funding, the partnerships formed are still working well.
- 6.3.12 In order to address the future economic development and inclusion element of Area Co-ordination, HBC will need to ensure that the two functions of Community Services and Economic Development align very closely in the near future. LAA targets are likely to reflect this element in more depth even than previously, and the meeting of targets will be a responsibility of all agencies and areas in the town. There must be an understanding of this new agenda across the Council. Strenuous efforts must also be made to gain the support and understanding of partner organisations and, importantly, the community.
- 6.3.13 **Recommendation 17:** The Council demonstrate through its plans and targets that the two functions of Regeneration and Community Services are robustly integrated and that the Council is still able to demonstrate that it has the support of communities and partner agencies through the mechanisms of consultation and service shaping
- 6.3.14 While it is undeniable that poor health, low educational achievement, high crime levels and poor housing standards are contributors to multiple deprivation, without providing the opportunities for people to access training and employment, the levels of deprivation may not change quickly.

7.0 Conclusion and Next Steps

- 7.1 The past year has seen a solid start to the implementation of Area Co-ordination. However, there are a complex range of issues to be addressed if Area Co-ordination is indeed to become a working and successful reality. This cannot be achieved instantly, but over time, with the support of stakeholders, communities and service delivery agents will move more closely together.
- 7.2 Area Co-ordination is valuable to residents and the community, to elected members, partner organisations and the Council as a whole. It has the capacity to re-awaken interest in the democratic process within the town and to help agencies to become more efficient and effective. An Action Plan to put into effect the changes proposed in this report is appended

8.0 Policy Implications

- 8.1 Policy implications are dealt with in detail in the body of this report and in the attached Action Plan

¹⁰ Area Investment Framework

Appendices & background documents.

Appendix A: Brief informing the Jacotine Report

Appendix B: Proposed Action Plan

Appendix C: Glossary of Terms

Appendix D: Draft Jacotine Report

Background Document: Draft of East Sussex Sustainable Community Strategy

Policy implications

Please tick if this report contains any implications for the following:

Equalities & Community Cohesiveness	X
Crime and Fear of Crime (Section 17)	
Risk Management	
Environmental issues	
Economic / Financial implications	X
Human Rights Act	
Organisational Consequences	X

Any ticked areas should be referred to in the text of the report under the heading "policy implications"

**Report written by: Mary Denning
01424 451102
mdenning@hastings.gov.uk**