
Bute and Cowal Local Area Community Plan

1. SUMMARY

The 12 January meeting of the Bute and Cowal Area Community Planning Group (LACPG) agreed a draft area community plan. This plan was used as supporting information to the Community Event held on Saturday 6 March in Dunoon.

Sixty-six community participants took part in a series of workshops at the community event with electronic voting to prioritise key issues for Bute and Cowal. Representatives of partner organisations, including members of the LACPG, were observers at the event – they did not participate in the voting.

The summary analysis of the event is appended and this has been used to modify the area plan (which is also presented for approval). The analysis also includes detail of how the area plan has been changed in response to the community event feedback.

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Bute and Cowal Local Area Community Planning Group:

1. Note the analysis of the outputs from the Community Consultation Event on Saturday 6 March 2010 and the changes made to the draft area community plan as a result
2. Adopt the revised area community plan
3. Consider the adoption of a “To do list” to manage issues and actions that do not require detailed planning

3. BACKGROUND

The Bute and Cowal LACPG agreed four high level outcomes for the area community plan. Partners contributed actions and successes measures to the plan where they were significant and required partnership working for delivery. High level actions delivered solely by one partner were not included.

The LACPG has regular meetings with representatives of partner organisations, the third sector and Council round the table. The scope for direct community input to these meetings is limited, so each LACPG has two community events per year where a broad range of people and groups are invited to discuss issues and potential solutions (in addition to the networking that is an invaluable feature of these events). Participants discuss issues in workshops and vote using an electronic voting system similar to that used on TV shows such as “Who wants to be a millionaire”.

The electronic voting enabled direct feedback to the participants on the day. The feedback used a weighted scoring system where first, second and third choices were scored 3:2:1 and percentage results calculated on the overall weighted scores.

The Dunoon Community event took place on Saturday 6 March with the day and timing chosen to enable easier community participation. Partner organisations provided facilitators and the content was structured around the four local outcomes already agreed by the LACPG.

The four outcomes were translated into simple headings to help the community engagement process.

Local Plan outcome	Heading used at the community event
Towns and Villages which are Centres of Economic Activity and have Strong Community Identity	Town centre development
Transport Infrastructure and Services that are Good Quality, Well Co-ordinated and Support Easy Access to Services	Transport
People Feel Strong, Safe and Secure in their Community	Community safety
People Feel Healthier and have Access to Services Appropriate to their Needs	Health and wellbeing

4. ANALYSIS

The analysis of the outputs from the community event focused on understanding the priorities expressed on the day and how these impacted on the draft LACPG area community plan.

Initial analysis explored the overall percentages calculated for outcome sub-topics generated during the workshops. Analysis showed that the weighted score was useful in highlighting priority, but that the mix of first, second and third choices was also important. The weighting did affect overall scores where there were significant differences in numbers of votes for first, second or third choice. The gap between topics was reduced where there was a strong preference for first choice (lowering the percentage) and strong preference for second and third choices (increasing the percentage).

For example town centres had 51% of the first choices but weighted score of 34% and local markets had a first choice of 3% with a weighted score of 15% (because third choices were 34%).

When considering the scores both the raw preference scores and the weighted percentage were taken into account. This analysis was used to identify topics that should feature in the area community plan and a comparison made to see whether the topic was already featured in the plan.

Comments made under each topic were also reviewed and notes included with the analysis. A summary of the analysis is appended with scores for each topic and a comment on how this has impacted on the plan.

The simplification of the outcomes to plain English headings was useful, but care needs to be taken when doing this as it is possible to lose the essence of the outcome. For example two of the outcomes make reference to “access to services” and this did not feature in the shortened headings. In this instance, judging by comments made, there does not seem to have been a significant impact (there are still comments about accessing services), but care needs to be taken when planning future events.

5. CHANGES TO THE AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

The following changes were made to the area plan following the analysis:

- More detail included about town centre actions and CHORD in particular
- Items included for road condition and ferries (although success measures for ferries have not been finalised)
- Rationalisation of certain aspects, e.g. road safety and drugs/alcohol, where actions were combined because success measures were the same or similar. These topics are still essentially the same, but presented in a more compact form
- Simplification of certain topics – e.g. health services – because there clearly needs to be more dialogue to develop the detail. Actions are now focused on delivering additional detail by a particular time rather than more general statements about improved wellbeing
- Removal of some topics either because they were clearly undeliverable given the current financial climate or were not highlighted as priorities at the community event
- The capital investment table has been removed because there is insufficient information to produce meaningful content at this time. This should be considered for reinstatement in future years.

The community event was definitely worthwhile as a consultation exercise as the content of the plan has changed in response to the comments made and votes taken on the day.

6. OTHER ISSUES

Risk

The plan now includes links to some of the risks in the CPP Risk Register. The level of risk has not been assessed for these for Bute and Cowal. There may also be risks specific to Bute and Cowal that need to be developed and included in the plan. All these risks should come together to form the Bute and Cowal LACPG Risk Register.

Available data

Success measures for some outcomes have been suggested because they are relevant and have available data – but are not necessarily the ideal choice. For some topics, e.g. transport, the best measures would relate to satisfaction or perceptions of the service. This type of data is not available and is unlikely to be so for the immediate future. Possible commissioning of future random satisfaction surveys could be considered to address a number

of these gaps across a range of topics and measures. The Citizens Panel cannot be used for these repeat surveys because the Panel is a standing group of people best used for successive surveys with differing content rather than surveys with a standard set of questions each time.

Communication

There were a number of issues raised at the community event where partners are already taking action. More regular coordinated communication should be considered as an effective means to address these gaps and, for some measures, improve perceptions or allay public concerns.

Issues with 'simple' solutions

The comments made at the community event could be broadly grouped under two headings: those that need more detailed planning and will require additional resources; and those that could be addressed relatively quickly using existing resources (or explained with more effective communication).

The LACPG may want to trial the equivalent of a "To do list" to pick up and be seen to respond to issues that can be addressed relatively quickly. In this way confidence in the LACPG as a forum and partners more generally can be improved. Items would be allocated for action with the expectation that they would be addressed within the space of one or two LACPG meetings.

7. NEXT STEPS

The LACPG plan has been revised follow the community event and can now be adopted by the LACPG. The LACPG then needs to develop the performance scorecard and monitor progress on the different outcomes and actions in the plan. Some partners will need to develop some content further and come back to the LACPG with more detailed proposals for consideration.

BRIAN BARKER

Policy and Strategy Manager, Argyll and Bute Council

30 April 2010

For Further Information Contact:

Shirley MacLeod, Area Corporate Services Manager (Bute and Cowal)

t. 01369 707134

e. Shirley.MacLeod@argyll-bute.gov.uk

Bute and Cowal LACPG Plan – analysis of voting and outputs from 6 March consultation event

Outcome and sub-category	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Weighted rank ¹	Commentary on ranking and scores	Is this a priority?	Things to consider arising from comments made by event participants	Impact on draft LACPG plan
Town centre development								
Town centre facilities	51%	20%	13%	34%	Top weighted rank and 51% had this as their first choice – very strong preference	Yes – clearly stands out from the others in this section	Comments focus on access to basic amenities – many of which could be addressed at low or no cost within existing resources. There are some more significant items that would need more detailed planning	Not well covered in the draft LACPG Plan before the event except for a mention of TCRF. Plan modified to include more detail on CHORD programme. All three points around the town centre raise questions about coordination of activities in the main towns – including long term maintenance and promotion. Is this a possible topic for future partnership development perhaps with town centre businesses taking the lead?
Fabric of town centre	22%	37%	16%	26%	Strong preference in first, second and third choices	Yes – linked to facilities	Many issues relate to topics that should be addressed by the TCRF and CHORD	
Town identity	13%	11%	13%	12%	Consistent proportion in first, second and third choices	Yes – linked to facilities	Image and condition of the town links with fabric. Focus on Dunoon as a destination.	

¹ Weighted rank calculated using factor of 3x for first choice, 2x for second choice and 1x for third choice

Outcome and sub-category	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Weighted rank ¹	Commentary on ranking and scores	Is this a priority?	Things to consider arising from comments made by event participants	Impact on draft LACPG plan
Local markets	3%	23%	34%	15%	Only 3% had this as first choice – lowest score. Weighted score raised because of second and third choices	Very low first choice score suggests that this should not be a LACPG plan priority		Not included in plan
Parking	6%	9%	23%	10%	Weak on first and second choices	Weak first and second choices suggest that this should not be a LACPG plan priority		Not included in plan
Non-response	5%	0%	2%	3%		n/a		
Transport								
Integrated transport	34%	21%	11%	26%	Top score for weighted and first choice percentages	Integration is clearly the top priority	As well as integration this also needs to cover actions to support those who are less able or less physically mobile.	Covered by the Transport Forums, but integration is not explicit. Additional communication necessary as the forums develop. Draft plan text changed to clarify that there are two forums and measures added for usage of community transport and private services (excludes ferries).

Outcome and sub-category	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Weighted rank ¹	Commentary on ranking and scores	Is this a priority?	Things to consider arising from comments made by event participants	Impact on draft LACPG plan
Condition of roads	22%	23%	26%	23%	Consistently scores on first, second and third choices	Yes	Many aspects could be addressed via the planned maintenance programme (including better communication about the programme itself)	No mention of road condition in the draft LACPG plan. Content now includes reference to roads with measures included for road condition
Ferry transport	23%	21%	17%	21%	Consistently scores on first, second and third choices	Yes	A number of comments relate to operation of ferries which suggests that the operators need to be more actively involved in the LACPG	Draft plan weak on ferries – not explicit but there is a link via Transport Forums. Line included in revised plan, but measures not finalised (specific measures and data collection need to be clarified – an issue that affects all LACPGs)
Cost	18%	17%	17%	18%	Consistently scores on first, second and third choices	Yes	Mix of comments as would be expected. There are some where better communication would make a difference (e.g. explaining why some things are the way they are – and plans to address them if applicable)	Topic will be covered by the Transport Forums. No need to include additional success measures in the revised Plan.
Barrier to employment	2%	12%	17%	8%	Very low on first choice – mainly picks up on third choice	Very low first choice score suggests that this should not be a LACPG plan priority		Not included in plan

Outcome and sub-category	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Weighted rank ¹	Commentary on ranking and scores	Is this a priority?	Things to consider arising from comments made by event participants	Impact on draft LACPG plan
Environmental issue	2%	6%	14%	5%	Very low on first choice – mainly picks up on third choice	Very low first choice score suggests that this should not be a LACPG plan priority		Not included in plan
Community safety								
Anti-social behaviour	36%	29%	11%	30%	High score on first and second choices	Surprising that this has such a high score given the relatively low crime rate in Argyll and Bute.	Would be useful to link this with analysis of police data to see if this is a general problem, focused on particular areas (with broad publicity) or a matter of public perception. Resulting action will be different depending on this analysis	Action on Neighbourhood Watch in draft plan sufficient at this time. More detailed analysis and partnership planning could bring forward additional actions in future.
Road safety	20%	20%	13%	19%	Consistent scores on first and second choices	Yes	Some commentary about the need for road improvements, but main comments focus on speeding	Well covered in draft plan. Plan content rationalised, but actions and success measures remain the same.
Substance misuse	14%	15%	30%	17%	Similar scores on first and second choices. Very strong on third choice	Yes	Links made with crime. Alcohol highlighted as bigger issue than drugs	Well covered in draft plan. Plan content rationalised, but actions and success measures remain the same.

Outcome and sub-category	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Weighted rank ¹	Commentary on ranking and scores	Is this a priority?	Things to consider arising from comments made by event participants	Impact on draft LACPG plan
Young people	20%	11%	17%	16%	Higher on first and third choices	Yes	Several comments focus on the fact that there's a perception issue – coupled with more comments that are more commonly made	Action relating to the Burgh Hall is very broad. Item still included, but Hall Committee will need to provide more specific measures – perhaps following more detailed dialogue with project partners Music based diversionary project in draft plan removed because there is low likelihood that this will progress. Local staff are reviewing options. May feature in future if alternative approach and appropriate resources are identified.
Awareness of existing services	5%	15%	16%	10%	Low on first choice	Very low first choice score suggests that this should not be a LACPG plan priority		Not included in plan – should be covered by existing communications actions of partners.
Violence against women	6%	9%	13%	8%	Low on first choice	Very low first choice score suggests that this should not be a LACPG plan priority		Not included in plan

Outcome and sub-category	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Weighted rank ¹	Commentary on ranking and scores	Is this a priority?	Things to consider arising from comments made by event participants	Impact on draft LACPG plan
Health and wellbeing								
Older people services	27%	20%	15%	23%	Good scores on first, second and third choices. First choice is first equal (27%)	Yes	Familiar range of issues raised	Removed draft plan item replicating the Bute Healthy Living Initiative as this is covered by work with the third sector to provide advice and support.
Children and young people	27%	17%	18%	22%	Good scores on first, second and third choices. First choice is first equal (27%)	Yes	Familiar topics – including link with community safety on diversionary activities to keep young people away from drink and drugs	Detail on health related actions and success measures is still weak and so content altered to allow more detail to be brought forward during the year so that the LACPG has sufficient information in advance of the budget process
Ambulance services	21%	26%	17%	22%	Good scores on first, second and third choices. Second choice is highest	Yes	More important for rural communities. Need better engagement of SAS	
Preventative schemes	11%	22%	32%	18%	Reasonable scores, but much stronger on third choice	Yes – but not as strong as first three	Recognition of benefits. Actions could generally be achieved through existing services	Cover by draft plan actions relating to play areas and subsidised access to leisure facilities
Mental health	11%	14%	12%	12%	Consistently scores on first, second and third choices	Yes – but not as strong as first three	Comments about difficulty of accessing appropriate services	Not included – but may be when partnership support for service redesign is clearer
Maternity services	3%	2%	7%	3%	Consistently scores on first, second and third choices	No		Not included in plan