

Community Planning under the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015: Consultation on Draft Guidance and Regulation



Questions

Q1: The guidance identifies a series of principles for effective community planning. Do you agree with them? Should there be any others?

Please explain why.

The Community Planning Partnership agrees with the principles, except that reporting is annual. Bi-annual reporting is more effective given the nature of partnership working on significant challenges where time is needed to report progress. Strongly suggest a move away from annual reporting and an emphasis on this to be bi-annual which is more effective in long term project delivery.

Also:

The CPP and community planning partners have a clear understanding of distinctive needs and aspirations of communities of place and interest within its area, as a result of effective participation with community bodies.

Is a duplication of:

The CPP has a strong understanding of its local areas, including differing needs, circumstances and opportunities for communities (geographical and communities of interest) within its area.

Other expectations accompanying these require the community engagement to understanding therefore there is no need to have both of these and would suggest using one, combined as follows: *The CPP has a strong understanding of its local areas, including differing needs, aspirations, circumstances and opportunities for communities (geographical and communities of interest) within its area as a result of effective participation with community bodies.*

Q2: The draft guidance sets out common long-term performance expectations for all CPPs and community planning partners. Each CPP will adopt its own approach towards meeting these expectations, reflecting local conditions and priorities. Even so, do you think there are common short- or medium-term performance expectations which every CPP and partner should be expected to meet? If so, what are they?

Common principles are:

- Partners demonstrating collective ownership, leadership and strategic direction of community planning
- The CPP organises itself in an effective way, which provides platforms for strong strategic decision-making and action, and effective scrutiny and challenge.
- The CPP and community planning partners have a clear understanding of distinctive needs and aspirations of communities of place and interest within its area, as a result of effective participation with community bodies.
- The CPP focuses its collective energy on where its partners' efforts can add most value for its communities, with particular emphasis on reducing inequalities.
- The CPP has a deep-rooted commitment to continuous improvement

Q3: The 2015 Act requires CPPs to keep under review the question of whether it is making progress in the achievement of each local outcome in their LOIP and locality plan(s). CPPs must from time to time review their LOIP and locality plan(s) under review, and to revise them where appropriate. Even with this, do you think the statutory guidance should require CPPs to review and if necessary revise their plans after a specific period of time in every case? If so, what should that specific period be?

Yes No

Please explain why.

Should be given the freedom and trust to review plans and strategies at timescales appropriate to local area and type of plan. The requirement is for CPPs to continually review performance and it is implicit in this that plans would also develop.

Q4: What should the statutory guidance state as the latest date by which CPPs must publish progress reports on their local outcomes improvement plans and locality plans?

4 months 6 months Other

If other please provide timescale. Please explain why.

6 months would be our preference. This is due to the amount of time needed to

gather end of year performance data, prepare the report and the cycle of committees for approval.

Q5. Do you have any other comments about the draft Guidance?

Consultation with communities has provided the following feedback:

- The language is not plain English and not user-friendly to communities
- Local Outcomes Improvement Plan is not terminology which communities can relate to
- The words “locality plan” are being overused, for example Health and Social Care and are causing confusion

Further clarity needed from Scottish Government on determining deprivation, taking into account the differences between rural and urban deprivation. SIMD is not appropriate for rural areas and funding should be provided to support rural authorities to do the detailed work required for SIMD equivalent.

Bute and Cowal Area Community Planning Group

The view of the Bute and Cowal Area Community Planning Group feels that the language used in the draft guidance is not plain English and is not user-friendly to communities. In particular, the Local Outcomes Improvement Plan (LOIP) was not terminology which they felt communities could relate to.

Mid-Argyll, Kintyre and the Islands Area Community Planning Group

The view of the Mid-Argyll, Kintyre and the Islands Area Community Planning Group feels that the language used in the draft guidance is not plain English and is not user-friendly to communities.

Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Planning Group

No further comments

Oban, Lorn and the Isles Area Community Planning Group

The group wished their dissatisfaction be noted on the overuse of the word locality and the amount of plans being required by the Scottish Government.

Q6. We propose that the draft regulation for locality planning should set one criterion only, which is a maximum population permissible for a locality. Do you agree? What are your reasons?

Argyll and Bute CPP feels that a maximum population is a “red herring” for an area which has very dispersed settlements. The maximum populations proposed would

encompass a huge number of self-identified Argyll and Bute communities and therefore meaningless in terms of addressing their differing issues. Using the localities as defined by the Health and Social Care Partnership would best work for the area as these are accepted by the community as natural hubs.

Bute and Cowal Area Community Planning Group

The word permissible caused concern for members for the Bute and Cowal Area Community Planning Group and suggested words such as suitable or appropriate be used instead.

The use of numbers is too simplistic. A maximum number for the Bute and Cowal area was a “red herring” and potentially irrelevant. There was also concern on whether deprivation could be identified just by using numbers and that the use of indicators would be a more appropriate criteria.

Mid-Argyll, Kintyre and the Islands Area Community Planning Group

Members of the Mid-Argyll, Kintyre and the Islands (MAKI) Area Community Planning Group suggested linking locality plans for Community Planning with the locality plans within the Health and Social Care Partnership.

As there are a number of smaller communities within the MAKI area, it was felt that the criterion of a maximum number was largely irrelevant. However, as the aim of the Argyll and Bute Community Planning Partnership is to grow the population, members of the group were keen to know whether there would be leeway with the maximum number if the population were to grow.

Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Planning Group

Members of the Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Planning Group felt that the focus of locality plans should be on deprivation rather than numbers.

Oban, Lorn and the Isles Area Community Planning Group

Members of the Oban, Lorn and the Isles Area Community Planning Groups also suggested considering linkages between the geographical boundaries of locality plans for Community Planning to the Health and Social Care locality plans.

Q7: The draft regulation sets a maximum population size for localities subject to locality planning of 30,000 residents. It also proposes an exception which allows a CPP to designate a local authority electoral ward as a locality even where its population exceeds 30,000 residents. Are there circumstances in which these criteria would prevent a CPP from applying a reasonable approach to locality planning? What difference would it make to how localities were identified for the

purposes of locality planning in the CPP area(s) in which you have an interest, if the maximum population size were set at (a) 25,000 residents or (b) 20,000 residents?

Argyll and Bute CPP would like to see 30,000 as the maximum population permissible for locality plans. If we were to mirror the localities of our Health and Social Care Partnership, then the Helensburgh and Lomond area would have a population of 26,163 as per the National Records of Scotland 2014 Small Area Population Estimates. A figure lower than 30,000 would require the CPP to separate this defined and recognised locality area.

Bute and Cowal Area Community Planning Group

The Bute and Cowal area covers Dunoon, the Cowal peninsula and the Isle of Bute. The National Records of Scotland 2014 Small Area population estimates give a population of 21,080 for the entire Bute and Cowal area, 9540 for Dunoon and 4540 for Rothesay, the two main towns in the area.

The aim of the Argyll and Bute Community Planning Partnership is to grow the population and members of this group would not want to limit numbers to suit current population levels for the area.

Mid-Argyll, Kintyre and the Islands Area Community Planning Group

The Mid-Argyll, Kintyre, and the Islands area covers a large area including Inveraray, Lochgilphead, Ardfern, Tarbert, Carradale, Campbeltown, the Isle of Islay and the Isle of Jura. The National Records of Scotland 2014 Small Area population estimates give a population of 20,533 for the entire MAKI area, 3710 for Lochgilphead and Ardrishaig combined, 4800 for Campbeltown, 570 for Inveraray, 1130 for Tarbert and 760 for Bowmore, the main towns in the area. The group is keen to stress that one locality plan would be too geographically diverse for this area.

The aim of the Argyll and Bute Community Planning Partnership is to grow the population and members of this group would not want to limit numbers to suit current population levels for the area.

Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Planning Group

The National Records of Scotland 2014 Small Area population estimates give a population of 26,163 for the entire Helensburgh and Lomond area. This is broken down to 15,590 for Helensburgh, 2130 for Cardross, 2110 for Garelochhead, 1290 for Kilcreggan and 1260 for Rosneath. For Helensburgh and Lomond to be captured in its entirety, the maximum number would need to be set at 30,000 however the group recognised that it was more realistic to look at smaller areas.

Oban, Lorn and the Isles Area Community Planning Group

The National Records of Scotland 2014 Small Area population estimates give a

population of 20, 248 for the entire Oban, Lorn and the Isles area. This is broken down to 8540 for Oban, 610 for Dunbeg and 1010 for Tobermory. The group suggested considering linking the geographical boundaries of the Health and Social Care Locality Plans to these locality plans to minimise confusion. The maximum numbers suggested in the draft guidance would not cause the CPP to take an unreasonable approach to locality planning.

Q8: Do you have any other comments about the draft Regulation?

- Concern over the amount of resource required to create and deliver locality plans
- Concern about the potential duplication and confusion with the locality plans of the Health and Social Care Partnership

Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Planning Group

There was concern over the amount of resource that would be required to create and deliver locality plans.

Oban, Lorn and the Isles Area Community Planning Group

The Oban, Lorn and the Isles Area Community Planning Group were very concerned about the potential duplication and confusion with the Locality Plans required by the Health and Social Care Partnership and the Locality Plans for Community Empowerment.

There was also concern that no resource was being made available by the Scottish Government to accompany the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act requirements.

Q9: Are there any equality issues we should be aware of in respect of local outcomes improvement plans and locality plans

The CPP would be keen to use local knowledge alongside SIMD data in order to highlight hidden deprivation to address inequalities. This requires a resource to be developed, challenging at a time of budget reduction.