Argyll and Bute Community Planning Partnership

Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Planning Group 21 September 2010

Helensburgh and Lomond Local Area Community Plan

1. Summary

Using the information collected at the Forward Together event, held in Helensburgh on 22 May 2010, and presented in the Third Sector Partnership's Forward Together report, this paper:

- Considers the extent to which there is community support for, and understanding of, the local plan outcomes
- Considers the alignment of actions and outcomes in the Local Area Community Plan
- Considers how well the actions identified in the plan match with the issues identified by the participants at the Forward Together Events.
- Makes recommendations for areas for revision to the Local Area Community Plan.

The appended tables identify areas of agreement and mismatch between the plan and issues raised by participants of the Forward Together event.

2. Recommendations

That the Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Planning Group:

- Considers how the Local Area Community Plan outcomes can be clearly linked to the Single Outcome Agreement and Community Plan, and to the Scottish Government's fifteen National Outcomes.
- Considers revising the wording of the Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Plan outcome 'Improved overall health, wellbeing, independence and social inclusion', which confused participants at the Forward Together event because of its lack of clarity.
- Considers revising some of the actions as set out in the local plan to create a closer alignment between:
  - the local plan outcomes and actions
  - the actions as articulated in the plan and issues raised by participants in the Forward Together event.
- Notes that the analysis contained in this paper includes all issues raised at the Forward Together event, and does not prioritise these or make judgments with regard to the appropriateness of their inclusion in the plan.

3. Background

A draft community plan was agreed at the January meeting of the Helensburgh and Lomond Area Community Planning Group. This plan formed the basis of the themes explored at the Forward Together event, held in Helensburgh on 22 May, 2010.

The Forward Together event was one of three facilitated by the Third Sector Partnership, on behalf of the Argyll and Bute Community Planning Partnership. (The others looked at the local area community plan issues for Mid Argyll, Kintyre and the Islands and for Oban, Lorn and the Isles.)

The Third Sector Partnership has described the findings of the three events in their 'Forward Together' report.

This current paper is based on analysis of the data from the Helensburgh and Lomond 'Forward Together' event.

4. Community engagement

Approximately 60 people attended the Helensburgh Forward Together event. Of the 59 people who gave information:
- 32 (54%) represented community groups
- 6 (10%) were from the Council
- 2 (3%) were from other public agencies
- 19 (32%) were individual residents.

Geographically, representation was biased towards Helensburgh and the Rosneath peninsula. There is marked and noticeable underrepresentation from other areas. The lack of participants from Lomondside, Arrochar and Tarbet needs to be borne in mind when considering the findings of the event.

There was a very good turnout of members of the local Youth Forum at the event. The high level of engagement with a frequently hard to reach group is to be welcomed. However, there is likely to have been a bias in terms of the views presented, with the needs of young people being voiced at the expense of other demographic groups. This bias needs to be borne in mind when considering the issues raised. The extent to which this occurred is hard to gauge as no information was collected with regard to the age profile of participants at the event. (This will be rectified at future events.)

5. Analysis

Using the information contained in the Third Sector Partnership's Forward Together report, analysis has been undertaken to consider:
- How far there is support for, and understanding of, the Local Area Community Plan outcomes
- To what extent participants associated the actions in the plan with their associated plan outcomes
- How well the actions identified in the plan match with the issues identified by the participants at the Forward Together Events. (The appended tables identify areas of agreement and mismatch.)

The recommendations for changes to the local plan reflect the findings of this analysis.

At the event, little attempt was made to ascertain the relative importance participants attached to the priorities, as set in the Local Area Community Plan outcomes. There was no vote as to the relative importance of the priorities / local plan outcomes, only of the actions / priority areas *within* each of the outcomes.

Data collected at the event were of two types:
- Qualitative data (text).
- Quantitative data (numbers), collected via the electronic voting process.

The electronic voting only allows verification of impressions from qualitative data gathered.

On the basis of the votes cast, it is possible to identify differences of opinion expressed by participants from Helensburgh and the Rosneath peninsula, and to note the underrepresentation of residents from other parts of Helensburgh and Lomond.

The content of qualitative data collected at the event has been subjected to analysis. The strength of feeling about particular issues has been noted where possible from the information reported in the Forward Together report.

6. Results

6.1 Local Area Community Plan outcomes

Although there was no disagreement expressed with any of the local area priorities, event participants were clearly confused by the local outcome 'improved overall health, wellbeing, independence and social inclusion'. Nineteen people (a third of all participants) found the priority to be confusing. Feedback suggests that the outcome covers such a wide range of topics that is unclear what it really means.

RECOMMENDATION: The wording of the outcome 'improved overall health, wellbeing, independence and social inclusion' is changed to make clearer the outcome sought.

Additionally, all plans developed by the Council currently are being brought into closer alignment with the Scottish Government's fifteen National Outcomes, and the Community Planning Management Committee has recently agreed to work toward bringing the Community Plan and the Single Outcome Agreement together into a single document. As a result of these changes, the following recommendation is also being made:

RECOMMENDATION: There should be clear links between the Local Area Community Plan outcomes and the Single Outcome Agreement, Community Plan and to the fifteen National Outcomes.

6.2 The relationships between Local Area Community Plan outcomes and actions

The workshop discussions suggest that:
- Parking was seen as a transport issue, rather than as a 'town centre' issue
- Driving and the quality of driving was seen as a community safety issue as well as transport issue
- Streetscape issues, particularly lighting were seen as community safety issues.

RECOMMENDATION: that the Helensburgh and Lomond Area Planning Group considers reorganising the actions in the plan so that they relate to alternative outcomes.

6.3 The alignment of Local Area Community Plan actions and issues raised at the Forward Together event

Of all the actions in the local plan, the action 'Implementation of CHORD project Helensburgh town centre Traffic Management and Streetscene improvements' showed the strongest alignment with issues raised at the community event.

There are mismatches between all actions and issues raised. These are detailed in the appendix to this document.

RECOMMENDATION: that the Helensburgh and Lomond Area Planning Group check the alignment between actions in the local plan and the issues identified in the Forward Together event in order to determine that the current local plan actions are the most appropriate possible.

7. Conclusion

This paper has focussed on recommendations based on feedback from participants at the Forward Together event in May 2010. However, the recommendations given in this paper need to be considered within a wider context, wherein the contraction of public sector budgets will have significant impacts on service delivery in all areas.

For further information, contact:

Eileen Wilson
Community Planning Manager
Tel: 01436 658726
Email: eileen.wilson@argyll-bute.gov.uk

APPENDIX: Results of Helensburgh Forward Together Event

Heading used at community event	Town and village development
Local Area Community Plan outcomes	• Helensburgh Town Centre has vibrant economic activities • Revitalised Village Centres
Priority as discussed at event	"Helensburgh town centre has vibrant economic activities and Lomond village centres are revitalised"
Support for / comments about the priority	• All respondents supported the priority
Top priorities within 'Town and village development' as identified by the electronic voting	• Overall, provision of local facilities was the highest priority, reflecting very strong feelings of participants from the Rosneath peninsular • Top priorities from participants from Helensburgh were 'streetscape' and 'leisure facilities'. • Note, however, that it is likely that 'local' and 'leisure facilities' are overlapping categories, although were presented as separate options in the voting.

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
Helensburgh Town Centre has vibrant economic activities	
Implementation of CHORD project Helensburgh town centre Traffic Management and Streetscene improvements	Actions AGREE with issues raised about: • parking and traffic management • town centre parking needs planning and managing • parking insufficient at Helensburgh station • more parking needed (Note: participants saw this more as a transport issue).
	Actions AGREE with: • Issues raised about streetscape in Helensburgh • suggestion for pedestrianisation of centre of Helensburgh • mend and make safer pavements and roads. (Note: streetscape issues were also -- perhaps more obviously -- seen as community safety issue.)
Implementation of CHORD Project Redeveloped West Bay Esplanade	Although no explicit mention of West Bay Esplanade made in comments from the event, actions AGREE with: • need to turn Helensburgh back into seaside town • clean up beach etc • sea front run down and with no facilities

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
	A few comments made suggested that not all aspects of CHORD had been thought through / discussed with the community. (Seven comments were made; not enough to raise this as a top priority, but enough to point to this being a possible issue.)
Development of Helensburgh Pier	MISMATCH: no mention of / comments about this in event
Provision of a Park and Ride Facility within Helensburgh	Action AGREES with: demand for park and ride in Helensburgh. (However, this was raised / seen as transport issue in event.)
	MISMATCH: Plan does not mention economy of Helensburgh more widely; suggestion made for business park in Helensburgh; reduction in rates; need to identify community ID for Helensburgh
	MISMATCH: issues were raised with regard to the need to improve quality and mix of shops in Helensburgh; need to support businesses / organisations taking over shops. Issue not covered in these terms in plan.
Revitalised Village Centres	
Undertake community audit in villages outwith National Park	MISMATCH: No comments related to the need to carry out community audit (but note lack of representation from these areas).
	MISMATCH: Nothing explicit in the plan about Rosneath / the peninsula, although issues relating to the peninsula were raised multiple times during the event.
	MISMATCH: empty shops in Rhu raised as an issue; no direct mention in plan.
	MISMATCH: Other issues raised, but not included in the plan, include activities / facilities for young people in Rosneath / on peninsula; suggestion for demolition and rebuild of Community Centre in Rosneath
	MISMATCH: housing raised as an issue; reduction of numbers of holiday homes; need to monitor new housing in Cove and Kilcreggan (though not clear what this actually means); revitalisation of housing and affordable housing supported; volume build not supported.
	MISMATCH: issue raised about need for more petrol stations in area.

Heading used at community event	Transport
Local Area Community Plan outcome	• Enhanced Transportation links with rest of Argyll and Bute, Glasgow conurbation and rest of Scotland
Priority as discussed at event	"This area has enhanced transport links with the rest of Argyll and Bute, Glasgow and the rest of Scotland"
Support for / comments about the priority	• Comments suggest attitudes vary within the area; transport links in Helensburgh are better than elsewhere.
Top priorities within 'Transport' as identified by the electronic voting	• Overall, the top two priorities were 'infrastructure' and 'integrated transport'. • These priorities were consistent between participants from the Rosneath peninsula and from Helensburgh.

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
Undertake road improvement schemes at A818 Daligan to Callendoune, A818 Daligan Bends and A814 improvements at Keppoch	Possible MISMATCH: no comments recorded relate to this. Roads maintenance raised as an issue in far more general terms than in this action. • potholes / poor general condition needs improved • road markings need replaced / lack of white lines • need better footpaths / lighting • A82 needs upgrade Lomondside
Provision of a Disability Discrimination Act compliant bus service	Action AGREES with: • comments made about disability access for ferries and buses being required. Need for disabled taxis also identified.
Finalise Helensburgh to Cardross cycleway	Possible MISMATCH: limited / negligible support recorded for cycle routes, although some need for safe cycle paths noted. However, cycle paths were also noted as a need under the health and wellbeing theme.
	MISMATCH: Transport / access to hospitals was raised under both the transport and health and wellbeing themes. • Parking difficult / inadequate at hospitals • Need for improved transport access to Paisley hospital (including the point that access is difficult from peninsula); cost; no Sunday transport; timetables need improved. • Transport / pedestrian access to Vale of Leven also raised as issue.

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
	MISMATCH: Transport integration / planning was raised • need for consultation with communities to create sensible plan • need integration of transport services • improve information.
	MISMATCH: Levels / qualities of public transport service raised as an issue: • rural areas highlighted as requiring action • buses start too late / finish too early • transport from peninsula poor • various comments made about the quality of the services / vehicles etc themselves.
	Possible MISMATCH: Parking raised as issue. But see actions relating to CHORD project.
	OTHER comments: cost: e.g. of petrol and of travel zones; need to reduce RTCs.

Heading used at community event	Community Safety
Local Area Community Plan outcome	• People feel safe and secure in their homes and communities
Priority as discussed at event	"People feel safe and secure in their homes and communities"
Support for / comments about the priority	• No disagreement with priority.
Top priorities within 'Community safety' as identified by the electronic voting	• No clear priorities could be identified from the results of the electronic voting. • This reflects marked differences between Helensburgh participants and participants from the Rosneath peninsula, leading to averaging effects in the overall results. • Top priorities in Helensburgh were 'anti-social behaviour' and 'environmental safety' (presumably relating to the streetscape issues highlighted during the discussions) • Top priorities on the peninsular were 'policing' and 'road safety'.

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
Enforcement of public drinking byelaws	Possible MISMATCH: no comments about public drinking made (but note lack of input from Lomondside communities, which may have affected this). illegal drug use was raised as an issue, but only illegal drinking is mentioned in this action.
High visibility police patrols	Action AGREES with: • comments about need for more / greater presence of police • more community policing. Concerns raised about policing on peninsula (if someone is being taken to the police station, the peninsula is left unpoliced; response times on peninsula).
Enforcement action taken against fly tipping, dog fouling, littering and graffiti	Possible MISMATCH: comments made about dog fouling and quality of play areas (see first outcome), but no comments about fly tipping, littering or graffiti.
Junior warden initiative undertaken in all communities	Possible MISMATCH / CONFUSION: no comments obviously relate to this.
Enforcement of road traffic legislation	Action AGREES with comments made about: • Speeding • drivers using mobile phones • poor driving by visitors to the area.

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
Undertake experimental learning events, safe kids for primary school children and targeted community safety events	MISMATCH: no comments relate to this.
	MISMATCH: Comments were made about need to stop sale of alcohol to under 18s, stopping smoking outside pubs, and noise associated with pubs and clubs, but are not reflected in plan.
	MISMATCH: Streetscape issues (see first outcome) very clearly seen as community safety issue. Improved streetscapes / better lighting would make people feel safer (e.g. Street lighting; lighting in alleyway at Co-op; lighting at Craigendoran station). Pavement improvements also mentioned (see also road / pavements under transport).
	OTHER comments: community wardens not around when needed; need more support for volunteering
	There was CONFUSION with regard to whether participants feel safe in their area or not, with mixed messages coming from comments made. Young people feel unsafe; want more policing.

Heading used at community event	Health and wellbeing
Local Area Community Plan outcome	• Improved overall health, wellbeing, independence and social inclusion
Priority as discussed at event	"Improved overall health, wellbeing, independence and social inclusion"
Support for / comments about the priority	• Priority is confusing with 19 respondents indicating confusion / uncertainty about it. • Priority covers such a wide range of topics, it is unclear what it really means
Top priorities within 'Health and wellbeing' as identified by the electronic voting	• No clear priorities can be identified from the electronic voting. • This reflects differences between participants from the peninsula and from Helensburgh. • Note that more issues were raised in the discussion than were presented as options to be voted on. Voting options may not have reflected the full range of possible priorities.

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
Undertake various diversionary activities to target individuals suffering with mild to moderate depression	MISMATCH: no comments relate to this.
Undertake physical activities targeting identified inactive client groups	Possible MISMATCH: A number of comments relate to providing facilities for young people (free swimming; sports facilities), but it is unclear whether they are one of the identified inactive client groups. Support for cycle paths also mentioned; how this relates to inactive groups is unclear.
Undertake diversionary activities to reduce alcohol related deaths and hospital admissions, targeting young people, vulnerable communities and people with addictions	MISMATCH: no comments relate directly to this. However, issues relating to the too-easy availability of alcohol were raised, as was the need for alcohol services. (See below.)
Undertake activities to reduce tobacco related morbidity and mortality	MISMATCH: no comments relate to this.
Undertake feasibility of extending Home Start service into H&L area	Action AGREES: Homestart should be introduced in Helensburgh.
Deliver In The Pot project to support local produce and carbon reduction measures in the Rosneath Peninsula and Garelochhead	MISMATCH: no comments relate to this.
Deliver Welfare Rights service to tackle poverty and financial exclusions amongst tenants	MISMATCH: no comments relate to this.

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
	MISMATCH: *Mobility*. A range of issues were mentioned, but with no meaningful commentary attached: • Day Centre • adult respite services • supported employment • better care of people with Learning Disabilities • access to large / small pools.
	MISMATCH: *Support to young people*. The relevance of the issues raised here, under the theme of 'health and wellbeing', is debatable. What was meant by some of the points is also unclear. • Facilitate good peer-support for young people • roles and employment for young people with support needs • transition for young people • acknowledgement sex education for all(?) • need for facilities for young people, especially in Cove, Kilcreggan and Rosneath (covered elsewhere) (youth clubs; cyber cafes; sports facilities); free swimming for young people.
	MISMATCH: *Support to elderly people*: better support all round; sheltered accommodation and wardens.
	MISMATCH: *Improve neighbourliness*. Again, the report lists a number of points under this heading, but there is no commentary attached: • community centres • no housing to be built without facilities • harness untapped pools of volunteers • improve social links with communities • adopt a granny.
	MISMATCH: *Reward healthy lifestyles*. The idea that spend should be diverted away from self-inflicted illnesses to 'genuine' patients was raised. The onus on healthy lifestyles should come from parents rather than schools, with the role of the nuclear family being strengthened.
	MISMATCH: *Lack of services and threats*. Lack of services covering the following were raised: • baby clinic premises • space for services • breakfast clubs in schools • 'inclusion' zones for specific treatments (not sure what this means) • wellbeing for people with learning disabilities • respite care for 16 to 18 year olds. A general comment was that GCC vs Highland means that the area loses out. Parklands School should be kept open.

Actions set out in Local Area Community Plan	Issues raised at local event
	MISMATCH: *Lack of funds* / confusion over new structures and funding. Now that the ADG is gone, how should people get support and funds for services. Parklands School was also mentioned, but unclear in what context.
	MISMATCH: *Information*. Need for more information to be made available. Gaps in information provision relate to: • availability of 'local' health services / services more generally / services available in the community • better information from the public sector • information for people with literacy issues, visual problems, or without internet access.
	MISMATCH: *Access to services*. These issues overlap with those raised under the 'transport' theme. Issues raised related to: • transport to meetings and appointments • distances to hospitals / difficulties in getting to hospitals / need for facilities to be local and accessible • lack of out of hours GP provision • no Saturday / bank holiday surgeries • NHS 24 inadequate • reduced service at Vale of Leven
	MISMATCH: *Safety issues*. These seem to be more closely aligned with the Community Safety theme, with discussion touching on the following issues: • smoking outside pubs causes trouble • lack of regular police support / need for more police in villages / quality of police call centres • vandalism • alcohol being too easily available.
	Other COMMENTS: • There is an obvious, and general, mismatch between issues raised in the event and the actions contained in the Local Area Community Plan. A number of comments covered elsewhere were repeated under the health and wellbeing theme, reinforcing the general impression of confusion and lack of focus in this topic. • Although 'health and wellbeing' issues are listed in the report, no information is recorded about levels of agreement from other participants. As a result, it is unclear whether the comments under the health and wellbeing theme are held by the minority or majority of participants.