



Craigentenny & Duddingston Neighbourhood Partnership Annual Report 2012/13

August 2013

Purpose of the report

1. To report the work of the Craigentenny & Duddingston Neighbourhood Partnership during 2012/13 and assess general progress against the local priorities to date. (Evidence relevant measureable improvement - where data is available).
2. To encourage self-assessment and further development of the Neighbourhood Partnership's strategic approach. The report will:
 - outline progress delivered by the Neighbourhood Partnership and its sub-groups in tackling the priorities included in the Local Community Plan 2011/14;
 - provide both hard and contextual evidence of progress against these priorities in the last year/recent years in support of the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA); and
 - outline ways in which the Partnership might develop its strategy and outcome focussed approach, in preparation for the update of the Local Community Plan next year.

Context/Links

3. There has been significant strategic growth/change since the last C&D Neighbourhood Partnership Annual Report for 2010/11. A short outline of where we are now follows:

All members of the Partnership, sub-groups and partners have continued to work towards improving the quality of life for all residents across the neighbourhood. The local priorities are based largely on what local people have told us are important to them. These closely match many citywide and national priorities and include, a safer community, positive outcomes for our children and young people, a good environment, better health and wellbeing, and economic growth including jobs.

Although the language in our local community plan and citywide plans may be different, all our local priorities closely link and support the outcomes included in the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA). To help evidence and support ongoing progress, finalising an effective Neighbourhood Partnership Performance Framework is vital.

The delivery, learning and development of Total Neighbourhood within the Lochend area over the coming year(s) will also directly impact on the outcomes achieved for the community. (**Appendix 1: Total Neighbourhood – Quick Guide**)

Citywide links are also stronger with direction from the Scottish Government ensuring that the Edinburgh Partnership, other strategies such as GIRFEC, and partner service plans etc are more closely aligned to outcomes included in the SOA. Publication of a Final Draft of the Edinburgh Community Plan is currently with the Scottish Government for final approval

Outcomes from the Neighbourhood Partnership Review, which will be reported to the new Communities and Neighbourhood Committee this autumn, will raise the profile and importance of the local arrangements as part of Edinburgh's approach to Community Planning. An aggregate of key partnership work across the city from all the Annual Reports will also be reported to the Committee. The aim is to support further development of Partnerships across the city.

Initial preparation for the update of the Local Community Plan due next year should be built into this year's work plan. This will provide an opportunity in the coming cycle to begin evaluating current progress, drive effort in identifying more measurable outcomes, refine the current work focus, and perhaps, to consider short term, but specific delivery.

Main Report

4. This Partnership has many good examples of how improved local influence, joint planning, co-ordination and service delivery has resulted in change. For example, following original research funded (via the Fairer Scotland Fund) to assess services for older people in the Northfield area, the Health and Wellbeing sub-group retains a focus on supporting independent living. The research findings also helped drive practical local solutions such as ongoing installation of handrails and benches on Northfield Broadway funded via the Environment Forum. A small focus-group of older people was established to help identify locations etc. The Children and Families sub-group has recently been reinvigorated following a successful event for young people which identified a range of local issues that will be addressed. Progress has also been made through the work of the Community Alcohol Partnership which is led by the Police and involves the retail sector and youth work agencies to tackle underage drinking around the Piershill area. The work of the Environment Forum and joint work with Friends of Parks Groups and the community has successfully pursued and retained the retention of Green Flag Park Status for two parks. Following the success of a 'Living Streets Audit' carried out by a local walking group, the Environment Forum adopted the process. Four further audits have been completed to date, with actions for departments input, pursued and reported back. The Northfield Drive & Grove street audit was instrumental in the recent establishment of the new Northfield Drive & Grove Neighbourhood Association, who aim to encourage the community to work together and improve the area. Initial Partnership funding and support helped enable the successful retention of the old YWCA building for the community. The building now known as 'The Hub' is a busy and well used building managed by the Ripple Project. Many of the Partnerships original Fairer Scotland Fund decisions are also continuing to be funded via the Strategic Partnerships. This continues to support many valued local projects including the Buzz, the Ripple's outreach Youth Workers and transport for the Lunch Club etc.
5. Ongoing success of the NP allocation process managed by the Environment Forum and Area Board, for the distribution of Neighbourhood Improvement Programme (NIP) and Neighbourhood Environment Programme (NEP) budgets, has delivered a wide range of

valuable local environment improvements. The participatory approach encouraged community identification of potential local projects, assessment, discussion and ultimate decision making. This is viewed as valuable in the development of a community partnership approach. Critically over the last few years, the work of the sub-groups also helped secure extra funding which enabled additional work to be undertaken at Piershill Squares which gained £75,000 in 2011/12 and in Lochend Gardens which received an additional £25,000 in 2011/12. (**Appendix 2:** Neighbourhood Improvement Programme - Overall value/number of projects). (**Appendix 3:** Neighbourhood Environment Programme – Overall value/number of projects).

6. The NP Community Grants Fund also continues to provide local funding for smaller projects and initiatives. Due to demand, the Partnership recently agreed to adjust its guidance on amounts of awards and repeat applications. The aim is to help spread access to funds and widen the local impact of this budget. (**Appendix 4:** Community Grants Fund – Overall value/number of awards and most recent awards).
7. Over the last few years, results from the Neighbourhood Survey show some changes in the 'priorities' of local people. Movement between recurring issues such as street cleaning, road/traffic improvements (which has now moved to the top of the priority list), and more things for children and young people to do, as well as dog fouling remain a concern for local people. Many specific actions have been taken such as, dog fouling campaigns which increased penalty notices and installed new signage on bins, funding for extra activities during school holidays via Community Grants and the ongoing use of Living Streets Audits continue to tackle local issues and increase community input and engagement. The Partnership is aware that local priorities can change quickly e.g. it is possible that recent but rare incidents of serious crime may have a negative impact on reported perceptions of safety in the community at the next survey. (**Appendix 5:** Neighbourhood Survey Results – List of local priorities 2007 to 2012).
8. Other development can also influence local perceptions. Regular Meet the Funders events aim to help local groups access funding, specific Neighbourhood Partnership meetings for older residents and young people give them the opportunity to have their say and discuss what is important to them. Other work undertaken by Partners such as public consultation on the Local Policing Plan, Tenant Led Inspections, regular drop-in Housing Surgeries and support for local people working to establish the new residents group in Northfield
9. Despite progress, the neighbourhood still retains some pockets of deprivation and need. The updated Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2012 (SIMD) indicates remaining pockets of poverty and inequality within this neighbourhood. The higher number of older residents within this community will keep independent living high on the agenda. In addition, the impact of the economic climate has affected work and other opportunities especially for young people. Welfare Reform and other reducing resources will continue to impact on many local people. (**Appendix 6:** Collated SIMD & Neighbourhood Survey data).
10. Engaging the community remains a critical work stream for the Neighbourhood Partnership. Specifically themed partnership meetings e.g. Services for Older People and a Youth Consultation Event and participation in local area inspections, walkabouts and Living Street Audits etc and out with the 'Get On Bus' allows members of the

partnership to speak to local residents. The aim is to encourage local people to have their say and identify up to date information about the specific issues that are most important to residents of all ages. Ongoing consultation linked to Total Neighbourhood will also help build a more robust picture of issues that still need to be jointly tackled

Next Steps?

11. The aim of the Partnership is to be a driving force for change, local influence and measurable improvements within the community.

Despite limited decision making powers, the Partnership can drive progress by:

- Identifying and promoting innovative ways of encouraging local people to 'have their say' and get involved,
- finding more effective ways of holding service providers more locally accountable;
- scrutinising the planning and effectiveness of suggested local solutions for priorities;
- pursuing clearer outcomes and evidence of progress;
- encouraging sub-groups to seek joint approaches and develop local self-help;
- reviewing the operation of the partnership; and
- identifying and implementing ongoing improvement.

12. A degree of self-assessment of the effectiveness of the business operation is likely to help drive progress and widen discussion. The 'Improvement Service' has developed a range of questions to support this type of process and this has been piloted in other partnerships. However even a mini-review can help set new and challenging priorities for the coming year(s)? For example, it is important that Partnership (and its sub-groups) retains an overview of ongoing performance of local services, but can the delivery of expected changes from Total Neighbourhood be strengthened by targeted Partnership support and appropriate action via the sub-groups? To support next year's update of the Local Community Plan should we now start reviewing the focus of work based on the SIMD and other data etc? Can we utilise Business Meetings and sub-groups to review and discuss possible improvements? Could/should work be retargeted towards tackling new/remaining local priorities etc?

13. It is also recognised that the expectations and role of the community cannot be underestimated. The Partnership may also wish to consider how it can best achieve increased local influence via a renewed joint effort to build local engagement and capacity. This is especially important but more difficult when all resources are diminishing.

Recommendations

14. It is recommended that the Neighbourhood Partnership;

- i) notes the measurable progress that has been achieved;
- ii) considers a degree of self-assessment to support the ongoing development of an updated strategy as outlined in paragraphs 12 and 13;
- iii) prioritises for action 'identified outstanding need' as reported via the SIMD and other data (included in Appendices 5 and 6); and

- iv) acknowledges the commitment and work of the Partnership Board, the community, and all partners and thanks them for their ongoing support.

Jim Hunter

Neighbourhood Manager
Services for Communities

Appendices	Appendix 1: Total Neighbourhood – Easy Guide Appendix 2: Neighbourhood Improvement Programme Details Appendix 3: Neighbourhood Environment Programme Details Appendix 4: Community Grants Fund Details Appendix 5: Neighbourhood Survey Results (2007 - 2011) Appendix 6: Table of SIMD and Neighbourhood Survey data
Contact/tel/Email	Jim Hunter, Neighbourhood Manager Services for Communities 0131 529 7185
Wards affected	14 – Craigentiny & Duddingston



C&D Area Board
51 Projects: Value - £1,102,784 (2007 – 2013)

NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME (NIP) 2012-2013

Location	Project description	Cost
Lochend Quadrant	Community Growing Group (Lochend Secret Garden)	£20,000
Piershill Square	Create access to allotments	£3,600
Hawkhill Avenue	Fencing	£10,300
Northfield	Fencing (various locations)	£51,800
Willowbrae	Fencing (various locations)	£18,400
Loaning Road Sheltered Housing	Wildflower area	£15,500
Lady Nairne Grove/Loan	Improvements to drying green	£36,600
Lady Nairne	Fencing (various locations)	28,400
	Total	£184,600



**C&D Environment Forum
10 Projects: Value - £555,000 (2007 – 2013)**

C&D NEIGHBOURHOOD ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (NEP) 2012-2013

Location	Project Description	Cost
Craigentenny	Maintenance of Craigentenny marbles site to restore railings and ensure safety	£3,500
Duddingston Road	Upgrade footway at entrance to primary school	£16,000
Marionville / Dalgety	Zebra crossing (£12,000 from 2012/13 budget)	£13,000
Northfield Grove & Drive	Upgrade Steps from drive leading to grove	£8,000
Northfield	Northfield Development Plan	£45,000
	Total	£85,500



C&D COMMUNITY GRANT FUND AWARDS 2007-2013
54 Projects: Value - £162,799

Awards 2012/13

Project	Award (£)
St Ninian's Youth Club	£415
Friends of Lochend Park	£500
Restalrig Lochend Local Area Forum	£510
Dr Neil's Garden Trust	£654
The Ripple Project	£687
St Ninian's Community Parent Council	£500
Craigentenny Lochend Social Centre	£2,445
Craigentenny & Lochend Playgroup	£3,000
The Alma Project	£318
Northfield Willowbrae Community Services Group	£1,727
The Field Group (Duddingston)	£1,310
PACTRA (Piershill Residents)	£540
The Youth Bus Project (The Buzz)	£2,420
The Royalettes	£1,421
Northfield & Willowbrae Playgroup	£790
Total	£22,817

**Top Neighbourhood Priorities 2007 – 2012 (From Neighbourhood Survey)**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
1	Clean up the area / improved street cleaning	Tackle anti social behaviour	Tackle anti social behaviour	Activities for children / young people	Road / traffic improvements	Road improvements and safety
2	Tackle anti social behaviour	Activities for children / young people	Activities for children / young people	Road / traffic improvements	Activities for children / young people	Tackle dog-fouling
3	Deal with dog fouling	Road / traffic improvements	Clean up the area / improved street cleaning	Tackle anti social behaviour	Shopping, entertainment, amenities	Clean up the area/ street cleaning/ rubbish collection
4	Road / traffic improvements	Clean up the area / improved street cleaning	Deal with dog fouling	More jobs / employment opportunities	Clean up the area / improved street cleaning	Activities for children/ young people
5	Better police service / more patrols	Better police service / more patrols	Road / traffic improvements	Shopping, entertainment, amenities	Better police service / more patrols	Tackle anti-social behaviour/ get rid of undesirables



**C&D Data - collated from Scottish Index Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) & Neighbourhood Survey
Satisfaction Levels**

C&D - Economy delivers increased investment jobs and opportunities						
Indicator	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	City average
Total Population	24847	24883	24881	25056	25616	28956
% Working age	62	62	63	63	63	68
% Pensioners	23	23	23	22	22	17
% Income deprived			14		13	12
% working age employment deprived	13		11		11	9
All working age benefits claimants	2390	2375	2660	2575	2645	41950
Working age benefit claimants as % working age residents	15	15	16	16	16	12
JSA claimants	293	508	666	646	721	12117
JSA as % of working age residents	2	3	4	4	4	4
JSA claimants under 24	855	135	185	165	175	3140
JSA under 24 as % of residents aged 16-24	34	5	7	6	7	5

C&D – Children and Young people enjoy childhood and fulfil their potential						
Indicator	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	City Average

% going onto positive destinations	81	84	84	85	87	83
% going onto further education		32	25	27	21	26
% onto higher education		34	32	35	39	37
% onto training		3	3	4	4	5
% onto employment		19	26	18	22	20
% unemployed and looking for work		12	15	14	11	12
% unemployed and not looking for work		1	1	1	1	1
Events for children and young people in libraries			116	162	201	Not Applicable
Number of Duke of Edinburgh Awards				27	27	Not Applicable
% half days attended in primary school	95	95	94	94	95	95
Number of primary pupils ½ days - temporarily excluded	63	87	25	22	19	Not Applicable
% taking school meals	33	36	33	35	43	46
% half days attended secondary schools	89	90	90	90	92	93
number secondary school ½ days - temporarily excluded	1494	941	1030	591	520	Not Applicable
% secondary school taking school meals	23	19	17	13	14	22

C&D – As place to live, study, work, visit and invest

Indicator	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	City average
% satisfaction with NH as place to live	91	76	87	94	95	90

NH is place different backgrounds can get on well	58	69	81	86	81	81
Road traffic accidents per 100,000 population	68		44			49
% road defects repaired/attended within 3 working days				85	92	88
% Satisfaction road maintenance	63	52	82	55	55	53
% Satisfaction pavement maint/	60	52	79	82	57	56
% Satisfaction street lighting	87	84	83	97	88	85
Cleanliness of streets %		100	94	94	91	93
% Satisfaction street cleaning	68	69	75	92	74	72
% Satisfaction library	88	85	85	98	94	90
% Satisfaction parks and green spaces	79	68	91	88	83	80
All crime		2226	1893	1804	1655	Not Applicable
Violent crime		29	53	46	42	Not Applicable
% Feeling safe after dark		69	77	81	77	77
% Satisfaction of how CEC dealing violent crime		75	95	89	79	71
% Satisfaction how CEC dealing neighbour disputes	56	68	87	93	76	72
% - How CEC dealing ASB	51	45	72	48	67	67
% - How CEC dealing with dog fouling	40	37	60	74	50	56

% - How CEC dealing with vandalism and graffiti	57	57	80	79	72	71
---	----	----	----	----	----	----

C&D – CEC is efficient and effective organisation

Indicator	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	City average
% Satisfaction with Neighbourhood Management	59	57	74	82	75	74
% - Feel able to have a say on things happening or how local services are run	36	31	15	61	58	50