

Report of the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee

‘Maximising the Benefits of Regeneration’



May 2008

Derbyshire County Council



Contents	Page
1. Executive Summary	3
2. Introduction	8
3. a) Background - National	10
b) Background – Derbyshire	18
4. Summary of Findings	23
5. Conclusion	26
6. Recommendations	28
7. Appendices	30

Maximising the Benefits of Regeneration

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Introduction

Derbyshire County Council's Council Plan for 2005-09 has a strategic goal to 'strengthen the local economy and tackle deprivation within the County'. There are currently 16 areas in Derbyshire that are within the 10% most deprived areas in England. The districts of Bolsover and Chesterfield contain 12 of these areas and out of the 354 districts in England, Bolsover ranks as 40th most deprived.

Evidence suggests that most large regeneration initiatives fail to reach disadvantaged groups. A number of initiatives have been undertaken by numerous agencies and partners to improve the prosperity of deprived communities within Derbyshire. Despite this investment largely the same communities continue to feature at the top of the index of multiple deprivation for the County.

1.2 Review Terms of Reference

The predecessor to the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee agreed to undertake a review examining the impact of multi-agency investment on levels of local social deprivation in November 2005.

The review focussed on the communities of Cotmanhay and Swadlincote, both of which had suffered from relatively high levels of deprivation. The review working group visited both communities and undertook extensive consultation and identified the following factor that had aided the regeneration of Swadlincote:

"Successful regeneration requires effective partnership working to ensure the co-ordinated involvement of all key services to address health, education, environmental, community safety, social and economic issues".

In recognition of the significance of the Markham Vale development and the importance of partnership working the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee, in agreement with the Cabinet, decided to develop the review. Focus moved to ascertaining how Derbyshire County Council departments, and selected external partners, are working together to maximise the benefit that the Markham Vale development will have on local communities.

The Markham Vale focussed review commenced in September 2007 with the objective of ensuring that lessons learnt nationally and locally were being applied to Derbyshire County Council's flagship regeneration project.

To develop the review a Member Working Group was established. The working group comprised Councillor Gillott, Councillor Buckley, Councillor

Lauro, Councillor Booth, Councillor Clark, Councillor Hart, Councillor Camm, and Councillor Flitter.

The working group has consulted with numerous organisations and academics. A list of consultees is detailed in Appendix 1.

1.3 Summary of Findings

The consultation exercises have identified that much of the work being undertaken in north east Derbyshire to address worklessness is following best practice and there is confidence amongst organisations such as Job Centre Plus and the Learning and Skills Council that when employers locate to Markham Vale they **will have the capacity** to adequately meet employers recruitment needs with local people.

This optimism is not shared by all partners and in general despite recognising the tremendous work being undertaken across the area to regenerate deprived communities, and in particular to develop the Markham Vale site, there was agreement that more strategic thinking and closer co-operation between partners would result in better outcomes for the local communities suffering from long term deprivation. The challenge will be to ensure that the partnership arrangements work effectively to achieve employers' needs.

This is not a criticism of any of the partners, each of which is aiming to improve the outcomes for local people and meet their specific targets utilising different funding streams. It is a reflection of structures created by successive Governments that hinders strategic place shaping in two tier areas.

1.4 Conclusion

Will Markham Vale help to address worklessness and act as a catalyst for wider regeneration in north east Derbyshire?

Through the hard work undertaken by all those involved with the Markham Vale development it is likely that the projects initial objectives of bringing employment to the former colliery site will be achieved thereby creating a significant number of jobs and improved access for the local community.

A number of barriers to employment that have existed in the Markham area have been reduced through the activities of Derbyshire County Council and its numerous partners.

A number of good examples of partnership working have been identified and there is clear engagement from key partners. In addition a number of excellent projects have been established seeking to address problems within local communities.

However, the review working group recognises the complexity of the issues regarding regenerating communities and evidence suggests that most large

regeneration schemes fail to reach the most disadvantaged groups. The working group believes that there is a high risk that the Markham Vale development will follow the national pattern and despite the investment it is likely that the communities that are the most deprived today will remain the most deprived in the foreseeable future.

This is because there appears to be a lack of co-ordination and strategic thinking behind the regeneration of the Markham area, of which the Markham Vale development is the flagship project. Each local authority has a vision for the area but due to the nature of multi-tier local government and partnership working no single organisation has the authority to pull everything together and influence partners to work holistically to a single master plan.

Jobs will be created. Despite a number of initiatives designed to raise awareness, aspirations and the employability of local people it is likely that unless greater co-ordination is achieved many of the jobs will be taken up by commuters, migrants, and those who are the most employable from the locality. This will not address the fundamental problems within the community and could lead to people who gain employment leaving the area rather than improving the economic situation within the area.

Communication with key partners and the local community needs to improve. Partners must be kept informed about the timescales for the opening of the motorway junction and the situation regarding negotiations with potential employers. In addition in a survey of Staveley residents undertaken for the Staveley Neighbourhood Management in 2006 and 2007 only 44.7% of respondents said that they were aware of the Markham Vale development.

Members of the working group believe that more could be achieved if target communities adjacent to the Markham Vale development were identified rather than trying to utilise the development to address issues of worklessness and deprivation across three districts.

Whilst Members recognise that the economic situation may not provide too much scope for negotiation the review working group have concerns regarding the type of employers who may be attracted to Markham Vale.

Much of this corresponds to weaknesses identified in Derbyshire County Council's 2007 Corporate Assessment report that stated:

*'The Council has yet to develop a co-ordinated and strategic approach to influence the broader place-shaping agenda across all areas of the county. Such an approach would bring partners together in a holistic way to influence sustainable development and community wellbeing..... Without a co-ordinated approach there is a risk currently that activity is unconnected and does not maximise resources or improvements in health, housing, jobs, crime, education and the environment.'*¹

¹ Derbyshire County Council Corporate Assessment Report, Audit Commission, December 2007, para 85

1.5 Recommendations

To benefit future regeneration initiatives, and to assist the Markham Vale development buck the national trend of large regeneration schemes failing to support sustainable renewal, the working group have identified the following recommendations:

Working Strategically

To effectively tackle the issues of worklessness and wider regeneration it is necessary to work strategically. It is therefore recommended that:

Derbyshire Partnership Forum, through the LAA, prioritises the issue of reducing the inequality gap between communities in Derbyshire and gives particular focus to driving forward the Markham Vale development.

The findings from this review are incorporated into the forthcoming revised Sustainable Community Strategy for Derbyshire.

Resources

To ensure that resources are focussed on reducing inequality it is recommended that:

Derbyshire County Council either;

- a) Incorporates criteria in funding decisions that prioritises investment in deprived communities, and / or
- b) Establishes a budget for place shaping in deprived communities.

To avoid spreading resources too thinly Derbyshire County Council and partners should concentrate efforts on reducing worklessness and inequality through the Markham Vale development on deprived communities adjacent to the Markham Vale site. It is recommended that:

Derbyshire County Council and partners identify a limited number of communities close to Markham in which efforts to maximise the benefits of the Markham Vale Business Park are targeted.

Communication

To improve communication with partners and the wider community it is recommended that:

Derbyshire County Council takes greater responsibility for making sure that partners are aware of ongoing developments and timescales for the Markham Vale development. In addition awareness of the Markham Vale development needs to be raised amongst the local community. This can be achieved by placing articles on a regular basis in publications such as Buzz, the newsletter of the Staveley Neighbourhood Management.

Access

Public Transport will be an important factor in determining whether local people are able to access job opportunities at the Markham Vale site. It is recognised that commitments have been made to ensure that local communities are well connected to the site. It is recommended however that:

Public transport provision be provided at times that coincide with the shift patterns of the large employers that are to be located within the Markham Vale development. In particular, the initial emphasis should be on providing transport links to those communities identified by the Authority under the earlier recommendation.

Schools

Integration back into the world of work becomes important from a young age in areas where aspirations and expectations are low due to the prevalence of worklessness. To raise aspirations and awareness amongst school children in the vicinity of the Markham Vale development it is recommended that:

Closer links be made between the Markham Vale development and local schools so that without compromising the quality of education offered schools can, where discretion allows, tailor aspects of the curriculum to raise awareness of the opportunities at Markham Vale.

2. Introduction

Derbyshire County Council's Council Plan for 2005-09 has a strategic goal to 'strengthen the local economy and tackle deprivation within the County'. There are currently 16 areas in Derbyshire that are within the 10% most deprived areas in England. The districts of Bolsover and Chesterfield contain 12 of these areas and out of the 354 districts in England, Bolsover ranks as 40th most deprived.

Evidence suggests that most large regeneration initiatives fail to reach disadvantaged groups. A number of initiatives have been undertaken by numerous agencies and partners to improve the prosperity of deprived communities within Derbyshire. Despite this investment largely the same communities continue to feature at the top of the index of multiple deprivation for the County.

2.1 Review Terms of Reference

The predecessor to the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee agreed to undertake a review examining the impact of multi-agency investment on levels of local social deprivation in November 2005.

The review focussed on the communities of Cotmanhay and Swadlincote, both of which had suffered from relatively high levels of deprivation. The review working group visited both communities and undertook extensive consultation and identified the following factor that had aided the regeneration of Swadlincote:

"Successful regeneration requires effective partnership working to ensure the co-ordinated involvement of all key services to address health, education, environmental, community safety, social and economic issues".

In recognition of the significance of the Markham Vale development and the importance of partnership working the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee, in agreement with the Cabinet, decided to develop the review. Focus moved to ascertaining how Derbyshire County Council departments, and selected external partners, are working together to maximise the benefit that the Markham Vale development will have on local communities.

The Markham Vale focussed review commenced in September 2007 with the objective of ensuring that lessons learnt nationally and locally were being applied to Derbyshire County Council's flagship regeneration project.

The original Improvement and Scrutiny Committee scoping report is attached as Appendix 2. The report to Cabinet is shown in Appendix 3. The report to the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee outlining the change in focus for the review is attached as Appendix 4.

To develop the review a Member Working Group was established. The working group comprised Councillor Gillott, Councillor Buckley, Councillor Lauro, Councillor Booth, Councillor Clark, Councillor Hart, Councillor Camm, and Councillor Flitter.

The working group has consulted with numerous organisations and academics. A list of consultees is detailed in Appendix 4. In addition information has been gathered from various local authorities, Government departments, and research conducted by academic bodies.

2.2 Acknowledgements

Members of the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee would like to thank all those who have assisted with the development of this review.

3. Background

3.1 National Context

The Government has made a commitment to reduce inequality and levels of deprivation. In 2001 the Government published a *National Strategy Action Plan: A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal*. This set out a vision that within 10-20 years no-one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live.

It would appear that the Government's strategy has had an impact in the most deprived areas. Overall, the gap in performance has narrowed between deprived local authority areas and the rest². Initiatives such as Pathways to Work and New Deal for Communities have directly helped some areas in creating jobs, improving the physical environment, reducing crime and fear of crime and improving community involvement and social cohesion.

New initiatives are emerging from the Government such as the Working Neighbourhoods Fund, a programme designed to promote work and enterprise and strengthen the economic base of an area (recently awarded to Bolsover and Chesterfield). In addition greater duties are being placed on local authorities to revive communities through economic development with the emerging focus on place shaping and community cohesion.

However, academic research shows that most large regeneration schemes routinely fail to reach disadvantaged areas / groups³. Despite significant investment and improved performance in narrowing inequality the areas that were the most deprived 30 years ago continue to be the most deprived today.

3.1.1 Barriers to Regenerating Communities

The national economy has been successful at creating jobs and increasing personal wealth over the past decade and the Government has developed initiatives to encourage more people to access work opportunities. However, according to research:

'National programmes have had less impact on disadvantaged groups and areas than on the overall level of unemployment and worklessness'⁴.

This leads us to question why the various individual and area based initiatives have not been able to lift certain communities out of deprivation.

Regenerating communities is complex because the factors that can cause deprivation operate at both individual and community levels and can vary

² ONS Labour Force Survey, Department for Communities and Local Government

³ Professor Stephen Syrett, CEEDR, Maximising Community Economic Benefits Through Regeneration, presentation handout to Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee, 26/09/07

⁴ The Economies of Deprived Neighbourhoods: Summary of Research, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, p85

between communities. The Government recognises that regeneration is not just about creating employment and has noted that **the most effective regeneration combines physical, social and economic renewal**⁵ and should be tailored to the specific needs of the individual community.

A key priority of the Government has been to enhance the economies of deprived neighbourhoods by reducing worklessness, a term used to describe all those who are out of work but are capable of working, with the aim of achieving an 80% employment rate.

The Government's rationale for focussing on economic development and tackling worklessness is based on evidence that shows that those in employment are happier, healthier, and less likely to be involved in crime⁶. Therefore, by addressing worklessness you may be able to tackle a number of the social and physical factors, as well as economic ones, that can disadvantage deprived communities.

3.1.2 Barriers to Employment

Although every community is different a number of key factors have been identified that have an important influence on the scale and nature of the worklessness problem in deprived neighbourhoods. These factors can contribute to high levels of worklessness irrespective of the state of the wider labour market as there can be a weak connection between the job opportunities that are available and the ability of workless people to access the opportunities.

The factors have been classified as being either individual and household factors or institutional factors, and many are inter-dependent.

Individual and household factors:

- Household structure (especially lone parentage)
- Level of qualification and skills
- Health and impairment
- Age and ethnicity
- Access to personal transport
- Alcohol and drug dependency

Institutional factors:

- Housing market segregating more disadvantaged groups in deprived neighbourhoods
- Benefits system acting as a constraint on the willingness of some of the unemployed and inactive to take up work perceived as low paid and insecure

⁵ Unlocking the Talent of Our Communities, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p4

⁶ Unlocking the Talent of Our Communities, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p5

- Available and affordable childcare
- Inadequate public transport services
- Scarring effects associated with the experience of long periods of worklessness, this can impact on attitudes and motivations towards work
- Access to health and welfare services⁷

Appendix 5 details barriers to work identified in case studies of Middlesbrough and Wolverhampton.

3.1.3 Why have many initiatives designed to reduce worklessness failed?

Despite significant investment in tackling worklessness in the most deprived communities within the UK, many of the initiatives have been ineffective at overcoming the barriers to employment. As a result the initiatives have not had the desired impact on employment and deprivation levels.

Studies have identified a number of key elements that have been present in a number of these failed initiatives. These have included:

- **A lack of understanding of local issues** – To reduce worklessness it is necessary to understand the particular barriers to employment that are operating within the community. Each community requires a different emphasis depending on the barriers identified. A one size fits all approach does not work.
- **Initiatives have predominantly benefited those who were already ‘job ready’** – The more disadvantaged client groups, often the residents of deprived neighbourhoods, have benefited least from the initiatives. These include interventions such as job search, advice and guidance, training programmes, and national programmes run by Jobcentre Plus where evidence has suggested that they ‘...did not significantly improve the employment prospects for the more disadvantaged client groups’.⁸

The initiatives have not been able to address the underlying causes behind the endemic worklessness levels within some communities and whilst programmes such as New Deal and Pathways to Work have helped reduce long-term unemployment and inactivity, they have less of an impact in the more deprived areas.

- **A lack of a strategic, integrated approach** – Regional, sub-regional and local bodies have performed poorly in addressing the needs of deprived

⁷ Information adapted from The Economies of Deprived Neighbourhoods: Summary of Research, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, p84 and The Learning Curve: Developing Skills and Knowledge for Neighbourhood Renewal, Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, 2002, p9

⁸ The Economies of Deprived Neighbourhoods: Summary of Research, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, p14

areas / groups. There is a need to improve performance and flexibility, co-ordination and integration of provision.⁹

- **The type of employment created within the local economy has provided few incentives to move off of benefits** – Low wage and unstable employment reinforces low expectations and aspirations, and provides few incentives to move off of benefits.¹⁰
- **Failure to understand that creating jobs is not enough** – Many areas with high concentrations of worklessness exist alongside prosperous areas where there is a strong demand for labour. A study, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, investigating the nature of social exclusion in deprived council estates found that:

‘Although many more jobs have been created they have not been taken by people furthest from the labour market. This suggests that creating work opportunities is not enough: workless people need more tailored support back to work.’¹¹

The failings identified above highlight the difficulties associated with addressing worklessness and wider regeneration within communities. If you improve the economic position within a community but do not address the physical and social problems that may exist, such as crime and anti-social behaviour, housing conditions, environmental degradation, and the reputation of an area it may result in ‘get on and get out syndrome’.

This term refers to the situation whereby a person living in a deprived neighbourhood who enters employment has an increased possibility of moving out of the area. This can lead to a falling proportion of people in employment, further reducing the wealth within the community and the links to the local labour market.¹²

Case Study – Regeneration of the Thames Gateway

A number of the failings identified above have been highlighted in a report by the Public Accounts Committee on the Thames Gateway Project. The report on Britain’s biggest regeneration project has criticised the management of the project that aims to build 160,000 new homes, and create 180,000 new jobs in an ambitious attempt to regenerate the Thames Gateway.

The report includes various statements that link in with issues identified in this report including:

⁹ Professor Stephen Syrett, CEEDR, Maximising Community Economic Benefits Through Regeneration, presentation handout to Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee, 26/09/07

¹⁰ The Economies of Deprived Neighbourhoods: Summary of Research, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, p38

¹¹ Respect and Renewal: A study of Neighbourhood Social Regeneration, David Page, 2007, p2

¹² The Economies of Deprived Neighbourhoods: Summary of Research, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, p28

‘Without significant improvement in the overall management of the programme it will remain a series of disjointed projects and is unlikely to achieve its potential.’

‘There is a risk that the economic benefits of regeneration will not reach existing residents’.

‘Stakeholders questioned whether the DCLG had enough clout within Whitehall to persuade other partners to prioritise the project.’

These identified weaknesses have led to concerns that the existing 1.45m residents in the area would not feel the benefit of new jobs and public services in the area, and that unless action was taken the enterprise could end up being another public spending calamity.¹³

3.1.4 What works in interventions to reduce worklessness in deprived neighbourhoods?

Studies have identified a number of elements that have been present in initiatives that have led to higher levels of employment, self-employment and enterprise within disadvantaged areas. Obviously a number of the factors are the reverse of the failings identified in the previous section.

Professor Syrett, Reader in Local Economic Development at the Centre for Enterprise and Economic Development Research (CEEDR) at Middlesex University arranged them under the following headings in his presentation to the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee:

- **Strategic approach**
 - avoid ad hoc/unplanned approach
 - clear relationship local needs and opportunities
 - measures: labour supply and strengthening labour demand
 - local evidence base and understanding of local labour markets/supply chains
 - co-ordinated governance and delivery arrangements
- **Co-ordinated and integrated provision**
 - local integration: avoid complexity, fragmentation and competition
 - co-ordination within and across spatial levels
 - clarity of roles: provide continuity of support
 - linkages/referrals between agencies
 - outcomes for clients > narrow targets of agencies
 - tracking of clients
- **Sensitivity to diverse needs**
 - client-centred: respond to individual needs > standardised provision
 - holistic interventions

¹³ The Thames Gateway: Laying the Foundations, House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, October 2007

- continuity of support
- high quality personal advisers
- assessment and improvement of basic skills
- **Engagement with people out of work**
 - active engagement measures: multifaceted programmes
 - voluntary and positive > coercion and compulsion
 - localised discretion
 - committed, enthusiastic and accessible staff
- **Employer engagement**
 - active engagement to ensure activity is demand led
 - ongoing training once in employment
 - supply chain management and procurement strategies
 - dialogue on employment practices and prejudices
 - dialogue on providing decent pay and conditions
- **Voluntary and community sector engagement**
 - fundamental role in support systems for certain groups
 - provide access as trusted local organisations
 - build VCS capacity so 'fit for purpose'

3.1.5 What are the policy implications?

Taking into consideration the key elements that are required for the effective economic renewal of deprived neighbourhood there are a number of implications for policy makers:

- **Need to deliver a more strategic and co-ordinated local approach**
 - improve co-ordination and integration of mainstream and local specialist services
 - improved co-ordination of local activity with higher spatial scales
 - better local intelligence
 - contracts related to outcomes
- **Need to deliver better engagement of employers and VCS stakeholders**
 - active involvement of local employers (public and private; different firm sizes) and suppliers
 - capacity building of VCS
- **Need to deliver a more personalised approach which engages with residents / workless people**
 - targets related to different workless groups
 - ongoing outreach programme
 - more and better quality personal advisers
 - access points
 - better co-ordination/integration of service provision

- fast/efficient services¹⁴

Decision makers must however recognise that the problems of deprived neighbourhoods require long-term holistic strategies to achieve sustained improvement.¹⁵

Case Study – Regeneration in Rotherham

Rotherham's economy was traditionally based on heavy industry, this suffered massive downsizing in the 1980s and 1990s.

Following a Best Value review of Regeneration in 2003 a regeneration plan was produced by Rotherham MBC. A number of areas are now undergoing significant regeneration within Rotherham including the redevelopment of the former colliery site at Dinnington.

Rotherham MBC and partners have put in place a number of employment initiatives to help Rotherham residents access the job opportunities that are being created. These have included:

- Stepping Stones – An employability project to re-engage the economically inactive. This project is delivered by local social enterprise and is based in local neighbourhoods
- Academy of Construction Trades – Trains and places people within the construction industry
- Job Match - An HR consultancy service providing assistance to both inward investors and expanding companies in the Rotherham area
- Business Incubator Centres

Outcome:

- 1987 - 75,000 people employed in 3,500 companies
- 2005 - 105,000 people employed in 6,700 companies
- 1986 - employment rate was 61.3% & unemployment was 18%
- 2005 - employment rate was 74% & unemployment was 3.9%

Summary:

- Through the activities of Rotherham MBC and its' partners many Rotherham residents have accessed jobs
- Lower success rate with higher value jobs, but changing
- Historic growth by inward investment, but seeking to move to an innovation led model

Rotherham MBC has been awarded a number of Beacon Awards for its work regarding economic regeneration. In 2005 it was awarded two for Supporting New Businesses and Asset Management and in 2003/04 for Removing

¹⁴ Professor Stephen Syrett, CEEDR, Maximising Community Economic Benefits Through Regeneration, presentation handout to Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee, 26/09/07

¹⁵ The Economies of Deprived Neighbourhoods: Summary of Research, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, p89

Barriers to Work. In 2002/03 it won its first Beacon Award for Fostering Business Growth.¹⁶

¹⁶ Information provided by Simeon Leach, Economic Strategy Manager, Rotherham MBC

Case Study – Tackling worklessness in Kent

Kent, one of the UK's largest shire counties, is a dynamic, diverse region with pockets of both wealth and deprivation. The challenge of this diversity is seen in Kent's annual spending of £1.7bn on welfare benefits for people of working age. This exceeds the whole of the County Council's annual budget for schools, adult social care, waste disposal, road maintenance and community facilities.

Kent County Council is pioneering new approaches to tackling these issues. The County Council established the Supporting Independence Programme (SIP) which coordinates work across all sectors to help people lift themselves out of a life of dependency and achieve their potential, and the 14-24 Innovation Unit, working in partnership with the LSC, Connexions, schools and businesses to deliver real transformation in learning and skills for Kent's young people.

Already, these innovations have encouraged over 4000 students this year to take up a vocational course of their choice. In targeted areas those living in key SIP wards are 29% more likely to exit benefits than in other areas of the South East.

Through these new approaches, Kent County Council will ensure that all Kent's residents, including the most vulnerable, share in the county's success.

An in-depth case study the approaches undertaken by Kent County Council to tackle worklessness can be accessed by the following link:
<http://www.nlgn.org.uk/public/wp-content/uploads/the-local-journey-to-work.pdf>

3.2 Derbyshire

3.2.1 Indices of deprivation

According to the English Indices of Deprivation 2007 Derbyshire's ranks lie between the 6th and 9th most deprived of the 34 shire counties in England.

Within the county there exists contrasting pockets of wealth and deprivation. Out of the 354 districts in England, Derbyshire Dales ranks as the 247th most deprived area and South Derbyshire ranks 233rd. This compares to Bolsover that ranks as the 40th most deprived area on the 'rank average rank' and Chesterfield with a rank of 68 on the 'rank of extent' summary measure.

There are 16 LSOA's (Lower layer Super Output Areas – each with a population of about 1,500) within the 486 LSOA's in Derbyshire that are within the top 10% of most deprived areas in England. Out of the 16 areas the greatest concentration lies within the former coalfield areas in the north east of Derbyshire. A table identifying the 16 LSOA's is shown in Appendix 6.

The Indices of Deprivation 2007 break down deprivation into various component parts, each of which can contribute to deprivation within a community. The component parts are:

- Income deprivation
- Employment deprivation
- Health deprivation and disability
- Education, skills and training deprivation
- Barriers to housing and services
- Crime
- Living environment deprivation

The seven domain scores are weighted before being combined into the single overall Index of Multiple Deprivation.

The 2007 statistics identify that Derbyshire has a greater concentration of LSOA's in the most deprived 10% in the employment, health and education domains.

In the employment deprivation domain Derbyshire has 46 LSOA's in the top 10% of employment deprived areas nationally (compared to 16 in the overall combined index). This domain includes recipients of Job Seekers Allowance, Incapacity Benefits, Severe Disablement Allowance, and participants in New Deal schemes.

In the health deprivation and disability domain Derbyshire has 34 LSOA's in the top 10% of health deprived areas nationally. This domain covers rates of poor health, early mortality and disability in an area.

In the education, skills and training deprivation domain Derbyshire has 48 LSOA's in the top 10% of education, skills and training deprived areas nationally. This domain includes the level of skills and qualification of working age adults and information on children and young people such as pupil attainment, school absence rates, percentage entering higher education, and the proportion not staying on at school.

Putting it simplistically the employment deprivation statistics identifies that worklessness is a significant problem within a number of Derbyshire's communities. The health and education, skills and training statistics perhaps indicate some of the main causes behind the worklessness.

In each of the domains the north east of Derbyshire is overwhelmingly represented in the most deprived areas. This is reflected by a target in the latest Local Public Service Agreement that focussed on reducing worklessness in wards so that no area in Derbyshire has twice the national average. All but one of the 12 wards targeted were in the north east of the county and it is likely that the May 2008 target will not be met.

3.2.2 Regeneration activity in Derbyshire

Derbyshire County Council, district councils, private organisations and other agencies have been active in their attempts to regenerate communities across Derbyshire.

Activities have sought to improve the infrastructure within Derbyshire, help people into work, develop businesses and enhance the environment in which people live. Large economic regeneration initiatives have included Holmewood Business Park, Brook Park in Shirebrook, Toyota and the Community Economic Development project amongst many.

In addition numerous smaller programmes designed to address social, physical as well as economic problems across Derbyshire have been undertaken and continue to be delivered. Many of these have benefited from Coalfield Regeneration Trust, SRB, NRF, ESF or other sources of external funding. Much of this is in addition to the statutory responsibilities that local authorities, PCT's and other public bodies are required to undertake to improve communities.

3.2.3 Markham Vale

Derbyshire County Council Plan 2005-9 identifies the aim of regeneration 'to strengthen the local economy and tackle deprivation within the county' through the following priorities:

1. Create more new jobs for local people, and
2. Improve the employment of local people.

The County Council has made progress in supporting the restructuring of the local economy in areas affected by the decline of traditional sectors, particularly the former coalfield areas. Central to this approach is the development of Markham Vale Business Park.

Markham Vale Business Park is Derbyshire County Council's flagship regeneration scheme. The £62m project is expected to create 5,000 jobs, bring in around £130m of private investment in the county and breathe new life into the local economy that has suffered from the loss of employment in heavy manufacturing industry and coal mining.

The economic regeneration scheme includes the creation of an 85 hectare business and industrial park, improving the road network and constructing a new junction for the M1 motorway, as well as environmental landscaping.

The Markham Vale Business Park is situated on the site of the former Markham Colliery, located between Staveley and Bolsover. Within the vicinity of Markham are 5 of the 16 most deprived LSOA's in Derbyshire and pockets where worklessness exceeds twice the national average. (See Appendix 6)

Derbyshire County Council and partners have targeted the districts of Chesterfield, Bolsover and North East Derbyshire in their efforts to maximise the benefits that the Markham Vale development can have on the community.

3.2.4 Barriers to employment - Markham Vale

Section 3.1.2 identified key factors that have had an important influence on the scale and nature of the worklessness problem in deprived communities. The factors vary between communities. Information from studies undertaken on behalf of the Staveley Neighbourhood Management Project identified the following key barriers to employment within the Staveley area:

- Ill Health
- Employer preference for healthy workers
- Lack of employer flexibility
- Too few jobs available
- Low wages
- Fear of loss of benefits
- Length of unemployment
- Transport needs¹⁷

This information came from a survey of residents with health problems and is therefore focussed on health issues. Health is a specific focus because Staveley and other parts of north east Derbyshire have a significantly higher number of residents of working age claiming incapacity benefit than the national average.

¹⁷ Barriers to Employment – The perspective of those with health problems, Commissioned by Staveley Neighbourhood Management, July 2004

A wider community survey within Staveley identified a number of additional factors that would help improve chances of getting a job or a better job. The most prominent were:

- More support with child care
- More training / qualifications
- More information about jobs¹⁸

To maximise the potential for Staveley residents who are currently without work to access the forthcoming opportunities at Markham Vale it is necessary to, wherever possible, overcome the above barriers.

3.2.5 Addressing the Barriers – What is happening?

The Markham Vale development has acted for some agencies as a catalyst for activity in north east Derbyshire with new initiatives designed to help local people become more competitive in the job market.

However, a lot of activity was being undertaken by various partners at a district or neighbourhood level prior to the construction of the Markham Vale Business Park. Neighbourhood Renewal Funding distributed by Bolsover Local Strategic Partnership and organisations such as Staveley Neighbourhood Management have been key in supporting, funding and developing numerous initiatives designed to encourage social, physical and economic regeneration.

Listed in the table below is a selection of initiatives being undertaken within north east Derbyshire that are designed to help address the barriers to employment identified by the Staveley Neighbourhood Management reports. These initiatives should therefore help local people access the forthcoming job opportunities at Markham Vale. Due to the number of partners involved and the sheer quantity of initiatives being undertaken only a small sample of initiatives have been highlighted.

Barrier to Employment	Initiative to Address Barrier*
<p>Ill Health – High % of residents in receipt of Incapacity Benefits</p> <p>(Combined ill health, employer preference for healthy workers and lack of employer flexibility)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Communities that Work ○ Staveley Moving Forward project ○ Bolsover Wellness ○ North Derbyshire Alcohol Advice Service ○ Staveley Healthy Living Centre ○ GP Exercise Referral ○ Smoking Cessation Groups ○ Walking for Health Group ○ Pathways to Work
<p>Too few jobs available</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Markham Vale Business Park

¹⁸ Staveley Community Survey, Commissioned by Staveley Neighbourhood Managed, July 2005

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Small Business Grant Schemes ○ Apprenticeship schemes for young people ○ New Deal
Low wages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Henry Boot Developments Ltd seeking to attract a mix of employers to Markham Vale
Fear of loss of benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GP outreach project, CAB ○ Welfare Rights Service
Length of unemployment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Family Employment Initiative ○ Pathways to Work ○ Working Communities Project ○ LSC support employees
Transport needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Improvements to Markham road network and new motorway junction ○ Planned improvement to public transport to and from Markham Vale
More support with child care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New Children Centre's (audit shows spare capacity in general/) ○ Little Angels Group ○ Activities designed to reduce rates of teenage pregnancy
More training / qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Routes for Young People ○ Education Business Partnership ○ Aim Higher ○ Education for Employment ○ Train to Gain ○ Disaffected Youth ○ Supporting Families
More information about jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staveley Neighbourhood Management Jobs Sheet ○ Job Centre Plus

* A number of initiatives seek to address more than one barrier identified above but are only included once within the table.

Initiatives have also been undertaken in areas such as crime reduction, housing renewal and environmental improvements. This will assist the long term sustainable regeneration of the communities and may help to avoid the 'get on and get out' syndrome from occurring in some north east Derbyshire communities.

4. Summary of Findings

Does Markham Vale follow identified best practice?

The number of initiatives being undertaken in north east Derbyshire is impressive. However, will they lead to local people from deprived communities accessing jobs at Markham Vale, and will the communities then benefit from this?

Section 3.1.4 identified a number of elements that have been present in initiatives that have led to higher levels of employment, self employment and enterprise within disadvantaged areas. Through the consultation undertaken with key partners the review working group has sought to discover if these key factors are being applied to the attempt to reduce worklessness in north east Derbyshire using Markham Vale as a catalyst.

Evidence from consultation

- **Is a strategic approach being taken to reducing worklessness?**

Through the detailed community profiles and various surveys there is an understanding of the local community and its needs.

Key partners meet regularly through the Derbyshire Partnership Forum, Markham Vale management groups or network meetings. There is a strong commitment from all partners to the regeneration of parts of north east Derbyshire and the role that each partner can play in this.

Partners that the working group interviewed identified the following issues regarding the strategic approach being taken:

- A more holistic approach is needed. At times changes are being made at the margins through partners working individually.
- There is no shared master plan for the regeneration of Markham Vale through the development of the business park.
- No organisation has the authority to act strategically for the area due to the number of partners and agencies involved and the nature of multi-tier local government in north east Derbyshire.

- **Is provision co-ordinated and integrated?**

There are numerous projects being delivered that are seeking to reduce levels of worklessness in north east Derbyshire. These vary from small neighbourhood initiatives to wider sub-regional activity. Many of these initiatives involve partnership working and there are good examples of well co-ordinated and managed initiatives being delivered across north east Derbyshire at a local level through Bolsover NRF, Staveley Neighbourhood Management or through district council, county council or sub-regional bodies.

A co-ordinating group exists for the development of the Markham Vale Business Park and the Local Employment Group for Markham Vale is seeking to co-ordinate employment activity.

Partners that the working group interviewed identified the following issues regarding the co-ordination and integration of provision:

- There is a need for greater sharing of information between partners, specifically regarding outreach activity where there is potential for duplication.
- The target community for the Markham Vale development is too wide resulting in resources being spread too thinly.
- Communication updating partners and residents on the Markham Vale development needs to improve.
- More could be achieved if partners worked collectively.

- **Is sensitivity shown to diverse needs?**

There are a number of programmes and initiatives each of which has a different focus. Information about local barriers to employment has been analysed and programmes are targeting relevant diverse needs such as teenage pregnancy, smoking cessation and welfare advice depending on individual need.

- **Is there engagement with people out of work?**

There are a number of programmes operating that actively engage with people out of work. These vary from health initiatives such as Communities That Work to the Family Employment Initiative.

The number of outreach workers operating in north east Derbyshire is increasing but partners recognise that it can be a long process getting the most disadvantaged 'job ready' and that many people will not be 'job ready' when employment commences on the Markham Vale site.

- **Is there employer engagement?**

Focussing on Markham Vale the developers are seeking to attract a mix of employers to the site. Linkages have been made with training providers to improve the generic work skills of local people seeking employment and once employers are known specific training schemes can be delivered.

The Learning and Skills Council will deploy the Train to Gain programme helping to update the skills of new employees and assist them as they commence employment.

Partners that the working group interviewed identified the following issues regarding employer engagement and recruitment:

- There were concerns that the location of the site and access to the motorway will make the forthcoming jobs attractive to commuters and migrants and that the commuters may be more employable than local people. Partners did recognise that this was an issue and they are putting resources into helping local people become more competitive in the jobs market.
- Concerns were expressed about the type of employment that could be attracted to the site. A mix of manufacturing, retail and distribution is preferred to merely distribution warehouses that employ fewer people.
- Links between the Markham Vale development and local schools could be improved to help raise awareness and aspirations.

- **Is there voluntary and community sector engagement?**

North east Derbyshire has a strong and active local voluntary and community sector.

The consultation exercises have identified that much of the work being undertaken in north east Derbyshire to address worklessness is following best practice and there is confidence amongst organisations such as Job Centre Plus and the Learning and Skills Council that when employers locate to Markham Vale they will be in position to adequately meet employers recruitment needs with local people.

This optimism is not shared by all partners and in general despite recognising the tremendous work being undertaken across the area to regenerate deprived communities, and in particular to develop the Markham Vale site, there was agreement that more strategic thinking and closer co-operation between partners would result in better outcomes for the local communities suffering from long term deprivation.

Evidence indicates that most large regeneration schemes routinely fail to reach disadvantaged groups. In two tier areas where multiple agencies are involved additional barriers are created and the effort and co-ordination required is therefore greater.

This is not a criticism of any of the partners, each of which is aiming to improve the outcomes for local people and meet their specific targets utilising different funding streams. It is a reflection of structures created by successive Governments that hinders strategic place shaping.

5. Conclusion

Will Markham Vale help to address worklessness and act as a catalyst for wider regeneration in north east Derbyshire?

Through the hard work undertaken by all those involved with the Markham Vale development it is likely that the projects initial objectives of bringing employment to the former colliery site will be achieved thereby creating a significant number of jobs and improved access for the local community.

A number of barriers to employment that have existed in the Markham area have been reduced through the activities of Derbyshire County Council and its numerous partners.

A number of good examples of partnership working have been identified and there is clear engagement from key partners. In addition a number of excellent projects have been established seeking to address problems within local communities.

However, the review working group recognises the complexity of the issues regarding regenerating communities and evidence suggests that most large regeneration schemes fail to reach the most disadvantaged groups. The working group believes that there is a high risk that the Markham Vale development will follow the national pattern and despite the investment it is likely that the communities that are the most deprived today will remain the most deprived in the foreseeable future.

This is because there appears to be a lack of co-ordination and strategic thinking behind the regeneration of the Markham area, of which the Markham Vale development is the flagship project. Each local authority has a vision for the area but due to the nature of multi-tier local government and partnership working no single organisation has the authority to pull everything together and influence partners to work holistically to a single master plan.

Jobs will be created. Despite a number of initiatives designed to raise awareness, aspirations and the employability of local people it is likely that unless greater co-ordination is achieved many of the jobs will be taken up by commuters, migrants, and those who are the most employable from the locality. This will not address the fundamental problems within the community and could lead to people who gain employment leaving the area rather than improving the economic situation within the area.

Communication with key partners and the local community needs to improve. Partners must be kept informed about the timescales for the opening of the motorway junction and the situation regarding negotiations with potential employers. In addition in a survey of Staveley residents undertaken for the Staveley Neighbourhood Management in 2006 and 2007 only 44.7% of respondents said that they were aware of the Markham Vale development.

Members of the working group believe that more could be achieved if target communities adjacent to the Markham Vale development were identified rather than trying to utilise the development to address issues of worklessness and deprivation across three districts.

Whilst Members recognise that the economic situation may not provide too much scope for negotiation the review working group have concerns regarding the type of employers who may be attracted to Markham Vale.

Much of this corresponds to weaknesses identified in Derbyshire County Council's 2007 Corporate Assessment report that stated:

*'The Council has yet to develop a co-ordinated and strategic approach to influence the broader place-shaping agenda across all areas of the county. Such an approach would bring partners together in a holistic way to influence sustainable development and community wellbeing..... Without a co-ordinated approach there is a risk currently that activity is unconnected and does not maximise resources or improvements in health, housing, jobs, crime, education and the environment.'*¹⁹

¹⁹ Derbyshire County Council Corporate Assessment Report, Audit Commission, December 2007, para 85

6. Recommendations

To benefit future regeneration initiatives, and to assist the Markham Vale development buck the national trend of large regeneration schemes failing to support sustainable renewal, the working group have identified the following recommendations:

Working Strategically

To effectively tackle the issues of worklessness and wider regeneration it is necessary to work strategically. It is therefore recommended that:

Derbyshire Partnership Forum, through the LAA, prioritises the issue of reducing the inequality gap between communities in Derbyshire and gives particular focus to driving forward the Markham Vale development.

The findings from this review are incorporated into the forthcoming revised Sustainable Community Strategy for Derbyshire.

Resources

To ensure that resources are focussed on reducing inequality it is recommended that:

Derbyshire County Council either;

- a) Incorporates criteria in funding decisions that prioritises investment in deprived communities, and / or
- b) Establishes a budget for place shaping in deprived communities.

To avoid spreading resources too thinly Derbyshire County Council and partners should concentrate efforts on reducing worklessness and inequality through the Markham Vale development on deprived communities adjacent to the Markham Vale site. It is recommended that:

Derbyshire County Council and partners identify a limited number of communities close to Markham in which efforts to maximise the benefits of the Markham Vale Business Park are targeted.

Communication

To improve communication with partners and the wider community it is recommended that:

Derbyshire County Council takes greater responsibility for making sure that partners are aware of ongoing developments and timescales for the Markham Vale development. In addition awareness of the Markham Vale development needs to be raised amongst the local community. This can be achieved by placing articles on a regular basis in publications such as Buzz, the newsletter of the Staveley Neighbourhood Management.

Access

Public Transport will be an important factor in determining whether local people are able to access job opportunities at the Markham Vale site. It is recognised that commitments have been made to ensure that local communities are well connected to the site. It is recommended however that:

Public transport provision be provided at times that coincide with the shift patterns of the large employers that are to be located within the Markham Vale development. In particular, the initial emphasis should be on providing transport links to those communities identified by the Authority under the earlier recommendation.

Schools

Integration back into the world of work becomes important from a young age in areas where aspirations and expectations are low due to the prevalence of worklessness. To raise aspirations and awareness amongst school children in the vicinity of the Markham Vale development it is recommended that:

Closer links be made between the Markham Vale development and local schools so that without compromising the quality of education offered schools can, where discretion allows, tailor aspects of the curriculum to raise awareness of the opportunities at Markham Vale.

7. Appendices

- Appendix 1 - Consultees
- Appendix 2 - Improvement and Scrutiny Committee Scoping Report
- Appendix 3 - Report to Cabinet
- Appendix 4 - Improvement and Scrutiny Committee Report
- Appendix 5 - Barriers to employment in Middlesbrough and Wolverhampton
- Appendix 6 - Derbyshire LSOAs in the 10% most deprived in England

Appendix 1 Consultation

The following people have been consulted during the development of this review:

- ❖ Ian Viles - Chief Executive, Erewash Partnership Ltd
- ❖ Brenda Davies – Chief Executive, Community Concern Erewash
- ❖ Malcolm Roseburgh – Partnership Development Officer, South Derbyshire District Council
- ❖ John Oak – Chair, Made in Swadlincote Partnership
- ❖ Jeanette Clayton – Neighbourhood Manager, Staveley Neighbourhood Management
- ❖ Professor Stephen Syrett - Reader in Local Economic Development at the Centre for Enterprise and Economic Development Research (CEEDR) at Middlesex University
- ❖ Simeon Leach - Economic Strategy Team Manager for Rotherham Investment and Development Organisation (RIDO), Rotherham MBC
- ❖ Steve Pintus – Associate Director of Public Health, Derbyshire PCT
- ❖ Mike Hayden – Head of Planning, Chesterfield Borough Council
- ❖ Alison Craig – Business Planning and Strategy Manager, Housing Services, Chesterfield Borough Council
- ❖ Keith Burn – District Manager, Derbyshire Job Centre Plus
- ❖ Kevin McCann – Employment Engagement Director, Derbyshire Learning and Skills Council
- ❖ David Lowe – Strategic Director, Policy and Community Safety, Derbyshire County Council, Chair of the DAAT
- ❖ Mike Brittain – Head of Regeneration, Derbyshire County Council
- ❖ Donald Rae – Assistant Director, Engagement and Skills, Derbyshire County Council
- ❖ Katherine Knox – Principal Research Manager, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Appendix 2

(In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, equality of opportunity, environmental, financial, health, legal and human rights, personnel and property considerations.)

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

STRATEGY & BUDGET / REGENERATION / EXTERNAL AFFAIRS IMPROVEMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

22 NOVEMBER 2005

Report of the Chief Executive

REVIEW OF LOCAL SOCIAL DEPRIVATION

1. Purpose of the Report

To consider the project brief for this Improvement and Scrutiny review.

2. Information and Analysis

- 2.1 At its meeting on 28th June 2005 the Committee agreed that it would undertake a review in 2005/06 of Local Social Deprivation.
- 2.2 A copy of the draft project brief for the review may be found in the Appendix. Consultation on the scope of the project brief has already commenced with the Chief Executive's Office.
- 2.3 To ensure consistency with other reviews, members of the Committee are also asked to nominate representatives to form a working group who will work with the Improvement and Scrutiny Officer in supporting this review.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: That:

The Committee:

- (a) Agrees the project brief for the review
- (b) Nominates members to form a working group to oversee progress with this review. Meetings of the working group will be public meetings

**NICK HODGSON
CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

STRATEGY & BUDGET / REGENERATION / EXTERNAL AFFAIRS IMPROVEMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REVIEW OF LOCAL SOCIAL DEPRIVATION

PROJECT BRIEF

1. Purpose of the Review

To examine the impact of multi-agency investment on levels of local social deprivation

2. Objectives of the Review

Focussing on two communities that have suffered from high levels of deprivation, Cotmanhay and Swadlincote, the review will seek to:

- Identify the level of funding that has been invested in the community
- Identify the source of the funding
- Identify the objectives associated with the funding
- Analyse the impact the investment has had on levels of deprivation
- Highlight examples of good practice

3. Review Methodology

Extensive consultation will be undertaken with a variety of key stakeholders. Consultees will include:

- Community Groups
- Funding Agencies
- Derbyshire County Council Officers
- Elected Members
- Other local authorities
- External experts

4. Outline Consultation Plan

- Prepare a plan including a balance of written and oral views of those groups and individuals outlined above
- Develop further understanding by members of the Working Group through a series of interviews with expert witnesses

5. Outline Project Plan

- Nov 2005 I & S Committee approves the project brief and appoints a working group.
- Nov 2005 to Feb 2006 I & S working group prepares consultation plan, gathers information and undertakes consultation
- Jan 2006 I & S Committee receives a progress report
- Mar 2006 I & S Committee receives the final report

Appendix 3

(In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, equality of opportunity, environmental, financial, health, legal and human rights, personnel and property considerations.)

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

6 JUNE 2006

Report of the Chair of the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee

Review of Local Social Deprivation – Interim Report (Regeneration)

1. Purpose of the Report

To inform Cabinet of the progress made by the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee on the review of local social deprivation, and to outline how the Committee intends to proceed with the review.

2. Information and Analysis

- 2.1 At its meeting on 28th June 2005 the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee agreed that it would undertake a review in 2005/06 of local social deprivation. A copy of the review scoping report is appended.
- 2.2 In March 2006 members of the review working group visited Ilkeston North/Cotmanhay and Swadlincote. In addition the Neighbourhood Manager for the Staveley Neighbourhood Management Project delivered a presentation to the Committee outlining achievements made in the Staveley area.
- 2.3 Using information gathered the Committee identified key factors that have led to successful regeneration initiatives. The most notable being that successful regeneration requires effective partnership working to ensure the co-ordinated involvement of all key services to address health, education, environmental, community safety, social as well as economic issues.
- 2.4 The Improvement and Scrutiny Committee recognises that a number of regeneration activities are ongoing within Derbyshire and it supports the Council's approach in prioritising the Markham Vale development as a major opportunity to provide new investment and job opportunities in the area. The Committee endorses the work of Cabinet Members and officers involved in advancing the project.

- 2.5 Whilst there is no doubt that the Markham Vale development will now proceed, the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee recognises that the challenge that now faces the Authority and its partner agencies is of ensuring that the communities surrounding the development obtain the maximum benefit from the opportunities that will be created.
- 2.6 In recognition of the significance of the Markham Vale development and the importance of partnership working it is the intention of the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee to develop the review following further consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration to ascertain how Derbyshire County Council departments, and selected external partners, are working or are preparing to work together to maximise the benefit that the Markham Vale development will have on local communities.
- 2.7 It is anticipated that discussions with Derbyshire County Council departments and selected external partners will be undertaken by the working group in June/July with the intention to develop a final report by the end of 2006.
- 2.8 During the visit to Ilkeston North/Cotmanhay the working party were struck by the level of deprivation within that community. As a result, the Committee are minded to recommend that consideration be given to making this area a high priority for the Authority as and when the necessary resources become available to the Council.

3. RECOMMENDATION: That:

- (c) Cabinet notes the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee's support for the prioritisation of the Markham Vale development and endorses the work undertaken by Cabinet Members and officers in progressing the project
- (d) Cabinet notes the intention of the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee to develop the review following further consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, by discussing with Derbyshire County Council departments and selected partners the steps that are proposed, or are being taken, to maximise the benefit the Markham Vale development has on local communities
- (e) Consideration be given to focusing on Ilkeston North/Cotmanhay after the Markham Vale development becomes established

Councillor Kevin Gillott
Chair of the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee

Appendix 4

(In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, equality of opportunity, environmental, financial, health, legal and human rights, personnel and property considerations.)

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

RESOURCES IMPROVEMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

27 September 2006

Report of the Chair of the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee

REVIEW OF LOCAL SOCIAL DEPRIVATION

1. Purpose of the Report

- a) To inform the Committee of the outcome of discussions held by the review working group with the Head of Regeneration regarding maximising the community benefits of the Markham Vale development.
- b) To agree how the Committee proceeds with the review.

2. Information and Analysis

- 2.1 A report was presented on 6 June 2006 informing Cabinet of the progress made by the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee on the review of local social deprivation.
- 2.2 Using information gathered during the review the Cabinet report identified key factors that have led to successful regeneration initiatives. The most notable being that successful regeneration requires effective partnership working to ensure the co-ordinated involvement of all key services to address health, education, environmental, community safety, social and economic issues.
- 2.3 Cabinet approved the following recommendations: that
 - (f) Cabinet notes the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee's support for the prioritisation of the Markham Vale development and endorses the work undertaken by Cabinet Members and officers in progressing the project
 - (g) Cabinet notes the intention of the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee to develop the review following further consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, by discussing with Derbyshire County Council departments and selected partners the steps that are proposed, or are being taken, to maximise the benefit the Markham Vale development

has on local communities

- (h) Consideration be given to focusing on Ilkeston North/Cotmanhay after the Markham Vale development becomes established.

A copy of the interim Cabinet report is appended.

- 2.4 Members wished to gain an understanding of the progress of the Markham Vale development and in particular wanted to assess how this development was dealing with some of the key factors that had been identified during the course of this review as being essential ingredients to the success of previous regeneration projects. Consequently, the review working group met Derbyshire County Council's Head of Regeneration on 12 July 2006. During a lively meeting the Head of Regeneration outlined the various activities that the County Council and its partners were engaged in, or have planned, to ensure that the Markham Vale development benefits the local community.
- 2.5 The Head of Regeneration advised the Committee that Derbyshire County Council was the lead partner in the Markham Vale Project. He expressed the opinion that it would not be possible for the review working group to effectively analyse the success of the activities that are being undertaken, or are planned by the County Council and its partners at this moment in time because insufficient information is currently available. The Head of Regeneration however, advised the working group that all the necessary mechanisms were in place and was confident that significant progress would be evident in the next 12 months as Markham Vale gathers momentum.
- 2.6 Taking the above comments into consideration members of the review working group were minded to recommend that the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee continues to monitor the progress of the Markham Vale development and that an evaluation of the activities being undertaken to ensure that the local communities benefit from the development be undertaken by the Committee in 2007/08.
- 2.7 To prepare for the proposed evaluation members of the review working group were keen to develop their knowledge of regeneration issues and initiatives prior to the review commencing.

RECOMMENDATION: That:

- (a) The Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee agrees to postpone any further enquiry into the Markham Vale development until 2007/08 when it will be better placed to examine the progress being made in ensuring that the communities surrounding the Markham Vale development obtain the maximum benefit from the opportunities that will be created.

- (b) Training be arranged to develop members of the review working groups understanding of regeneration issues and initiatives.

Councillor Kevin Gillott
Chair of the Resources Improvement and Scrutiny Committee

Appendix 5 Worklessness in Middlesbrough & Wolverhampton

Middlesbrough - Major barriers to employment were seen as:

- A lack of confidence amongst clients and the fear of meeting new people
- Fear of losing benefits
- Credibility – e.g. not having the right clothes
- Fear of failure (when starting their own business)
- The lack of basic literacy and numeracy skills, especially amongst younger people.
- Application forms that can discriminate against those people who may have the requisite skills for the job but not necessarily the experience of filling in application forms
- Motivation - The fact that people can and do survive on the benefits and or the support of family and friends and adjust their lifestyle to suit their income
- Language barriers²⁰

Wolverhampton - Barriers to obtaining employment

- Lack of basic skills eg literacy and numeracy
- Low self esteem and self confidence
- Inadequate IT skills
- Unethical recruitment practices in the construction sector, eg jobs being given to family and friends
- Ethnic minority status a disadvantage for job seekers
- Possible lack of graduate level employment in the West Midlands region
- Mature students are hindered by a lack of mobility on graduation
- Lack of work experience and confidence in the working environment
- Discrimination, eg over disability, mental illness or ethnic background
- Need for flexibility in working hours
- Problems with transportation
- People returning to work after illness or injury require a period of adjustment that is often not offered
- Lack of awareness of job opportunities
- Language barriers
- Child/carer needs
- Lack of semi-skilled manufacturing work because of closures and redundancies in the city
- Problems over Housing Benefit and Council Tax payments when customers return to work
- Some young people have certain issues eg drugs problems, teenage pregnancy, lack of employability skills which hinder their employment prospects
- Lack of first level provision (basic skills support) for those who need a lot of support before they can access mainstream work or training
- Lack of relevant qualifications and experience²¹


²⁰ Worklessness Report, Overview and Scrutiny Board, Middlesbrough Council, January 2006, p12

²¹ Local Jobs for Local People, Overview and Scrutiny, Wolverhampton, February 2005, p10-11

Appendix 6

Derbyshire LSOAs in the 10% most deprived in England – The English Indices of Deprivation 2007

LSOA	Ward containing LSOA	Local Authority	England ranking of IMD (where 1 is most deprived)	County Ranking	Workless ness Rate (national average 12 %)
E01019663	Ilkeston North	Erewash	733	1	26.1
E01019578	Rother	Chesterfield	908	2	36.6
E01019509	Shirebrook North West	Bolsover	1422	3	33.5
E01019507	Shirebrook East	Bolsover	1530	4	31
E01019575	Rother	Chesterfield	1661	5	30.8
E01019566	Middlecroft & Poolsbrook	Chesterfield	1940	6	31.3
E01019444	Ironville & Riddings	Amber Valley	2054	7	32.1
E01019488	Bolsover West	Bolsover	2077	8	29.4
E01019728	Gamesley	High Peak	2270	9	29.3
E01019527	Barrow Hill & New Whittington	Chesterfield	2664	10	28.4
E01019498	Elmton-with-Creswell	Bolsover	2776	11	27.7
E01019510	Shirebrook North West	Bolsover	2816	12	23.3
E01019568	Middlecroft & Poolsbrook	Chesterfield	2948	13	26.2
E01019561	Loundsley Green	Chesterfield	3049	14	33.2
E01019729	Gamesley	High Peak	3153	15	26.6
E01019483	Bolsover North West	Bolsover	3169	16	25.3

Key  - LSOA's that are adjacent to the Markham Vale Business Park