



AGENDA ITEM: 6

SUMMARY

Report for:	Housing and Community Overview & Scrutiny
Date of meeting:	18 July 2012
PART:	1
If Part II, reason:	

Title of report:	Deprivation in Dacorum – follow-up report
Contact:	Neil Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services Author/Responsible Officer – Katie Warner, Customer Insight Officer
Purpose of report:	To give a follow up to the report presented to the Committee last October.
Recommendations	1. That members note the work to tackle deprivation in Dacorum being undertaken by the Council and our partners
Corporate objectives:	Building Community Capacity
Implications:	<u>Financial</u> None relating to this report. However, each service and activity noted in this report are supported by a budget.
'Value For Money Implications'	<u>Value for Money</u> One form of deprivation is often linked to other forms of deprivation. In particular, there are clear links between deprivation relating to crime, education and health. Much of the work the Council undertakes directly to address one form of deprivation has effects that extend beyond their primary purpose. This investment therefore improves the quality of life for many people in communities and demonstrates good value for money.

Risk Implications	There are no specific risk implications contained within this report.
Equalities Implications	Equality Impact Assessment carried out* See Appendix 2
Health And Safety Implications	None
Consultees:	
Background papers:	Committee report – 19 October 2011
Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report:	ASB – Anti-social behaviour IMD – Indices of Multiple Deprivation NAG – Neighbourhood Action Group HEEP – Herts and Essex Energy Partnership

Background

A report was brought to Scrutiny in October 2011 giving an initial snapshot of deprivation in the borough based on the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2010. Following the meeting, a follow-up report was requested showing how the Council is working to meet the challenges posed by the IMD figures.

For more information about the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, please refer to the report to Housing and Community Scrutiny of 19 October 2011.

Key points:

1. There is a lag in the data – the Index of Deprivation is based largely on 2008 data.
2. The index showed that the average rank of sub-ward (Lower layer super output area) areas across the borough is within the 30% least deprived boroughs in England.
3. Despite the low levels of deprivation across most of the borough, there remain ten lower layer super output areas (LSOAs) featuring within the 40% most deprived in England. These areas are: Adayfield East/West, Bennetts End, Woodhall Farm, Hemel Hempstead Town, Grovehill (3 LSOAs), Highfield (2 LSOAs) and Leverstock Green.
4. The domains which feature most prominently in the ten most deprived areas are: income, employment and education deprivation.
5. It should be noted that Highfield was highlighted as an area of particular concern in the 2007 IMD data but has improved its relative position.

6. In Dacorum there is a strong correlation between income deprivation and education, skills and training deprivation.

What Dacorum Borough Council is doing

The table in appendix 1 gives an outline of the work carried out by Dacorum Borough Council services and matches that work to the relevant IMD domain and indicator.

Next steps

There are a number of existing partnerships in Dacorum which address different elements of deprivation:

- Destination Dacorum, the Local Strategic Partnership
- The Community Safety Partnership
- Neighbourhood Action Groups.

The strategic partnership is taking a proactive approach to addressing issues of economic wellbeing.

The Community Safety Partnership is continuing its work with a variety of agencies and organisations to help reduce crime rates in the borough.

The Residents Services team will be continuing to explore and address issues raised in the 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation with the various Neighbourhood Action Groups.

If members wish to make additional suggestions or recommendations these will be considered with the Portfolio Holder for future action.

Conclusion

Deprivation is being addressed borough-wide by both the existing partnership structures and Council run services.

Only some of the indicators making up the deprivation domains feature within the Council's remit, therefore limiting its ability to directly influence them. That said a lot of the work carried out by Council services and the existing partnership structures can be considered to have an indirect influence on the indicators. The table at appendix 1 and the case studies presented at the meeting, show that the Council's indirect influence on issues can be regarded to be equally as important. This is because the Council is able to have substantial impact on the wider state of deprivation in the borough as it works to improve the quality of life of its residents.

Appendix 1

Table key

AE	Adeyfield East
AW	Adeyfield West
A&W	Aldbury and Wigginton
ACH	Apsley and Corner Hall
A	Ashridge
BE	Bennetts End
BkC	Berkhamsted Castle
BkE	Berkhamsted East
BkW	Berkhamsted West
BFC	Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield
B	Boxmoor
CWE	Chaulden and Warners End
G	Gadebridge
GH	Grovehill
HHT	Hemel Hempstead Town
H	Highfield
KL	Kings Langley
LG	Leverstock Green
NM	Nash Mills
N	Northchurch
TC	Tring Central
TE	Tring East
TW	Tring West and Rural
W	Watling
WF	Woodhall Farm