Section 1. Context

1. How does your proposal demonstrate delivery of the 2050 Ambition?

Context:
The Southend 2050 Ambition has been co-created with residents, local groups, partners and businesses. The outcomes cannot be effectively delivered only by Southend Borough Council. As the process moves to co-designing proposals, co-production and delivery engaged and empowered citizens and partners are required to make the outcomes a reality.

What stands in the way is a legacy relationship between the residents and the public sector which is framed in a deficit led, mainly transactional and one way service delivery context. The focus has been on what the local authority can do and this has been made more difficult by years of reducing budgets. Communities are fluid and individuals more mobile leading to atomisation, epidemic of social isolation and apathy.

The proposal is informed by ABCD (Asset Based Community Development) considering first the importance of strengths and local assets of residents and communities in developing neighbourhoods and creating conditions to live well. This applied community building approach found that residents and communities have many gifts, passions and assets which when discovered and connected can result in engaged citizens who take more action to live good lives and create resilient communities.

Delivery:
The community builders (AI1 and AI2) employed in local organisations for a period of 2-3 years initially would walk the streets in chosen areas and undertake strength based conversations with residents. They would identify community connectors who could carry these conversations out in their networks.

This would rebuild residents and communities trust in their own strengths and assets and for connections to be made between residents. In turn residents would link up around their very local priorities to develop projects and activities to address them. They could invite the public sector and voluntary sector partners to help where that help is welcome and to do things for the community where it is required. The sequence is important:

1) What can the residents do? (ie local campaign, litter pick)
2) What do the residents want help with? (ie equipment)
3) What do the residents want done for them? (ie. refuse collection and recycling borough wide)

**The “start up” type funding** (AI4) could be made available for groups which need some additional resource to take action or scale it up matched by residents time or own resource. The design of the fund would be aligned with Asset Based Development Principles and enhance rather than replace the enthusiasm and resources gifted by residents.

**The forums created by activated citizens** (AI3) would offer an opportunity to inform and authentically feed into existing local authorities (and other public bodies) plans and priorities via Southend 2050 outcomes, particular service design processes, the development of the Local Plan and Localities development as part of population health agenda.

Engaged and linked up residents are more likely to have improved outcomes in the areas of:
- Safety
- Health and wellbeing
- Cultural activity
- Economic activity
- Civic activity

The Community Builders could effectively link with the **Community Hubs** as central locations for neighbourhoods and animate the communities around them to engage with them and contribute.

Areas for Community Builders work could be chosen on the basis of existing enabling activity in the area ie. around community hub, a willing host organisation, area of particular interest to the public sector due to opportunities and challenges presented.

2. What evidence have you got that this approach will deliver of the outcome?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABCD Ayrshire Report</td>
<td>improvements in population wellbeing, new groups set up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCD Croydon Report</td>
<td>increased residents participation, new groups set up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wigan Deal – Kings Fund report
https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/lessons-wigan-deal

Community Paradigm NLGN

Shared Power Principle CPI
https://www.centreforpublicimpact.org/journey-shared-power-principle/

Civil Society Futures Final Report
https://civilsocietyfutures.org/final-reports/

Collaborative Society Report

5 Ways of Wellbeing –
https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/stress-anxiety-depression/improve-mental-wellbeing/
https://neweconomics.org/uploads/files/8984c5089d5c2285ee_t4m6bhqq5.pdf

ABCD and Funding
https://www.nurturedevelopment.org/blog/abcd-approach/thinking-differently-about-funding/

3. What are the measures of impact, success and how will you embed learning?
Numbers of residents involved, number of community connectors, new groups set up, existing groups enhanced, number of events, residents matching hours and resources to the “start up fund”.

Numbers of residents involved in forums contributing to development, delivery and review of local priorities, projects and actions.

Public perception survey – related measures improved ie. perception of environmental quality, perception of people being valued, community cohesion, having a say on council services.

Locality/neighbourhood specific measures ie. if safety, health or community cohesion is an issues in an area changes in relevant measures could be observed (antisocial behaviour, number of admissions to the hospital, perceptions of mental wellbeing).
Section 2. Aims, Objectives & Collaboration

4. What are the key aims and objectives of the proposal?

1. Empowered residents who are aware of their strengths and assets
2. Residents map local areas and identify opportunities and challenges
3. Residents shape and inform local priorities
4. Residents link together to create projects and initiatives
5. Residents invite the public sector and civil society organisations to help with or carry out functions.

5. Who else have you involved in discussions and how have they helped to shape the proposal?

Outcome leads and business case owners:

Active and Involved outcome leads – we considered similarities and synergies between proposals, restated importance of supporting conditions for Active and Involved citizens

Safe and Well outcome leads and related service leads – considering health and wellbeing impacts on individuals and population, potential preventative impacts on health and social care, safety.

Community Hubs Merger leads and contributors – considered links with community hubs, enhancing shared narrative around increasing community ownership of priorities and activity

SAVS CEO and deputy CEO as part of ABCD workshops:

Ideas of where to host the community builders, how to leverage existing community infrastructure, where the “start up fund” could be hosted or who could facilitate it.

A Better Start Southend – Jeff Banks Director
There could be a joint up approach in wards covered by ABSS - “it takes a village to raise a child”

Cormac Russell – Nurture Development
Ensuring fidelity with the ABCD approach, practical considerations in regards of recruitment, choosing areas, ongoing support, evaluation.

Ayrshire/Scotland implementation site officers
Importance of long term commitments to a project 2 years min, 3 years good scope.

Sarah Baker – Interim Adult Social Care Director
Community builders and their impact for prevention of need for formal care, alleviating social loneliness.

6. What are the links and dependencies with the other outcome proposals?

Merging proposals

AI 1.2 Community Builders
AI 2.4 Community Catalyst
AI 3.1 Increasing community and stakeholder participation and ownership of the Southend 2050 Ambition and outcomes
AI 4.3 Build Community Infrastructure Nick/Carl

Contributing to:

OP 1.1. Continued development of the Local Plan

Explored links with:

SW1.1 Increase the Community Safety team - although currently paused considered how an upstream
approach to community building could improve local safety.

Community Hubs Merged proposal ie. community ownership/health and wellbeing/safety aspects

Strong links with current Locality design work as part of the population health management and integration agenda.

Links with other themes:

The strength based conversations bring out peoples strengths and gifts allowing them to make a contribution which makes them feel MORE VALUED. Residents will have opportunities to link with others from DIFFERENT BACKGROUND more frequently and by focusing on positive and fun activities which make Southend a better place to live residents have a chance to GET ON WELL TOGETHER.

Outcomes in the A&I theme benefit as more people connect, can take collective action through decision making or action to improve their environments which will have a physical activity element.

The Safe and Well Theme will benefit as residents who are activated are less likely to be socially isolated and stay well for longer. Neighbours who know each other feel safer where they live and are more likely to look after those who are most vulnerable.

The P&J theme benefits are: residents feel better about themselves and feel pride and joy about the place they live and are more likely to contribute, get involved in and promote the cultural offer.

O&P theme will benefit as a strong community is more likely to contribute to the development and delivery of a Local Plan and contribute its skills, passions and other gifts to the reimagining of the town centre.

7. Who are the partners (or potential partners) and how to you envisage their role(s) in collaborating to delivering the proposal to achieve the outcome?

Host organisations
The community builders should be ideally placed with a local host organisation matrix managed with the council but without imposing branding to facilitate bottom up ownership of the project. It could be SAVS or another local organisation with sufficient capacity and sharing an ABCD narrative.

Community Hubs
Organisations leading on the hubs and involved in their delivery could be supportive collaborators as the community builders could link people to them and the community hubs could link people with the community builders to share assets and activities.

Existing organisations in an area
Community builders and connectors could help enhance the activity of existing organisations present in an area by linking residents into ie. lunch clubs/sports clubs/residents associations. Existing groups could take part in ABCD training and continue the strength based conversations with their membership and people they work with.

A Better Start Southend - leadership interested in the Asset Based Community Development approach informing delivery, explore joint funding and management

Social Prescribing – the social prescribing model will be developed by Sept 2019 and facilitated by an organisation, an important aspect is building community capacity through ABCD so that the increase use of community assets through referrals from the public sector does not overwhelm groups.

IAG platform – Live Well – Asset mapping activity undertaken by the community builder and the community could feed into the platforms database which in turn could communicate the work of the community builders and connectors back to the residents via digital means.
8. What potential challenges do you anticipate in respect of a) implementing this proposal, b) caused by this proposal once implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges to implementation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Identify source of funding and agree joint funding if partnership for a long enough period of time for change to be noticeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identifying an area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finding a host organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employing the right community builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing support and mentorship to ensure alignment with ABCD principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allow space for creativity and development of relationships (at speed of trust) vs too early/much pressure from an evaluation framework/expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges as a result of the proposal implementation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Increased expectations from the community in regards of engagement and participation opportunities from the public sector in setting local priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some system priorities currently identified via data or senior level agreements might be challenged by community perceptions of priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 3. Social Value

#### 9. How could the proposal deliver social value - in terms of the local community, businesses, economy and environment and what will the specific impact and benefits be?

The community builders support local residents to discover their gifts and assets and mobilise them to deal with individual and community opportunities and challenges. This creates confidence in citizens power, increases community resilience through new connections and a solution focused, citizen centred and citizen owned attitude to challenges.

New groups set up and existing groups strengthened would increase community capacity. Individuals through new connections and the community through a more caring outlook increase their ability to care for the wellbeing of its members reducing risk of crisis and pressure on formal services. The perceived community cohesion can support improvements in overall mental wellbeing and perceptions of safety. Actual safety can be improved through early intervention and better reporting and intelligence sharing.

Increased numbers of events and activities could increase the feeling of pride and joy in the locality and Southend and the unique, cultural offer could attract more visitors.

Residents who are linked together and confident are more likely to be able to consider coming together to create business proposals with charities, social enterprises being some of the potential vehicles. The experience from Barking and Dagenham for example is that entrepreneurial residents will utilise the new community associations as avenues to test business ideas scale up.

Local environment issues are one of the most obvious and practical areas the residents can get involved with as a one of or regular basis through local campaigns, street cleans, stewardship of green spaces, tree planting etc.

#### 10. What is the perceived impact the proposal will have on groups with ‘protected characteristics’?

The approach of the community builders is generally non – targeted to avoid reinforcing labels and stigma. However in practice as residents are approached on the street and other public arenas a more representative demographic is being worked with resulting in activities being created which are more representative of the local diversity. By placing community builders in first instance in areas where groups with “protected characteristics” are more prevalent their positive impact will be also strengthened.

Supporting new groups being set up and strengthening the capacity of existing ones can have the impact of reducing the threshold for accessing groups and increase opportunities for participation for people with “protected characteristics” who often face additional barriers ie. accessibility, transport, cost.

#### 11. What is the proposal’s potential direct or indirect impact on the wider community?

Most points covered above.

High level impact: Increased engagement and participation in own self-care, community life and civic and democratic processes.