

# Public Document Pack



**North  
Northamptonshire  
Council**

**Meeting:** Scrutiny Commission  
**Date:** Tuesday 24th August, 2021  
**Time:** 7.00 pm  
**Venue:** Council Chamber, Corby Cube, George Street, Corby, NN17 1QG

## **To members of the Scrutiny Commission**

Councillors Wendy Brackenbury (Chair), Kevin Watt (Vice Chair), Matt Binley, Robin Carter, John Currall, Mark Dearing, Jim Hakewill, Philip Irwin, John McGhee, Elliot Prentice, Simon Rielly, Geoff Shacklock and Lee Wilkes

Substitutes:  
Councillors Lynn Buckingham, Peter McEwan and Sarah Tubbs

## **AGENDA SUPPLEMENT**

**The following additional reports have now been published which were not available at the time agenda was published.**

This supplementary agenda has been published by Democratic Services.  
Contact: [democraticservices@northnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@northnorthants.gov.uk)

Item	Subject	Page no.
05	Levelling Up Scoping Document	3 - 12

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY COMMISSION 24 August 2021

<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review in to Levelling Up Communities</b>
<b>Report Author</b>	David Watts Executive Director for Adults, Communities and Wellbeing
<b>Lead Member</b>	Cllr Wendy Brackenbury, Chair of Scrutiny Commission

### List of Appendices

**Appendix 1:** Scoping document – Levelling up communities

### **Background Reading**

**Appendix 2:** Left behind? Communities on the edge (August 2019)

**Appendix 3:** Left Behind areas data analysis (updated July 2020)

**Appendix 4:** Communities at risk: the early impact of COVID-19 on ‘left behind’ neighbourhoods (July 2021)

### **1. Purpose of Report**

---

- 1.1. To provide the Scrutiny Commission with an initial scoping document to set the terms of the scrutiny review proposed in the Council motion on 28 July 2021.

### **2. Executive Summary**

---

- 2.1 This report introduces the scoping document and associated background reading to inform the scoping session for the Levelling Up Scrutiny Review.
- 2.2 At Full Council on 28 July 2021, a motion was moved by Councillor Zoe McGhee and seconded by Councillor Lee. During debate, Councillor Binley moved, and Councillor Lawal seconded an amendment to the motion submitted. The amendment altered the motion to read:

“North Northamptonshire Council notes that Kingswood in Corby, Avondale Grange in Kettering, and Queensway in Wellingborough are among the neighbourhoods identified across the country by an All-Party Parliamentary Group as ‘left behind’. This motion calls for the Scrutiny Commission to review the underlying data and associated report relating to areas highlighted as “left behind”. Working with our communities and partners to propose an approach on the way forward, including learning from the Big Local Programme in Kingswood, in order to develop a plan on how we can level up - as per the government’s levelling up agenda - those left behind neighbourhoods here in

North Northamptonshire in an appropriate and agreed timeframe. This may involve specifically targeting health inequalities, youth unemployment and new skills, and improving housing in these areas.”

- 2.3 Whilst the three wards identified as left behind are the focus of the reports that are available as appendices 2 and 4 it is important to recognise that there are also other communities that are experiencing similar issues but are not identified as left behind but may still benefit from the resulting outcomes for this scrutiny review.

### **3. Recommendations**

---

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Scrutiny Commission:

- a) Considers the draft “Levelling Up Communities” scoping paper and advises officers of proposed amendments and additions to the scope of the scrutiny review following discussion
- b) Proposes a non-executive elected member to act as the political lead for this scrutiny review
- c) Approves that David Watts, Executive Director for Adults, Communities and Wellbeing, is appointed as the officer lead for this scrutiny review
- d) Identifies the range of techniques it would intend to use in order to undertake this review
- e) Considers the high-level timeline it intends to adhere to for completion of this review
- f) Identifies any desired outcomes or products/publications it would intend to deliver as part of this review
- g) Identifies any groups or individuals that it would want to be engaged or co-opted on to the review

- 3.2 The reasons for the recommendations can be summarised as follows:

- a) At Full Council on 28 July 2021 an amended motion was approved calling for the Scrutiny Commission to review the underlying data and associated report relating to areas highlighted as “left behind”. Working with our communities and partners to propose an approach on the way forward, including learning from the Big Local Programme in Kingswood, in order to develop a plan on how we can level up - as per the government’s levelling up agenda - those left behind neighbourhoods here in North Northamptonshire in an appropriate and agreed timeframe.
- b) The series of recommendations aim to inform the framework for further development of the scope of the scrutiny review.

### **4. Report Background**

---

- 4.1 At full Council on 28 July 2021 the following motion was MOVED by Councillor Zoe McGhee and SECONDED by Councillor Lee:

“North Northamptonshire Council notes that Kingswood in Corby, Avondale Grange in Kettering, and Queensway in Wellingborough are among the neighbourhoods identified across the country by all all-party Parliamentary Group as “left behind”. This motion calls for the Council to come forward with a

plan in the next six-months, on how we can level up – as per the Government’s levelling up agenda, those left behind neighbourhoods here in North Northamptonshire. This may involve specifically targeting health inequalities, youth unemployment and new skills, and improving housing in these areas”.

- 4.2 During debate, Councillor Binley MOVED, and Councillor Lawal SECONDED an amendment to the motion submitted. The amendment altered the motion to read:

“North Northamptonshire Council notes that Kingswood in Corby, Avondale Grange in Kettering, and Queensway in Wellingborough are among the neighbourhoods identified across the country by an All-Party Parliamentary Group as ‘left behind’. This motion calls for the Scrutiny Commission to review the underlying data and associated report relating to areas highlighted as “left behind”. Working with our communities and partners to propose an approach on the way forward, including learning from the Big Local Programme in Kingswood, in order to develop a plan on how we can level up - as per the government’s levelling up agenda - those left behind neighbourhoods here in North Northamptonshire in an appropriate and agreed timeframe. This may involve specifically targeting health inequalities, youth unemployment and new skills, and improving housing in these areas.”

- 4.3 In August 2019, The Local Trust and Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion (OCSI) published their paper “Left behind? Understanding communities on the edge” (**background reading appendix 2**). Within this paper, three areas in North Northamptonshire; Avondale Grange in Kettering; Kingswood and Hazel Leys in Corby; and, Queensway in Wellingborough, were 3 of the 206 wards across England identified as left-behind wards. The data set used for this report was subsequently updated in July 2020 (**background reading appendix 3**). In addition, a further report titled “Communities at risk: the early impact of COVID-19 on ‘left behind’ neighbourhoods

## **5. Progress to date**

---

- 5.1 The initial scoping document prepared for the Scrutiny Commission’s consideration is attached as **appendix 1**.
- 5.2 The scoping document sets out initial proposals prepared by officers for discussion at the Scrutiny Commission meeting.
- 5.3 Furthermore, at section 3 of this covering report are a series of recommendations for the Scrutiny Commission to consider approving.

## **6 Implications (including financial implications)**

---

### **6.1 Resources and Financial**

- 6.1.1 At the point of writing this report there are no direct financial implications of setting up this scrutiny review. However, after developing the scope of the review it may be necessary for resources to be identified, either financial or officer time, in order to provide sufficient resource to progress the scrutiny review.

6.1.2 At the point of setting up the scrutiny review it is not possible to know the potential outcomes and any resourcing requirements to deliver against any plans or strategies developed as part of the review. Further reports will be brought forward at the conclusion of the scrutiny review that would address any financial or other resource implications.

## 6.2 Legal

6.2.1 There are no direct legal implications as a result of the content of this report and all appropriate governance processes will be followed in line with the Council's constitution.

## 6.3 Risk

6.3.1 There are no significant risks arising from the proposed recommendations in this report.

## 6.4 Consultation

6.4.1 Consideration for methods of engagement and consultation will be developed as part of the scoping session and will form part of the scrutiny review.

## 6.5 Consideration by Scrutiny

6.5.1 Not applicable.

## 6.6 Climate Impact

6.6.1 There are no known direct climate impacts of this scrutiny review, however there is the potential for outcomes plans and strategies to have impacts on the climate agenda. Those impacts would be considered in later reports, brought forward as a result of the scrutiny review.

## 6.7 Community Impact

6.7.1 The intended consequences of a scrutiny review are expected to lead to positive impacts for communities or the way council services are provided to residents and communities.

## 7 Background Papers

---

**Appendix 2:** APPG: Left Behind Neighbourhoods & OCSI (2021) "Communities at risk: the early impact of COVID-19 on 'left behind' neighbourhoods", available at [Communities-at-risk-the-early-impact-of-COVID-19-on-left-behind-neighbourhoods.pdf](https://communities-at-risk-the-early-impact-of-COVID-19-on-left-behind-neighbourhoods.pdf) ([appg-leftbehindneighbourhoods.org.uk](https://appg-leftbehindneighbourhoods.org.uk))



Communities-at-risk-  
the-early-impact-of-C

**Appendix 3:** Local Trust and Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion (OCSI) (2019), "Left behind? Communities on the edge", available at [local-trust-ocsi-left-behind-research-august-2019.pdf](https://local-trust-ocsi-left-behind-research-august-2019.pdf) ([localtrust.org.uk](https://localtrust.org.uk))



local\_trust\_ocsi\_left\_  
behind\_research\_augi

**Appendix 4:** OCSI (2020) “Left Behind areas data analysis updated July 2020”, available at [Left-Behind-Areas-IMD-2019-REVISED-SLIDE-DECK-with-revised-unemployment-slide-Read-Only-copy.pdf](https://localtrust.org.uk/Left-Behind-Areas-IMD-2019-REVISED-SLIDE-DECK-with-revised-unemployment-slide-Read-Only-copy.pdf) (localtrust.org.uk)



Left-Behind-Areas-I  
MD-2019-REVISED-SI

This page is intentionally left blank



## Scrutiny Review - Planning & Scoping Document

<p><b>What is the Purpose of the Review?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Specify exactly which Outcome(s) the review is examining?</i></li> <li>• <i>Also being clear what the review is <u>not</u> looking at</i></li> <li>• <i>What is the Scrutiny Review seeking to achieve?</i></li> <li>• <i>Where possible refer to value for money issues of service cost, service performance and/or customer satisfaction.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Kingswood in Corby, Avondale Grange in Kettering, and Queensway in Wellingborough are among the neighbourhoods identified across the country by an All-Party Parliamentary Group as 'left behind'.</p> <p>An amended motion at Full Council on 28 July 2021 called for the Scrutiny Commission to review the underlying data and associated report relating to areas highlighted as "left behind".</p> <p>Working with our communities and partners to propose an approach on the way forward, including learning from the Big Local Programme in Kingswood, in order to develop a plan on how we can level up - as per the government's levelling up agenda - those left behind neighbourhoods here in North Northamptonshire in an appropriate and agreed timeframe. This may involve specifically targeting health inequalities, youth unemployment and new skills, and improving housing in these areas."</p> <p>Scrutiny review is seeking to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and understand the underlying data and report relating to areas highlighted as "left behind"</li> <li>2. Engage with and explore the views of people within those neighbourhoods to understand the challenges and opportunities</li> <li>3. Engage with and explore the views of partner agencies and voluntary and charitable organisations to understand the challenges and opportunities</li> <li>4. Understand and learn from the Big Local programme in Kingswood, identifying both good practice and challenges that can help shape future proposals</li> <li>5. Make recommendations to council around a potential plan</li> </ol>
---	---

<p><b>What are the Criteria for Selection?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Why has this particular topic been considered to be a priority issue for scrutiny?</i></li> <li>• <i>Which of the principle criteria promoted by the Centre for Public Scrutiny does it satisfy?</i></li> </ul>	<p>This scrutiny review is considered a priority for a scrutiny review for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the item is of significant community concern</li> <li>2. the issue is significant to Partners/Stakeholders</li> <li>3. a focused scrutiny review is likely to add value to the performance of its services or promote efficiencies/savings?</li> <li>4. evidence to support the work is set out in the associated report referenced in the council motion</li> </ol>
<p><b>What are the Indicators of Success?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What factors / outcomes will demonstrate that this Scrutiny Review has been a success?</i></li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This review aims to tackle issues of direct relevance to local people;</li> <li>2. Aims to involve engaging with a wide range of people, drawing them together and building consensus around developing levelling up plans</li> <li>3. Will consider how approaches can challenge the accepted ways of doing things and acting as a champion for developing a culture of improvement in multiple areas.</li> <li>4. This review aims to deliver a positive impact on the geographical areas identified as “left behind” and on associated population indicators and performance</li> <li>5. Arriving at clear conclusions to deliver tangible outcome improvements through clear recommendations to develop a Levelling Up plan</li> </ol>
<p><b>What Methodology / Approach is to be followed?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What types of enquiry will be used to gather evidence.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Following a structured and proportionate review process, which is likely to involve the active consideration of evidence, direct representation(s), a review of financial, performance and risk data to arrive at an objective opinion against some Key Lines of Enquiry;</i></p>	<p><b><u>Key lines of enquiry</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If we do nothing where is the trend heading, is this OK?</li> <li>- What’s helping and hindering the trend?</li> <li>- Are services making a difference?</li> <li>- Are they providing Value for Money?</li> <li>- What additional information / research do we need?</li> <li>- Who are the key partners we need to be working with (including local residents)?</li> <li>- What could work to turn the trend in the right direction?</li> <li>- What is the Council’s and Members role and specific contribution?</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential enquiry types</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Workshops</li> <li>- Surveys</li> <li>- Focused literature review</li> <li>- Appreciative enquiry</li> <li>- Area visits (community centres, schools)</li> </ul>

<p><b>What specific resources &amp; budget requirements are there?</b>  <i>What support is required for the review exercise?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>specialist staff</i></li> <li>• <i>any external support</i></li> <li>• <i>site visits</i></li> <li>• <i>consultation</i></li> <li>• <i>research</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead officers identified to support in coordinating activity including site visits and developing and administering surveys</li> <li>- Consideration for external independent support to facilitate engagement sessions</li> <li>- Literature review – potentially support from public health with analysing data, the report and associated literature in order to advise the scrutiny review</li> </ul>
<p><b>Are any Corporate Risks associated with this Review?</b>  <i>Identify any weaknesses and barriers to success</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Insufficient resources to support the review appropriately (people)</li> <li>- With any review of this nature there is a risk of creep in scope</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who will receive the review conclusions and any resultant recommendations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To be confirmed but it is likely that the outcome will be of interest to partners, Health and Wellbeing Board and Full Council</li> </ul>
<p><b>What is the Review Timescale?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Identify key meeting dates and any deadlines for reports or decisions.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Timescale requires discussion and agreement by the Scrutiny Commission</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who will lead the Review Exercise?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Identify a nominated:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Elected Member</i></li> <li>- <i>Lead Officer</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Nominated Leads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A lead elected member that is not an executive member – TBC</li> <li>- David Watts, Executive Director for Adults Communities and Wellbeing</li> </ul> <p>Other officers likely required to contribute</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Democratic Services – TBC</li> <li>- Communities – lead officer</li> <li>- Public health – (literature review and data analysis)</li> <li>- Finance</li> <li>- Communications</li> </ul>

<b>Media Interest / Publicity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Communications Plan</i></li> <li>• <i>Do we need to publicise the review to encourage community involvement?</i></li> <li>• <i>What sort of media coverage do we want? (e.g. Fliers, leaflets, radio broadcast, press release, etc.)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establish a proportionate communications plan (external and internal) to support the review process.</li> <li>- Will this review be subject to a press embargo? No, community involvement should be encouraged</li> <li>- Who is the lead communications contact? TBC</li> <li>- Who is the designated spokesperson for the Scrutiny Review (Elected Member &amp; Officer)? Councillor Wendy Brackenbury, David Watts (officer)</li> </ul>
<b>Completed by:</b>  Date:	David Watts, Executive Director for Adults Communities & Wellbeing  16 August 2021
<b>Approved by Scrutiny Committee</b> Date:	Scrutiny Commission