

**Report to:** Community Protection Panel

**Date:** 21 July 2008

**Subject:** Rollout of Partnerships and Communities Together (PACT)

**Report of:** Director of Environmental Services

**Contact officer:** Nicola Yates Telephone: 01942 488301

---

**Purpose/summary:** To inform Panel about the methodology used to recommend to Cabinet the order of rollout for PACT's and the agreed final rollout schedule.

**Alternative options considered and reason for selecting the one recommended:** Alternative options were discussed by Cabinet.

**Recommendation/decision:** That Panel note the methodology used and the proposed rollout order for the development of Partnerships and Communities together.

**Key Decision:** This report does not involve a key decision.

**Risks/Implications:**

Financial and staffing:	Costs will be contained within existing staffing and revenue budgets
Policy:	Local Area Agreement Building Stronger Communities
Equal Opportunities - has a Diversity Impact Assessment been conducted?	Not applicable – the PACT process will provide us with the information to ensure we are meeting the needs of diverse communities
Wards affected:	All as the programme is rolled out across the borough

**Property Implications – Does the proposal involve a reduction, addition or change to the Council's asset base or its occupation?**

No

**If yes have the property implications been agreed with the Corporate Property officer?**

**Does this proposal have significant implications for the Council and the local population?**

A diversity impact assessment is not necessary at this stage, however, equality and diversity implications have been considered when producing this report.

**Does this proposal involve a new policy or procedure or significant changes to an existing policy or procedure?**

A diversity impact assessment is not necessary at this stage, however, equality and diversity implications have been considered when producing this report.

Has the Director of Legal and Property Services confirmed that the recommendations within this report are lawful and comply with the Council's Constitution? **Yes**

Has the Director of Finance and IT confirmed that any expenditure referred to within this report is consistent with the Council's budget? **Yes**

Are any of the recommendations within this report contrary to the Policy Framework of the Council? **No**

\* delete which applicable

**For Cabinet reports only:**

Categorisation of the report:	<b>x</b>
Discussion leading to a decision	
Monitoring	
Sharing for corporate understanding	

Discussion	
Decision	
Information	

**Tracking/Process:**

	Consultation	Ward Members	Partners
Panel	Overview & Scrutiny	Cabinet	Council
CPP 21.7.08		26.6.08	

There are no Background Papers to this Report within the meaning of Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Proper Officer Martin Kimber

Date 4 July 2008

## 1.0 Background:

- 1.1 On 27 March 2008 Cabinet decided to implement the Partnerships and Communities Together (PACT) approach to community consultation on a borough wide basis. In making that decision Cabinet requested an opportunity to consider the methodology used to decide the order of rollout for implementing the PACT approach and to influence the order of rollout if it was deemed necessary.
- 1.2 In response to that request, a summary of the methodology used to recommend the rollout order is provided below and the data to support this is attached in the appendices.

## 2.0 Methodology

### 2.1 Community Safety Partnership Key Priority Analysis by Ward

- 2.2 The roll out order of PACTs was determined by analysis of key Community Safety targets and key objectives on a ward by ward basis. Key targets were chosen from those the PACT process ultimately has the potential to address at the community level and are a mix of perception measures and hard crime and incident levels.
- 2.3 The analysis basically provides a rank score (smaller = negative / larger = positive) for each ward across the Borough across the following individual indicators.

Theme	Indicator	Source
<b>Priority Crimes and Incidents:</b>	Total BCS 10 Crime Counts April 07 – March 08	GMP
	Total FDR3 Counts April 07 – March 08	GMFRS
	Total ASB Calls April 07 – March 08	GMP
	Total YCA Calls April 07 – March 08	GMP
	Total Domestic Burglary Counts April 07 – March 08	GMP
	Total Criminal Damage Counts April 07 – March 08	GMP
	Total TFMV Counts April 07 – March 08	GMP
	Count of SOAs by ward that fall within the top 10% most deprived in the country	GMP
<b>Public Confidence and Reassurance</b>	% people who feel that ASB is very / fairly big problem	Citizens Panel March 08 March 08
	% people who don't know their local police officers by name or sight	Citizens Panel March 08
	% people who feel very / fairly well informed about what the Council is doing to tackle ASB	Citizens Panel March 08
	% People Victims of Crime in last 12 Months	Citizens Panel March 08
	% People who think Wigan Borough Police are doing an excellent or good job	Citizens Panel March 08
<b>Failing Performance</b>	Burglary Performance (% on / off target) as at April 07 - March 08	GMP
	Criminal Damage Performance (% on / off target) as at April 07 - March 08	GMP
	TFMV Performance (% on / off target) as at April 07 - March 08	GMP

- 2.4 A final total rank score for each ward was then calculated. This table is presented below
- 2.5 Wards have been banded into the Townships and then the Twin Townships they sit within, and are ordered based on an average score of each wards total rank score (smaller = negative / larger = positive). Please note that Pemberton appears at the top as this area was the Pilot Area for the initial PACT process

### 3.0 Proposed Rollout Order and Composite Ranking Scores

3.1 The following table details the ward and township rankings and composite ranking scores resulting from the methodology summarised above. Wigan South Township whilst it does not have the highest ranked composite score, was the pilot area for rollout, and is now entering the second cycle of community engagement and so is detailed at the top of the rollout order.

Area (n.5)	Township (n.10)	Ward (n.25)	Composite Rank Score	Average Composite Rank Score
Pemberton	Wigan South	Worsley		
		Mesnes	22	
		Pemberton	23	
		Douglas	29	
		Total	74	24.6
Leigh	Leigh	Leigh East	5	
		Leigh South	21	
		Leigh West	22	
		Total	48	16
Wigan	Wigan North	Ince	14	
		Wigan Central	18	
		Wigan West	20	
		Total	52	17.3
Hindley	Hindley	Hindley Green	35	
		Abram	16	
		Hindley	22	
		Total	73	24.3
Atherton	Atherton	Atherton	23	
		Atherleigh	26	
		Total	49	24.5
Atherton	Tyldesley	Astley MC	35	
		Tyldesley	16	
		Total	51	25.5
Hindley	Ashton	Bryn	37	
		Ashton	29	
		Total	66	33
Leigh	Golborne/Lowton	Golborne Lowton	29	
		Lowton East	42	
		Total	71	35.5
Wigan	SAS	Standish/Langtree	49	
		Shevington	45	
		Aspull	33	
		Total	127	42.3
Pemberton	OBW	Winstanley	52	
		Orrell	34	
		Total	86	43

## **4.0 Recommendations**

- 4.1 Based on the methodology and the ranking information which takes into account a range of needs based information on which a priority order has been produced. It is recommended that PACT is rolled out on the order indicated by the matrix above.
- 4.2 Alternatively, Cabinet may have provided a rationale for amending the order of rollout and it was recommended that any amendments were discussed and decided in order that the rollout out plan could be amended with minimal impact on timescales for implementation.

## **5.0 Conclusion**

- 5.1 Cabinet discussed and accepted the order of rollout for the implementation of Partnerships and Communities Together.



	BCS 10 Apr - Mar08	Target at Mar08	% Over / Under		Burg Apr - Mar0 8	Target at Mar08	% Over / Under		TFMV Apr - Mar0 8	Target at Mar08	% Over / Under		CD Apr - Mar0 8	Target at Mar08	% Over / Under		Composite Rank Score	
ABRAM	801	778	2.90	11	97	60	61.04	4	82	73	11.59	6	357	356	0.16	12	8.25	<b>6</b>
ASHTON	506	498	1.70	12	40	32	24.94	9	71	102	-30.70	22	218	189	15.37	7	12.5	<b>9</b>
ASPULL, NEW SPRINGS WHELLEY	441	470	-6.10	18	39	38	1.61	14	90	106	-14.73	11	178	152	17.40	5	12	<b>8</b>
ASTLEY MOSLEY COMMON	495	494	0.11	14	54	85	-36.53	24	97	99	-1.83	7	201	194	3.85	10	13.75	<b>12</b>
ATHERLEIGH	761	610	24.73	5	89	79	12.38	11	132	105	25.63	3	304	223	36.41	2	5.25	<b>3</b>
ATHERTON	1131	774	46.15	2	129	95	35.08	6	122	86	41.06	2	493	372	32.57	3	3.25	<b>2</b>
BRYN	486	517	-5.93	17	63	47	33.35	7	50	69	-27.02	21	220	189	16.20	6	12.75	<b>10</b>
DOUGLAS	1143	1057	8.12	9	72	78	-7.30	18	252	324	-22.23	17	413	448	-7.74	20	16	<b>13</b>
GOLBORNE AND LOWTON WEST	568	523	8.60	8	32	45	-28.74	23	88	110	-20.07	15	280	216	29.60	4	12.5	<b>9</b>
HINDLEY	767	819	-6.39	19	65	53	23.49	10	83	107	-22.73	18	338	359	-5.95	17	16	<b>13</b>
HINDLEY GREEN	331	468	-29.20	22	40	50	-19.86	21	53	46	14.76	5	109	140	-21.92	23	17.75	<b>16</b>
INCE	963	978	-1.55	15	120	93	28.69	8	75	90	-16.37	12	398	424	-6.22	18	13.25	<b>11</b>
LEIGH EAST	1145	906	26.36	4	149	75	99.94	2	201	205	-2.08	8	401	363	10.32	8	5.5	<b>4</b>
LEIGH SOUTH	802	747	7.35	10	97	97	-0.46	16	132	168	-21.26	16	329	329	0.09	13	13.75	<b>12</b>
LEIGH WEST	1146	906	26.43	3	122	121	1.10	15	236	203	16.25	4	419	426	-1.54	14	9	<b>7</b>
LOWTON EAST	361	453	-20.36	21	48	65	-25.94	22	93	121	-23.15	19	129	151	-14.67	22	21	<b>17</b>
ORRELL	281	301	-6.74	20	63	45	39.78	5	38	71	-46.23	24	100	110	-9.02	21	17.5	<b>15</b>
PEMBERTON	890	878	1.34	13	60	61	-2.13	17	86	193	-55.34	25	413	384	7.68	9	16	<b>13</b>
SHEVINGTON WITH LOWER GROUND	281	410	-31.39	23	35	32	11.01	13	57	64	-11.46	10	103	112	-7.68	19	16.25	<b>14</b>
STANDISH WITH LANGTREE	317	951	-66.67	25	44	101	-56.36	25	75	92	-18.84	14	115	365	-68.53	25	22.25	<b>18</b>
TYLDESLEY	799	390	105.01	1	106	34	213.00	1	94	58	62.07	1	296	132	124.03	1	1	<b>1</b>
WIGAN CENTRAL	1113	991	12.34	7	52	46	12.07	12	159	213	-25.38	20	310	329	-5.82	16	13.75	<b>12</b>
WIGAN WEST	652	539	20.90	6	61	34	82.04	3	81	91	-10.60	9	305	296	2.99	11	7.25	<b>5</b>
WINSTANLEY	233	460	-49.32	24	22	24	-9.30	19	64	112	-42.83	23	73	103	-29.18	24	22.5	<b>19</b>
WORSLEY MESNES	588	620	-5.08	16	60	69	-12.75	20	86	106	-18.57	13	228	236	-3.56	15	16	<b>13</b>