

## **Background Paper to BSPIG: COMMUNITY COHESION BASELINE RESEARCH**

**To:** Bucks Strategic Partnership Implementation Group  
**Date:** 1 July 2010  
**Author:** Neil Gibson, BCC

### **PURPOSE**

To hear from Harris Joshua, Director of Reviews at the Institute of Community Cohesion (ICOCO), and to comment on the key recommendations for improving community cohesion in Buckinghamshire (see pages 13-18 of the attached paper).

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The BSP Implementation Group is asked to DISCUSS AND COMMENT on the recommendations. It is also asked to AGREE that the Safer Stronger Partnership Board should oversee the implementation of actions agreed and provide a progress report to BSP Implementation Group annually.

## **B BACKGROUND**

In January 2010, the BSP Implementation Group received a report which provided background information about the research project looking at community cohesion in Buckinghamshire together with a verbal update on the emerging issues.

The research team have now completed their documentary analysis and have conducted 73 one to one interviews and 29 focus groups.

**Attached at Appendix A is an executive summary of the draft report.**

We know we are starting from a more comfortable position on cohesion when compared with continuing tensions in others parts of the county e.g. Birmingham and Bradford. However, there is work to do if we are to have strong, confident and active communities and meet our aims to:

- Making it easier for people and communities to support one another
- Encouraging local volunteering across all age groups
- Helping the voluntary and community sector to thrive
- Encouraging people to be active in their community
- Improving the lives of the vulnerable and disadvantaged
- Promoting opportunities for all



Institute of Community Cohesion

# **A County Wide Review of Community Cohesion in Buckinghamshire**

(Draft – Confidential)

## **REVIEW TEAM**

**Harris Joshua**

**Daljit Kaur**

**John Tatam**

**Nadeem Baksh**

**Daniel Range**

**Sabira Ali**

**Annette Hay**

**Aurelie Broeckerhoff**

**26 June 2010**

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. Buckinghamshire County Council invited the Institute of Community Cohesion to conduct a county-wide review of community cohesion in order to better enable the County, District and Parish Councils to work together along with their Partners in targeting resources and developing co-ordinated programmes to help build strong communities and avoid future tensions and conflicts.
- 1.2. The County Council and its partners are directly responsible for a range of services, which are of critical importance to the residents of Buckinghamshire, but are also critical to the success of community cohesion. The Review was asked to pay particular attention to:
  - The roles and functions of the Public Sector Partners
  - Developing County wide Information and Intelligence
  - The potential for local delivery within a County wide Approach
- 1.3. The work was carried out in the autumn of 2009 and spring of 2010. It consisted of a review of Council documents and demographic data, interviews with Councillors and council officers, at county, district and parish level, other workers in the public and voluntary community and faith sectors, and a range of focus groups. A multi agency steering group was formed to oversee the work.

## 2.0. What is Community Cohesion?

- 2.1. Although the term community cohesion gained national prominence following the various reports into the disturbances in a number of Northern towns in 2001,<sup>1</sup> it has since gained a much broader meaning. The definition of an integrated and cohesive community most commonly used, is where:-
  - People from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities,
  - People know their rights and responsibilities, and
  - People trust one another and local institutions to act fairly.

---

<sup>1</sup> Notably, Cattle T, *Community Cohesion: A report of the Independent Review Team*, Home Office, 2001

It also involves communities having:-

- A shared future vision and sense of belonging,
- A focus on what new and existing communities have in common, alongside a recognition of the value of diversity,
- Strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds.

### **3.0. Why Review Cohesion in Buckinghamshire?**

3.1. Buckinghamshire is a very prosperous county. It also scores fairly well on many of the key indicators used to measure community cohesion. The county is a long way literally and metaphorically from the towns of the northwest. However:-

- The County's population is growing and projected to increase significantly over the next two decades.
- The mix of ethnicities, faiths and nationalities are also changing as a consequence of growth in the County's Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) population and international migration from Eastern Europe and from the rest of the world. In addition, many of these communities are not well understood.
- Less affluent and elderly people in rural locations can experience isolation, and while most rural communities exhibit high levels of cohesion, they can be unwelcoming to outsiders.
- There are small pockets of deprivation within the County which impacts disproportionately on its BME communities.
- Despite the County's prosperity it has not been untouched by violent extremism and terrorism. Localities within the County have also been targeted by Far Right Groups.
- Finally, the County Council's own Cohesion and Equality Strategy is now over four years old and needs to evolve and develop in light of current community cohesion challenges as well as the challenges to come.

3.2. Many of these issues and challenges have been recognised by the County Council. For example, in its Local Area Agreement for 2006 – 2009 'Promoting Prosperity – Tackling Inequalities', it was noted that:

*'The changing composition of the county in terms of ethnicity and age characteristics, and the addition of new communities in housing growth areas will all provide challenges for both new and established communities. A challenge for the Partnership will be to promote cohesive communities, strengthening intergenerational, interfaith and cultural understanding, and to promote equality of opportunity for all residents, ensuring that communities have the capacity to help themselves.'*

## **4.0. Executive Summary**

### **Methodology and Content of Final Report**

- 4.1. In addition to the specific elements of the brief outlined in the introduction, the review of community cohesion across the County also sought to identify what was seen as the key challenges for Buckinghamshire by conducting interviews with key personnel across the public, voluntary and community sectors, as well as focus groups with residents in urban and rural locations and representing different age, interest, faith, ethnic and other minority groups.
- 4.2. Broadly, the final report, which is still in draft form for comment, will include population change, deprivation and disadvantage, rural isolation, hate crime and tension monitoring, as well as the roles of the voluntary, community and faith sectors, along with the roles of different tiers of local government. Where possible, we have tried to identify which key issues predominate in different parts of the County, as this may have implications for individual or a group of local authorities. The following sections sets out the final report's key findings and recommendations.

### **Population Change**

- 4.3. Buckinghamshire has been designated a major housing growth area in the South East and its population is projected to grow by 16.7% between 2001 and 2031. A great deal of this expansion will occur in parts of Aylesbury Vale where the population is projected to grow by over 29% between 2001 and 2031. This is probably the most significant challenge for the County and for Aylesbury Vale in particular. Both local authorities are well aware of the potential demands on the infrastructure, key services, and of the need to attract employment for the new population. However, more emphasis could be given to identifying the fears and concerns of established communities, to building community and cohesion amongst the new population and in connecting the new population with established communities. Investing in these aspects at an early stage could avoid increased expenditure on key local authority and other services later.
- 4.4. The age profile of the county's overall population is also predicted to change with a decline in the 0-15 age group and an increase in the pensionable age population. In contrast with other local authority areas, young people aged 16 to 24 in Buckinghamshire are less likely to believe that people of different backgrounds get on well together, according to the County's local Survey of public attitudes in 2010. They are also the least likely to agree that they can influence decisions affecting their local area. There have also been periodic bouts of racial harassment in the south of the county, and street gangs were identified as an issue in Aylesbury and High Wycombe. More widely, older

residents in rural areas were thought to be less tolerant of young people congregating in public places and more likely to complain over what could be regarded as relatively trivial issues. Young people have a critical role to play in building cohesion both within and across communities and should continue to be a priority in future community cohesion strategies.

- 4.5. New migration is also contributing to population change. The overall size of the new migrant population is difficult to estimate, but one source – National Insurance Number registrations (NINo) – indicate annual numbers doubling between 2002/3 and 2007/8, from 2040 to 4000. Not surprisingly, new migrants have been attracted to the County's two largest urban areas – Aylesbury and High Wycombe.
- 4.6. While the largest national group are from Poland, the County has also attracted migrants from South Africa, India, Pakistan and Lithuania. Many of these migrants are transient and may not have remained in Buckinghamshire. However, there are communities that have settled in different parts of the County, the largest and longest standing being Polish – dating back to the Second World War, but also smaller communities from Russia, Hungary, Greece and Zimbabwe. These communities have different experiences of migration and different histories of settlement. Though there is a strong element of self-help, their integration in schools and in access to services cannot be taken for granted. Issues highlighted in interviews included ESOL provision - which was seen as a major barrier to employment and access to services. Also, children arriving in schools with little or no English, new migrants working in jobs well below their qualifications, knowledge of employment and other rights under British law, and securing a voice in local consultation arrangements with the Public Sector.

### **Buckinghamshire's BME Communities**

- 4.7. The County's population is also becoming more diverse in terms of ethnicity and faith. Black and Minority Ethnic communities are significantly younger than is the average for the general population, and in Buckinghamshire increased from 7.9% in 2001 to 10.7% in 2007 according to ONS Mid-Year population estimates. Indicative of continuing change in the size of the County's BME population, 18.8% of pupils in Primary Schools and 18.2% in Secondary Schools are from BME groups. Asian and Asian British constitute by far the largest group – 4.6% of the overall population – who are mostly of Pakistani heritage. Though Christians make up 74% of Buckinghamshire's population, at 3.6% Muslims are the second largest declared faith group. However, there are also smaller Hindu, Buddhist, Jewish and Sikh faith communities.

- 4.8. The largest BME communities are to be found in High Wycombe - where they make up over 12% of the population - and in Aylesbury and South Bucks where BME groups constitute over 6% of the population.
- 4.9. Buckinghamshire's BME population is lower than the national average, but higher than in the South East region. Nevertheless, issues of residential concentration, inequality and disadvantage, are in most respects similar to that found in most of England's larger cities.
- 4.10. To begin with, Buckinghamshire's BME communities are residentially concentrated in particular Wards in urban areas – wards that are the most deprived in the County. BME pupils continue to under-achieve in the County's schools. This was an issue of great concern within the Pakistani heritage and Black communities, along with under-representation in the County's Grammar Schools.
- 4.11. In the labour market – arguably the key to tackling disadvantage and inequality – participation rates are significantly lower for Non-Whites 71.9% (most likely to be the Pakistani heritage working age population) than for Whites 85.2%. The Asian working age population (again dominated by those of Pakistani heritage) are significantly more likely to have no qualifications than the rest of the workforce – particularly for older age groups. As a consequence the Asian workforce is most likely to be found in Manufacturing, Wholesale/Retail and Transport, which accounts for 52% of employment compared with 37% for Whites. In terms of occupations, the Asian workforce is under-represented at senior managerial level and concentrated in lower skilled occupations – in particular sales, process plant and machinery and elementary jobs – which accounts for 37% of the workforce compared with 19.3% for Whites. Patterns of labour market concentration are not dissimilar for the Black workforce who are most likely to be found in the manufacturing and Health and Social Work Sectors and in lower skilled occupations.
- 4.12. Similar to national patterns, the County's Asian population were more likely to agree that people of different backgrounds got on well together. However, this was not the case for Black and Mixed heritage groups.
- 4.13. The level of understanding of the different BME communities and the extent to which they are engaged is varied and tends not to extend far beyond traditional leadership structures, which may not be inclusive of women and young people.

#### **Cohesion in Rural Communities**

- 4.14 Though 65% of the County's population live in urban area, 35% live in rural areas. By and large, the County's rural population is fairly affluent. Many have strong urban connections, working, shopping and seeking their entertainment

in London or other major urban centres. However, there are some who because of income, age or disability are much more dependent on local services and transport and can feel quite isolated. There is a good deal of feeling in rural areas that resources are too focused on the urban centres to their detriment – particularly for the elderly and for young people.

- 4.15. In addition to the County's arrangements for consulting and engaging rural communities, the voluntary and community sector is also playing a significant role. However, rural communities, whilst having strong local bonds and high levels of social capital, can be very defensive in respect of new Social Housing being cited in their neighbourhoods. Similar issues also came to the fore in rural areas around Aylesbury where further housing expansion is planned. As already indicated, intergenerational tensions and facilities for young people, also featured as issues in rural areas.

### **Hate Crime and Tension Monitoring**

- 4.16. The number of racially or religiously aggravated offences has increased in Buckinghamshire – from 174 in 2004/5 to 217 in 2008/9, particularly in Aylesbury Vale, but also in Wycombe and South Bucks. Concerns were also raised regarding under-reporting and the low number of non-police reporting sites. Arrangements for monitoring tensions between different communities appeared to be dominated by the Police and were essentially reactive. Though information is shared with local authority partners, their involvement was not clear. The Police, local authorities and their partners in other parts of Britain are developing tension monitoring systems that involve gathering intelligence from a wider range of public sector frontline staff and seeks to anticipate tensions and intervene at an early stage. Quite often, fairly trivial events - a proposed Far Right demonstration or a small number of new migrants in a largely mono-cultural area - can escalate quite quickly.

### **The PVE Agenda**

- 4.17. Individuals resident in Buckinghamshire have been linked to the London bombings in 2005 and the threat to blow up aircraft in 2006. Both incidents have raised considerable tensions locally but have also demonstrated a capacity for communities to come together in times of crisis. Two Districts within Buckinghamshire are in receipt of PVE funding and many positive and well received initiatives were launched following the 2006 incident. Nevertheless, there is resentment amongst many Muslims that they were being put under the spotlight, labelled and spied upon because of the activities of a few. Other communities, including the African Caribbean community in Wycombe, are also resentful that funding and resources are 'yet again' being focussed on Muslim communities.

- 4.18. Some Muslims are working with the PVE agenda, albeit with reservations. However, many established Muslim groups, in Wycombe and Aylesbury have not wanted to have anything to do with PVE, though they have not condemned the programme publicly. Specific projects in Buckinghamshire, approved and funded under the PVE programme are wide ranging and do address issues of isolation and cohesion. However, greater emphasis could be given to tackling all forms of extremism including the activities of Far Right groups and on connecting the County isolated Muslim communities to other communities in their localities.

### **The Roles of County and District Councils**

- 4.19. Buckinghamshire is a three tier local authority area with a County, Districts and Parish Councils. In addition, the County Council has also established Local Area Forums (LAFs) to promote involvement and engagement of communities and bring services together at a local neighbourhood level.
- 4.20. Community cohesion by its very nature is a bottom up process. Moreover, Buckinghamshire is a large and varied county and as illustrated in this report, different community cohesion issues feature in different areas. A 'bottom up' approach, in which District Councils are seen as the key drivers of local cohesion strategies would seem to be the best way of avoiding a 'one size fits all' framework in which the same issues are tackled in every area – whether or not these issues exist. It would also avoid conflicting and confusing policy objectives and allow District Councils to focus on key issues in their areas.
- 4.21. Without genuine co-operation between County and District Councils based on a clear understanding of their respective roles, the efforts of all tiers of local government and their Partners are likely to prove ineffective and wasteful in the longer term.
- 4.22. Within such a framework the County Council has a number of critical roles to play. In the first instance, it is responsible for a number of key services – in particular, schools and Youth and Adult Services – which are already making a vital contribution to building cohesive and resilient communities. However, greater emphasis could be placed on supporting the overall approach and initiatives led at District level.
- 4.23. The County Council also has excellent facilities for both pulling together and mapping complex statistical and qualitative data. In so far as community cohesion is concerned, it is in a position to play a role similar to that of an 'Observatory' – by making information available to District Councils and Partners in a form that is relevant to their areas, but also by being more open to their information needs.

- 4.24. Further, the County Council is in a position to bring together and focus the contribution of key Partners in the Public, Voluntary, Community and Faith Sectors at a strategic level. This could also apply to key agencies – for example, local Race Equalities Councils where funding for individual provision in different local authority areas may not be tenable in the current economic climate. The County’s overall role in this respect could also include:-
- helping to drive change based on ‘best practice’,
  - engaging with new Partners not currently making a significant contribution – for example the County’s Universities,
  - supporting the development of new mechanisms enabling small and medium sized Voluntary and Community organisations to get involved in the commissioning process, bid for and undertake Public Sector Service contracts,
  - where appropriate encouraging Voluntary and Community organisations to be more inclusive of new and under-represented voices in their local communities, and in making their facilities and the services they provide open to all, and not based exclusive on a single national, ethnic or faith group.
- 4.25. Finally, the County Council’s role should be to develop and co-ordinate a county-wide community cohesion framework in which the contributions of Partners and the different levels of local government can flourish, share best practices and avoid needless duplication and conflict.

## 5.0. Key Recommendations

### Integrating New Communities

5.1. The Council and its partners are well aware of the demands on the physical infrastructure that will arise from housing and population growth but less attention has been given to the need to promote social integration between the new and existing communities.

**(1) Greater prominence needs to be given to the task of integrating new communities with clear officer and BSP responsibilities and plans across all service areas. Actions could include:**

- **Involving existing communities in the design of new developments through exercises such as Planning for Real;**
- **Initiatives to introduce newcomers to existing residents, making them feel welcome and telling them how things work locally and the community organisations and facilities which are available;**
- **Using S106 funds to support community activities, including community workers, and not just physical infrastructure.**
- **Learning from other Housing Growth areas.**

### Cohesion in Rural Areas

5.2. A great deal is already being done to consult, engage and involve communities at a neighbourhood level by the three tiers of local government in Buckinghamshire, often working with the Voluntary and Community Sector. We found many examples of initiatives helping to sustain and build community in rural areas – for example, the Pub-Club Scheme, Timebanking and the support and advice given to Village Halls. In addition, the Adult Services are currently piloting a project on 'Building Community Capacity' in two areas with a focus on helping communities to help themselves.

**(2) Intergenerational issues have consistently featured as a priority in rural areas. However, in addressing these problems, the emphasis appeared to be on diversionary activities for young people causing a nuisance. Consideration could be given to encouraging more activities involving young and older people helping, understanding and supporting each other.**

**(3) Specific attention will also need to be given to those rural areas identified for new housing development in line with proposals set out in recommendation 1.**

## Youth

5.3. Schools have a central role to play both in addressing under-achievement and through their duty to promote community cohesion. In Buckinghamshire it does appear that many heads have recognised the need for pupils to have a wider knowledge and experience of other cultures and faiths, and we found many examples of innovative and exciting projects that were well received by both pupils and parents.

**(4) Schools should continue to develop and share imaginative approaches to meeting the duty to promote cohesion but recognise that the duty applies to all schools, not just those with a multi racial intake. Further ways of supporting schools in understanding and delivering on the duty and of sharing good practice, should be considered. This could include mediation skills in dealing with tensions between different groups of pupils and a contact point for information on welcoming and integrating pupils from new migrant families.**

**(5) Initiatives in schools should go hand in hand with a similar approach within the Youth Service. Though the Service is already doing excellent work - for example on Intergenerational issues, and with the Police on youth gangs – it could learn from Projects in schools like the Schools Linking Programme.**

## New Migrant Communities

5.4. Buckinghamshire has not attracted large numbers of economic migrants, asylum seekers and refugees. Though new migrants were said to concentrate in the County's larger urban areas, pressures on social housing, school places and GP services were not raised in interviews and focus groups. However, it was thought that:-

**(6) More could be done to increase the provision of ESOL classes, particularly for new migrants with little or no English, as this was seen as the biggest barrier to employment and access to services. The Business Sector as a major stakeholder should be encouraged to play a greater role in this respect, but other Public Sector partners – e.g. the PCT and Police - with an interest in welcoming and integrating new migrants, could also contribute.**

**(7) At one and the same time, ESOL classes could also be used to raise awareness amongst new migrants on how to access services and their employment and other rights under British law.**

## Tackling Inequality and Disadvantage

- 5.5. There is a great deal of evidence to support the connection between deprivation, less cohesive communities and their capacity to take care of themselves, reducing dependence on public sector resources. High levels of deprivation are relatively low in Buckinghamshire, but there are significant pockets. The County's BME groups are disproportionately represented in these areas. In addition, some BME communities experience relatively high levels of residential segregation, under-achieve in the County's schools, are also under-represented in Grammar Schools, and are significantly disadvantaged in the labour market. The County's Pakistani heritage community – the largest BME group - feature prominently in these respects, though similar patterns are to be found in African Caribbean communities.

**(8) The County and its partners should continue to prioritise tackling disadvantage, reducing educational under-achievement, and raising skill levels to break the inter-generational cycle of disadvantage. The focus should be principally on adjusting and targeting main stream services rather than, often small scale, special projects which can create cynicism. This approach should explicitly address BME communities as well as disadvantaged White communities.**

**(9) Consideration should also be given to what steps can be taken to ensure that access to Social Housing – either through design or the provision of appropriate information – is accessible to all.**

**(10) In interviews and focus groups it was thought that special and different provision tackling these issues and targeting individual groups was divisive and that the emphasis should be on adjusting and making main stream services more accessible.**

## The Role of the Voluntary and Community and Faith Sectors

- 5.6. Buckinghamshire has high levels of volunteering and a generally strong voluntary sector – particularly in rural areas. Community cohesion is essentially a 'bottom up' process and the Voluntary and Community have a vital and leading role to play. However, the voluntary sector is not specifically charged with or supported in promoting cohesive communities.

**(11) The County and its partners should continue to support the development of capacity, leadership and representation within the voluntary sector and consider making the promotion of cohesive communities a requirement of funding support.**

**(12) The Voluntary and Community sector should also be challenged to develop specific proposals on how they can contribute to building**

**more cohesive and resilient communities by involving and engaging local organisations and communities.**

**(13) The Voluntary and Community sector is also going through a period of change with the emphasis on funding switching from annual grants to service commissioning. Small and medium sized organisations are already at risk and are concerned for the future, given the potential impact of reductions in local and central government services and funding. Consideration should be given to supporting the development of voluntary sector consortia bringing medium sized and smaller organisations together to bid for and undertake Public Sector Service contracts.**

**(14) The Faith Sector is also making a contribution to community cohesion and inter-faith understanding. However, compared with the experience in other areas, there is potential for individual faith denominations and Inter-faith groups to do a great deal more to help bring communities together and tackle tensions. Taken together, the faith sector has a great deal of assets and personnel on the ground, and could play a more prominent role in projects that for example:-**

- bringing young people from different faiths together;**
- undertaking joint rather than single presentations in schools and Youth Clubs involving faiths in conflict in different parts of the world, and showing young people that people of different faiths can be friends - e.g. Jews and Muslims;**
- acting as a facilitator in bringing communities together in Hate Crime hot spots.**

### **Understanding and Engaging with BME Communities**

5.7. The level of understanding of the different BME communities and the extent to which they are engaged is varied. The appreciation of the diversity within the Muslim community is - perhaps understandably - limited, but there is also little known about newly arrived communities including Eastern Europeans. Contact is often through community leaders who may not be representative of their wider communities – in particular women’s and young people’s voices. In recent years much engagement activity has been focused on the PVE agenda which is in many ways both controversial and divisive.

**(15) The Council and its partners need to understand better the diversity and location of new and established BME communities and**

to use information provided in this report as a basis to begin improving engagement with groups genuinely representative of the main elements in their communities.

- (16) Consultation and engagement should go beyond traditional community leaders and support given to encourage the development of leaders from young people and women.

### **Hate Crime and Tension Monitoring**

5.8. The Police have a structured approach to reviewing hate crime and monitoring tensions, and these issues are clearly taken seriously. However, there is a case for adopting a wider and more inclusive approach.

- (17) Consideration should be given to setting up a county wide panel to review hate crime in order to provide a better county overview and allow easier comparison with other counties.

- (18) Adopting an approach to tension monitoring which involves regular input from a wider range of frontline personnel across different organisations, and has capacity to be more predictive of developing tensions rather than reactive.

### **The PVE Agenda**

- (19) In taking forward the Prevent agenda the Council needs to work with Districts and other partners to ensure that engagement with Muslims is not just around issues of Prevent or indeed just as Muslims but recognises their wider concerns and interests.

- (20) To challenge all forms of extremism whether religious inspired or by Far Right groups, and working with the Voluntary, Community and Faith sectors to tackle myths about Islam and Muslims and misinformation promoted by the Far Right.

- (21) More attention also needs to be given within the PVE Programme to initiatives connecting isolated and in some cases insular Muslim communities with others in their localities.

### **The Roles of County and District Councils**

5.9. Community cohesion is by its very nature is a bottom up process. In addition, different issues of cohesion feature in different local authority areas and wards, and a 'one size fits all' approach is likely to be either divisive or ignored in areas where particular issues are not relevant or a priority. It is proposed

that the following broad principles be adopted in organising the contributions of different tiers of local government within Buckinghamshire.

- (22) District Councils should be seen as the key drivers of local community cohesion strategies;**
- (23) The County Council's overall role should be to develop and co-ordinate a county-wide community cohesion framework in which the contributions of Partners and the different levels of local government can flourish, share best practices and avoid needless duplication and conflict.**
- (24) The County Council is also responsible for key services, the contributions of which is critical to the success of an overall community cohesion strategy - in particular, schools and Youth and Adult Services. Greater emphasis in these respects should be placed on supporting the approach and initiatives at District level.**
- (25) The County Council has excellent facilities for both pulling together and mapping complex statistical and qualitative data. In so far as community cohesion is concerned, it is in a position to play a role similar to that of an 'Observatory' – by making information available to District Councils and Partners in a form that is relevant to their areas, but also by being more open to their information needs.**
- (26) The County Council is in a position to bring together and focus the contributions of key Partners in the Business, Public, Voluntary, Community and Faith Sectors at a strategic level. This could also apply to key agencies – for example, local Race Equalities Councils where funding for individual provision in different local authority areas may not be tenable in the current economic climate.**