

### Corporate Strategy consultation – summary of responses Oct 2015

#### Introduction

Following the corporate strategy consultation exercise that closed on Friday 2<sup>rd</sup> October, we have received over 20 responses from a number of councillors and partners.

The general response is one of understanding of the pressures we face and in some instances, a willingness for us to work with our partners across all sectors to re-design services and co-locate in neighbourhoods.

Some consistent messages raised that have been addressed in the revised strategy, were;

- working with our district and parish, VCFS and private sector partners in our future planning;
- working with Lancashire's employers to help with the skills deficit;
- the neighbourhoods plan was being mistaken for 12 neighbourhood plans;
- confusion with new 34 Service Planning Areas and political administration areas;
- priorities around the older population and rural communities not clear in the document;
- more detail on our universal standard, targeted services and premises; and
- IMD date needs to be refreshed.

A summary of the responses received is attached with comments on how we have reflected these into the revised corporate strategy. Many of the comments will help us develop future plans rather than revise this strategy as much of the detail will evolve as we design and commission our services.

The comments have been divided into context/priorities and service planning area comments.

Responses received from;

- A county councillor
- CC Gina Dowding
- CC Alan Scofield
- Lancashire Parent Carer Forum
- Lancashire Youth Council
- Burnley Council
- West Lancs BC
- Lancaster City Council – Business Committee
- Ribble Valley BC
- Hyndburn BC
- Police & Crime Commissioner
- Dean Blackburn Cathedral
- Lancashire North CCG
- Lancashire Teaching Hospital Trusts
- NWL Chamber of Commerce
- Federation of Small Businesses
- Progress Housing
- St Anne's on Sea parish council
- Trawden parish council
- Bretherton parish council
- A partner organisation
- Other

Comments on context/priorities

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
Police & Crime Commissioner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response is one of a general understanding of the pressures we face. Response clearly sets out how the PCC can support our strategic outcomes.</li> <li>• As a key partner that will assist LCC to meet its stated aim "<i>working with partners, including the Police and Crime Commissioner we will improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime ensure that citizens feel safe, are actually safe in their homes, out and about in our communities and at work in our county</i>"</li> <li>• Clearly these are convergent with a number of the priorities I have set out in my Police and Crime plan and I am <b>keen that we clearly identify the commitment to these issues through dedicated investment of both resources and funding</b>. I would therefore ask that the <b>investment we will both need to make for these is confirmed as soon as possible and that a multi-year commitment is made</b>. I will make my office available to discuss these in detail with yourselves as I believe certainty is key over the next few years to allow sensible financial planning to take place</li> <li>• I cannot emphasise enough the <b>importance of continued support both financial and through the provision of staffing resource to the prevention and Early Action strategy</b> and indeed the damaging effect that any reduction in support would have.</li> <li>• I would therefore ask that you provide me with an opportunity to <b>be consulted in detail on your final</b></li> </ul>	All points taken on board and will be addressed as part of further work on our service re-design work.

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p><b>budget</b> proposals that will deliver this strategy so that we can engage in a meaningful dialogue as to the potential impact it will have for policing and the demands placed on the service and therefore my own budget.</p>	
Lancashire North CCG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CCG <b>agrees and supports the aspirational vision and values set out in the Corporate Strategy</b> document and it is encouraging to see the obvious links to a population approach and the links to the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.</li> <li>• The strategy sets out three positive strategic outcomes and has 27 priorities. It may be <b>beneficial to classify these priorities under one of the three strategic outcomes</b> and consider further whether it <b>will be feasible to achieve all of these in the period covered by the Strategy</b>.</li> <li>• The direction of travel and a move to focus on neighbourhoods is a familiar approach and one that we are pursuing with partners as part of Better Care Together. However, as the <b>boundaries of the CCG subsume all or part of 5 neighbourhoods</b>, it will be <b>helpful for us to understand how the Authority wishes to use the neighbourhood model to work in smaller communities and with partner organisations</b> as well as to work at a Lancashire level where appropriate.</li> <li>• We understand that the neighbourhood model will lead to a stronger focus on both universal and targeted service offers. Although we agree that deprivation and poor outcomes go hand in hand and services should be based on need, the CCG is <b>concerned that a pure geographical focus could result in an increase in</b></li> </ul>	<p>Noted. As part of the development of the strategy, we realised that although classifying priorities under each strategic outcome was helpful, each priority impacts on multiples outcomes. We have however, re-ordered the list of priorities so they are in more natural groupings.</p> <p>We will use the service planning areas as a basis for planning our own service delivery and for engagement with partners.</p> <p>Noted. We believe that working on our service planning areas approach (20,000 – 40,000 population), will help us identify those smaller vulnerable groups where traditionally, they have been masked due to using district level data. As we work</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p><b>health inequalities for some vulnerable groups and cohorts of the population.</b> This is particularly when small groups or areas are masked within a wider neighbourhood e.g. older people in an area that is considered affluent may well require adult and social care services or be fuel poor etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regards to the delivery of services we would welcome a <b>more detailed explanation of what core services are and how this will work across the 34 identified neighbourhoods</b> and in particular some reassurance that individuals with a need for an enhanced service will not be disadvantaged because they live in a certain geographical area.</li> <li>• We strongly suspect that colleagues in LCC share our most significant concern about the Corporate Strategy – how the significant financial and resource challenges facing the County Council in the coming years will impact on services, communities and partner organisations. From a Health perspective, we are <b>particularly concerned about the potential impact on changes to the offer available in Adult Social Care, Children and Young People’s services and Learning Disability services.</b> We are willing to <b>work jointly</b> with the Authority and our partner CCGs to understand these challenges and impacts in more details. The <b>Health and Wellbeing Board may provide a suitable partnership to undertake some of this thinking.</b></li> </ul>	<p>on our service re-design, this will be addressed further and we are conscious of the need to ensure that smaller pockets of need are not ignored.</p> <p>More detail around this will be addressed as part of further work on service design. We are clear that individuals who meet statutory thresholds will continue to receive services appropriate to need.</p> <p>Further engagement with all our partners will take place as part of our service re-design.</p>
A County Councillor	I do not see that there is <b>sufficient regard in the Strategic Outcomes, nor in the Priorities, so far to properly include for the needs of the elderly</b> (possibly subject to definition per M Kirby) - including transport and access to other necessary services. Not divorced from	We consider the strategy does reflect the needs of the elderly. This is covered through a number of priorities.

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p>that, I suggest that it would be even more pertinent to split the baseline indicator 'Barriers to housing and services' between the two so that barriers to services (including accessible public transport) can be a useful statistic.</p>	<p>We will split the IMD domain of barriers and services into the sub-domains of geographical barriers (the physical proximity of services) and wider barriers (access to housing such as affordability).</p>
<p>CC Gina Dowding</p>	<p>To live a healthy life- <b>None of the outcomes reflect the outcome of creating a conducive environment for health</b> i.e. access to healthy food, local services. There is much focus on enabling people to make healthy choices without making it explicit that <i>those choices needed to be readily accessible</i>.</p> <p><b>Our priorities</b> - There is a good range in the list. Number one is good; it mentions supporting development of resilient communities and self-help. What is <b>missing is an explicit mention of the voluntary, community and faith sector organisations, indeed all non-governmental organisations which facilitate, and help build capacity for this resilience and self-help</b>.</p> <p><b>Point 10</b> mentions working in partnership with other agencies to make local communities strong- but this is in relation specifically to reduce criminal activity. <b>Working in partnership is required to meet needs, fill gaps and empower communities</b>.</p> <p><b>Point 22</b> Invest in our towns and city centres. <b>This needs to be expanded on – to make them thriving for local traders, residents, visitors and to allow social and economic activities i.e. to make Liveable town and city centres</b>.</p>	<p>Noted and this will be addressed as part of further work on service design.</p> <p>In the revised strategy, we build on how we will work with partners e.g. VCFS sector.</p> <p>Cabinet members have since changed this priority to 'work in partnership with all other agencies to make local communities strong, self-reliant and cohesive. Thus removing the emphasis on criminal activity.</p> <p>Noted and will be considered in the future planning/delivery of an Economic Development policy/strategy.</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p><b>Our approach to service delivery</b>  <b>Our community presence</b> - There is <b>no mention of using other agencies' buildings as neighbourhood centres</b>. Yet there will be some areas where other local organisations may be able to provide accessible venues which are appropriate as neighbourhood centres. E.g. The Marsh community centre in the proposed Lancaster Central SDA.</p> <p><b>Working with others</b> Pg. 7. There is <b>no mention explicitly of our district (lower tier) levels of government</b>. There is a chance here to mention reducing duplication, and <i>providing one point of access to other district and county services and even some health services</i>.</p> <p>The <b>approach lacks a recognition of the need of the county council as <i>an enabler</i> of other organisations in the VCF sector to meet local needs</b>. The county council will not be able to afford to do all things – but it will still have more resources than the VCF sectors in most communities and the corporate strategy needs to acknowledge not just a need to work with – but <i>to enable, and facilitate other organisations who are meeting local needs to address priorities</i>.</p> <p><b>Commissioning and design of services</b>  I think there is a need to be <b>more explicit about working with NHS, VCF and district councils</b>. This offers a huge opportunity to save money.</p>	<p>We have now included this.</p> <p>We have now included district and parish councils.</p> <p>We are more specific within the 'working with others' section.</p> <p>This section has been updated to reflect this.</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p><b>Promotion of personal and family responsibility. Page 8.</b>  Bad choice of verb as this implies that all is required is a 'promotion' (telling people to do it) of responsibility rather than <i>support, enabling and facilitating approaches to personal and family responsibility.</i>  <b>This section must include communities identifying problems and working for their own solutions.</b></p> <p><b>To live in a decent home in a good environment. Page 10.</b>  The details in this section <b>do not give any mention of <i>protecting, enhancing and maintaining green spaces.</i></b>  Para 2 Transport infrastructure. <b>Badly written</b> – needs input about the Transport hierarchy- confuses accessibility with modes of transport and driving is not the first on the list as 'as essential part of our everyday lives' Needs an emphasis on local provision of services and jobs</p> <p><b>Housing</b>  You say "Lancashire is displaying signs of renewed confidence in the housing market" This is not necessarily meaningful in terms of meeting our aim for <b>affordable housing.</b></p> <p>You say ' We will promote the development of new housing on good quality sites that builders want to build on and where people want to live. <b>THIS IS BAD Choice of words</b> – developers invariably want to build on green fields, this is not good planning policy and is undermining of many local</p>	<p>This has been added into the text within this section.</p> <p>We have added an overarching approach to cover 'promote and protect our natural environment' to pick up this comment.</p> <p>Noted and we will pick this particular issue up as we work with partners on our plans to ensure people can live in a decent home in a good environment.</p> <p>Noted. We believe there is a balance to be struck and between green field and brown field development. Our updated draft places more emphasis on the need to ensure that growth and regeneration go hand in hand.</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p>plans. Building on brown fields is a priority, building smaller units is necessary for affordability and planning. This is not what developers want if they are given a choice.</p> <p><b>Strategic outcome: employment page 13</b>  You say "Continue unblocking stalled development opportunities critical to the economic regeneration of Lancashire". <b>Not very clear</b> what this means and should not refer to 'unblocking 'planning applications that are part of the democratic process –not for the county to try to influence I think.</p>	<p>This section has been redrafted.</p>
<p>Burnley Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burnley Council has heard from local voluntary and community sector representatives that while they welcome the commitment in the draft strategy to make communities more resilient through self-help, the <b>strategy is not specific on what , if anything, this means for the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector in practice.</b></li> <li>• LCC may wish to <b>consider the impact of a Combined Authority on how it currently operates</b> and may also wish to reflect on whether its draft corporate strategy reflects the ambition we expect to see in the CA plan for Lancashire.</li> <li>• How the strategic objectives will be translated into action will only become clear once the Neighbourhood Plans have been developed. Burnley Council has some <b>reservations about the creation of new administrative areas and the potential for this to undermine Burnley Council’s place-shaping role</b></li> </ul>	<p>Our intent to work with the voluntary, community and faith sector has been strengthened.</p> <p>We have strengthened content relating to working with partners on a new settlement for public service in Lancashire.</p> <p>We have added a sentence to make this clearer under 'meeting needs in communities'.</p>



Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p>and the development of a coherent approach to partnership working between Burnley Council and LCC to help it deliver its corporate strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our main feedback is that we would <b>like to be consulted on the draft Neighbourhood Plans</b> as soon as possible. We would like to get a clearer understanding of how services will be targeted in the neighbourhoods. For example, health profile data shows that Burnley faces a bigger challenge compared to neighbouring areas in respect of rates under 18 conceptions and drug and alcohol abuse. We would like to see the neighbourhood plans deal with these issues.</li> <li>• In developing the Neighbourhood Plans for Burnley, we ask that the county council <b>engage with us to explore the potential for more joined up working</b> amongst local service delivery partners in Burnley, including co-location where a business case can be made.</li> </ul>	<p>Our neighbourhoods plan is a single plan for Lancashire and not 12 district plans. We have changed the wording in the strategy to a 'single neighbourhoods plan'.</p> <p>See above point.</p>
West Lancashire Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make it <b>more explicit in the strategy about LCC's role in safeguarding children and adults along with highways and transport</b></li> <li>• Neighbourhood centres/main offices – WLBC willing to work with us to explore this opportunity across West Lancs</li> <li>• We would like to see the <b>economic narrative widened to reflect the past/future growth rate of West Lancs</b></li> </ul>	<p>Although the priorities are explicit, we now make stronger reference on statutory provision in the 'our resources' section.</p> <p>Noted for future plans.</p> <p>All following points noted and will be considered in the future planning/delivery of an Economic</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p><b>particularly in Skelmersdale, and to see reference to Edge Hill University.</b> The economic development focus still seems to be around the arc of prosperity and nowhere else.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only reference to delivering housing is through the Growth Deal. It would be helpful to know how this will help existing neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• In achieving a 'decent home', partnership work with districts is key. As a way forward, could LCC gift sites to Borough Councils for them to work with RSLs to deliver affordable housing subject to Local Plan policies?</li> <li>• Document seems to be <b>inward looking</b> and there is <b>no mention of links with other LEPs.</b></li> <li>• It also appears that there is <b>no consultation planned to take place beyond the county boundary</b> and should this be the case, it would help to understand why, or for some consideration to be given to this suggestion.</li> </ul>	<p>Development policy/strategy. We have strengthened sections of the narrative to make a clearer link between economic development and our most deprived communities and removed specific reference to the "arc of prosperity".</p> <p>Whilst the consultation on the draft strategy has focussed primarily on partners within the Lancashire administrative area we will work with others, as appropriate, on strategic agendas.</p>
One Lancashire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We note that the case for the council's community presence in <b>neighbourhood centres could be further strengthened through the inclusion of voluntary, community and social enterprise partner agencies</b> and the faith sector in the delivery and utilisation of services in the community. These organisations already have an established</li> </ul>	We have now included VCFS in the revised draft.

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p>presence and strong relationships with those most vulnerable in our society and could impact beneficially on the social wellbeing of a neighbourhood through the utilisation of social capital and community assets present in the local community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would also urge the council to <b>give credence in its strategy to the legislation contained in the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012</b>, in particular when commissioning services.</li> </ul>	<p>We have now included a new section 'Maximise social value from the services we commission'.</p>
Dean Blackburn Cathedral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 34 proposed areas of need look very straightforward and go straight to the heart of the perceived austerity areas. I can however see an <b>opportunity for muddle as the county shifts from one geographical distribution to another</b>. I assume this has been costed as, for some areas, there will have to be some capital expenditure. I think it should be done - it is an obvious and excellent idea! - But I think it might cause some initial confusion.</li> <li>• The FC Recommendations see clearly the potential for volunteer work, adequately organized. Government policy 12 years ago moved in this direction and then the money ran out. If the county can <b>provide seed-corn money and clear direction for voluntary and faith communities</b>, there is still a huge resource out there.</li> </ul>	<p>We will address this issue as part of further work on service design.</p> <p>We have now included this point in the 'our workforce' section.</p>
Lancashire Parent Carer Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would have liked to give an informed response but have been <b>unable to understand the proposed strategy in context to our families within any of the documents available</b></li> <li>• we have strong concerns regarding the impact of any</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Our priorities include, for example, support for families and carers, the need to prevent crisis interventions and to protect the most vulnerable for avoidable harm. Our priorities will guide the decisions we make on future services. Detail of what this</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p>changes in service provision and delivery on our families as there is <b>insufficient information within the Equality Analysis Toolkit</b> for us to assess this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are approximately 25 000 children and young people (CYP) in Lancashire with special educational needs and/or disability (SEND) and our families require appropriate and timely support in order that best outcomes for our CYP are achieved.</li> </ul>	<p>means on a service by service basis will come as part of our budget proposals and future service design.</p> <p>A full Equality analysis will be conducted before any changes to service delivery going forward.</p>
Lancashire Youth Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some <b>points did not understand</b> / have information about e.g. Preston, South Ribble etc. deal, and development of 'Northern Powerhouse'. It was appreciated that it is written in language for everyone and the points in places are general but it was difficult in places fully understand to discuss and have a view about.</li> <li>• What will be included in the <b>'universal standard'</b>?</li> <li>• How limited given the funding the services will be in the areas in least need – or how they could gain more services if situation changes.</li> <li>• What the impression is of people who live in the top few areas versus the last few – important not to see this has a negative.</li> <li>• How much it will cost to provide services, staffing, and resources to large number of areas versus present situation of 12 districts.</li> <li>• Wanted to know more of the details – what service in which building in what areas</li> </ul>	<p>We have tried to address this issue within the updated draft where we are able. We acknowledge though that there are aspects which will require some further detail to be able to fully understand and discuss. Officers will be happy to meet with the Youth Council to talk through the strategy.</p> <p>These points have been noted and will be picked up in our more detailed service planning.</p>
Lancaster City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>More clarity of LCC's role in the planning delivery process, through its role as Highway Authority.</b> It</li> </ul>	<p>The priorities are explicit and we now make stronger reference on statutory provision in the 'our resources'</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
Council – Business Committee	<p>should acknowledge the importance of that role in assisting the Local Planning Authorities delivering housing growth and should ensure its Highways and Transport Teams are sufficiently resourced to avoid delays occurring in plan making and Development Management at the local level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of the <b>terminology 'neighbourhoods plan' confusing</b> with the Localism Act 2012 neighbourhood plans.</li> <li>• Considerable emphasis on the <b>Combined Authority</b>. Combined Authorities based on single counties might not receive the support from Government, therefore the document has drafted has <b>inbuilt inflexibility</b>. Could the door be left open to consider a combined authority between Lancashire and, potentially, Cumbria, should the Government reject a Lancashire proposal?</li> </ul>	<p>section.</p> <p>We have now changed the terminology so we are clear that it's a 'single neighbourhoods plan' and not a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>We now place greater emphasis on a new model for public service delivery.</p>
North and Western Lancashire Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the avoidance of doubt the document should <b>make it clear that the Strategy relates to the geographical area covered by Lancashire County Council and not Lancashire as a County</b>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lancashire's two unitary authorities are not mentioned by name and yet both will have a key role to play in improving the prosperity of Lancashire as a County. In addition there are <b>several sections in the text which imply that the Strategy is county-wide and this is misleading</b>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Whilst mention is made of the proposed <b>Combined Authority</b> for Lancashire there is <b>little explanation</b> regarding its purpose or remit.</li> </ul>	<p>The strategy is the Lancashire County Council Corporate Strategy and is underpinned by the evidence base covering the administrative area of the County council.</p> <p>We now place greater emphasis on a new model for public service delivery.</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our preference would be to see <b>a single Strategy for the whole of Lancashire</b> that unifies the aims and objectives of Lancashire County Council, the unitary authorities of Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen, and the 12 borough and district councils.</li> <li>• As it stands the Strategy is an aspirational document noticeably <b>lacking in any firm objectives</b> by which it can be measured. In our view a “Corporate Strategy” document should include SMART objectives, agreed by all stakeholders, for each of its Strategic Objectives.</li> <li>• Lancashire should be judged on the strength of its economy. The Strategy should be “pro-growth” and “pro-business” and acknowledge the <b>role of the private sector</b> in ultimately delivering the wealth and sustainable jobs that Lancashire needs to prosper.</li> <li>• A key aim of the Strategy should be to <b>join up the many disparate activities delivered and managed by Lancashire County Council and re-focus them on promoting economic growth.</b></li> <li>• Lancashire County Council needs to <b>commission more and deliver less</b>. Whilst the Strategy does make reference to “commissioning and design of services with our partners”, the inference is that this is to be done with partners in the public sector.</li> <li>• We believe that Lancashire County Council should make far better use of the skills and experience of existing private sector structures as an alternative mechanism for providing services. Devolving activity to the private sector (as part of a formal partnership or joint venture) could potentially enable the Council to make better use of its budget.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted for future consideration.</p> <p>Our performance management frameworks and service plans, referenced in the document, will address this.</p> <p>We have redrafted aspects of the strategy, recognising the need for growth and the private sector, but highlighting the need to ensure that the benefit is felt in our most deprived communities.</p> <p>The promotion of economic growth remains as one of our priorities.</p> <p>We are clear that we value the benefits of being an in-house provider but where there is a more efficient way to do business we will adopt the most effective approach.</p> <p>Noted and will be addressed as part of further work around service re-design. We are clear that all partners, including the private sector, have a role to play in meeting the challenges faced by communities in Lancashire.</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By harnessing the skills and talents of the private sector we believe that appropriate services could be delivered at lower cost and deliver better value for money. In our view this could create a model capable of operating without the constraints of public service delivery potentially resulting in a smarter and flexible way of working.</li> <li>• Publically-funded support programmes are prescriptive and short term and can create a culture of grant dependency. We would like to see <b>more work done to help charities, voluntary, and community organisations</b> across the County develop strategies to move away from grant dependency and towards income generation activities.</li> <li>• The Strategy’s timeframe could cover several election cycles and therefore be potentially subject to change depending on the political aims of the ruling party. Business confidence would be greatly enhanced if the aims of the <b>Strategy were shared by all political parties across the whole Council.</b></li> <li>• There is a wealth of data to show that many <b>young people are leaving school without adequate careers advice or the necessary skills required by employers.</b> This clearly shows that <b>more needs to be done to encourage schools to engage with business in order to raise young people’s expectations of work.</b></li> <li>• The Strategy makes reference to the provision of “a range of traded services to schools” to help improve young people develop the skills they need to find work. However the <b>Strategy does not acknowledge the importance of engaging businesses (as the “end user”) in addressing this issue.</b></li> </ul>	<p>Noted as above.</p> <p>Noted as above.</p> <p>Noted. By adopting an evidence based approach to service planning and delivery, we see the evidence being the focus alongside any political priorities.</p> <p>We have now made reference to working with employers to enable young people to develop the skills they need to find work.</p> <p>We have now made reference to working with employers to enable young people to develop the skills they need to find work.</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likewise there is <b>no recognition</b> in the Strategy of the <b>importance of providing careers advice to young people</b>. This is a fundamental concern for business and one where the private sector is willing and able to play an important role.</li> <li>Increasing the <b>collaboration between education and business needs to be embedded</b> as a long term priority for Lancashire County Council and acknowledged as such in the Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>We have now made reference to working with employers to enable young people to develop the skills they need to find work but acknowledge that this needs to be addressed In service design.</p> <p>We have now made reference to working with employers to enable young people to develop the skills they need to find work.</p>
St Annes on Sea Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change terminology around <b>Neighbourhoods Plan and conflicts against Localism Act terminology with Neighbourhood Plans</b></li> <li>Support decent home and good environment priority and push for M55 link to be included in core strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>We have changed the terminology to a 'single neighbourhoods plan'.</p> <p>Noted and will be considered as part of determining future investment priorities.</p>
Trawden Forest Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions asked from residents regarding their <b>Council tax proportion of what is paid to County Council for receiving less of a service</b></li> <li>Trawden is seen to be in an affluent area, there are concerns that the small amount of service we already receive will be cut even further. We have good portion of elderly people in Trawden, who are less mobile than others, and there is <b>concern that things like to library will close</b>. This is a well-used facility especially for those who wish to gather and maybe use the computers available.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and will be addressed in the council's Medium Term Financial Strategy which alongside the Corporate Strategy, will be presented to Cabinet on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015.</p> <p>Noted. Proposals at service level will be guided by the priorities and evidence base within the strategy.</p>
Bretherton parish council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A summary document would be helpful</li> </ul>	<p>Once the Core Strategy is agreed we will consider this issue.</p>



Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
Lancashire Teaching Hospitals Trust's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhoods Plan – In order to streamline some of the locality working developing throughout the county, it would be useful if these <b>areas have some relation to the areas (peer groups) as utilised by our Clinical Commissioning Groups</b>. Overall, a standardised approach to locality based geography/working may help across public services as a whole – for those of us who cover multiple boundaries and organisations this can be a particular issue and a consensus towards standardisation would certainly help.</li> <li>• Neighbourhood Centres – Whilst we recognise the county council aims to develop multi- functional centres, we would encourage them to <b>think more widely about what kinds of services can be provided from these centres that would support all public sector partners, given the move to have more health and care delivered in the community</b> – how do the local primary, community and acute services fit within this vision? We may in the future be looking at the development of locality centres; would this be something that would develop out this proposition?</li> <li>• Working with others – we recognise the role of the Health and Wellbeing Board but we would advocate that this Board needs to ensure that it is able to deliver the massive agenda facing the health and care system. We would like the <b>county council to ensure that it is able to respond to the Healthier Lancashire work</b> and be able to engage fully with the rest of the health and care system in terms of ensuring a sustainable system for the future.</li> <li>• Strategic Outcome 'to live a healthy life' - With regards</li> </ul>	<p>We will pick this issue up as we work with partners in our future service re-design.</p> <p>We have now included this point in 'community presence' section.</p> <p>We will work with partners to try and deliver together, a complete system change that is sustainable.</p>

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p>to the description regarding the strategic outcome ‘to live a healthy life’, we would like to <b>ensure that the county council are able to meet the demands of our communities with regards to social care</b>, and the various forms that this may need to take to enable people to avoid hospital admissions or readmissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our health and care system is highly dependent on residential care and nursing homes – the consequences of failure in this regard is an issue for us all, and we need to be able to address these potential risks together. We are aware that providers are facing financial difficulties or quality issues in Preston, Chorley and South Ribble, and we want to reiterate the importance of this sector to our whole health and care system. <b>Changes in services have a knock on effect for other public services</b> – it is all interrelated and we would <b>ask that as you set your budgets, with particular reference to social care, you continue this dialogue with partners to ensure that any changes in your services don’t have an unintended consequence elsewhere in the system</b>, for example, exacerbating pressures on the NHS by increasing emergency admissions and delayed discharges from hospital.</li> </ul>	<p>We have not changed our strategic outcomes but make clear reference to our statutory responsibilities, and the need to work collectively to meet this challenge.</p> <p>We will, where appropriate, consult with our partners on any service re-design proposals.</p>
Federation of small businesses	Focus on <b>increasing wage levels</b> is a sound objective but needs to be <b>linked to upskilling Lancashire residents so that higher employer salary</b> costs are offset by greater productivity. We would like to see an <b>additional priority around supporting the rural economy</b> , with a greater ambition on broadband accessibility and speeds across the whole County. Involvement in the <b>Northern Powerhouse should be greater than just contributing</b> , Lancashire should be <b>playing a lead role to ensure that</b>	Noted and will be addressed as part of further work around service re-design.

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p><b>devolved powers and funds are not disproportionately directed to those conurbations along the M62 corridor.</b>            We strongly agree with the focus on promoting personal and family responsibility and the consolidation of services into Neighbourhood Centres. <b>The third sector is best placed to lead on delivery of services at a neighbourhood level where communities can take responsibility.</b></p>	
A partner organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear in the document how this <b>fits with Healthier Lancashire</b> although there is reference to the Lancashire Devolution agenda.</li> <li>• Under community infrastructure there is <b>no specific reference to healthcare facilities</b>, the planned population growth under the City Deal will place additional strain on the existing Primary Care services.</li> <li>• Ensuring sufficient high quality financially viable and sustainable residential care is key to ensuring residents are cared for in the most appropriate settings and hospital admissions are reduced, there are significant challenges in this sector in Lancashire with fewer care home beds, staffing shortages and ongoing viability of safe, effective care home provision, this should link to employment and the focus for the LEP work.</li> <li>• Under the strategic outcome to live a healthy life, does thin link to the Public health priorities such as Childhood Mortality?</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and will be addressed as part of further work around service re-design.</p> <p>We have now included in 'community presence' section.</p> <p>This priority will be developed as part of our service planning.</p> <p>Yes. We have included a selection of indicators as part of our evidence base attached as Appendix 1. There are further measures available, many of which are included within the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, which will provide more insight in to specific population groups.</p>
Other	It is an aspirational document but <b>does not give any</b>	The strategy provides an overarching set of priorities

Responder	Summary of response	How comments have been reflected
	<p><b>support to the rural communities</b> and how LCC are going to <b>help them</b> in particular in relation to <b>jobs and digital inclusion</b>.</p>	<p>and evidence base which will guide decision making and service planning. We will need to make targeted interventions appropriate to needs.</p>
Progress Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress Housing Group welcomes the intention to forge links with communities and would suggest that <b>LCC co-ordinate the establishment of a community asset register across the county</b> to facilitate the achievement of outcomes.</li> <li>• We understand that it is not possible to include detail in such documents, but <b>reference to</b> such service provision as technology enable care and support would be in keeping with LCC's <b>Telecare Strategy</b>, along with reference to <b>health and wellbeing and supporting people</b> initiatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. We will take forward in conversations in relation to our property strategy which alongside the corporate strategy, will be presented to Cabinet for decision on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015.</p> <p>This will be addressed as part of further work around service re-design.</p>
Ribble Valley Borough Council	<p>The Priorities don't, so far, give sufficient recognition to the needs of the elderly or to those living in rural areas. Baseline indicator 'Barriers to housing and services' should be split to sub-indicators to enable a separate focus on barriers to services.</p>	<p>This will be addressed as part of the ongoing work in identifying the most appropriate indicators that will recognise the needs of our communities.</p>

### Comments on Service Planning Area data/indicators

Responder	Response	Suggested change to strategy document....
CC Alan Schofield	<p>A point that I haven't included in my online feedback is that, in finding that part of my county electoral division is in 'Pendle Hill' SPA 30 and part is in 'Bowland' SPA 33, the latter part of Ribble Valley SW hasn't really any significant employment, commuting nor, to some extent public transport, links with the one town in Longridge-with-Bowland division i.e. Longridge.</p>	<p>This is more about the rurality of the whole area. Bowland was extended as close to the M6 boundary as possible, where it meets Preston East.</p>
CC Gina Dowding	<p><b>BASELINE NEEDS ASSESMENTS</b>            There is <b>no indicator regarding car ownership or access to cars during the day</b>. This is necessary to demonstrate what barriers to employment might be and also need to transport services. If this information is available it should go in section 2 about homes and environment</p> <p>Also and importance – there are <b>no actual indicators in this section about the environment</b>- e.g. distance to a green space. ! I don't know where this information is available but I know there are measures for this somewhere.</p>	<p>We will include an indicator on car ownership, which would be the percentage of households with access to no cars.</p>
Lancashire Youth Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how up to date / relevant the data was that was being used to inform the needs assessment – information on the glossary page suggests 2011 data.</li> <li>• Some questions if there are not too many areas, plus aware there are boundaries in areas you cannot see e.g. people not attend centres in the next estate.</li> </ul>	<p>Data will be refreshed when released (eg IMD 2015). 2011 refers to the 2011 Census data (only conducted every 10 years).</p> <p>Given the size of the SPAs and the underlying LSOAs it is not possible to break by individual housing estates.</p>

Responder	Response	Suggested change to strategy document....
West Lancashire District Council	Concerns over SPA boundaries – Eastern part of West Lancs in Chorley West SPA and Skelmersdale SPA excludes the Stanley extension industrial site. Please consider a more sensible boundary	The majority of Stanley industrial estate is in the Skelmersdale SPA. The MSOA boundary does not allow the remained be included without a large geographic part of SPA 24 (Ormskirk and Newburgh) also becoming part of Skelmersdale SPA.
A County Councillor	Southern part of my electoral division (Ribble Valley SW) is in service planning area 33 'Bowland', while the northern part of RVSW I see is included in SPA 30 'Pendle Hill'.	No change needed.
A partner organisation	There are some errors in the appendices in particular in relation to Preston East as this includes The Hills which is part of Grimsargh so should not be included in Preston East as it gives an inaccurate perception of part of Grimsargh.	The Hills is part of Grimsargh parish. However the MSOA boundary includes The Hills as part of Preston. Changing boundary would have a major implication for the Preston East, eg Brookfield and Holme Slack in Preston would become part of Bowland.
Ribble Valley Borough Council	<p>Concerns regarding the approach to 34 SPAs. 'Pendle Hill' SPA comprises not only the whole of Clitheroe and Ribble Valley North East (in terms of existing LCC electoral divisions) but also some northern parts of Ribble Valley South West and also some west parts of the borough of Pendle. The other proposed SPA – 'Bowland' – encompasses the rest of Ribble Valley and combines with the southern parts of Ribble Valley South West.</p> <p>There doesn't seem to be any consistency in the size of the 34 SPAs – ranging from 56,990 for Hyndburn East to 10,996 for Barnoldswick. On this basis why can't the borough of Ribble Valley, with a population of 58,091, be treated as a SPA in its entirety? Or just split into two Ribble Valley SPAs?</p> <p>SPAs do not match any of the current electoral county divisions and we are concerned about the effect this will have on the way that electors are represented by their county councillor especially when it comes to budget decisions.</p>	The Ribble Valley area, as covered by the SPAs also includes parts of Pendle, and Longridge and Grimsargh. These rural areas have similarities which cross the district boundaries.

Responder	Response	Suggested change to strategy document....
	<p>Baseline indicator 'Barriers to housing and services' should be split to sub-indicators to enable a separate focus on barriers to services.</p>	<p>We will split the IMD domain of barriers and services into the sub-domains of geographical barriers (the physical proximity of services) and wider barriers (access to housing such as affordability).</p>
<p>Hyndburn Borough Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is also recommended areas should be clustered by LSOA areas and not at MSOA which are too large and cover a mixed socio-demographic profile.</li> <li>• All areas should be ranked using the latest 2015 IMD rankings and not the 2010 IMD ranking that used 2008 data.</li> </ul>	<p>MSOAs provide a good geographic building block for which a lot of data are available and some of the data used in the baseline needs assessment are not available at LSOA, eg median house prices. Some ward-level data are included in the baseline scores that will factor into the MSOA and, therefore, the SPA scores. Additionally much of the public health data used are only available at ward and MSOA level; hence another reason for using MSOAs.</p> <p>The IMD 2015 was released on 29 September, almost two months after the draft SPA document was produced. The SPA data is being updated with the 2015 data.</p>