



Identification, Dissemination and Exchange of good practice in
Local Employment development and promoting better governance

Clapham Park Project

General details

Name of contact	Sarah Lee
Organisation	Clapham Park Project
Address	1-4 Brixton Hill Place London SW2 1HJ
Telephone no.	020 8678 5900
Fax	020 8678 5901
Email address	slee@claphampark.org.uk

Details of activity

Background to the case study	<p>Aims and objectives Clapham Park Project is a government based New Deal for Communities programme, developed to work with those groups of people understood as most excluded from mainstream activities and services. The programme emanated from the 'New Labour' agenda of 'Joined Up' thinking developed through the Social Exclusion Unit as a means of tackling poverty in the country's most deprived neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Brief rationale The three main objectives were to: Create 'bottom up' approaches to regeneration activity. Create 'test beds' for the design and delivery of local services. Provide long term funding (10 years) for deprived areas.</p> <p>Implementing organisation Clapham Park Project board is a not for profit organisation governed by a partnership board that includes local residents and statutory agencies.</p>
------------------------------	---



	<p>Funders</p> <p>The main funding for the programme is from central government - The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, managed through the regions. In terms of Clapham Park, Government Office for London</p> <p>When activity started / end date? 2000 - 2010</p>
Description of activity	<p>Outline of programme / activities and approaches used</p> <p>Activities for the programme are developed and delivered under five key theme areas, these are :</p> <p>Health Crime and Community Safety Business, Employment and Training Education and Youth Neighbourhood Management and Community Development</p> <p>The themes involve theme groups that include members from residents and statutory agencies, theme managers, project managers and project staff, some projects are delivered in-house and some through outside agencies.</p> <p>Project's include jobs and enterprise, education, youth, crime and community safety and community development, some of which have their own partnerships and steering groups and have adopted empowerment and capacity building strategies.</p> <p>The activities have adopted a community regeneration 'bottom up' approach with inbuilt project cycle management monitoring and evaluation processes and procedures</p> <p>Origins – how it came about – bottom up / top down, grew from previous initiative (if so what)</p> <p>The project grew from two main sources: resident dissatisfaction with housing and crime and community safety and government calls for proposals targeted at local estates in the London borough of Lambeth</p> <p>In addition the programme has benefited from three years of community consultation which lead to a successful compromise on housing tenure and management for the area that culminated</p>



	<p>in a successful stock transfer for the area. Residents compromised on mixed housing tenure for higher standards in housing by coming out of local authority control. Clapham Park Project benefited from poor quality Local Authority housing services, which assisted with the success of the stock transfer programme.</p> <p>Who was involved in the design, management and delivery of the programme Central, regional and local government, local residents and a core staff team based centrally and on outreach.</p> <p>Recognition – has the programme been recognised as good practice? If so, by whom? The programme has been recognised as best practice by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit. Clapham Park has been given a ‘good’ rating for the last two years which is the second highest rating, there is also evidence of mainstream education services using best practice through the employment of project based staff in local schools.</p>
<p>Policy context within which the programme operates</p>	<p>Describe the policy context in which the programme operates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an explicit relationship between policy priorities / local activities? The programme is located within the government’s primary agendas of Social Exclusion, ‘Joined Up’ thinking, poverty eradication, Worklessness, Localisation, environmental/green agendas and the new RESPECT agenda. The most explicit agenda is Neighbourhood Renewal. • Is the policy context supportive / prohibitive? The policy agendas reflect NDC agendas and as such are supportive. Any conflict is based on government being unclear about the real needs of local people. An example is the new RESPECT agenda where it can be argued that government policy is leading to the criminalisation of young people and parents as opposed to understanding the realities of parents who have to live with a range social and health problems that affect their children and the families concerned.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the policy context changed during the life of the activity Government policy is constantly changing and governments tend to look to NDC's to implement much of this policy, examples include: Faith Communities, Community Cohesion, Green Spaces, Sports Agendas, Worklessness and the new Respect agenda previously mentioned. <p>Which came first – local activities or policy priorities (i.e. is activity leading or following policy priorities)? Work grew alongside each other. As the key priorities in Clapham Park were crime and community safety and housing much of the original NDC proposal was framed to address these issues. Also, as there was a steer from government in the beginning to spend money quickly a lot of project work did meet resident needs and priorities</p>
Geographical focus of the case study	<p>At what level does the programme operate? At a local area based level.</p>
Impact	<p>Describe the impact of the programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outputs – scale and scope of people reached through the programme The key output targets are focussed at those members of the community understood as most excluded from mainstream services and activities. In Clapham Park this is primarily targeted at lone parents, those from BME communities (50% are from Black and Asian communities), those with social and health problems and those who are long term unemployed and who find it difficult to enter employment. Targets for the programme are based on theme based activities as indicated. • Outcomes: <i>at local level</i> – what difference at local level and <i>at regional and / or national level</i> – what difference made? Activity is measured against government and local floor targets. Currently our highest performing themes are crime and community safety and education. Our Education theme boasts a



	<p>significant increase in the raising of achievement between 2002 and 2004 where the NDC pupil Key stage 2 results for English increased by 14%, achieving the NDC's 10 year target in year 4 of the programme, only 1% below the borough average. Over the same period the Key stage results for Maths have also increased by 14% and are also 1% below the borough average and 5% below the national average. Both these trends display a significant 'narrowing of the gap' in educational standards between the NDC area and the borough and other parts of the country in these subjects. An important aspect of the stats is that the comparator local indicators reflect very similar demographics. In addition there has been a 4% increase in the numbers of pupils in the area gaining A* to C Grades. This increase reflects the very small number of pupils from the area who take exams at this level. In terms of crime there has been a 28.5% decrease in reported crime figures for the area between 2000 and 2005. Clapham Park Project has closed down in cooperation with the police a total of 40 crack houses and redesigned the lighting and security on the estates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any impact at European level? <p>We have received European delegations via the local authority and are currently bidding for co-financed ESF monies. It would be difficult at this stage however to actually measure impact.</p>
Partners' details	<p>Name and briefly describe partner's contributions to programme Residents operating as board and theme group chairs are primarily responsible for the management and strategic direction of the programme, statutory partners are responsible for partnership development, management and identifying mainstreaming opportunities. Statutory partners include: The police, Job Centre Plus, The Learning and Skills Councils, Local Colleges, the Local Authority, (officers and politicians) and business representatives.</p>

Theme-Specific Questions

Who was targeted by the	Name target group / groups
-------------------------	----------------------------

programme?	Those most disadvantaged and excluded from mainstream activity.
Which levels of government were involved, informed or consulted?	Describe Central, regional and local government.
What actions resulted in mainstreaming?	How did they do it? Serendipity / luck, contacts, drive, X factor? Where has programme been replicated? All of these, however there was a greater expectation in the beginning of the NDC programmes that much of the activity would be mainstreamed. This as yet has not been realised.
Sustainability	What achieved / how funded? Most sustainability options will be explored with our partner Metropolitan Housing the new Social Landlord for the area. Other opportunities are through education, the police and the health sector. New local Area Agreements also pose new sustainable opportunities
Successes / lessons learned	What contributed to the programme's success? A key contributor to the programme's success has been resident involvement which has been a main contributory factor to the strength and quality of the projects. Another has been their commitment and level of resident involvement particularly at the beginning of the project and up to the housing stock transfer. The project has also benefited from a committed and highly skilled staff team and a large injection of cash from central government. Clapham Park Project received 56 million pounds from central government. 28 million went to support the housing aspect of the programme. What lessons have been learned How hard resident work can be. There appeared to be an expectation in the beginning that as the government money existed that resident involvement would follow, also ideas of community were flawed and outdated. The idea that everyone will pull together in a neighbourhood is somewhat outdated as it has been shown that most involvement is about individual and to



	<p>some extent collective (single interest) gain. However resident work is worth the effort as it normally makes for better project activity, as residents tend to have a greater awareness of real need and local priorities.</p> <p>If they had their time again what would they do differently? The project would have benefited from better guidance in the beginning and longer lead in time to activity. We would propose that there should be no project spending until at least year 2.</p>
--	---

