

Public Document Pack



BARRY KEEL
Chief Executive
Floor 1 - Civic Centre
Plymouth
PL1 2AA

www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy

Date 03/11/09 Telephone Enquiries 01752 304022 Fax 01752 304819

Please ask for Helen Wright, Democratic Support Officer e-mail h.wright@plymouth.gov.uk

CUSTOMERS AND COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL (SCRUTINY REVIEWS)

TO FOLLOW

DATE: THURSDAY 5 NOVEMBER 2009
TIME: 10.00 AM
PLACE: HAMOAZE HOUSE, MOUNT WISE, DEVONPORT, PLYMOUTH, DEVON, PL1 4JQ

Please find attached additional information for your consideration under agenda item 5.

BARRY KEEL
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**CUSTOMERS AND COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL
(SCRUTINY REVIEWS)**

5. EVIDENCE REVIEW

(Pages 1 - 8)

Members will review the evidence form the meeting on 2 November.

**Customers and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Localities Working Task and Finish Group
Key Points from the Meeting held on Monday 2 November 2009**

**1. Witness Andy Bickley
 Superintendent Devon and Cornwall Police**

Key Points:

- Neighbourhood working is far more responsive;
- Policing areas are not aligned with other agency boundaries;
- Co-ordinating budgets and an opportunity for public engagement;
- Some areas would need more intensive intervention;
- Not precious about budgets;
- Data informs where the resources need to go but would need constant review;
- Not policy making evidence but evidence based policy;
- Use of actual scientific data and not public perception (in some areas people wont be persuaded that crime has reduced);
- Place survey and MORI survey in Devonport produced different results and perceptions;
- Too many meetings are not productive;
- Area Committees are not productive, poorly advertised, and attendance is largely due to the issues on the agenda (if it does not affect people they will not attend).

**2. Witness Peter Flukes
 Wolseley Trust**

Key Points:

- Functions of partners should be carefully defined;
- Core expertise of each of the partners should be used effectively, core expertise has to be identified;
- Opportunities to improve the role of Councillors;
- Opportunities to utilise partners more fully (partners have a great capacity for communication which at present is not harnessed – partners do have a substantial role to play);

- Enabling role not one grouping of representatives;
- No interference with the co-ordination teams (communication and accountability);
- Councillor role right at the heart of this process.

**3. Witness Jane Donovan
 Assistant Director Environmental Services**

Key Points

- Actions not meetings have a lean structure (issue with being able to provide staff to attend meetings);
- Place resources where they are needed and not divide the budget by the six localities;
- Flexibility and the need for innovation (disappointed that minimum standards may not be achieved in all areas in order to place resources in the more challenging areas);
- Localities working is not addressing the 'business as usual issues' need highlight matters that are not working;
- Need to have the right system in place to enable ownership for those things to be done properly and encourage a sense of pride and ownership in an area;
- No extra funds, very clear deliver within existing resources;
- Use of resources from partners;
- The local authority is the budget holder for street scene and environmental issues and not other partners;
- There were benefits for a community if residents live in a clean environment (the police were willing to share resources);
- Use the probation service;
- Who would be the representatives (Services for Children and Young People had appointed people across the localities – do not have anyone within the structure to act as representatives, do not want to take resources away from the front line, the challenge would be the right people doing the right job);
- Key element regarding where people live (people respond to whether they live in a mess or clean area, accountability and continuity were important to achieving this).

**4. Witness Pam Marsden
Assistant Director for Community Services**

Key Points:

- Flexibility, although 25 staff had moved into Plympton/Plymstock this would be under review and they were confident in working with health partners;
- Co-location and shared resources would only be placed in three of the localities and not all six;
- Better service for the service user that was our aim (integration that was what you would achieve);
- Working well with health partners;
- Flexibility about management;
- Other partners;
- The work on localities seems to be further advanced;
- No thought about accountability/governance arrangements.

**5. Witness Pat Patel
Tamarview Community Complex**

Key Points:

- Acknowledge PACT meetings are working well and were a good vehicle for community engagement for a small area;
- Residents know what is needed in their area;
- Community groups were able to pull people together;
- The ability to have some influence over budgets would be a good thing;
- Area Committees are just for Councillors and Co-opted representatives;
- Little involvement by service providers at Area Committee meetings;
- Lack of youth service provision in the area;
- Small neighbourhood working would be best.

**6. Witness Phil Mitchell
Housing and Regeneration Manager**

Key Points:

- Use of the super output areas focus on where there was the most deprivation, this might be a way of prioritising some of the neighbourhood working;
- There was a difference in what was being said he seemed to be suggesting that the locality level should be used for strategic issues that were not resolved at neighbourhood level, other witnesses seem to imply locality level is more taskforce working;
- Not possible to have an infrastructure in all 43 neighbourhoods to deal with issues (focus on deprivation).

**7. Witness Mr Emery
Resident of Plymstock**

Key Points:

- Lack of consultation with localities working (only a small sample of people involved in the process);
- Area Committees were not local enough;
- Service providers did not attend Area Committee meetings;
- General PACT meetings liked the neighbourhoods;
- The consultation response on locality working from the Plymstock Area Committee did not accurately reflect the minute;
- Area Committees were too formal (council meetings form a barrier for residents, it is a council meeting for councillors as oppose to a meeting with residents);
- Consultation was insufficient (no information or background was provided for people to enable them to make a recommendation);
- Recommendations community engagement on consultation;
- The system is not working for individuals and individuals make up communities.

8. **Witness** **Peter McNamara**
 David Brown
 Will Blagdon
 Anne Freeman
 Devonport Regeneration Community Partnership

Key Points:

- Evidence based resources based on evidence and priorities;
- Money resources to be dropped down to the neighbourhood could hit targets but have no great benefit;
- Not one size that fits all;
- Use existing access points;
- Clear purpose;
- Partnership working is efficient, saves time and opens doors;
- Funding is not everything;
- Need to take with a pinch of salt level of community consultation, lack of involvement in DCLT and Land Trust.

9. **Witness** **Annie McGee**
 Consultant to PFSS

Key Points:

- Workforce development new ways of training staff;
- Develop trust of people prior to embarking on the formal part;
- One service long time proven record of success might consider expertise apply work throughout the local authority;
- Three key issues not an issue Area Committees relationship with neighbours and boundaries;
- Lack of parity across the city (Barn Barton hard to reach groups have not got a youth worker);
- Not aware of work going on in half term.

**10. Witness Sam Swaby
 Granby Island Community Centre**

Key Points:

- Commonality of purpose;
- Danger of solely looking at deprived localities as there were pockets of deprivation in affluent areas;
- Only way Index Multi Deprivation – evidence based;
- Data collection inform funding in the future (be clear in the recommendations).

11. Witness Councillor Wheeler

Key Points:

- Neighbourhoods were key to enabling the community, happy to use the neighbourhoods as building blocks;
- People were only interested in what goes on in their area;
- Problem resourcing 43 neighbourhoods.

**12. Witness Martin Clay
 Roger Mitchell
 North Prospect Partnership**

Key Points:

- Loss of an area's identity;
- Concerns relating to losing the improvements that have already been made;
- Funding needed to be driven rather than just divided into the localities;
- There was an assumption that funding would be divided equally into the six localities;
- Attention to make representatives views at the localities level, loudest voice not have the most say danger historically that has happened;
- Mature neighbourhoods invest and grow.

**13. Witness Councillor Dr Mahony
 Chair of Compton and Peverell Area Committee**

Key Points:

- Central and North East locality is too big and diverse;
- Not challenging neighbourhoods and building blocks more flexible with ward boundaries.

14. General Panel

Key Points:

- Concern relating to the way the localities have been set out;
- The Panel were very disappointed that Carole Burgoyne the Director for Community Services was not present as it was important for her to give evidence relating to the commitment of the Council;
- Recommendations from the Panel on the collection and use of data my need to be discussed with a data officer to make sure that this was built into the locality framework and evidence based distribution of resources.

This page is intentionally left blank