

## Locality Working: Feedback from Public Consultation: Summary

(29 RESPONSES RECEIVED ON CONSULTATION PORTAL; ADDITIONAL 4 LETTERS)

### Q1 – Set up 6 Locality Teams/4 key services?

**68% of Portal responses recorded yes.** Whilst 3 feel this is a waste of time and money, and another states existing services are effective, many emphasised the need to involve local residents, local community groups, employers and schools in locality working. Another stressed the need for equal involvement across services and a further clear involvement of Third Sector on equal partnership. Other services that need to be considered include housing, transport, open spaces, culture, sport, education.

### Q2 – Led by Champion, assisted by coordinator?

**48% of Portal responses recorded yes.** Whilst 3-4 think this is a waste of time, others suggested the use of re-trained Council staff. One felt the team needs to be well resourced and have clear accountability. One felt the Champion should have sufficient clout to see things delivered and to be accountable to the Locality Partnership. There was a view that the Champion should not have political allegiance, but could possibly be a local resident or community activist. Another suggestion to wait until the initiative is established before appointing. Some unease about the term 'champion', and the need to involve young people was stressed.

### Q3 – Replace 8 Area Committees with 6 Locality Partnerships?

**62% of Portal responses recorded yes.** There is concern about accountability and the constitutional basis, also the need for more openness, consultation and accessibility. A concern that councillors roles diminished. The question of devolved budgets was raised, as was the need for a local base regularly staffed. Third sector organisations to be elected as per Third Sector Strategy. The differing needs of localities was mentioned. What would happen to the AC's current important agenda (traffic orders etc)? Two opposing views on whether PACTs should be independent or alongside. Another that fewer partnerships should be the aim.

### Q4 – Involving local people.

A big emphasis on speaking to local residents, advertising meetings and keeping people informed through news sheets, media, web, etc. Councillors to consult more, not just before elections. Involve people of all age groups. People will want to see early results. Set up a residents' forum within each locality.

### Q5 – What information is needed?

The main source should be residents, schools, community groups. Especially residents. Local needs, range of people, problems all need defining. Need to work with partners, eg police, highways, health.

Q6 – Governance arrangements?

A few suggested the locality team should have decision power over only low priority issues, another that there should be agreed powers of delegation. A view that the team should act as an interface, making representations, rather than decisions. A suggestion that a Locality Service Plan be prepared, also the need for a devolved budget. Concern about accountability, and once again the need to have resident input.

Q7 – Any other comments?

The following are emphasised: communication with residents more widely, accessibility, avoid duplication with what's done already, recognise views of Area Committees, Partnerships to have the ability to scrutinise how budgets applied and Third sector involved, and need for careful monitoring. A view that the proposal needs to incorporate the principle of priority neighbourhoods.

NJM/20/10/09