



**Customers and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Joint Task and Finish Group
Scrutiny Review – Report
November 2009**

Localities Working

Plymouth City Council

Content

- 1 Introduction**
- 2 Executive Summary**
- 3 Vision for Localities Working**
- 4 Panel**
- 5 Scrutiny Approach**
- 6 Witnesses**
- 7 Key Issues Arising from the Evidence**
- 8 Findings**
- 9 Recommendations**
- 10 Acknowledgements**

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board approved in principle, on 5 August 2009 the establishment of a joint task and finish group to review Localities Working, with membership to be drawn from Customers and Communities, Children and Young People and Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Panels. The Task and Finish Group will submit its findings for approval to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 2 December 2009, prior to consideration of Localities working at Cabinet on 19 January 2010 and Council on 1 February 2010.

2 Executive Summary

- 2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board established a Joint Task and Finish Group to review Localities Working. The Council wants Locality Working to help it create a city with successful, strong, cohesive and sustainable communities.

- 2.2 The Group was asked to make recommendations on –

- the best way of joining up services in Localities and the proposal to have Locality Service Co-ordination Teams in each locality;
- ways we can improve links between organisations providing services and the community in each Locality and whether Area Committees should be replaced with Partnerships (one for each locality) with a new focus on joint problem solving between services and communities; and
- what sorts of information Locality Teams will need to help with their work.

- 2.3 The Group heard representations from a variety of witnesses and received written information from the Youth Parliament.

- 2.4 Key issues and findings included that -

- There is broad support for better service co-ordination based on the establishment of multi-agency teams at Locality level.
- There is a strong view that Neighbourhoods, not Localities, are the appropriate unit for community engagement. Most Localities are too large and diverse to be natural boundaries for community engagement.
- It is widely acknowledged that the Area Committees were not working effectively.
- Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings and initiatives could, with some improvements, provide a good vehicle for community engagement but this needs to be supplemented with a variety of methods, beyond meetings, to maximise community engagement.
- Ward Councillors, engaged in improved PACT processes and equipped with feedback via these different methods, could advocate key priorities on behalf of their communities.
- Localities Working needs to be delivered within existing budgets, but has potential to respond to different needs and to priority Neighbourhoods, in relation to relevant data.

2.5 The Group believes that Localities Working can successfully deliver improvements if it is based on: good community engagement at Neighbourhood level; improved joining up of key services at Locality level; a strengthened role for Ward Councillors as advocates on behalf of communities; availability and consistency of relevant data at neighbourhood and Locality levels.

2.6 Recommendations are made covering -

- Service Co-ordination Teams for each Locality (reflecting proposals put out for consultation) within minimum representation of: street scene and environment; community safety; health; and children and young people, across partner agencies. Each team should be pulled together by a Locality Lead.
- Community engagement, to support Localities Working, focused at Neighbourhood level incorporating existing Partners and Communities Together (PACT) initiatives and strengthened arrangements to involve Ward Councillors and facilitate community involvement. (This is an alternative to proposals put out for consultation).
- Availability of information, to support Localities working, covering: local issues; feedback from consultation and community engagement; and data on city-wide priorities, disaggregated at Neighbourhood and Locality levels.
- Directing resources in response to need, using appropriate data sets.
- A post-implementation review.

3 Vision for Locality Working

3.1 The Council wants Locality Working to help it create a city with successful, strong, cohesive and sustainable communities. Residents in these communities should be actively involved in shaping the places in which they live and improving services, leading to increased satisfaction and better quality of life.

4 The Panel

4.1 The Joint Task and Finish group had a cross-party membership comprising the following Councillors –

- Councillor Fox (Chair)
- Councillor Wildy (Vice Chair)
- Councillor Purnell
- Councillor Roberts
- Councillor Mrs Stephens
- Councillor Mrs Watkins

For the purpose of the review, the joint task and finish group was supported by –

- Pete Aley, Assistant Director for Safer Communities
- Helen Wright, Democratic Support Officer

5 Scrutiny Approach

5.1 The task and finish group convened on two occasions to consider evidence and hear from witnesses -

- 2 November 2009
- 5 November 2009

5.2 Members of the Joint Task and Finish group aimed to examine and make recommendations on –

- the best way of joining up services in Localities and the proposal to have Locality Service Co-ordination Teams in each locality;
- ways we can improve links between organisations providing services and the community in each Locality and whether Area Committees should be replaced with Partnerships (one for each locality) with a new focus on joint problem solving between services and communities; and
- what sorts of information Locality Teams will need to help with their work.

The Work Programme Request (PID) is attached as Appendix 1.

5.3 At its meetings on 2 November and 5 November, the task and finish group considered evidence from witnesses, raised questions and considered answers and recommendations relating to Localities Working.

6 Witnesses

6.1 The task and finish group heard representations from –

- Pete Aley – Assistant Director for Safer Communities
- Superintendent Andy Bickley – Devon and Cornwall Constabulary
- Peter Flukes – Wolseley Trust
- Jane Donovan – Assistant Director for Environmental Services
- Pam Marsden – Assistant Director for Community Care
- Pat Patel – Tamarview Community Complex
- Carole Burgoyne – Director for Community Services
- Phil Mitchell – Housing and Regeneration Manager
- Mr Emery – Resident
- Sam Swaby – Granby Island Community Centre
- Peter McNamara and colleagues– Devonport Regeneration Community Partnership
- Annie McGee – Consultant to Plymouth Family Support Service
- Councillor Wheeler - Chair of Ham and St Budeaux Area Committee
- Martin Clay and colleague– North Prospect Partnership
- Councillor Dr Mahony – Chair of Compton and Peverell Area Committee

Responses from witnesses and written evidence received from the Youth Parliament are detailed in Appendix 2. Responses to the Localities Working Joint Task and Finish Group Questionnaire is attached at Appendix 3.

7 Key Issues Arising from the Evidence

- 7.1 From the evidence received the Panel considered the following to be the key themes.
- 7.1.1 There is broad support for better service co-ordination based on the establishment of multi-agency teams at Locality level. Although there could be some flexibility in how these teams are established, minimum service standards should apply across Plymouth. The establishment of such teams should not imply that all services would be located or delivered at Locality level.
- 7.1.2 Despite Localities being an appropriate unit for service co-ordination and some delivery, there is a strong view that Neighbourhoods, not Localities, are the appropriate unit for community engagement. It was widely acknowledged that the Area Committees were not working effectively, with low attendance from residents, limited involvement from service providers and few outcomes. The committees were also seen as too formal which inhibited some residents from engaging in the process.
- 7.1.3 Different models had been considered such as the 'Northern Network'. Meetings were held within the Southway Ward and involved Ward Councillors and representatives from the police, head teachers, doctor's surgeries, the church, allotment association and the scouts. Any issues raised were dealt with by the Ward Councillors. The meetings were held on an informal basis at which the Ward Councillors took the notes which avoided formal support service requirements. However, the Panel recognised that this model would not necessarily work in other Neighbourhoods, such as Devonport which is establishing a Board as part of New Deal for Communities succession arrangements.
- 7.1.4. It was acknowledged that Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings and initiatives were operating with differing degrees of success at Neighbourhood level and, with some improvements, could provide a good vehicle for community engagement within small areas (residents knew what was needed within their own communities). However community engagement should not be a 'one size fits all' approach. Different Neighbourhoods have different needs and a variety of methods beyond meetings need to be employed to maximise engagement.
- 7.1.5 Although the scope of the Work Programme Request (PID) excluded the task and finish group from examining the boundaries of the six Localities (which had been agreed by the Local Strategic Partnership), it was acknowledged that most Localities (nb the Central and North East Locality) were too large and diverse to be seen as natural boundaries for community engagement. The 43 Neighbourhoods could be used as building blocks in this process as they were seen as key in enabling community engagement.
- 7.1.6 Although there should be minimum service standards across Plymouth, resources need to be directed in response to need rather than divided equally between the six Localities. It is evident that Localities Working needs to be delivered within existing budgets, as there was no additional funding available. However, a focus at Neighbourhood and Locality level would provide real potential to respond to different needs and to priority Neighbourhoods in relation to the Index of Multiple Deprivation and other data sets.

In particular, there is an opportunity to better co-ordinate resources in South West Locality which contains particular targeted interventions in Stonehouse, North Prospect and Devonport Neighbourhoods. However pockets of deprivation in more affluent areas should not be overlooked.

- 7.1.7 Data research should be used to inform future funding and where resources needed to be focused. It was acknowledged that scientific data should be used and not solely public perception, e.g. as in some areas residents would not be persuaded that crime had reduced. It was further acknowledged that the use of surveys could produce differing results and perceptions, i.e. the Place Survey and MORI Survey which had been undertaken in Devonport.
- 7.1.8 Specific resourcing issues had been identified at the Service Co-ordination Team level within Street Services (resources should not be taken away from the front line). It was recognised that this service could move more gradually to Localities Working.
- 7.1.9 Potential savings had been identified as a result of the recommendation to disband Area Committees (this saving could be allocated across the six Localities). Although it should be emphasised that 'cost cutting' was not a driver to move to Localities Working.
- 7.1.10 It was acknowledged that Localities Working should put the role of the Ward Councillor at the heart of this process and provide an opportunity to enhance the role.
- 7.1.11 The core expertise of each partner would need to be clearly identified and used effectively. Partners had a substantial role to play in this process and had a great capacity for communication which currently was not being exploited to its full extent.

8 Findings

- 8.1 Based on the evidence the Panel has collected, it believes that Localities Working can successfully deliver improvements if it is based on –
 - good community engagement at Neighbourhood level;
 - improved joining up of key services at Locality level;
 - a strengthened role for Ward Councillors as advocates on behalf of communities;
 - availability and consistency of relevant data at neighbourhood and Locality levels.
- 8.2 Service Co-ordination Teams in each Locality, pulled together by a Locality Lead, should include representatives of key services such as street scene, community safety, health, and children and young people, across partner agencies. Working together, within clear terms of reference, they would problem-solve and tackle relevant issues prioritised by the Councillors.
- 8.3 Each of Plymouth's 43 Neighbourhoods would have a recognised process for engaging its communities and gathering feedback. This needs to be relatively informal and can be based on existing PACT (Partners and Communities Together) initiatives eg street surveys and community meetings, improved where necessary to encourage wider participation.
- 8.4 This would be supplemented by information gathered by other methods, web-based, feedback from other fora and consultations etc, analysed at neighbourhood level.

- 8.5 Ward Councillors, engaged in the improved PACT process and equipped with feedback via these different methods, would advocate key priorities on behalf of their communities. Straightforward service requests and complaints (e.g. an individual householder's refuse collection) would continue to be directed to relevant services but issues reflecting a breakdown of services across different agencies or more complex cross-cutting matters (e.g. a run-down area attracting anti-social behaviour) would be referred to Service Co-ordination Teams; one for each Locality.
- 8.6 One Councillor from each neighbourhood would expect to be able to meet with their Locality's Service Co-ordination Team a few times during a year; but over time, working relationships based on problem resolution outside meetings should become more common place. Councillors would have a role in feeding back on progress to communities. This would put Ward Councillors at the heart of a process which engages communities in their Neighbourhoods. It would enhance Councillors' roles as advocates amongst different agencies, and encourage improved joint working at Locality level across the city.
- 8.7 To support Localities Working, information should be available covering local issues. This should include feedback from community engagement and consultation, as well as data on city-wide priorities, all disaggregated at neighbourhood level in a way that would inform decision-making and service responses.

9 Recommendations

- 9.1 In order to achieve the required outcomes, listed as 'benefits' in the Work Programme Request, i.e. –

“The scrutiny is an opportunity to examine ideas, good practice and a range of views before development of proposals on Localities Working. This will enhance the consultation process underway and will afford a particular opportunity for Members and others to contribute prior to recommendations being made to Cabinet and Council.”,

the following recommendations are proposed –

9.1.1 The Best Way of Joining up Services in Localities and the Proposals to have Locality Service Co-Ordination Teams in each Locality

Service Co-ordination Teams are formed for each Locality reflecting proposals put out for consultation, i.e. as a minimum, with representatives from four key services, street scene and environment; community safety; health; and children and young people, across partner agencies. This would not preclude a limited number of additional services being represented permanently or on an ad hoc basis, in line with individual Locality requirements. Each team should be pulled together by a senior person (Locality Lead) and this role could be shared across different partners by mutual agreement.

City-wide minimum service standards should be developed to assist Locality Service Co-ordination Teams and standard Terms of Reference should apply to all Teams. Terms of Reference should cover any powers, decision-making, accountability, complaints, and any budget responsibility.

The majority of witnesses agreed that the formation of Service Co-ordination Teams within each Locality was a good idea and the Panel supported this proposal (see 6.1.1).

9.1.2 Ways to Improve Links Between Organisations Providing Services and the Community in each Locality and whether Area Committees should be replaced with Partnerships (one for each Locality) with a New Focus on Joint Problem Solving between Services and Communities

Community engagement to support Localities Working, should be focused at neighbourhood level (i.e. in each of Plymouth's 43 Neighbourhoods) incorporating existing Partners and Communities Together (PACT) initiatives and with strengthened arrangements to involve Ward Councillors and facilitate community involvement. Arrangements should be as informal as possible (in terms of minute-taking etc) avoiding formal support service requirements.

Opportunities should be explored to involve Third Sector organisations in facilitation and to feed in community views from different sources e.g. web-based feedback, 'trade fair' events (i.e. not just meetings).

This proposal is an alternative to the suggestion made during consultation, of developing new community engagement structures at Locality level. However, the strengthened Neighbourhood arrangements should replace Area Committees which should be disbanded.

Ward Councillors should act as advocates on behalf of their Neighbourhoods and one Councillor from each Neighbourhood within a Locality should meet regularly with the relevant Service Co-ordination Team to raise issues, receive feedback and monitor progress. These Councillors should feedback to communities at Neighbourhood level.

The majority of witnesses considered the proposal for Area Committees to be replaced with Partnerships (as detailed in the consultation questionnaire), as an inappropriate vehicle to deliver effective community consultation/engagement. To be effective, this needed to be delivered at Neighbourhood level. The Panel recognised that the proposed model to replace Area Committees with Partnerships would not work and therefore put forward the alternative proposal as outlined above (see 7.1.2, 7.1.4, 7.1.5 and 7.1.10).

9.1.3 What Sorts of Information Locality Teams will need to Help with their Work

To support Localities working, information should be available covering local issues, feedback from consultation and community engagement, and data on city-wide priorities, all disaggregated at Neighbourhood and Locality levels in a way that can inform decision-making and service responses.

The Panel agreed that it was important to base decision making on good information and data to compliment community feedback and identify need and inequalities; and that this needs to be available at Neighbourhood level to help address this need (see 7.1.7).

9.1.4 Addressing need

The Panel also identified the issue of addressing resources in response to need (see 7.1.6). Although minimum service standards should apply across Localities and pockets of deprivation in more affluent Neighbourhoods should not be overlooked, Locality working should be used to direct resources to priority Neighbourhoods using appropriate data sets to identify need.

9.1.5 Review

The panel acknowledged that a review of the progress of Localities Working would be required. It was proposed to set up a task and finish group 12 months after the implementation of this model in order to undertake the review.

10 Acknowledgements

- 10.1 The Joint Task and Finish Group wished to thank staff and Service Users at Hamoaze House, and acknowledge the contribution from the witnesses, council officers, Pete Aley the Assistant Director for Safer Communities and Helen Wright the Democratic Support Officer.



Request for Scrutiny Work Programme Item

1	Title of Work Programme Item	Localities Working
2	Responsible Director (s)	Carole Burgoyne
3	Responsible Officer Tel No.	Peter Aley, Assistant Director for Safer Communities 304388
4	Aim	Contribute to, and encourage participation in, consultation to develop a model for Locality Working in Plymouth's 6 Localities identified by the LSP.
5	Objectives	<p>Objectives of Locality working are to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable residents to influence and challenge service delivery • Make services more 'joined up' • Improve councillor involvement • Reducing inequalities between communities • Focus money and staff more effectively • Improve the sharing and use of information • Monitor service provision more effectively • Meet local and national targets.
	Benefits	The scrutiny is an opportunity to examine ideas, good practice and a range of views before development of proposals on Localities working. This will enhance the consultation process underway and will afford a particular opportunity for members and others to contribute prior to recommendations being made to cabinet / council.
	Beneficiaries	The LSP Service providers The Third sector Communities Cabinet Full council
6	Criteria for Choosing Topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate priority area • Public interest issue covered in local media

7	Scope	<p>To examine and make recommendations on:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The best way of joining up services in Localities and the proposal to have Locality Service Co-ordination Teams in each locality • Ways we can improve links between organisations providing services and the community in each Locality and whether Area Committees should be replaced with Partnerships (one for each locality) with a new focus on joint problem solving between services and communities. • What sorts of information Locality Teams will need to help with their work. 		
	Exclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The boundaries for our 6 Localities (which the Local Strategic Partnership has already agreed). • Any new arrangements for service delivery or new approaches to neighbourhood working, i.e. at the level of our 43 neighbourhoods. (However this would not preclude looking at how neighbourhood issues and concerns can best be considered at Locality level). 		
8	Programme Dates	<i>Needs to be complete by mid November</i>		
	Timescales and Interdependences	Milestones	Target Date for Achievement	Responsible Officer
		<p style="color: red; text-align: center;">Known milestones for achieving the final report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27.7.09 Customers & Communities OSP – this PID needs to be approved by them, will have to be tabled; • 5.8.09 O & S Management Board – this PID should be published on 27.7.09 with the agenda, Management Board will need to appoint Members; • Task & Finish Group needs to meet in August if going to 02.11.09 and 05.11.09 O & S Management Board. 	<p style="color: red; text-align: center;">Dates of known milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19.01.10– Cabinet • 01.02.10 – Council 	Peter Aley
9	Links to other projects or initiatives / plans	Part of CIP4		

10	Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel	Customers and Communities OSP
11	Lead Officer for Panel	<i>Peter Aley</i>
12	Reporting arrangements	<p>Dates of Panels, Commission and Cabinet /Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28.9.09 – Customers & Communities OSP – too late, won't be able to approve task & finish group report, need mechanism to approve task & finish group report before O & S Management Board • 01.12.09 – O & S Management Board to approve scrutiny report. • 19.01.10 – Cabinet • 01.02.10 – Council
13	Resources	<p>Staff and other resources</p> <p>Strategic Housing and LSP staff</p>
14	Budget implications	<p>Resources within existing budgets and any additional resources required</p> <p>Staff time</p>
15	Risk analysis e.g. if no scrutiny	A potential major change in the way the council and partners co-ordinate services and engage the public would be developed without the opportunity for proactive scrutiny to influence it.
16	Project Plan / Actions	Project Plan to be prepared by Select Committee appointed by Panel

**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. Witness Carole Burgoyne
 Director for Community Services**

Key Points:

- 'One size did not fit all' localities would be operated in slightly different ways;

- Minimum service standards should be developed;
- Not all services will be located at Locality level i.e. Mental Health or Adoption;
- Learn lessons from previous consultation exercise, i.e. the recent waste rezoning initiative could have engaged the PCSOs to make residents aware of what would be happening to their street's waste collection arrangements;
- Important to manage expectations do not want to move to a more complicated way of working.

15 Written Youth Parliament Evidence

Key Points:

- young people were unaware that Area Committees existed and therefore did not attend the meetings;
- a proposal to hold a Localities Working open day to launch the initiative;
- a suggestion to send questionnaires to school to establish the issues affecting young people (young people found Area Committee meetings boring);
- in order to encourage people to become engaged, examples could be provided of successful outcomes;
- a proposal to form Localities Working committees aimed at young people; membership could be drawn from the youth forums within the Localities which could then feedback the local issues to the committees;
- there were potential issues relating to transport and whether young people would be able to attend the meetings due to size of the Localities.

Written Evidence Gathered from Questions set out by the Panel

Locality Working: Task & Finish Group Questionnaire Responses

Feedback to date

(9 RESPONSES RECEIVED TO 28/10/09).

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

77% recorded yes, 0% no. Need regular newsletters, feedback from the community, involve university in SE locality. Other services suggested to be covered: security, housing maintenance, social divide, planning and transport.

Q2 – Led by Champion, assisted by coordinator?

44% recorded yes, 10% no. Champion needs to have commitment and ability, recognise needs of low income families, work alongside Area Committees (ACs), councillors could be Champions, should be a Community champion and not recompensed. Coordinator could volunteer for free.

Q3 – Replace 8 Area Committees with 6 Locality Partnerships?

44% recorded yes, 22% no. A view that Neighbourhood level is preferred and most effective level of community engagement (PACTS work well at this level), so need two tier system. Localities are based on school catchments, these are irrelevant: suggestion of four way split to create 4 strategic areas. Another disagreed with boundaries.

PACTS should continue. Localities too big for community to be heard. Develop ACs to take on new role. Regular newsletters needed, need regular meetings with police.

Q4 – Involving local people.

Emphasis on well publicised meetings, accessible, central venues, use questionnaires, door to door inquiries, work together, have flexible agendas, draw up a plan, support active tenants organisations, link with community anchors.

Q5 – What information is needed?

Statistical information, information from areas, record of what work is being done, local knowledge, disability issues, listen to TRAs (?), need full range of information from all services.

Q6 – Governance arrangements?

Decisions should be based on necessity and consensus. All services to be covered. Listen to community views. Need delegated budget, decide where finances spent.

Q7 – Any other comments?

AC experience is of very low attendance from residents. Rethink the whole boundary issue. Areas too big. Keep it simple and it will work. Councillors need budget to improve area. Keep residents informed.

A view that after Scrutiny need to feedback to ACs.

Ensure consultation is not about what's already decided.

NJM 28/10/09