## Locality Working Progress - Neighbourhood working task and finish group Debbie Burton - Neighbourhood Manager

Views on how locality working has developed – taking into account the recommendations put forward to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board – June 2011.

This feedback has been gathered from Neighbourhood Regeneration Team (NRT) – who currently undertakes the role of NLO in 8 Neighbourhoods, alongside our Neighbourhood working role in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods in the city.

Role of NLO	<ul> <li>Need to be realistic in terms of what NLO's can achieve – on top of day job – and to make sure expectations are managed so that NLO's remain committed/enthusiastic</li> <li>NLO's need to feel confident in their role and feel that Councillors/partners are willing to work in partnership to solve neighbourhood issues through locality working mechanisms</li> <li>NLO's should be able to access front line workers more to support community engagement and target the under representated– e.g. youth workers, PSA's</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>NLO's need to be provided with an incentive to take on the additional role – free training?</li> <li>NLO's need more back up support – provision of resources for meetings/coordination of information and publicity</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>NLO's can provide a proactive resource at meetings – educate the public on how to access services/where to go to get issues resolved – if support was provided centrally – e.g. information and literature on Council services</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Suggestion that NLO's do not have to be sought from Grade H and above, that experienced Grade E officers for example could be utilised from within the Council</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Would have helped to have had a stronger corporate message initially to stop inconsistency in terms of new roles/management of change</li> </ul>
Locality teams	Support the recommendation that there could be 1 city wide Locality team – as long as they are the right people
	<ul> <li>Some confusion about the role of locality teams</li> <li>Some locality teams have been reluctant to respond to issues raised</li> </ul>

	SE locality team however have been very responsive and proactive
Community engagement	<ul> <li>Support recommendation to re-brand – felt that there was no publicity launch so message was put out there haphazardly</li> <li>Central coordination of publicity would help – e.g. one person contacting press to inform them of meetings – will free up NLO time</li> <li>Less emphasis on numbers at meetings to measure success – this only allows for number of those confident/able to attend meetings to be accounted for – valuable issues can be fed into the process in other ways</li> <li>NLO's should be given flexibility so that other methods of community engagement can be achieved – e.g. holding playground surgeries/on street meetings instead of attending 4 formal meetings a year</li> <li>There are differences how each neighbourhood wants to publicise meetings – there should be a</li> </ul>
Proposed locality boundary changes	<ul> <li>minimum standard set</li> <li>Feedback already given to Nick McMahon regarding impact of changes on Devonport, Efford and North Prospect</li> <li>The proposed splitting of North Prospect would be problematic – option 2 is the preferred option as it keeps North Prospect estate together</li> <li>Community identity is important when looking at neighbourhood boundaries</li> </ul>
Neighbourhood issues	<ul> <li>Although some issues remain on-going in neighbourhoods, NLO's can improve understanding among residents in terms of why issues cannot be resolved – the barriers that the Council/Partners have to overcome</li> <li>Services have responded well to neighbourhood issues – providing information to NLO's regarding current priorities – e.g. parking/highways</li> <li>Councillors are effective at chairing meetings and steering the public away from focusing on unresolvable issues</li> </ul>