

MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT SERVICES

5 DECEMBER 2007

Councillors * Davies (Chair), *Bevan, and *Weber

* Members present

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none received.

2. URGENT BUSINESS

There was none

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Bevan declared that he was the Chair of the White Hart Lane and Northumberland Park Area Assembly.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Panel gave consideration to the proposed terms of reference and process for the review. There was some discussion regarding how success and achievement could be measured and that this might be helped if the Panel was able to identify indicators for measuring performance. The Head of Partnerships advised that there were National indicators underpinning Local Area Agreements and the Government were using residents' perceptions and satisfaction as a measure of success. Also the Audit Commission was driving customer participation and residents perceptions. Additionally the Annual residents' survey indicated that residents felt more engaged in local decisions.

A review of "Making the difference" funding was taking place which would examine residents' priorities on mainstream provision and how to engage local residents in decisions.

It was noted that how Neighbourhood Management linked with Council partners would be considered during the course of the review.

RESOLVED:

That the terms of reference and process for the review be agreed.

5. PRESENTATION FROM YOUNG FOUNDATION

The Panel received a presentation from the Young Foundation on their work nationally and in Haringey (attached as an Appendix). Details of the strengths of Haringey's Neighbourhood Management were identified including being one of the

first London boroughs to have a pan borough neighbourhood structure. An advantage of this structure was that costs were lower. Also Haringey had been successful in bringing in regeneration resources. Furthermore work was ongoing to develop further joint working between services at neighbourhood level. Examples of good new initiatives such as the Summer University and particularly innovative work on diversity and cohesion were given.

Issues for the future were identified, including future funding following the cessation of NRF funding, embedding good practice and strengthening links with the LSP.

It was agreed that clarity was required in respect of the roles of both Ward Councillors and Neighbourhood Management staff. Also it was suggested that the workload for some Neighbourhood Managers was excessive and that the possibility of redesigning services based on local residents' priorities could be examined.

RESOLVED:

That the Young Foundation be thanked for their presentation.

6. REPORT FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT

The Head of Neighbourhood Management referred the Panel to an Information Pack which had been circulated to members as background information. Particular issues that arose included:-

- Concern over the future funding of the service due to:- 1) Savings of £625K through the PBPR process and 2) uncertainty of £300K Empowerment Seed Funding after March 2008.
- Particular successful case studies in Northumberland Park and White Hart Lane were identified. It was noted that Councillor Bevan, the Chair of that Area Assembly, considered that Neighbourhood Management worked well.
- Although there were many good examples of area based working with other services, it was an area where it might be possible to make further improvements.
- It was suggested that at the next round of Area Assembly meetings, before each meeting Members should meet for half an hour to discuss the guidance on member/officer protocol.
- All Neighbourhood Managers had a work programme which was endorsed by the Cabinet Member for Community Involvement and Cohesion and the Area Assembly Chair and Staff Performance was measured through this and by appraisal.
- A number of possible visits were suggested. Also the Young Foundation invited the Panel to address a Network meeting to obtain the views of other Borough's on Haringey's service.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Head of Partnerships provide details of possible visits Members could make if they wished.
2. That the Area Assembly Chair's be invited to submit comments on the review in advance of the planned meeting with them.

Matt Davies
Chair