

## **Review on the Interface between Neighbourhood Working *and* Highways and Transportation – Report of the Sub-group meeting held 7 January 2009**

Present: Councillor Poulter, in the Chair, Councillor Repton and Councillor Harwood

Also present: Jonathan Guest, Christine Durrant and Rob Davison.

Apologies for absence: Councillor Batey (represented by Councillor Harwood)

1. The Chair welcomed those present and referred to a report which explained the background to the selection of the topic, the need for careful scoping and that the three members had been delegated to undertake this. Reference was also made to Ms Durrant's informative presentation at the 18 September Awayday.

2. There was then a discussion among the members and officers about the complex factors that meant the review was needed. These included:

- the decision making process: balancing community wishes with the role of professional advice
- stakeholder understanding: communication, perceptions
- service delivery and performance
- limited resources: i) for actual H&T works ii) H&T staffing capacity to attend the 17 Boards

3. The report explained that it had originally been envisaged that the bulk of the review would be conducted by the Commission itself, so as not to be too onerous on the Regeneration and Community Department's officers. However, it later became apparent that the Community Safety Partnership was itself considering engaging an external consultant to conduct a two-stage review of the Neighbourhood/ Highways and Transport interface.

4. The consultant's outline proposal had been seen by Councillor Poulter and he had agreed some suggested changes to the wording so as to:

- cover the Commission dimension enabling it to be integral to the Commission's review *and*
- provide for some engagement with resident/community reps at Stage 1, as that perspective would be needed to understand the current position.

The changes had been incorporated into the updated version which had been provided to the sub-group. The wording now included: "this proposal can provide a thorough and laminated body of evidence from which recommendations can be derived or scrutinised".

5. The Sub-group was asked how it wished to proceed and whether the external review should be considered as:

- a 'stand alone' exercise to run parallel to the Commission's own review, or

- integral to the Commission's review and thereby avoid duplicated effort.

**Agreed – that a) the external review be considered as integral to the Commission's work; b) it be requested that Stage 1 of the consultancy commences in the near future, enabling the findings to be reflected on and further steps to be agreed at a further meeting of the Sub Group (and officers) to be held before the end of April and c) the desirability of devolving a proportion of the H&T budget to Neighbourhood Boards be considered before the completion of the Commission's review.**

RD

9/1/9