



## **Streetpride Devolved Budgets to Neighbourhood Boards**

### **SUMMARY**

1. As pre-decision scrutiny, on 20 October the Neighbourhoods Commission considered the proposals due before Council Cabinet at this meeting.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council Cabinet approve the proposals with the following modifications:

- 2.1 That three (not two) ward councillors be included in 'signing off' and agreeing any subsequent variation to the Neighbourhood Spending Plans, NSP, but, in the absence of a consensus, two have authority to do so.
- 2.2 At the request of ward councillors the area co-ordinator will provide information about Streetpride service standards and expenditure plans to ensure the 'additionality' of devolved expenditure decisions.
- 2.3 Subsequent to 'sign off' of the NSP the Board be informed which items will be undertaken when during the 12 month period.

### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 Regarding recommendation 2.1, the Commission accept that using full Board meetings for agreement would impede real progress due to the meeting cycle. However it is preferable to involve all three ward members, as happens currently with Ward Committees. This would also avoid the possible public perception of there being two tiers of ward councillors. An inclusive approach is in itself likely to promote consensus as all three would be party to the same level of information. The fall back of majority decision making avoids any risk of delay.
- 3.2 Regarding recommendation 2.2, both ward councillors and the local public need to feel confident that local expenditure decisions will provide more services, or an extra amenity, on top of what would have been delivered any way. Streetpride service standards and mainstream expenditure plans can provide that information, with area co-ordinators able to give ward councillors answers and advice before NSPs are finalised.
- 3.3 Regarding recommendation 3.3, subsequent to NSP sign off and near the start of the financial year ward members and the wider Neighbourhood Board need to be informed 'what will be done when'. This can greatly assist in managing public

expectations, for example, it is far better to know in April that new signage is planned to be installed the following February, rather than the position being unclear and the public then asking in June and September why nothing has happened.

## **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

- 4.1 On 20 October Tom Knight, Interim Director of Streetpride, and Paul Robinson, Strategic Director for Neighbourhoods, were interviewed by the Commission on the proposals now before Council Cabinet. All members were positive about the principle but at the outset had a number of concerns about the process and practicalities. These issues were fully explored in the lengthy dialogue. Members made the three recommendations set out at 2.1 to 2.3 above. Subject to those being accepted by Council Cabinet the Commission endorse the proposals. Mr Robinson indicated his willingness to modify the scheme to meet the Commission's wishes

## **OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 Not applicable. The Commission was considering the proposals before Council Cabinet.

**This report has been approved by the following officers:**

<b>Legal officer</b> <b>Financial officer</b> <b>Human Resources officer</b> <b>Service Director(s)</b> <b>Other(s)</b>	Chair and Vice Chair on behalf of the Neighbourhood Commission
---	--

<b>For more information contact:</b> <b>Background papers:</b> <b>List of appendices:</b>	Name 01332 255596 e-mail <a href="mailto:rob.davison@derby.gov.uk">rob.davison@derby.gov.uk</a> None Appendix 1 – Implications
---	--

<b>IMPLICATIONS</b>
---------------------

**Financial #**

- 1.1 The proposals will not increase or decrease net expenditure on Streetpride. Instead a further £10,000 will be devolved to each Neighbourhood. The total of all Neighbourhood-controlled funds will rise from £26,000 per year to £36,000.

# subject to comment/endorsement by the Strategic Director

**Legal +**

- 2.1 Section 236 of the Local Government Act 2007 enables the delegation of decision making authority to ward councillors, provided that a written record is made of every decision. The proposals before Council Cabinet accord with that and offer a transparent and, when necessary, swift means of decision making. In contrast Ward Committee meeting have to be called with five clear days notice to comply with the 1985 Access to Information requirements.

+ subject to comment/endorsement by the Director of Legal and Democratic Services

**Personnel**

- 3.1 None directly arise from this report.

**Equalities Impact**

- 4.1 None directly arise from this report, however enhancing Neighbourhood decision making offers the opportunity to identify issues and priorities at sub-ward level and hone service delivery and spending to meet very localised needs.

**Health and Safety**

- 5.1 None directly arise from this report, however the decision making and implementation mechanisms should ensure Council-wide standards on equipment, materials and safe working are systemically complied with.

**Carbon commitment**

- 6.1 Probably neutral.

**Value for money**

- 7.1 The costs of equipment, materials and staff time are unaltered by the proposals. In the medium term there may be feed back from Forums and Boards about the costs of undertaking works and providing services leading to consideration of alternative methods and/or suppliers if current quality and safety standards can be matched.

## **Corporate objectives and priorities for change**

8.1 The proposals accord with the following:

- To deliver value for money across all services (ref. COD2)
- To promote local democracy and active citizenship (ref. SSC1).
- To improve levels of safety and cleanliness and to develop confidence and pride across our communities and neighbourhoods (ref. SSC2).