SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL
Cabinet Report

Report of:	Executive Director, Communities
Date:	17th July 2013
Subject:	Proposal for a new approach to engaging and involving local communities
Author of Report:	Vince Roberts, 0114 273 4486

Summary:

This paper seeks to reshape the Council's current local partnership arrangements and community engagement work that goes on in our *geographic communities.*

It proposes the Council:

- take a **Ward based** approach where Ward Councillors are supported to take the lead for engaging with the communities they serve;

- establishing a **Ward Pot of £300,000**;

- establishing **seven Local Area Partnerships**, one for each Area of four Wards, chaired by a lead Elected Member selected by Full Council with an appropriate Special Members Allowance.

Reasons for Recommendations:

The proposed model is recommended on the basis that it:

- targets support to communities where engagement and involvement is most needed and where capacity for self-support may be limited;

- develops the community leadership role of councillors in working with communities to support their interests;

- makes the ward and neighbourhood the focus of most activity rather than the much larger former Community Assembly area/meetings which few residents identified with, while acknowledging that some partnership working is required at a wider area level;

- would enable the Ward Pot arrangements to be up and running before the summer to ensure that the small investments that make a big difference can enhance provision during the summer holidays. These proposals would establish the Ward Pot guidance and decision making process as soon as possible;

- has taken into account the consultation and equalities impact assessment;

- is within the budget set by the Council.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is recommended to agree the proposals set out in this report and in particular:-

(a)   to agree the creation of a Ward Pot Budget of £300,000 to be allocated between the City's 28 electoral wards as described in paragraph 3.3;

(b)   to note that the appointment of the Lead Ward Member for each ward and their resulting appointments to sit on an appropriate Local Area Partnership, will be matters for the Full Council to determine, and that the Council has now appointed the 7 Local Area Partnership Chairs;

(c)   to recommend to the Council that, in view of the role profile attached to the report now submitted, it confirms that the role of Local Area Partnership Chair be established with a Special Responsibility Allowance included in the new Band C (old Band B2) of Schedule 1 to its Members' Allowances Scheme, and that the payment of this allowance be backdated to 16th May 2013 in recognition that the Chairs have been operating in shadow form since that date, helping to lay the foundations for the new ways of locality working;

(d)   to request the Chief Executive:-

(i)   to establish a pool of 14 senior officers and allocate them to an area/s to support the work of the elected ward members and the work of each Local Area Partnership;

(e)   to authorise the Director of Community Services:-

(i)   to determine how the Ward Pot Budget for each ward is spent, subject to the proviso that this authority must be exercised in close consultation with all the elected Members for the ward concerned with a view to wherever possible achieving consensus over the use of funds, and to determine the terms on which such expenditure is incurred including authorising the completion of any related

funding agreement or other legal documentation, subject to compliance with Contracts Standing Orders and Financial Regulations;

(ii) to determine the composition of and settle the terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Local Area Partnerships, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion;

(iii) to agree the detailed arrangements for the Local Area Team, subject to Council policies and procedures and due consideration of the outcome of any related consultations, and provided the arrangements are within the maximum available initial budget;

(f) to request the Chief Executive to make appropriate arrangements, in consultation with the Chair of the Scrutiny Management Committee and the Chair of the LAP Chairs' group [or whatever it's called], to facilitate the consideration of issues of local concern through the Council's scrutiny arrangements.

Background Papers:	Consultation Materials
	Equality Impact Assessment

Category of Report:	OPEN

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

Financial Implications
YES   Cleared by: Andrea Nix

Legal Implications
YES   Cleared by: Andrew Bullock

Equality of Opportunity Implications
YES   Cleared by: Phil Reid

Tackling Health Inequalities Implications
YES

Human rights Implications
NO:

Environmental and Sustainability implications
YES

Economic impact
YES

Community safety implications
YES

Human resources implications
YES

Property implications
NO

Area(s) affected
ALL

Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader
Cllr Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Communities & Inclusion

Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee if decision called in
Safer & Stronger Communities Scrutiny Committee

Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?
NO

Press release
NO

Proposal for a new approach to engaging and involving communities

1. Introduction

1.1. This paper seeks to reshape the Council's current local partnership arrangements and community engagement work with our *geographic communities*. These replace the previous Community Assembly arrangements.

1.2. The proposals contained within this paper have come about following extensive work by the *Members' Voice and Influence Task and Finish Group* and the consultation with the public that was undertaken between the 16th and 28th January 2013. A further consultation on the detailed proposals took place between 23rd April and 3rd June 2013.

1.3. Further work is being undertaken to reshape how, as a Council, we engage with communities of *interest* (such as those with a common interest who want to come together on a city wide basis, for instance tenants or environmental groups) and *identity* (e.g. older people, or people with disabilities).

1.4. The report makes proposals for how the Council could support and facilitate our work with geographic communities work more efficiently within the overall budget set by the Council, and provides a structure for the expansion of support at a later date if more resources become available. In developing proposals we want to support communities to become *stronger* and more *resilient* – more able to help themselves, gain influence, and deal with what the world throws at them.

As a result of unprecedented Government cut-backs, the Council is facing extreme pressures on increasingly limited budgets. Over the past two years the Council has received heavy cuts to its funding from Government, and has had to find savings of around £140 million. Over the last two years the Council has found these savings whilst avoiding significant impact on visible frontline services.

This year the Council had to find a further £50 million of savings, with more cuts in the following years. Efficiency savings will not be sufficient and the Council consequently has to reduce the budgets of many frontline services.

Within these constraints, the Council's approach is to protect where possible those services provided for the most vulnerable people in our community and to examine where they spend on discretionary provision.

1.5. Our aims are to ensure we reinvest the remaining resources we have in the most efficient and effective ways. This means fundamentally redesigning our approach by:

- Targeting support to communities where engagement and involvement is most needed and where capacity for self-support may be limited;

- Developing the community leadership role of Councillors in working with communities to support their interests;

- Making the ward and neighbourhood the focus of most activity rather than the much larger former Community Assembly area/meetings which few residents identified with while acknowledging that some partnership working is required at a wider area level.

1.6.   It is clear that, with the scale of reductions proposed, we will not be able to resource the breadth of locality working and associated governance arrangements across the city to former levels and support communities through grant funding to anything like the current provision. The proposals in this report provide a solid basic framework that is affordable within the budget set by Council and can be used as the foundation of locality work, which can be enhanced at a later date if required.

1.7.   Our proposals are summarised in section 2. Greater details are provided in sections 3-7 and further work will be undertaken to further develop the proposals.

1.8.   A new approach requires the development of new community planning mechanisms, new ways of undertaking community scrutiny and creative ways of involving local people, including use of social media and on line approaches. The resources available will have to:

- be targeted towards enabling communities to help themselves;

- be prioritised to areas of greatest need and tension;

- foster good relations, reduce barriers to involvement and enable inclusive communities;

- support and develop new ways of engagement; and

- support Councillors to lead in their local area.

1.9   The proposals have been developed in line with the Council's values and priorities in our corporate plan, Standing up for Sheffield, including our commitment to fairness; enabling individuals and communities; and working better together. We have been particularly mindful of the work of the Fairness Commission, and have used the Fairness Framework developed by the Commission to guide our thinking during the development of these proposals.

They particularly recognise the Commission's priority *to tackle and ameliorate those inequalities that cause the greatest damage to the life-chance and wellbeing of some Sheffield communities and individual citizens. Those in greatest need should take priority.*

The proposals will also help to contribute to the Council's outcomes of making everywhere a great place to live, and tackling poverty and increasing social justice.

2.   Proposal Summary:

Outlined below are the key elements of the new operating model.

2.1 Setting up a **ward based** approach where Ward Councillors are supported to take the lead for engaging with the communities they serve. To support the administrative and decision making processes, a **Lead Ward Member** will need to be appointed for each Ward who will be the first point of contact for communication and also represent the Ward on the **Local Area Partnership** (see 2.4 below). It is proposed that there will be a senior officer of the Council available to support the work of the Ward Councillors, covering between one and three Wards, depending on need with fourteen in total. Administrative support will be provided by the **Local Area Partnership Team**.

2.2 Establishing a **ward based discretionary budget of £300,000, called the Ward Pot**. This will be allocated at £2,000 per ward (£56,000 in total) plus £244,000 to be distributed by IMD. (Ecclesall approx. £3,570 and Manor Castle £19,664). Ward Councillors, working together and with the allocated senior officer will develop a **'Ward Plan'** consisting of a small number of priorities to inform spending decisions. These funds will then be allocated with regard to the ward priorities.

2.3 Recognising the move away from Community Assemblies as part of the City Council's formal governance structures. The former **Community Assembly geographical boundaries will continue** to support partnership working and service delivery by the Council and partners. These will be called the North Area, North East Area, East Area, South East Area, South Area, South West Area and the Central Area.

2.4 Establishing **Local Area Partnerships** for each of the Areas chaired by a lead Elected Member with an appropriate Special Member's Allowance called the **Local Area Partnership Chair**. The Local Area Partnerships will have a membership appropriate to the priority issues identified for each area. Each Local Area Partnership will be chaired by an Elected Member agreed at Full Council and include a **Lead Ward Member** from each of the remaining three wards. At a minimum, membership will include representatives from the public sector, local VCF sector, private sector and others as appropriate. Support will be provided by the Local Area Partnership Team and in addition there will be a Lead Council Officer. The LAPs will be responsible for establishing an area plan taking account of the priorities identified by the Ward Members (three per Ward.)

2.5 The arrangements will be supported by the centrally managed, flexible **Local Area Team** of officers at an initial cost of £400k. There will be a named officer for each area who will be primarily responsible for supporting the Member led Local Area Partnership which will be underpinned by the Ward based arrangements and priorities. Administrative support will be provided by the Local Area Team for the Ward based structures.

2.6 It is recognised that from time to time there will be issues arising at Ward level that will require additional resourcing and attention by the Council and partners. In such circumstances it will be for the Local Area Partnership through the Lead Council Officer and Local Area Partnership Chair to raise the issue with the Director of Community Services and the relevant Cabinet Member. Following consultation with the Corporate Management Team and discussion with appropriate services, additional resourcing may be made available as required, but this would need to be found within the Council's approved budget and be approved in accordance with the Council's usual governance arrangements. It is also proposed that there be a **Local Area**

Partnership Chairs Group, chaired by the relevant Cabinet Member with membership of the Chairs of the Local Area Partnerships.

2.7   Cabinet in the Community will continue on a rolling basis around the City and will be held in a Ward, but with an invitation to attend being extended specifically to residents and businesses in neighbouring Wards with meetings being generally open to members of the public.

Outlined below is additional detail in relation to each area identified above.

3   Locality Working – replacement of Community Assemblies

3.1   The Ward Structure:

It is proposed that we recognise what works for communities and move to a flexible, rolling programme of Ward based events that focus on the big issues in different communities and provide an opportunity for the community to engage with their Ward members and scrutinise local services .The previous approach to formal Community Assembly meetings did not attract or engage many local people. Key features of the proposals will include less bureaucratic meetings, more opportunities for local people to discuss and engage with local councillors, and more consistent links with other local events such as Police and Communities Together (PACT) and Neighbourhood Action Group (NAG) meetings, etc. These events will be led by Ward Councillors with administrative support offered by the Local Area Team.

3.2   Under a Ward based approach, we propose that as a minimum, once a year communities and local partners get together to develop ward based Ward Plans, agreeing 3 key priorities for their area. Local Councillors will lead in these events, with some administrative support from the Local Area Team and engagement by the Lead Council Officer. Depending on the type of key priorities and actions required these could be supplemented by additional Councillor-led ward based events and meetings. Where issues and activity require, local Councillors could initiate events crossing ward boundaries, to link in with the Local Area Partnerships and events.

3.3   The proposed delivery model will focus on the work of Ward Councillors at a Ward Level. A Lead Ward Councillor will be selected who will act as the key point of contact for the new structure and represent the Ward Councillors on the Local Area Partnership.

3.4   Each Ward will be presented with a periodic Ward profile that can be used, alongside the knowledge of the Ward Councillors and their engagement with their community, to establish a small number of priorities that will form the basis of a plan and for periodically reporting on progress. A template for the production of the plan will be provided to ensure a level of consistency across the 28 wards.

The Plan will be the evidence base for decisions around the Ward Pot and will also be fed into the Local Area Partnership so issues common across Wards can be taken forward in their planning process.

Each Ward will have access to a Lead Council Officer (total of 14 taken from the Council's Senior Management Team) who can provide advice and support on developing a plan and also act as the first point of contact for Ward Councillors if existing channels of communication with the Council are problematic.

Ward Councillors will also be given an information pack of key contacts within the Council so they know who to raise Ward issues with and to raise questions or concerns.

They will receive regular eBriefs and training to ensure they have access to up-to date information about services and the City which they may find useful in terms of leading their Communities.

Administrative support and resources will be available to enable them to hold up-to four events/meetings a year at which they may wish to engage with their local communities, invite services to discuss delivery issues or undertake walk-abouts. (This list is in no way exhaustive: Ward members will have other formats which they wish to work with.)

3.5 Ward Pot

There will be a budget allocation for each Ward to help the delivery of identified Ward Priorities. This will be a light touch grant programme, but Council Standing Orders will be followed. Beneficiaries could be eligible groups, organisations or public sector services. Ward funds could be used to fund Council activity that would not otherwise be undertaken.

3.6 Each Ward would be allocated a minimum amount of £2,000 (equivalent to £56,000 across all 28 wards). A further £244,000 will be distributed according to need across the City.

The needs based element of the allocation to each ward will be decided using the National **Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)**. IMD shows comparative level of multiple deprivations across England at a small area level and links to the findings of the Fairness Commission.

It will also be possible for Members to use the ward budgets to join forces with other wards (i.e. on joint projects) or to match fund other local programmes (e.g. Community First).

This is in line with the first point of the Fairness Framework produced by the city's Fairness Commission's report, namely:

The first priority is for the city to tackle and ameliorate those inequalities that cause the greatest damage to the life-chance and wellbeing of some Sheffield communities and individual citizens. Those in greatest need should take priority.

3.7 It is proposed that decisions about expenditure of Ward based budgets are delegated to the Director of Community Service, with the proviso that this authority must be

exercised in close consultation with all the Ward Members, and with a view to achieving, where possible, consensus over the use of funds.

There will be no additional cost of administering the Ward Pot, which will be done within existing resources.

Outlined below is the proposed allocation for each Ward.

Discretionary Budget:		£300,000	
Apportioned by IMD with minimum allocation			
	Minimum Allocation	£2,000	

Ward	Minimum Allocation	IMD Allocation	Total Allocation
Arbourthorne	£2,000	£15,032	**£17,032**
Beauchief and Greenhill	£2,000	£9,925	**£11,925**
Beighton	£2,000	£5,901	**£7,901**
Birley	£2,000	£8,723	**£10,723**
Broomhill	£2,000	£4,674	**£6,674**
Burngreave	£2,000	£15,359	**£17,359**
Central	£2,000	£10,611	**£12,611**
Crookes	£2,000	£2,499	**£4,499**
Darnall	£2,000	£12,903	**£14,903**
Dore and Totley	£2,000	£2,274	**£4,274**
East Ecclesfield	£2,000	£6,796	**£8,796**
Ecclesall	£2,000	£1,570	**£3,570**
Firth Park	£2,000	£17,394	**£19,394**
Fulwood	£2,000	£1,992	**£3,992**
Gleadless Valley	£2,000	£12,638	**£14,638**
Graves Park	£2,000	£4,486	**£6,486**
Hillsborough	£2,000	£6,494	**£8,494**
Manor Castle	£2,000	£17,664	**£19,664**
Mosborough	£2,000	£7,127	**£9,127**
Nether Edge	£2,000	£4,895	**£6,895**
Richmond	£2,000	£11,200	**£13,200**
Shiregreen and Brightside	£2,000	£13,334	**£15,334**
Southey	£2,000	£15,314	**£17,314**
Stannington	£2,000	£5,048	**£7,048**
Stocksbridge and Upper Don	£2,000	£6,094	**£8,094**
Walkley	£2,000	£8,655	**£10,655**
West Ecclesfield	£2,000	£6,165	**£8,165**
Woodhouse	£2,000	£9,234	**£11,234**
Total	**£56,000**	**£244,000**	**£300,000**

3.8 Local Area Partnerships

Though the proposal is that the focus of the new locality arrangements will be at ward level, there are some advantages in retaining the current seven geographical areas of the city as operational entities. This will be reviewed, but in the first instance it is

Page 164

proposed to retain current boundaries and to call them simply 'Areas' This will prevent disruption to other agencies who have focused their work around the seven Community Assembly areas, and also ensure there are no unnecessary administrative costs in changing boundaries,'.

The Local Government Boundary Review for Sheffield to be completed by March 2015 will lead to changes to ward boundaries, and wider organisational boundaries, and therefore the boundaries of the Local Area Partnerships will be reviewed at this point.

3.9   Partnership working will remain an integral feature of the new arrangements and it is proposed that good practice from the existing partner panels is continued. This will involve creating seven Local Area Partnerships (one for each area), with active involvement from local and city organisations, businesses and the voluntary sector.

These will be different to the former Partner Panels as they will be led by Councillors and will focus on becoming structures as much owned by partners as the Council. We will be working with the Sheffield Executive Board to develop the approach further.

It is envisaged that these Local Area Partnerships will operate as the key arena in which Councillors, in partnership with the community, can take forward actions to address the area's priorities and also act as the place where local services and issues can be scrutinised. The particular partners who will sit on the Local Area Partnerships will be determined locally, in line with the needs of different parts of the city.

3.10   To ensure that the Local Area Partnerships are informed by and respond to the needs of local communities, they will be chaired by an elected member from the area selected by Full Council and will have representation from one elected member (the lead Ward Member) from each of the other three wards in that area. Together they will be responsible for producing an Area Plan that will be informed by the priorities identified within the Ward Plans. They will be supported by Senior Officers from across the Partnership, and an officer from the Local Area Team.

The role profile for the role of Local Area Partnership Chair is attached at Appendix A.

4. The Local Area Team (LAT)

4.1   The proposed staffing arrangements are affordable within the budget agreed by Full Council in March 2013. It is possible to grow or shrink the proposals, dependent upon future affordability.

4.2   It is proposed that a team of around 11 FTE officers is created to support as a priority, the Local Area Partnerships and priority issues and activity in the area. It is also envisaged that the team will support ward councillors by helping them arrange their Ward meetings/events. The level of practical support will depend upon the resources available, but in the first instance will focus on basic administrative functions. The team's main priority will be to support ward Councillors in dealing with pressing local issues – e.g. escalating community tensions, friction relating to a development, after-effects of serious incidents, development opportunities etc.

4.3   The team will maintain officer links with different geographical localities of the city, although its work will focus primarily on supporting the Local Area Partnership

arrangements. Areas where our strategic and operational intelligence suggests tensions are high, or where there is major change or cause for concern (e.g. when flagged through community tension monitoring for example) will also receive some additional support.

4.4   A key feature of the move to a Ward based model will be increased engagement of senior Council officers (to be called the Lead Council Officer) to build strong relationships with influential local partners, and facilitate partnership working as required.

4.5   In addition to the Local Area Team, it is proposed that there will be 14 such senior Council Officers . They will not be a new, dedicated resource and, instead will need to manage the role as part of their normal day to day job. The number of wards a Lead Council Officer is linked to will depend on the geography, size and complexity of the issues faced by that part of that city.

4.6   The Lead Council Officer's role will firstly be to help local Councillors and communities plan and prioritise for their area, and to assist the Local Area Partnerships in seeking active engagement and leadership from partner agencies locally. Secondly, they will respond to crises in the neighbourhood, galvanising services and agencies to help resolve issues. This role has been built into the new Director/Heads of Service job descriptions created as part of the senior management review. It is expected that this will be for 2 wards on average, but ranging between 1 and 3 wards (depending on the level of challenge in the areas covered). The role of the Lead Council Officer would be to deal with local issues by exception, galvanizing support from other officers.

4.7   The detailed working arrangements for the Local Area Partnership and the Lead Council Officer are still under development and it is proposed that they be finalised by the Director of Community Services in consultation with the Lead Cabinet Member.

5. Cabinet in the Community:

5.1   In order to maintain a direct link with key decision makers, 'Cabinet in the Community' is proposed to be retained as a regular feature, giving the opportunity for local people and agencies to raise local issues with the Council's Cabinet Team. It is expected that the Local Area Team would take account of the issues being raised through these routes when determining how best to prioritise their activity

6. Support to Ward Councillors

6.1   It is recognised that this new way of working will place additional responsibilities and demands on the individual ward Councillors. To support the transitional arrangements, Councillors will be given clear support and guidance on how the new arrangements may operate and encourage innovative approaches to the role.

6.2   In addition to the induction programme, all Members will be supported by:

- New guidance on the ward arrangements including organising community events and running meetings; promoting local engagement and communications; the new funding arrangements; and expectations on services in responding to Ward plans.

- Annually updated ward information packs covering profiles of each ward, key issues and strategic developments, and information on key service providers, external partners and Voluntary, Community and Faith organisations and forums operating in each ward.

- Direct engagement in consultation activity on specific service development activity directly impacting on their areas and notification of strategic plans and proposals affecting adjoining wards that Members may wish to discuss locally

- Publication of the schedule of ward events to discuss local issues and agree local priorities, as part of overall approaches designed to get closer and listen to communities, and strengthen the role of Elected Members as community leaders

- Councillors to be supported to use social media effectively to help them in their role as community leaders, and to aid communication and engagement with their communities and stakeholders.

7. Escalating Ward Issues:

7.1 It is proposed that the existing Community Assembly Chairs' Group is maintained. This will be chaired by the relevant Cabinet Member. Membership will include the chair of each Local Area Partnership and officers from the Local Area Team. This body will not hold any formal decision making powers. Lead Council Officers will also be invited to attend at the request of the chair.

7.2 It is recognised that from time to time there will be a need for ward councillors to escalate issues that require additional resources or a corporate response. In the first instance issues should be raised with the relevant member of the Local Area Team, Lead Council Officer and Local Area Partnership Chair. Ultimately it may be for the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion to decide on the best course of action, but as a guide:

- Issues that are Area (rather than Ward) specific should be raised at the Local Area Partnership via the Lead Ward Councillor.

- Issues of service delivery should be raised with the relevant Head of Service.

- Issues of policy should be raised with the relevant Cabinet Member in accordance with the Leader's Scheme of Delegation.

- Issues that are complex or require a 'whole Council' response should go to the Director of Community Services and the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion for consideration of how best to proceed, within the Council's governance arrangements.

7.3 Arrangements will be developed to ensure that issues of local concern influence the work programme of the Council's scrutiny arrangements.

7.4 It is recognised that with reduced resourcing some of the Councillor requests that were historically addressed by staff within Locality Management (particularly around case work, service requests/enquiries, meeting arranging) can no longer be provided at the

same level. However, as with any transitional arrangement, expectations will need to be managed and priorities assessed. This will be an on-going process and discussion and will primarily take place through the Local Area Chairs' Group, to ensure consistency across the City.

8. Consultation

8.1 The Council has undertaken a 6 week consultation on these proposals. This has included public meetings in each of the seven areas, full information on the Council's website, an on-line survey, and an all-day summary event held at St Mary's Community Centre. The consultation closed on 3rd June 2013.

8.2 The consultation has told us that there were a range of views about the best way forward. However the largest number of respondents (90) thought the proposals were a reasonable way forward given the budget available (some with a few reservations). 69 responses were undecided or unspecified and 51 did not agree.

The majority of responses (109) were undecided or unspecified about whether the proposals took account of the varying needs of Sheffield's residents. 60 responses did not agree and 40 responses agreed.

A range of ideas and suggestions were received as part of the consultation.

8.3 The full consultation report is attached at Appendix B.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 The proposals are designed to meet the budget agreed by Full Council in March 2013, while providing ward members and communities with the support they need.

9.2 This represents a reduction from £2.6m in 2011/12 to £580k in 2012/13, which forms part of the Council's response to the need to reduce spending by £50m over the year.

9.3 The proposals in this report increase the budget for Local Area Partnership arrangements from £580k to £700k, increasing the number of officers from 6.5 to 9.5. This has been achieved by transferring in extra resources from the Cohesion, Migration and Safety Team. All resources are included in the Council's base budget for 2013/14.

10. HR Implications

10.1 The reduction in staffing will be managed within the Council's HR processes and procedures. Where possible, mitigation against redundancy will be put in place.

11. Legal Implications

11.1 The proposed arrangements set out in this report are designed to comply with the law relating to the delegation of powers to Members and Officers.

11.2 This report proposes that the Director of Community Services be given delegated power to allocate the ward fund. At this stage it is not known exactly how these funds will be applied. Therefore, the legal implications which arise from specific proposals will have

to be addressed when specific proposals are formulated, in consultation with officers in Legal Services.

11.3 However, it is likely that in implementing the proposals reliance will be placed on the 'general power of competence' (the 'GPC') conferred on the Council by Section 1(1), Localism Act 2011. Section 1(1) provides that, "A local authority has power to do anything that individuals generally may do." This is clearly a very broad power. It is not, however, carte blanche for the Council to act in any way it pleases. As one example of this, Section 2(1) provides that, "If exercise of a pre-commencement power of a local authority is subject to restrictions, those restrictions apply also to exercise of the general power so far as it is overlapped by the pre-commencement power."

11.4 The procurement of any goods, works or services must be undertaken in accordance with all relevant provisions of Sheffield City Council's Constitution including the Council's Contracts Standing Orders and Financial Regulations and all applicable procurement rules.

11.5 In exercising their discretion, the Cabinet and Officers exercising delegated powers need to be mindful of the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. This is the duty to have due regard to the need to:-

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;

(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and

(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

This includes having due regard to the need to:-

(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; and

(b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it.

Generally speaking Section 158 of the Act permits the Council to take positive action where this is a proportionate means of:-

(a) enabling or encouraging persons who share a protected characteristic to overcome or minimise a disadvantage connected to that characteristic,

(b) meeting the needs of persons who share a protected characteristic which are different from the needs of persons who do not share it, or

(c) enabling or encouraging persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in an activity in which participation by persons sharing that characteristic is disproportionately low.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation.

12. Equality Impact

12.1 An Equality Impact Assessment was completed as part of the Council's budget process. The proposals outlined will have a range of potential equality impacts due to the reduction in funding and support to Communities in Sheffield. However, the EIA and analysis of consultation findings does not suggest that the recommendations in this report should lead to any disproportionate negative or discriminatory impact on particular groups, as long as mitigating actions identified in the EIA are implemented.

12.2 Mitigating actions identified in the initial EIA included:

- on-going monitoring of the fund and priorities will be built into the process and will include equality information;
- each ward will have a profile completed to inform decision making that provides information about the demography and needs within each area;
- the work of Assembly Team members will be assessed during the process of transition to identify functions and roles that can either cease, be transferred to another party and alternative arrangements put in place.

12.2 Numbers of responses in the consultation from different equality groups do not provide any statistical certainty for analysis, however on the basis of responses provided it appears there is no significant difference in responses in terms of protected groups.

12.3 Some issues, concerns, and suggestions were highlighted by individuals and groups which relate to protected groups (for example about the accessibility/inclusivity of future models of engagement with the community and groups) but these do not suggest that the proposals would lead to any disproportionate negative or discriminatory impact on particular groups. Issues that do arise will be addressed during implementation of the proposed model. Some community cohesion concerns/perceptions were also highlighted, which would need to be considered particularly as part of the communications about the new model.

13. Reasons for Recommendations:

The proposed model is recommended on the basis that it:

- targets support to communities where engagement and involvement is most needed and where capacity for self-support may be limited;

- develops the community leadership role of councillors in working with communities to support their interests;

- makes the ward and neighbourhood the focus of most activity rather than the much larger former Community Assembly area/meetings which few residents identified with, while acknowledging that some partnership working is required at a wider area level;

- would enable the ward pot arrangements to be up and running before the summer to ensure that the small investments that make a big difference can enhance provision during the summer holidays. These proposals would establish the Ward Pot guidance and decision making process as soon as possible;

- has taken into account the consultation and equalities impact assessment;

- is within the budget set by the Council.

Recommendations:

Cabinet is recommended to agree the proposals set out in this report and in particular:-

(a)   to agree the creation of a Ward Pot Budget of £300,000 to be allocated between the City's 28 electoral wards as described in paragraph 3.3;

(b)   to note that the appointment of the Lead Ward Member for each ward and their resulting appointments to sit on an appropriate Local Area Partnership, will be matters for the Full Council to determine, and that the Council has now appointed the 7 Local Area Partnership Chairs;

(c)   to recommend to the Council that, in view of the role profile attached to the report now submitted, it confirms that the role of Local Area Partnership Chair be established with a Special Responsibility Allowance included in the new Band C (old Band B2) of Schedule 1 to its Members' Allowances Scheme, and that the payment of this allowance be backdated to 16th May 2013 in recognition that the Chairs have been operating in shadow form since that date, helping to lay the foundations for the new ways of locality working;

(d)   to request the Chief Executive:-

   (i)   to establish a pool of 14 senior officers and allocate them to an area/s to support the work of the elected ward members and the work of each Local Area Partnership;

(e)   to authorise the Director of Community Services:-

   (i)   to determine how the Ward Pot Budget for each ward is spent, subject to the proviso that this authority must be exercised in close consultation with all the elected Members for the ward concerned with a view to wherever possible achieving consensus over the use of funds, and to determine the terms on which such expenditure is incurred including authorising the completion of any related funding agreement or other legal documentation, subject to compliance with Contracts Standing Orders and Financial Regulations;

   (ii)   to determine the composition of and settle the terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Local Area Partnerships, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion;

   (iii)   to agree the detailed arrangements for the Local Area Team, subject to Council policies and procedures and due consideration of the outcome of any related

consultations, and provided the arrangements are within the maximum available initial budget;

(f)   to request the Chief Executive to make appropriate arrangements, in consultation with the Chair of the Scrutiny Management Committee and the Chair of the LAP Chairs' group [or whatever it's called], to facilitate the consideration of issues of local concern through the Council's scrutiny arrangements.

Terms used in this report:

Local Area Partnership: The partnership that covers an area of 4 Wards

Local Area Partnership Chair: The elected Member selected by Council to Chair this meeting.

The Lead Ward Councillor: The elected Member selected to represent the Ward on the Local Area Partnership.

Lead Council Officer: One of 14 senior officers of the Council selected to support the Ward Councillors and Local Area Partnerships.

Ward Pot: The amount allocated to each Ward from the over allocation of £300,000.

APPENDIX A

Role of Local Area Partnership Chair

1. Background:

Within the emerging operating framework there are new roles for a Local Area Partnership Chair and Lead Council Officer. Outlined in this briefing are potential role profiles for the functions.

2. Local Area Partnership Chair: Draft role profile

2.1 <u>Role and responsibilities of the Local Area Partnership Chair (7 in total)</u>

The Lead Area Member will be appointed at Annual Council and have the key roles of:

- Chairing the Local Area Partnership and other meetings supporting the decision making process
- Owning a Local Area Plan on behalf of the Partnership
- Representing the Local Area Partnership
- Supporting the enhanced role of Ward Councillors.

2.2 The Chair will be expected to encourage and support the active participation of Ward Councillors on the Local Area Partnership, local residents and key partners, in all elements of the work of the Elected Members, including:

- Establishment and future development of the Local Area Partnership
- Preparation, agreement, implementation, and monitoring of an Area Plan
- Identifying and implementing approaches to effective Community involvement
- Influencing service delivery at a local level.
- Ensuring the Local Area Partnership operates in a manner that effectively represents the interests of the wider local community
- Liaising with the Local Area Team and Lead Officers to plan and co-ordinate the Local Area Partnership work programme and forward plan.
- Proactively liaising with Council Officers and partners/agencies to achieve the objectives of the Area Plan and ensure that the outcomes are delivered and funding decisions are consistent with any statutory, funding or other requirements, including the Council's Constitution, Financial Framework, Standing Orders and Commissioning and Procurement Guidelines.
- Ensuring that the Local Area Partnership works effectively with service providers to ensure the provision of services that meet local needs.
- Contributing to a combined periodic report on progress, setting out the Local Area Partnership's achievements to the Council and partners as required.
- The Lead Elected Member will have the key role of representing the Council in all dealings with the public, media and other bodies in respect of the work of the Local Area Partnership. This will involve:
- Representing the views of the Local Area Partnership based on decisions made and views expressed at relevant meetings and forums

- Representing the interests of the Local Ward Members and local community through two way communication with the Council and other key decision makers. This includes exercising rights:

  ▪ to put views and recommendations to Cabinet on issues of strategy and policy
  ▪ to draw matters to the attention of a Scrutiny and Policy Board
  ▪ to draw matters to the attention of the Chief Executive or relevant Executive Director
  ▪ representing the Local Area Partnership at events across the area as appropriate, cross area co-ordinating arrangements, city-wide events, and meetings with neighbouring Ward Members and Area Partnerships.

2.3   Chairing Local Area Partnership Meetings

The Local Area Partnership Meetings will involve three Lead Ward Members from the other 3 Wards in each Area, representatives from the Local VCF sector and public sector and private sector partners as appropriate . There will be a minimum of three meetings a year based around the requirements of the Area Plan. These meetings can use a structure relevant to the work of the Partnership. Some may be held in public as Q&A sessions or discussion forums, others may be held in private to explore key issues affecting the local area.

At these meetings, the Chair will oversee:

a) agreeing and checking delivery of the Area Plan including assessing quantitative and qualitative information
b) directing how local services should be delivered to achieve improvements
d) considering and expressing views on what services and partners are asking the Local Area Partnership
e) exploring and informing major council and partner activity such as new developments, regeneration schemes or service redesign
f) considering issues arising from Ward Members that require direction and action.
g) elevating issues to the Council for additional resourcing and prioritisation

2.4   Support

The Local Area Partnership Chair will be supported by:

- the Local Area Team who will advise on all agreed agenda items
- the Lead Council Officer who will advise on issues concerning Council policy and protocols and governance standards (including standing orders)
- the Local Area Partnership Chairs Group that will meet monthly, chaired by the lead Cabinet Member to discuss the operation of the Local Area Partnerships across the City and explore cross area boundary issues.

3.   Lead Council Officer (formerly Lead Director) – Draft Job Profile

The Lead Council Officers (14 in total) will be selected by the Executive Management Team.

They will be at Director or Head of Service Level (AD level).

They will cover between 1-3 Wards depending upon the comparative priority of each Ward (i.e. Wards that are seen as high priority because of need may have a dedicated Lead Council Officer, Wards with less pressing issues may share a Lead Council Officer with up-to 3 Wards).

They will support the Ward Members in:

- Identifying 3 Priorities for the Ward
- Providing advice and guidance on the workings of the Council and managing case work
- Being the first point of contact for addressing issues and problems that require advice and guidance
- Reporting on progress and issues for resolution
- Managing difficult situations, conflict and problem solving.

They will also:

- Represent the Council on the Local Area Partnerships
- Support the Local Action Partnership Chair on performing their function and role (see Draft Role Profile) for
- Promote joined up action at the Area and Ward level
- Help develop the Area Plans and report on progress
- Advise on appropriate courses of action and options in terms of addressing priorities within the area.
- Problem solve
- Ensure that the Local Area Partnership is fit for purpose and has clear aims, objectives and representation from the key stakeholders, including the Local VCF sector and community advocates.

They will receive administrative officer support from the Local Area Team (named officer) and the Head of Locality Management.

Vince Roberts – Head of Locality Management
12.3.13

Sheffield City Council

Evaluation of responses to Community Assembly Consultation

Budget Proposals 2013/14

Consultation Report

June 2013

Contents Page

1. Executive Summary

1.1. Sheffield has 7 Community Assemblies and makes Discretionary Grants Budget payments totalling £1.6 million. A total of £2.6 million investment has previously been made in Locality Management per annum. In order to achieve the budget savings in 2013/14, budget proposals affecting Community Assemblies and Discretionary Grants Budgets were put forward. As part of the proposals £2 million savings would be generated per annum.

1.3. A Public consultation relating to detailed proposals was carried out to ensure that the Public were engaged in the decision making process and were given the opportunity to influence the proposals.

1.4. The consultation was carried out in two parts. The first part ran between 16th January and 28th January 2013 and outlined the proposals. The results of the consultation were used by Elected Members to inform the budget decisions.

1.5. On 1 March 2013 the budget for 2013/14 was formally agreed for implementation by Members at the Full Council Meeting.

1.6. The majority of respondents were in support of ending the Community Assembly structure.

1.7. The second part of the Consultation ran between 23rd April and 3rd June 2013 and consulted on more detailed proposals.

1.8. The purpose of this report is to outline the second part of the consultation which has taken place and analyse the feedback.

1.9. In total 248 responses were received. Of these responses 107 were from individuals and 20 responses were from groups/organisations. 99 people attended events across the city and 23 people attended the drop in event at St Mary's Community Centre.

1.10. There wasn't an overall majority view however the largest number of responses (90) thought the proposals were a reasonable way forward given the budget available (some with a few reservations). 69 responses were undecided or unspecified and 51 did not agree.

1.11. The majority of responses (109) were undecided or unspecified about whether the proposals took account of the varying needs of Sheffield's residents. 60 responses did not agree and 40 responses agreed.

1.12. A range of ideas and suggestions were received as part of the consultation.

2. Rationale for proposals

2.1. The detailed proposals were developed to support communities to become more resilient, and explained how the Council might support and facilitate local engagement and partnership working more efficiently.

2.2. This would mean fundamentally redesigning services to:-

- target support to communities where engagement and involvement is most needed.
- develop the community leadership role of councillors in working with communities to support their interests.
- making ward and neighbourhoods the focus of most activity
- support effective partnership working
- foster good relations, reduce barriers to involvement and enable inclusive and cohesive communities
- support and develop new ways of engagement including use of social media.

3. The Consultation Aims

3.1. To ensure that stakeholders were aware that the consultation was taking place

3.2. To provide an opportunity for everyone to shape the proposals affecting the future of Locality Management Services.

3.3. To ensure that Consultation provided the opportunity for a broad range of people to respond.

3.4. To ensure that the Consultation results were available to Elected members to take into account during their decision making.

4. Consultation Methodology and Process

4.1. Information about the detailed proposals (Appendix 1), frequently asked questions (Appendix 2) and an Easy Read version were produced and circulated.

4.2. A map of the proposed area boundaries was published online and used at the events.

4.3. The consultation sought feedback on the following questions:

> 1. Do you think the proposals are a reasonable way forward given the budget available?
>
> 2. Do you think the proposals take account of the varying needs of Sheffield's diverse citizens and areas?
>
> 3. Is there anything else you would like to say about the proposals or any other ideas that you would like to share?

4.4. There were several ways to respond by:

- completing paper copies of the Feedback Form, an optional Monitoring Form and submitting via the freepost address
- electronically using the online tool
- emailing comments, suggestions or views
- speaking to a member of staff via telephone and completing the form or offering opinion
- attending a consultation event in each of the Community Assembly areas
- attending a drop in event

4.5. The consultation documentation was published online and was available in other formats by request (e.g. braille, audio, large print etc.)

4.6. The Consultation Webpage was signposted from Sheffield City Council Homepage, In the News, Community News, Twitter and individual Community Assembly webpages and blogs and publicised on Schoolpoint.

4.7. A poster with all meeting dates was circulated for display in Community Assembly Area notice boards.

4.8.   The events were carried out across the city during daytime and evening and provided an opportunity for discussion and direct engagement with a wide range of stakeholders.

4.9.   The majority of events were scheduled for 2 hours and the agenda was adapted for events which were less than 2 hours.

4.10.   The events consisted of:

- A presentation on the rationale for proposals by Head of Locality Management.
- A presentation on the consultation so far & the purpose of part 2 by the Quality Team, Business Strategy Service.
- Facilitated group exercise to seek views on the proposals

4.11.   A daytime drop-in event at St Mary's Community Centre took place on 20th May 2013 to share the consultation feedback to date and to provide a further opportunity for discussion or comments on the proposals.

4.12.   The deadline for responses was originally 30 May 2013 but was subsequently extended to 3 June 2013 to allow maximum public engagement.

4.13.   The distribution/mailing lists included individuals, community groups, and other key stakeholders (Appendix 11)

4.14.   Reminder emails were sent 1st and 2nd May 2013 to additionally target younger, minority ethnic and disabled people.

5. Consultation Responses

5.1. In total 248 responses were received. The Table below shows the type of response:

Type of Response*	Total
Feedback Form – paper copy	71
Feedback Form – email	11
Online**	25
Email – general comment	18
Telephone	1
Attended Community Assembly Area event	99
Attended Central event	23
Total	**248**

* Some people who contributed to group activities at the area events also attended the daytime drop-in event at St Mary's Community Centre and submitted Feedback Forms individually.

5.2. Of these responses 107 were from individuals and 20 responses were from groups/organisations.

6. Summary of Responses

6.1. Despite wide spread publicity the consultation did not generate wide interest.

6.2. A range of responses from men, women, young people, disabled and minority ethnic groups, faith/religion/beliefs and postcodes were received (Appendix 12). However, given the small number of responses it is not possible to draw statistical conclusions about the views of protected groups as described in the Equality Act 2010 (Appendix 13).

6.3. In view of the different ways of responding this document summarises responses by individuals, organisation/group and events

6.4. The range of comments are detailed rather then each individual comment. Some of the comments were made by more than one person.

Individual Responses

6.5. There was a diverse spread of opinions about whether the proposals were reasonable way forward given the budget available. 41 responses agreed (some with a few reservations), 36 did not agree and 30 were undecided or unspecified.

6.6. The majority of individual responses (44) did not agree that the proposals took account of the varying needs of Sheffield's residents but note 39 were undecided or unspecified and 24 agreed.

Organisation/Group Responses

6.7. The table below details the number of participants or number of people the group/organisation represented:

Group/Organisation	Number
7 responses not specified	0
7 responses with 2 participants	14
1 response	3
1 response	9
1 response	12
1 response	17
1 response	120
1 response	1500
Total	**1675**

6.8.   The majority of organisation/group responses (14) agreed the proposals were a reasonable way) forward given the budget available (some with a few reservations. 4 responses did not agree and 2 response was unspecified.

6.9.   The majority of organisation/group responses (10) thought the proposals took account of the varying needs of Sheffield's residents, 6 responses did not agree and 4 responses were unspecified or undecided.

Event Responses

6.10. It was noticeable that the responses varied between areas.

6.11. There was a diverse spread of opinions about whether the proposals were reasonable way forward given the budget available. 37 responses were undecided or unspecified, 35 agreed (some with a few reservations) and 11 responses disagreed

6.12. Discussion about whether the proposals took account of the varying needs of Sheffield's residents centered on whether the budget should be allocated using Index of Multiple Deprivation.

6.13. The majority of the responses at the events were undecided or unspecified (67) that the proposals took account of the varying needs of Sheffield's residents. 10 responses did not agree and 6 responses agreed.

7. Summary of Responses by question

Q1 Do you think the proposals are a reasonable way forward given the budget available?

Responses	Yes	Yes (with a few reservations)	No	Undecided	Unspecified	Total
Individual	16	25	36	15	15	111
Organisation/Group	10	4	4		2	20
Event*						
Central	1	9		2	1	13
East					10	10
South		2	5		0	7
South East	3				1	4
North (Ecclesfield)	1	7		1	0	9
North East	1	9		1	1	12
South West		1	4	4	13	22
North (Stocksbridge)	1		2	2	1	6
Event Total	7	28	11	10	27	83
Grand Total	33	57	51	25	44	304

*Notes:

- Not everyone who participated in a group activity took part in the straw poll
- For purposes of this report Councillor voting has been excluded.
- Straw poll did not take place at the drop in event or the East event due shorter agenda

Individual Responses:-

- Excellent that funding is targeted to areas of greatest deprivation
- In isolation proposals seem reasonable but need to understand context of budget cuts elsewhere (e.g. keeping libraries open)

- What individuals have reservations about:
    - the way the pot is divided
    - the ratio between the admin costs of £280,000 and grants dispersed of £300,000
    - 50% of budget spent on administration of sum of money that is peanuts in Council terms
    - £2,000 plus IMD allocation is too insignificant to make a difference
    - It seems weighted towards some areas
    - Allocations should be weighted for population size
    - IMD calculation not fair or immediately transparent
    - Every ward has pockets of deprivation that will not be tackled equally by using IMD formula
    - Funding goes to large groups in Manor, Woodthorpe small groups will be left out
    - Some concerns about mechanisms for monitoring funding and loss of local knowledge as support team shrinks and is centralised.
    - Doesn't provide grants for activities that support people drawn from across the city
    - Need to see the essentials of democracy, transparency, accountability and participation as well as representation embedded in the structure and policy.

- What individuals don't agree with:
    - Less on staff and more should be allocated to the Ward Fund
    - Unequal distribution of money
    - Impossible to take into account substantial varying needs
    - The money is likely to go into small projects that win 'beauty contests' with the councillors/ favoured areas
    - Consultation between Councillors and community is impossible
    - Removes local accountability
    - Reallocate small amounts to services like libraries, Don Valley Stadium, Stocksbridge Leisure Centre
    - Areas should be same as "housing areas"

- What individuals are undecided about:
    - Unclear what local priorities funds will be used for
    - Motivation for getting involved with small sums at stake

Group/Organisation Responses:-

- What groups/organisations have reservations about:
    - Small amounts will have limited impact
    - Bias in Councillors allocating funds
    - Consultations take place locally
    - Accountability
    - Funding opportunities are equally available to all irrespective of size, affiliation or location.
    - Communities who were empowered by grants from the Community Assembly Structure will miss out financially under the new system, but will hopefully be involved in setting the local action plans.
    - 50% of the budget allocated for staffing
    - Principle of equitable distribution of discretionary funding welcomed but pot should be equitably divided so that each ward has 1/28th of the total
    - Some voluntary bodies that have previous received support may now find they are unable to continue to provide some of the services they have previously supplied in their local area
    - Planned changes will add further layers of confusion about the processes and procedures

- What groups/organisations don't agree with:
    - All areas should get the same amount of cash to share the cost of roads, lighting, policing, rubbish disposal etc.
    - No meaningful sign of political will for genuine community involvement

- What individuals are undecided about:
    - Local democracy means it is vital that the approach to local decision-making is genuine and inclusive. It should not be centrally controlled.

Page 187

Event Responses:-

- What people at the events like about the proposals:
  - There is some logic to the ward based relationships in proposals.
  - Partnership working is a good idea - opportunity to pool resources of various partner's health, police etc. More coordination and less duplication.
  - Social media could support/network
  - Ward based discussion/engagement better/more local emphasis

- What people at the events have reservations about:
  - £280,000 for administration of £300,000 is obscene/too much
  - Would be fairer to have more equitable distribution with larger minimum allocation (£3-4k) but Dore would have more than they need.
  - Differences between wards are too wide (e.g. Manor and Ecclesall). Some kind of averaging should be built in.
  - Not happy with IMD at ward level should be at a neighbourhood level/ greater sensitivity needed.
  - Wards with the highest allocations have already had considerable amounts of funding various sources not seen much progress/improvement.
  - Funding should be available citywide for things like crossings of roads, services for old people.
  - More clarity about pooling of resources and how this is going to work between wards.
  - Concerns on monitoring - need to be clear regarding evidence and monitoring systems especially for new groups.
  - Face-to-face public accountability/transparency
  - Social media remote and impersonal
  - The proposals don't foster inclusive and cohesive communities or reduce barriers to involvement. Enhances/increases existing polarisation in the city.
  - This is about influence, not decision-making/local democracy
  - Worried about money being wasted by communities.
  - Flexibility but need to have some minimum standards, sharing of best practice/ guidelines.
  - Seems complicated in relation to layers of staff. Structure within Council is confusing.
  - Councillors to take lead and be first point of contact for citizens. Officers don't have knowledge to act quickly enough.
  - Everything centrally based, will lose local knowledge

- Some concern/reservations expressed about the capacity of 'Directors' given their existing roles
- Continuity and stability of team members
- Cabinet in the Community more accountable but should be longer
- Concerns about 4 wards in each area, not like with like
- A review of the process after a year
- Area arrangements needed but needs to work well.
- Boundary divisions are artificial
- Concern about how ward/area dialogue can work
- Not made decisions of best value but strategically beneficial to Council (with specific reference to Sheffield Activity)
- People should be involved in Local Action Partnerships – there should be public meetings
- Communication is going to be key in model. Don't rely on internet and social media. Use the local press, newsletters, blogs etc
- On the other side social media is growing trend and a lot of people are using it. It's about getting the right balance to ensure you meet a wide an audience as possible
- Meetings need to be balanced. Older people, unemployed. Afternoons and evenings for those who work full time. One day as a drop in to share for those on shift work
- Better promotion, less jargon. More user friendly ways of accessing information

Page 189

Q2 Do you think the proposals take account of the varying needs of Sheffield's diverse citizens and areas?

Responses	Yes	No	Undecided	Unspecified	Total
Individual	24	44	25	14	111
Organisation/Group	10	6	3	1	20
Events*					
Central		2	3	8	13
East				10	10
South		2		5	7
South East	1		1	2	4
North (Ecclesfield)	3	1	2	3	9
North East	1	2	1	8	12
South West		2	1	19	22
North (Stocksbridge)	1	1	1	3	6
Event Total	**6**	**10**	**9**	58	83
Grand Total	**40**	**60**	**37**	72	304

*Notes:

- Not everyone who participated in a group activity took part in the straw poll
- For purposes of this report Councillor voting has been excluded.
- Straw poll did not take place at the drop in event or the East event due shorter agenda

Individual responses:

- What individuals don't agree with:
  - Disadvantaged citizens discriminated against based on their postcode.
  - Older residents deserve decent roads & footpaths.
  - Children should have decent and safe play areas
  - Spend the £280,000 on local services or put towards £50m savings
  - A larger fixed element (e.g. £5,000)
  - Need to listen to the public; it seems to alienate some areas.
  - Somali groups do not get help from anyone, so small groups finish - small groups need help.
  - A lot of projects funded by assemblies can no longer be done e.g. bring out rubbish days, cleaning and scrubbing.
  - Use of IMD values at ward level is simplistic. It takes no account of facilities used by people from all over the city.
  - Still giving money to favoured areas
  - Whilst money can be saved by pooling functions the spread of resources is very poor/thin/limited impact
  - More services / committees should be cut to reduce taxation.
  - Impossible to take into account substantially varying needs with such small amounts
  - Councillors should work within their Wards gaining information at existing meetings as to what local people feel their locality needs (TARA,Youth clubs, Surgery's, lunch clubs, etc).

- What individuals are undecided about:
  - Even so called affluent areas of Sheffield have small pockets of depravation, need, and ethnicity.
  - Will depend on the views of the councillors fulfilling the role and the abilities of the offices. Concern is that in some areas partnership may break down depending on the support they receive.
  - The IMD seems reasonable when taking these proposals in isolation. In the context of the bigger picture it may have greater impact to support through library provision thus tackling diversity and inequality issues in a more creative/proactive way.
  - There are a small number of wards who have either a Town/ parish Council with their own administration and costs, and separate subsidy. How do they fit with the Wards to avoid duplication of purpose. Many residents see this extra tier as unfair as they feel they are paying twice for services.
  - Equal distribution of monies so that it doesn't seem that the same "favoured few" are getting more resources than other areas/don't give it all to the usual areas

Group/Organisation Responses:

- What groups/organisations don't agree with:
  - Small pot of money needs to be more targeted on the 10%-20% of most deprived communities in Sheffield to have any genuine effect.
  - Weighted in favour of certain ethnic and deprived areas/parts of the City that already receive a boost from other funding
  - Possibly feel too much spent on 'diverse' citizens.
  - Why have assemblies at all? Councillors should make all these decisions - that is why they are elected
  - Prioritise 10-12 wards on grounds of deprivation etc
  - allocate all the £580,000 available funding to lead community groups in these area
  - Prioritise this funding to youth activities, as this is where serious cuts have happened (both from CA and Kids Can Do)

- What groups/organisations are undecided about:
  - A totally independent panel should be in charge of this to make it a fair process.
  - Agree with the approach that bases funding on the index of multiple deprivation since this recognises needs in an area. However, the formula also needs to reflect the population size of each ward.

Event Responses:

- Proposals do take account of varying needs by using IMD
- Useful way of using the remaining budgets/grants - it needs communicating well throughout the city in future.

- What people at the events don't agree with:
  - Funding allocations disadvantage little groups.
  - Possibly an issue for disabled people.
  - Does IMD take account of rural deprivation and the elderly?
  - IMD is wrong measure for local working.
    - Doesn't address multiple deprivations.
    - Isn't a fair approach /independent /use of IMD divisive.
    - Areas change constantly/ changing demographics.
    - Need to factor in equal distribution/total population in ward
  - Greater sensitivity in decision and allocation. Fear of funds being allocated in isolation of the community and not being consulted through the councillors' or monitored
  - Do not take account of diversity within each ward. There are different needs, aspirations and facilities/ pockets of deprivation within wards.
  - Equalisation is not fairness (deprivation Fulwood and Burngreave is not like for like).
  - System doesn't devolve decision-making to the local level.
  - Unfair that area that pay most in get least out.
  - unbalance, shouldn't be targeted at deprivation. Domino effect in accessing funding and provision of facilities
  - Political aspect to the funding allocation
  - Accountability of councillors in "safe seats" – won't be voted out/money goes to usual suspects
  - Need to engage hard to reach/ people who don't participate.
  - Specific needs at neighbourhood level rather than ward level.
  - Some concern about the collective impact on individuals from these changes and benefit changes. Many people are struggling to survive on a day to day basis and will have less time/ energy for involvement in community issues.
  - People not involved means no positive impact in terms of cohesion.
  - Harder for people to have their voice heard so system needs to be simplified
  - People who know their Wards best are people who live there but what about transient people?
  - What is meant by "diversity"?
  - Ward Councillors to be more innovative.
  - "You choose" worked well - small groups made presentations in public arena.

Q3 Is there anything else you would like to say about the proposals or any other ideas that you would like to share?

Individual Responses

General Comments

Positive
- Given the budget constraints, these proposals seem sensible.
- An intelligent response to the necessity to radically reduce the available funding.
- The amended proposals have addressed many of the concerns I had about support, communication networks which would be lost when the assemblies were abolished.
- Approach of using the IMD to allocate funding is fair and justifiable.
- Agree with the new proposals for the Community Assemblies.

Negative
- Believe the £300,000 is too much.
- Sum of money so small that very little will be achieved by it.
- Community Assemblies worked; are you just changing things because they were created by the LibDems?
- Wards are too small and increasing bureaucracy by increasing from 7 Community Assemblies to 28 wards.
- Losing local knowledge within the council by moving the council officers from Community Assemblies to a central team.
- Councillors are being given too much power when it comes to how this funding should be shared out.

Other Comments

- Make decision making more transparent/local accountability
- Central Government via the Office of Civil Society funds a number of community organisations (Community First) in different areas across the city. While these projects are 'centrally funded do the proposed funding allocations (IMD Allocation) take into consideration funding from Central Government?
- TARAs and local groups should be informed of a spending plan for their community to make it easily accessible to apply for funding, and it gives people a chance to have their say in where the money goes
- Upperthorpe used to be a good area to live, but now it is overrun with alcoholics and drug addicts and burglars. And nothing seems to be done about it. (No police patrol)!
- The NECA blog was well used and I would very much like that to continue, just with a name change. The information on there is very useful and I wouldn't want to see that lost. It is a good reference point.

- Will the consultation that was done via the CA's before Christmas to update local priorities, will this still be collated and published?

- The proposed names could create confusion. The names should reflect the difference between the Wards and Areas.
     1. replace Local Action Partnerships with '*Area Partnership'* prefaced by which area it is for example the 'North East Area Partnership'.
     2. replace 'Local Action Plans' with '*Ward Action Plans'* prefaced by the individual ward e.g. 'Brightside and Shiregreen Ward Action Plan'.
     3. replace 'Local Action Team' '*Area Network Team'* for example 'North East Area Network Team.' This reflects their networking/support role for all 4 Wards within the Area.

Other Ideas
- Put £280,000 into community initiatives which could address issues which have already been identified by public health, health & wellbeing boards etc.
- The money would be better spent
     o supplementing voluntary sector grant aid in the existing structure for allocating this, according to city wide priorities.
     o rolled up into a council department that is experiencing budget cuts to a service with core need.
     o reallocate to services like libraries, sport and leisure and not spread it thinly and potentially wastefully.
  Don't leave it up to the Councillors. Make sure meetings are held so the public can pass on ideas.
- Consider holding on-line community, for example at ww.sheffieldforum.co.uk
- Keep to ward areas, better publicity and advanced agendas to encourage attendance.
- Small organisations need help as they don't know where else they can apply for funds and so on. Not all have access to the internet.
- Targeting should be extended to other areas of policy/services, such as Activity Sheffield.
- Allocate all wards an equal distribution of monies, with a special pot held centrally that all areas can make an application for stating their special need.
- Wealthy parts of the city don't need any money (ie Fulwood, Ecclesall)

Group/Organisation responses

General Comments
- The success or failure of this plan will depend on communications to all stakeholders and should be a priority.
- The partnership working and the partner panels were key to the success of the community assemblies. The new Local Action Partnerships needs be able to replicate this; The Local Action Plans will provide the focus for the partnerships and this will then determine the most appropriate partners to be involved. This will ensure organisations can also make best use of their staffing resources.
- Citizens are being deprived of resources because they behave well. If we have a special need we should go to our local councillor for an answer.

Other Ideas
- Consider funding volunteers
- An independent body overseeing the allocation of funding, not local councillors.

Event Responses

General Comments

- This is an ideal opportunity for ward councillors to engage with the community and make decisions on the ward fund with the whole community of that ward.
- Openness and accountability should be the fundamental principle.
- Want to get hold of someone easily and have public opportunity for questions and feedback on decision.
- Certain councillors need to be more active in their community.
- Names - instead of the Local Action Partnership should be Local Area Partnership. Local Action Plan should be Local Ward Plan.
- Keep blogs going.
- Tapping into funding - ensure 'grassroots' are included and priority given.
- Community Assemblies cease to be at end of April but new proposals in Sept. What happens in between?
- The danger of small centred teams is bias towards favoured areas.
- Amounts too small for any meaningful plan.
- Loss of interest/lack of public engagement in proposals.
- Signal that local action and local involvement does not count, increased centralisation. Disconnect with taxpayer.
- What's the incentive for councillors to work on this? Not enough money. "Power is money, money is power".
- What will happen when public are upset when there's nothing left? Need to focus on the priorities.
- How is the new structure going to influence? (Particularly service delivery).
- Residents will struggle to understand the role of local councillors if they have no decision-making role (particularly in a Cabinet Style system) (p)
- Less democratic than the assemblies because Councillors do not have decision-making powers.
- How will members of the public be contacted about meetings etc as not all use the internet - there is a need for publicity.
- Police are dropping to 6 areas in 2016 so there will be a mismatched with the 7 areas in the proposal then.
- How will existing forums like Crosspool be formally linked/ constituted into the new structures?
- Will they need to restructure to fit proposed areas/establish a direct relationship?
- Concerns about year-end ward spending unnecessarily. If all held in one pot it could be bid for and prioritise its spending more carefully and effectively.
- £2,000 per ward is way too small a base figure.
- There will be a loss of commitment and capacity to grow local forums without the staff to support it.

- Need to make use of existing groups and organisations e.g. 'In Bloom' and link in with them to publicise the new 'ward fund'. Especially as Community Assemblies have not been well attended.
- Top up ward allowance with share of staffing budget and give it to Parish Council to fulfil role and fund secretarial support.
- Expertise in Central Team that can tap into.
- Going to create extra work
- Direct access to councillors – need maintaining (quarterly)
- Qualities Community Assemblies teams: organise, unsnag, support
- Develop/maintain relationships
- Important to meet members. Must remain visible.
- Central area very different – varied wards. North East more similar.
- Ward meetings very useful when they happen.
- Area level has more voice – some benefit.
- Feels wrong to have £280k to run £300k grants.
- Staffing levels feel very low.
- Really value information from Community Assembly team – informing of events etc. Sometimes across boundaries.
- Social media very important.
- Some concerns about too high reliance on social media. Colour contrast – needs to be accessible – criticism of SCC website.
- Criticism of Streets Ahead's communication.
- Councillors are stretched and need support.
- Really value work of Community Assembly staff – important to express it.
- Maybe should have fewer, better supported Councillors.
- Worry about increased workload on Councillors.
- Many community activists saying 'why do I bother?' Leads to reduced participation.
- A lot of community/ public capacity – need to tap into this.
- Liked "How Your Area Works". Really miss them.
- Want events calendar that everyone can add things to.
- Meetings need more publicity.
- Want Local Area Partnerships to be observed or public.
- Recognise sometimes need confidential discussions sometimes. Communicate. Social Media but also.
- Process to be revised (June 2014). How are aspirations (services holding to account, working with Councillors to local area) working.
- Knowledge and understanding of each ward/ area is vital and to what extent this could be built into job descriptions or person specifications. Or at least some attempt to match e.g. local knowledge might be seen as desirable in the person spec.

- It was also noted that wider knowledge of more than one area can be beneficial in terms of development (personal).
- In terms of affordability of the team/ staffing structure. One possibility missed was whether wards like Walkley and Crookes could be joined together as they are part of a community.
- Hearing what's going on in adjoining areas will be helpful – it can be inspiring!
- Like to see a 'council structure' chart available so that people can see how the proposals fit. 'Plain English'!
- Is it a good use of officer time if they have to do their own admin? Structure needs to allow for support.
- City-wide issues and local issues.

Other Ideas
- Electronic noticeboard.
- Better use of local radio (hard to reach people who don't use IT)
- Mentors and advocates to support attendance at meetings (PA support elderly/ interpreter) to not discriminate.
- Involve libraries in disseminating information and sharing information. Make libraries more of a community hub.
- Divide ward allocations equally and distribute other budgets using IMD. All wards need very basic services like crossings, doesn't relate to deprivation.
- Need a formally constituted body for the ward so that it can consult with residents.
- Have 3 Town Parish Councils in each area therefore don't need assemblies/area panels. A duplication of existing structures/efforts. Parish Council more in touch
- Youth Service promotes young people working on parks. Young offenders enjoy it – need to get them involved before they offend
- Shirebrook Valley could organise litter picking. Pay for transport of offenders.
- Need to totally rethink local democracy. Nether Edge has a quarterly farmers market where "Everybody" comes out. "Everybody" talks to everybody else. This is a model for local democracy. We need similar activities in all parts of our wonderful city

General Comments about Consultation

- Impressed with SCC approach to the Consultation
- Given the fundamental philosophy to increase community involvement, it is unsettling that roughly less 0.1% of Sheffield's 500,000 population actually attended the consultations held in each of the seven Community Assembly areas
- Given too much information to make it complicated.
- The information provided about the proposals is unclear and confusing
- Why sexual orientation is considered important enough to be included in the questionnaire?
- Ethnicity on forms does not account of Group response. Yet another form not properly constructed.
- No working person can attend central event only retired people
- This arrived too late to attend the local event
- One person noted the low turnout at this meeting and thought there was a lack of publicity.
- Pleased to be invited to meeting again & receive mail & telephone calls very pleased about this. Meetings were run differently in past
- Lack of key officers' contact details within the proposals so that people could speak directly
- Would like comparative information from other Local Authorities (e.g. Birmingham) to be more available on the website before the consultation ends
- Is this meeting/roadshow just a front? Will you say "we consulted" and then go and do what Councillors want and ignore the people?

8. Appendix 1 – Detailed Proposals

The Future of Community Assemblies Consultation

Tell us what you think

Background

Sheffield's 28 Wards are currently divided into 7 Community Assemblies (4 Wards per Assembly). These Assemblies help to decide how Sheffield City Council delivers some services at a local level.

Reductions in Government funding together with increasing pressures means the Council has to save £50 million during this year. We are doing what we can to protect services for people most in need of our help and support but the cuts mean major reductions to services.

In January 2013 we launched the first part of a Consultation seeking views on the impact of the 2013/14 Budget Proposals affecting Community Assemblies. The Proposals included:-

- Stopping the investment of £2.6 million in Community Assemblies formal structures, staffing and discretionary grants budget and replacing it with an investment of £580,000 per year which would generate £2 million savings per year.

- This investment would include £280,000 into staffing a centrally managed team and £300,000 into discretionary grants

Responses to the Consultation were summarised in a Consultation Report which was presented to Councillors to consider as part of their decision making process on the overall amounts to be allocated to different service areas.

The Consultation Report is available online at https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/in-your-area/community-assemblies/consultation.html

On 1 March 2013 the Budget for 2013/14 was formally agreed for implementation by Members at the Full Council Meeting. This included the Budget Proposals to make changes to Community Assemblies.

Consultation on more detailed proposals – your views

We are now in the next part of the consultation process and are seeking your views and opinions on more detailed proposals based on the budget allocation of £580,000.

Councillors have listened to what you said in the first part of the consultation and used many of your ideas and suggestions to shape the proposals.

The more detailed proposals which are set out below have been developed to support communities to become resilient, and explain how the Council might support and facilitate local engagement and partnership working more efficiently.

Your views are important to us and the feedback you provide through this consultation help us to improve the way we make changes to the services. We will take your views into account when making our final decisions.

The consultation will end on 3rd June 2013.

The Proposals include:-

(*bold type indicates that proposals can be linked to Part 1 comments)

A new Ward Based Structure

1. Stopping Community Assemblies but continuing with the **geographical boundaries of the existing Community Assemblies** for partnership working and simply calling them **'Areas'**.

2. Setting up a **Ward based structure** which will support partnership working in the Areas and give local people a voice in creating ward priorities and plans and assist them in scrutinising local services.

3. Ward **Councillors will be supported to take the lead for engaging** with the communities they serve

A Ward based discretionary budget

4. Setting up a **Ward based discretionary budget of £300,000** which will be known as a **'Ward Fund'**. Each Ward would be allocated £2,000 totalling £56,000. A further £244,000 will be distributed according to need across the City.

5. The amount of money allocated to each ward will be decided using the National **Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)**. IMD shows comparative level of multiple deprivations across England at a small area level and links to the findings of the Fairness Commission. (Further information can be found at https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/your-city-council/policy--performance/fairness-commission.html)

6. **Ward Fund Allocation**

Ward	Minimum Allocation	IMD Allocation	Total Allocation
Arbourthorne	£2,000	£15,032	**£17,032**
Beauchief and Greenhill	£2,000	£9,925	**£11,925**
Beighton	£2,000	£5,901	**£7,901**
Birley	£2,000	£8,723	**£10,723**
Broomhill	£2,000	£4,674	**£6,674**
Burngreave	£2,000	£15,359	**£17,359**
Central	£2,000	£10,611	**£12,611**
Crookes	£2,000	£2,499	**£4,499**
Darnall	£2,000	£12,903	**£14,903**
Dore and Totley	£2,000	£2,274	**£4,274**
East Ecclesfield	£2,000	£6,796	**£8,796**
Ecclesall	£2,000	£1,570	**£3,570**
Firth Park	£2,000	£17,394	**£19,394**
Fulwood	£2,000	£1,992	**£3,992**
Gleadless Valley	£2,000	£12,638	**£14,638**
Graves Park	£2,000	£4,486	**£6,486**
Hillsborough	£2,000	£6,494	**£8,494**
Manor Castle	£2,000	£17,664	**£19,664**
Mosborough	£2,000	£7,127	**£9,127**
Nether Edge	£2,000	£4,895	**£6,895**
Richmond	£2,000	£11,200	**£13,200**
Shiregreen and Brightside	£2,000	£13,334	**£15,334**
Southey	£2,000	£15,314	**£17,314**
Stannington	£2,000	£5,048	**£7,048**
Stocksbridge and Upper Don	£2,000	£6,094	**£8,094**
Walkley	£2,000	£8,655	**£10,655**
West Ecclesfield	£2,000	£6,165	**£8,165**
Woodhouse	£2,000	£9,234	**£11,234**
Total	**£56,000**	**£244,000**	**£300,000**

7. **Ward Councillors will consider** how they wish to **allocate their Ward Fund based on the priorities** they have identified in their Plan and can work together across wards to pool resources

Local Action Partnerships

8. Setting up a **Local Action Partnership** for each of the Areas chaired by a lead Councillor selected by other Councillors. Each Partnership will include a wide range of representatives from the public, private and voluntary sectors.

9. On an on-going basis local people and Councillors get together to develop ward based **Local Action Plans**, agreeing key priorities for their area.

Local Action Team

10. Setting up a centrally managed, flexible team of officers to support the new arrangements. This team will be known as **Local Action Team**. A named officer for each area will be the contact officer for local people, Councillors, partners and local organisations.

11. A Lead Council Officer, from the Councils Senior Management Team will be available to provide advice and support to the work of the Councillors and Local Action Partnerships.

We want to know what your views on the proposals are:

- Do you think the proposals are a reasonable way forward given the budget available?

- Do you think the proposals take account of the varying needs of Sheffield's diverse citizens and areas?

- Is there anything else you would like to say about the proposals or any other ideas that you would like to share?

How you can get involved:

- Attend an **Event**:

  North – 1st May 2013 at 6.00pm to 8.00pm in Ecclesfield School, Chapeltown Road, Sheffield, S35 9WD and the 8th May 2013 at 6:00pm to 8:00pm in The Venue, 650 Manchester Road, Stocksbridge, Sheffield, S36 1DY

  North East – 2nd May 2013 at 6:00pm to 8:00pm in Shirecliffe Community Centre, 349 Shirecliffe Road, Sheffield, S5 8XJ

  South West - 7th May 2013 at 7.30pm to 9.30pm in All Saints Church of England Church, Ecclesall, Ringinglow Road, Sheffield S11 7PP

  South East – 9th May 2013 at 7:00pm at Beighton Miners Welfare Club, High Street, Sheffield S20 1ED

  East – 10th May 2013 at 1:00pm to 2:00pm in Centre in the Park, Norfolk Heritage Park/Guildford Avenue, Sheffield S2 2PL

  Central – 14th May 2013 at 7:00pm to 9:00pm in Quaker Meeting House, St James Street, Sheffield S1 2EW, Main Meeting Room

  South – 16th May 2013 at 7:00pm to 9:00pm in Newfield Green Tenants Hall, Gleadless Road, Sheffield S2 2BT

Please let us know if you:
Need a language or BSL interpreter at any of the meetings.
Will need support to help you to take part in any of the meetings.

- Complete an **Electronic Form** online at https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/in-your-area/community-assemblies

- Request a paper copy **Feedback Form** for individual responses by email Practicedevelop@sheffield.gov.uk or telephone 0114 273 5299

- Request a paper copy **Feedback Form** for your group or organization to complete together by email Practicedevelop@sheffield.gov.uk or telephone 0114 273 5299

- **Email** your comments to Practicedevelop@sheffield.gov.uk Please title your email 'Community Assemblies Review'

- **Telephone** 0114 273 5299 and giving us your opinions, or completing a questionnaire over the phone with a member of staff.

- If you need this information in **alternative formats** including large print and audio please let us know which format you require

What happens next?

We will share the feedback to date with you.

We will do this at a drop in event which will take place on the **20th May 2013 between 10:00am and 4:00pm at St Mary's Community Centre, Bramall Lane, Sheffield S2 4QZ**. If you are interested in attending this event just turn up, view the comments on the proposals, talk to Officers and have an opportunity to have your say.

After this event a Consultation Response Report reflecting your views and opinions will be published online and presented to Councillors to inform their decision making.

It is anticipated that the new arrangements will be fully implemented in September 2013.

Frequently Asked Questions

Why are we proposing to keep the Community Assembly boundaries?

The former Community Assembly boundaries would be kept to support partnership working and service delivery by the Council and partners as identified in the first part of the Consultation.

Keeping the former Community Assembly boundaries would prevent disruption to other agencies that have focused their work around the 7 Community Assembly areas, and to ensure there are no unnecessary administrative costs in changing boundaries.

The boundaries would simply be called Areas (North Area, North East Area, East Area, South East Area, South Area, South West Area and the Central Area)

What is a centrally managed, flexible team of officers?

Administrative support for the Ward based structures would be provided by the Local Action Team.

There would be a named officer for each area who would be primarily responsible for supporting the Councillor led Local Action Partnership which would be underpinned by the Ward based arrangements and priorities.

Why is the allocation for each ward set at £2,000?

Part one of this consultation indicated that people felt funding should be distributed equally across every ward. In addition to this pockets of disadvantage are found in every ward.

Therefore, it is proposed that a minimum allocation of £2,000 would be made available for each ward.

Each Ward would also receive an allocation based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation which links to the findings of the Fairness Commission.

What is the Index of Multiple Deprivation?

The Index of Multiple Deprivation is designed to show comparative levels of multiple deprivations. They provide a measure of deprivation relative to other areas across England and are calculated by the Department for Communities and Local Government.

In measuring deprivation a number of things are taken into account:-

- Income Deprivation
- Employment Deprivation
- Health Deprivation and Disability
- Education, Skills and Training Deprivation
- Barriers to Housing and Services
- Crime Deprivation
- Living Environment Deprivation

These are grouped together and weighted to produce an overall index of multiple deprivations.
These statistics allow the most and least deprived areas of the country to be identified.

Further information can be found online
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/english-indices-of-deprivation-2010

Why have we proposed the Index of Multiple Deprivation to distribute discretionary budget?

The first part of the Consultation indicated that people wanted a transparent and equitable way to distribute the resources. The Index of Multiple Deprivation provides a consistent measure of deprivation relative to other areas across England and links to the findings of the Fairness Commission.

Who decides how the discretionary budget allocation is spent?

The discretionary budget allocation is intended to be one off support rather than on going funding.

It would be for the Ward Councillors to decide how they wish to allocate their Ward Fund and would require a simple application form and monitoring. When making decisions Councillors would consider:

- Criteria linked to Ward plans/ priorities
- Annual call or rolling programme up to the Ward members
- working across wards to pool funds for one or more projects

Appendix 3 - Summary of Monitoring Information

Are you	
	Total
Member of Public involved in Community Assembly	22
Member of Public not involved in Community Assembly	41
Partner Organisation/Council Organisation	16
Recipient of Community Assembly discretionary fund	8
Unspecified	161
Total	**248**

Ethnicity	
	Total
Other mixed background	1
Pakistani	1
Caribbean	1
Chinese	3
English / Welsh / Scottish / British / Northern Irish	68
Mixed/Multiple Heritage: Other Mixed/Multiple Heritage background	1
Unspecified	173
Total	**248**

Language Preference	
	Total
English	26
Unspecified	222
Total	**248**

Sex	
	Total
Female	25
Male	44
Other	1
Unspecified	178
Total	**248**

Gender Identity: Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth?	
	Total
Yes	61
Unspecified	187
Total	**248**

Caring Responsibilities - Do you provide regular and substantial care for:	
	Total
Relative (e.g. disabled child, partner, parent etc)	16
Unspecified	232
Total	**248**

Childcare Responsibilities	
	Total
Children 11 - 18	6
Children under 11	4
Children under 5	1
Children under 11; Children 11 - 18	1
Children under 5;Children under 11	2
Son	1
Unspecified	233
Total	**248**

Disability	
	Total
No	51
Yes	14
Unspecified	183
Total	**248**

How Does Your Impairment affect you	
	Total
Long-standing illness or diagnosed health condition e.g. cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease, rheumatoid arthritis	3
Learning or developmental disability e.g. Downs syndrome, autism or dyslexia	1
Ability to see - blind or partial sighted; Mobility or physical impairment ,limits or restricts physical movement, coordination or manual dexterity ;Impaired memory / concentration or ability to understand e.g. Stroke, Dementia, Dyslexia, Head-injury	1
Ability to hear profound to mild deafness; Ability to see - blind or partial sighted	1
Mobility or physical impairment, imits or restricts physical movement, coordination or manual dexterity ;Long-standing illness or diagnosed health condition e.g. cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease, rheumatoid arthritis	1
Mobility or physical impairment -limits or limits or restricts physical movement, coordination or manual dexterity,	1
Speech impairment Mobility or physical - limits or restricts physical movement, coordination or manual dexterity	1
Other	3
Unspecified	236
Total	**248**

Age	
	Total
26-39	3
40 -64	35
65 - 80	28
80 +	1
Unspecified	181
Total	**248**

Sexual Orientation	
	Total
Heterosexual/straight	28
Bi-sexual	2
Gay man	1
Unspecified	217
Total	**248**

Relationship Status	
	Total
Civil partnership	1
Co-Habiting	2
Married	41
Other	6
Unspecified	198
Total	**248**

Faith/Religion/Belief	
	Total
Christianity	34
Atheist/None	20
Humanism	3
Islam	3
Other	3
None	1
Unspecified	184
Total	**248**

Residency: Are you a UK Citizen	
	Total
Yes	41
Unspecified	207
Total	**248**

Residency: Are you a national of another country	
	Total
Yes	29
Unspecified	**219**
Total	**248**

Postcode	
	Total
S1	5
S2	1
S3	1
S4	1
S5	2
S6	7
S7	1
S8	5
S9	1
S10	6
S11	12
S12	1
S13	1
S17	2
S36	1
Unspecified	**201**
Total	**248**

Appendix 4 - Question summary by age, gender and disability

Given the small number of responses it is not possible to draw statistical conclusions with certainty.

Age

Q1) Do you think the proposals are a reasonable way forward given the budget available?

Age	Yes	Yes (with a few reservations)	No	Undecided	Unspecified	Total
26 - 39	1		2			3
40 - 64	5	12	15	2	1	35
65 - 80	10	4	13	1		28
80 +		1				1
Unspecified	1	2	4	8	166	181
Grand Total	**17**	**19**	**34**	**11**	**167**	**248**

Q2) Do you think proposals take account of varying needs of Sheffield's diverse citizens and areas?

Age	Yes	No	Undecided	Unspecified	Total
26 - 39	1	2			3
40 - 64	8	17	10		35
65 - 80	14	12	2		28
80 +				1	1
Unspecified		4	7	170	181
Total	**23**	**35**	**19**	**171**	**248**

Gender

Q1) Do you think the proposals are a reasonable way forward given the budget available?

Gender	Yes	Yes (with a few reservations)	No	Undecided	Unspecified	Total
Male	13	9	20	1	1	44
Female	2	10	11	1	1	25
Other		1				1
Unspecified	1	2	4	8	163	178
Total	**16**	**22**	**35**	**10**	**165**	**248**

Q2) Do you think proposals take account of varying needs of Sheffield's diverse citizens and areas?

Gender	Yes	No	Undecided	Unspecified	Total
Male	16	20	6	2	44
Female	5	11	9		25
Other	1				1
Unspecified		4	7	167	178
Total	**22**	**35**	**22**	**169**	**248**

Disability

Q1) Do you think the proposals are a reasonable way forward given the budget available?

Disability	Yes	Yes (with a few reservations)	No	Undecided	Unspecified	Total
Yes	4	5	4		1	14
No	10	12	25	3	1	51
Unspecified	1	2	5	8	167	183
Total	**15**	**19**	**34**	**11**	**169**	**248**

Q2) Do you think proposals take account of varying needs of Sheffield's diverse citizens and areas?

Disability	Yes	No	Undecided	Unspecified	Total
Yes	4	7	1	2	14
No	18	22	11		51
Unspecified		5	7	171	183
Total	**22**	**34**	**19**	**173**	**248**

Sheffield City Council

Communities Assemblies Consultation Phase 2 Budget Proposals 2013/14

Public Consultation Responses

May 2013

All responses by question

Q1 Do you think the proposals are a reasonable way forward given the budget available?

Individual

Yes (with a few reservations)

Reservations are about the way this "pot" is being divided. I agree there needs to be some differences in amount of money, but the figures shown give serious worries - the areas who pay least get most money - those who pay little or nothing have very large pots.
Open public transparent publications of how money spent especially those with extra budgets e.g. Burngreave has had millions spent, but driving/walking there sees no improvement, especially Spital Hill.
I hope you don't get short of money.
My reservation is that so much of the £580,000 budget is for "staffing a centrally managed team" (£280,000). Surely this should be managed as the rest of the Council from, by, the existing Town Hall staff and more of the allocation to go to the wards. Wards are struggling to exist and providing funds for them to distribute will be an added incentive for people to stand as ward councillors. Tokenism is the blight of the Labour Party and this scheme smells a little of it. Potential "savings" of £2 million by cutting the existing £2.6 million means even less of the Council budget is going directly to local communities.
It seems weighted towards some areas.
Money allocations should also be weighted for population size. Perhaps the breadth of the variation should be reduced too.
Can't think that the £2k plus IMD allocation is sufficient and so insignificant that very little will be achieved and may prove to be a waste of the sums involved.
Not sure the IMD calculation is as fair as it could be and certainly not immediately transparent – seems somewhat confusing that Beauchief is deemed more in need than Hillsborough – practically every ward has pockets of deprivation that will not be tackled equally by using this formula and leaves one wondering if it will be worth even trying to address these issues with such a derisory ward settlement. I appreciate that all ward pots are greatly reduced but some hardly appear wasting time on.
Given the limited budget it is understandable that there needs to be a formula for dividing the monies, focusing on those in most need would be seen to make best use of the monies. However, the communities in which we work were empowered by grants from the Community Assembly Structure; it will be these communities that perhaps aren't the most deprived within the city will miss out financially under the new system, but will hopefully be involved in the setting the local action plans.
If funding goes to large groups in Manor, Woodthorpe, Burngreave smaller groups won't get a look in and will be left out.
I would be interested to know how the local action teams will work. How many jobs/people will be employed and what will their reach be? Will they have capacity to do an effective job.
Some concerns about mechanisms for monitoring funding and loss of local knowledge as support team shrinks and is centralised. Excellent that funding is targeted to areas of greater deprivation.
In isolation the proposals seem reasonable however, I find it difficult to state yes without understanding the context of budget cuts elsewhere i.e. keeping our libraries open is more important to me and other council decisions i.e. refusing the bedroom tax
If the council tried harder to recover rent/Council Tax they would have a lot of millions to send where it is needed. Also if the Assemblies are unable to fund the local items they used

to where is the money coming from now?
A weakness with the current system, which will continue with this proposed new system, is that it doesn't provide grants for activities that support people drawn from across the City. An example is Special Olympics Sheffield which provides weekly sports training in five sports in six venues involving people living in most, if not all Wards. Another reservation, for which there is possibly a perfectly acceptable explanation, is the ratio between the admin costs of £280, 000 and grants dispersed of £300,000.
Clear plan debated at meetings.
I have felt for many years that the way the Council decides what money is spent in my residential area in S11 is unfair. I now understand from the Liberal Democrats that there is a proposal to cut the amount such that some other areas of the city will receive up to five times as much spending per head as in Ecclesall. This is not what I call a decent policy by democratic government. It smacks of a strong bias against S11. Contrary to the sadly prejudiced views of a number of city councillors, we do not all live a life of luxury in S11. We pay our council taxes (and personal taxes) and deserve reasonable treatment. Indeed, surely we have the right along with other citizens in our city to expect the Council to spend the available resources wisely and fairly? For example, many roads in Sheffield are in an appalling state, much worse than those in adjoining areas such as Rotherham MBC and West Yorkshire. The bottom end of Knowle Lane, for example, now has more holes and patches than road! This is downright dangerous for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. When are we going to see any proper resurfacing here or are we to be neglected because of where we live? I fear this might be the case yet again.
NO
£2,000 is a very modest sum for Ward Councillors to use. You are spending £280,000 on staff to administer a fund of £300,000! Less on staff and more should be allocated to the Ward Fund.
I find it profoundly shocking that almost 50% of the budget should be spent in administration for a sum of money that is peanuts in Council terms. Given the excessive administration cost for such a small sum I consider it would be more appropriate to abolish Community Assemblies and reallocate the entire fund towards services that will not require additional administration staff. The benefit for taxpayers would then be £580,000 and not the £300,000 in your weak proposal.
The linking of this issue to budget cuts is puzzling. There is no reason why a good basic structure cannot be committed to and implemented partially but simply funded at an affordable rate in the same way that any other budget is slimmed down. Linking to cuts seems to offer an excuse to produce a process that is so half baked that it is worthless, barely scratching the surface on a centralist status quo. Overall Commitment to Devolving Powers The proposals show no meaningful sign of political will for genuine community involvement. They have been put together with a minimum of discussion with local people and other parties. Rather than bringing more power of decision making to neighbourhoods wards and local groups, in certain respects reflect a desire to further entrench power at the centre and with managers and politicians. Handing over powers to groups lower down the chain is always resisted within organisations. This is so well known that it should be an integral part of any policy to show how it will be dealt with. That looks unlikely which means practice will be defined by drift rather than management. We need to have a managed policy showing how we can move to less top down Town Hall management. This is being tried in some areas.

Transparency We need to see where this proposal fits in with a move to more democratic values. The essentials of democracy, transparency, accountability and participation, as well as representation, need to be embedded in the structure and policy. Transparency should also be part of the process that sets it up. Can we see a full breakdown of the way that all local authorities are approaching this issue (devolution/involvement/participation) showing the different structures being used? Can we see a comprehensive breakdown and analysis of the IMD data under each heading that determines the funding. Full minutes and reports presented to the Fairness Commission? Details of costs of Fairness Commisssion, expenses etc? Details of all spending going through the Council to different wards including from Westminster and from Europe?
It is impossible to take into account substantially varying needs with such small amounts. The money is more likely to go into small projects that win 'beauty contests' with the councillors. It will be admin cost heavy as well.
The budget is being agreed by the current council which is made up of councillors from the areas getting the most funding, and ignores the poverty in the rest of the city.
The consultation between councillors and community is impossible. Councillors do not have time for the community.
Removes local accountability.
I do not agree that "austerity" is necessary if there is enough money to pointlessly invade Iraq and Afghanistan, and not tax the rich then there must be enough money to properly fund local democracy.
So many priority areas have had cuts due to less government funding. This money should not free float like this in small amounts. Best to reallocate to services like libraries.
I think the areas should be the same as "housing areas" then more people in these areas would have a bigger say in where the money should go, also there is an unequal distribution of the money all areas have a part where IMD is applicable not just the favoured few areas.
Why can't the £300,000 be spent by the council as a whole saving Don Valley Stadium, Stocksbridge Leisure Centre, Libraries etc.
Undecided
1. Not sure which area Upperthorpe has been merged into. 2. Not many people interested in what the Council & government is doing. ie not enough English in the area.
It's unclear from the paper what funds will be used for other than 'local priorities'. This is a very broad term and as such can be somewhat meaningless. With such small amounts of funding now attributed to each area, it seems that the plans are rather optimistic in terms of the expectation of involvement of local people. Have you considered their motivation to get involved with such small sums at stake? If you fail to engage sufficient numbers of local people, then the money identified for the infrastructure would be excessive and could be better spent elsewhere. Plus the point of locally determined priorities would have been missed. Have you identified what sufficient numbers for involvement are so that you have success criteria and effectiveness can be measured?
Only £3,570 in Ecclesall Ward. Surely a very bureaucratic way of dealing with such a small sum. How far would it go in keeping Ecclesall Library open?

Organisation Response
Yes with few reservations
Our reservations are that if the councillors who are in charge have interests in certain groups, not in a councillor capacity, but maybe sit on committees, even if they declare an interest, if they're in charge of the final allocation what would stop them from being bias. Also would the consultations take place locally, this does not happen at all in my area at present and we have no idea what our money is being spent on, till after it has been spent.
So long as funding opportunities are equally available to all irrespective of size, affiliation or location.
The main reservation is around the fact that almost 50% of the budget has been allocated for staffing the proposed new ward based structure. How has this figure of £280,000 been calculated. What is the staffing proposal? Is it going to be based on a team of staff member plus running costs in each of the 7 ward areas. Wouldn't it be possible to have one staff member covering 2 wards, to cut down on the number of staff required? This would allow any surplus to be ploughed back into the budget and shared amongst all the wards.
The principle of an equitable distribution of discretionary funding is to be welcomed. However the pot should be equitably divided so that each Ward has access to 1/28th of the total. The proposal to limit that distribution by applying the IMD factor reduces the effectiveness of what was previously an effective local resource. Given the uses to which CA discretionary funding has been put in the past assisting both the activities of local voluntary bodies that provide support to SCC services, and to supplement central budgets (e.g. Highways), this has reduced the burden that might otherwise have fallen on limited central resources that have rightly been targeted towards areas of deprivation. If there is to be "targeting" of the allocation of grants then this must be undertaken against a clearly defined set of rules so as to ensure that discretionary funding is not displacing what should be a call on central resources and to avoid the potential for allegations of vote buying. Most of the actions that can be effectively undertaken to address deprivation are long term and should be financed from central budgets and not through a centrally directed transfer of limited discretionary funds from some communities to others. The effectiveness of future local initiatives will obviously suffer in the losing areas. Some voluntary bodies that have previously received support may now find they are unable to continue to provide some of the services they have previously supplied in their local area.
Having read through the Council's information with regard to various consultations, the most outstanding issue over the past 10 years is the seeming lack of clarity and frequent changes to the systems in place which are intended to involve people in our communities in the community's decision-making and political processes.

The latest planned changes to dispense with the Community Assemblies is hardly inspiring the confidence required by Sheffield City Council's constituencies in that these changes will add further layers of confusion about the processes and procedures which are open to ordinary lay people wanting to get involved in our communities.

As the entire situation is very confusing, it is also extremely difficult for anyone to provide specifics due to the complete lack of readily available clear information.

It also appears that there may be a lack of political will for the different parties to co-operate and build on their predecessors' work, most notably where there is an obvious intention to produce constructive outputs for the Sheffield City Region. |

Given the fundamental philosophy to increase community involvement, it is unsettling that roughly less 0.1% of Sheffield's 500,000 population actually attended the consultations held in each of the seven Community Assembly areas.

We gather that these statistics were cited in recent interim findings on this consultation and it would also appear that one of these seven Community Assembly areas apparently only had about four or five attendees turn up for their consultation meeting out of a 70,000 population.

It would seem that the apparent lack of response to such consultations could well indicate that ordinary people may feel their views are likely to be disregarded.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any queries regarding this response.

No

I think all areas should get the same amount of cash to share the cost of roads, lighting, policing, rubbish disposal etc.

The key issue is around fund distribution to wards. The sums involved are so small compared with the amounts of money lost through funding cuts that they will have a very limited impact in their communities. The demands on those pots of money are also likely to be so large that huge numbers of organisations will be significantly disappointed.

Undecided

Sheffield Green Party strongly believes in local democracy based on the principle that decisions should normally be taken at the most local level that works in practice. Genuine ward-level working would be far better for communities. However, we recognise that some decision-making - such as the introduction of 20mph safety zones and other highways schemes are more effective when considered over a wider area and need to be approached on a city wide, "worst first" basis.
Our view of the importance of local democracy means it is vital that the approach to local decision-making is genuine and inclusive. It should not be centrally controlled.
In connection with this, we do not agree with the proposal to pay extra "special responsibility allowances" to councillors appointed to oversee the replacement community assembly areas. We also point out that it is fundamentally wrong for these expenses to be agreed before the consultation has concluded.
Because of our belief in local working, we agree that ward councillors should be supported to take a lead in their areas. For councillors to be able to carry out appropriate support, it is important to have access to resources such as officer time and support. If the approach to local grant budgets is to be cut so far (as is proposed) as to be effectively meaningless, we believe it would be better to put these resources into providing funding for officers who have a track record of working in the community to support elected members and community groups.

People would have welcomed a clear statement of the underlying philosophy for the proposed structure, to be a guide to its future potential development. We note that the Community Involvement Strategy, including the section Putting People in the Driving Seat, is still on the Council WebPages and might have been the basis for such a statement of purpose.
Such a statement would assist in judging its success and effectiveness, with periodic reviews built–in at which the public could comment. The current proposal was described by one of the councillors present as merely a skeleton, to be build on.
It would also have been useful to have had heard more about the approaches that are being developed in other parts of the country, which we understood to have informed the thinking

behind this proposal.

Transparency and accountability: these were words that arose time and again in our discussion. We think they speak for themselves in how we want to see the proposed structure working, so scrutiny processes are important. Also the importance of communication was stressed – about when and where open meetings are to take place, and what has happened. It needs a clear strategy and continual vigilance & adjustment. Social media is one obvious way forward but not everyone has the skills or equipment to engage in this way.

Even where there have been no decision making powers, giving voice and influencing thinking have been important; and some people just prefer to listen & learn.

A wider concern was expressed that Councils were being given greater responsibilities at a time when their budgets were being reduced.

Overall, the proposal is seen as a salvage operation, replacing the one that has been abolished, which at the moment cannot be afforded. In the present consultation, we in Sheffield for Democracy consider that our role has been, in effect, the independent scrutineer.

Ward-based structure

There is broad support for the development of a forum of some kind within each ward, with councillor involvement. Some of us have experience of these and know they can work well and give ordinary folk the opportunity both to question councillors and other public servants and those contracted by them, and to make suggestions. So it would be good if there were such forums in all wards. This would mean a considerable effort, given that a minority of the 28 wards currently have such forums and this would have to be the first task of the Action Team.

We were surprised to find such lack of details in the consultation as to how the new forums would be set up. Whilst we support ward forums developing in their own fashion, we do think that there needs to be some basic guidance that they all adhere to e.g. minimum number of meetings in a year; who can attend. It would be important to publish the dates well in advance; we suggest dates for a year ahead.

The input of the councillors into these forums would be crucial, and their success would be dependent on councillors demonstrating their genuine support and engagement, and on taking the forums' deliberations seriously. We recognise the pressure this will put on councillors. It might be useful for all Parties to issue their councillors with guidance on how they demonstrate their commitment, and how councillors' other roles (e.g. in cabinet and committees; undertaking case work) should not be neglected in undertaking these new responsibilities.

Local citizens' focus groups, organised by their Ward Forums, could assist elected members to keep up with new developments and community opinions.

We note that there are examples of wards with councillors from different parties cooperating in the interests of their voters. That is welcomed. Where there are councillors from a single party in a ward, there is a danger that the opinions of those who differ from their councillors, possibly a majority, are not heard. (A proportional voting system would resolve this).

We understand that the cost of hiring meeting rooms and publicity for meetings will come from the central budget not the ward-based budget.

It would be useful to have assurances that council officers and other public servants as well as representatives of companies under contract to the Council will be expected to attend ward forums when requested, and do so without payment; council officers who act as client links should certainly be prepared to attend and answer questions.

Local Action Partnerships

We are concerned that at Area level, there does not seem to be a commitment to the involvement of the public.

We understand the need for some organisation "above" the ward and "below" cabinet, and so welcome the development of the Partnerships. But there is concern at the lack of engagement by the Partnerships with the public. Also, given that there is not a Community Assembly for the Partnership to report to, or for people to ask questions about, we are seriously concerned about the accountability of these bodies. Will they be minuted and will the minutes be made publically available? We would welcome their appearance on Council WebPages which, by the way, need a lot of work in order for them to be more accessible and easier to navigate. People do not want to have to spend a lot of time digging in order to gain access to information.

The membership of the Partnerships is also an issue. These seem to be representatives of organisations chosen by the Council. Could there be some other input (in addition to the councillors) e.g. from a representative of the ward forums? The ability of individuals to input, maybe in writing on items that have been flagged on the coming agenda, should be facilitated.

One comment that has been made about Community Assemblies is that, compared to the size of population in that area, attendance has been very small. But knowing that it was there and knowing that you could attend and make a contribution if you needed to, has been very much valued. Also, one person attending was probably representing the views of others, both individuals and groups, so involving one way or another a larger part of the population than attendance figures suggest.

Local Action Team

When the Area Panels were abolished, there was widespread disappointment that the contacts that had been built with your "own" officers, and knowledge gained about how the system works, were also swept away. This was a significant loss. We have the same concerns about the current changes.

Also, there will be a smaller number of officers trying to provide the same function with an obvious reduction in service, probably leading to increased dissatisfaction and more pressure on our councillors.

However, we are pleased that a contact will be published for each ward.

Just as the commitment of the councillors will be crucial to the success of the forums and partnerships, so the commitment and energy of these council officers will significantly affect their functioning. They need to be recruited accordingly.

Event	Responses
North (Ecclesfield)	• Look at other ways of saving money e.g. 'Don Valley'.
	• Deprivation masked by less deprived areas of an area.
	• Cabinet in the community more accountable but should be onger.
	• Concern about level of agreement between councillors in e.g. North area. Who will arbitrate when disagreement arises?
	• Want face-to-face public accountability. Does seem to be an element of

	accountability. Want public debate in local area.
	• Every ward should receive the same amount.
	• Differences between wards are too wide. Some kind of averaging should be built in. Discrepancies are far too great.
	• What can actually be achieved with such a small pot of money?
	• Continuity and stability of team members (officers). One of the existing staff to continue if possible
	• Partnership working is a good idea - opportunity to pool resources of various partner's health, police etc. More coordination and less duplication.
North East	• Concern about fairness of decision-making by Councillors - want public to have a say.
	• Why isn't the council getting the £33million owed in Council Tax back?
	• How will councillors come up with the priorities?
	• Can money be carried over e.g. saving up to £2k each year for a £6k project? Don't spend if don't lose.
	• Central pot for wards to bid into would be helpful to encourage cross-ward working.
	• Would like a review of the process after 1 year.
	• Feeling that it is ok to target at more deprived areas but must be proof of spend and must be used not wasted.
	• How are they going to fund community consultations - where is the money coming from? Are they going to 'burden' community organisations who are already struggling hoping they will give venue and time up free.
	• Needs to be more clarity about pooling of resources and how this is going to work between wards.
	• What is the discretionary grant /Ward Fund for? Is this a discretionary grant or would it cover things such as ward-based activities such as fly-tipping, bring rubbish out days etc. Out of the allocation how much can be awarded per application.
	• Concerns on monitoring - need to be clear regarding evidence and

	monitoring systems especially for new groups.
	• How are they going to engage with under-represented groups?
	• Will senior lead council officer visit areas/wards and if not how will they know what is needed?
South West	• Council website misleading, no longer reflects council practice. What is the governing principle on Areas?
	• Going back to old area panels. Concerned by centrally managed team run from one office. How can you run the city locally?.
	• Devolution of influence to area.
	• Public should be involved on partnership.
	• Centrally small team officer support not clear.
	• Senior roles Lead officers useful but Councillors losing direct contact with officer and signposting.
	• Social media remote and impersonal.
	• Do we need more communication on what is happening?
	• Are they going to be rebranded (noticeboards)?
	• Area working does not have to be about money.
	• There is a need to involve ward as local champions.
	• This is about influence, not decision-making.
	• Not enough/need more information.
	• Budget available should not be the main driver for budget - what are you aiming at? Should decide what you want.
	• Huge disparity between Manor and Ecclesall funding.
	• Would be fairer to divide equally especially as a lot of other money is being targeted at high IMD wards.
	• Funding should be available citywide for things like crossings of roads, services for old people.
	• Worried about money being wasted by communities.
	• CAs were for local democracy - this money is not now really for local

	democracy.
	• Would like some comparative information from other Local Authorities (e.g. Birmingham) to be made available on the website before the consultation ends.
	• Proposal enhances/increases existing polarisation in the city.
	• Would like to see politically mixed area partnerships if possible - prevent polarisation - therefore don't like IMD money.
	• Feeling that community engagement has been squashed. Woolly proposals so think this issue will perpetuate.
	• Glad to see more ward-based discussions. Area arrangements needed but needs to work well. Needs transparency for decision-making.
	• Want to be assured that at ward level will be able to get council officers to attend.
	• Don't know what the function is currently of senior officers, what will they do?
	• Concern about the role of local forums e.g. Crosspool Forum in the future and relationship with this new structure.
	• Disagree that the public don't seem to be represented in the proposed structure.
	• One weakness of team structure is what happens in absence of the named officer, there will need to be cover arrangements.
	• There is some logic to the ward based relationships in proposals.
	• The proposals don't foster inclusive and cohesive communities or reduce barriers to involvement
	• use of IMD is divisive
	• Public are not involved in the structure.
North (Stocksbridge)	• Rationale for boundary - gap can't be joined up?
	• Stocksbridge separate from Ecclesfield. Odd boundary.
	• Why 4 wards in each area, not like with like?
	• Council officers and Lead Officer were based in Ecclesfield.

	Stocksbridge suffered in the allocations. Transport an issue. Odd.
	• £280k administration for £300k grant is obscene/ too much.
	• Everything centrally based - will lose local knowledge.
	• More money in grant.
	• Have 3 town parish councils in each Area therefore don't need assemblies/area panels. A duplication of existing structures/effort. Parish council more in touch.
	• Different approaches in different areas/ styles.
	• Impressed with SCC consultation approach.
	• What works in some parts of the city don't work well across other parts of the city.
South East	• Local officer knowledge & input valuable, supported with helping complete funding applications.
	• Drop in face to face contact/ important to see officer in area. A physical presence. Regular meetings. A face to a name.
	• IMD reasonably updated. Statistics on crime considered.
	• Parks don't cater well for elderly people/ youth. Younger children frequently prioritised.
	• Youth Service promotes young people working on parks. Young offenders enjoy it - need to get them involved before they offend.
	• Individual involvement on partnerships?
	• Idea for small makes big difference. Shirebrook Valley could organise litter picking. Pay for transport of offenders. Sheffield Activity provides Tennis rackets.
East	• Prefer to meet 3-4 times a year with Councillors.
	• Dedicated meetings
	• Ward members meet with public regarding Community Safety.
	• More visible walkabouts.

Central	• Disagree with budget allocation – should be either population based or equal between wards.
	• More equitable distribution with larger minimum allocation (£3-4k) but Dore would have more than they need.
	• Some minor parts of IMD are out of date.
	• Not happy with IMD at ward level – should be at a neighbourhood level/ greater sensitivity needed.
	• Split between need, but too much according to need
	• Wards with the highest allocations have already had considerable amounts of funding various sources not seen much progress/improvement.
	• IMD doesn't take account of individual areas of high deprivation within wards/disparity
	• Small amounts of money not spread widely enough.
	• Why is Fulwood more than Ecclesall?
	• Councillors get to understand neighbourhood.
	• Where will Local Action Plans come from? Frequency of meetings. Councillors and local people to develop plans.
	• Flexibility but need to have some minimum standards, sharing of best practice/ guidelines.
	• A dedicated Officer (named person per area).
	• Councillors need admin support/ overseeing (support 84 Councillors).
	• Telephone support for public and being signposted to people/ team (e.g. collection of bins) provided by staff valuable.
	• Social media could support/ network.
	• A (rotational) duty officer with the Local Action Team to take telephone queries/ signposting.
	• Councillors to take lead and be first point of contact. Officers don't have knowledge to act quickly enough. Councillors can go directly to head of department. One person had reservations about one person i.e. named officer if they are the only access point to the discretionary budget/ ward

fund.

- There was value in all 'members' working in Community Assemblies together – this seems to be missing from the new structure.

- Concern that Green Councillors may be overlooked in the selection of the Area LAP chair/ lead Councillor.

- Noted that some of the CAs had been less effective than others and therefore reasonable to have one named person.

- It was felt vital that there is one person named for each ward as a minimum – one view was that to achieve this it would be worth sacrificing some of the discretionary budget/ ward fund.

- Some concern/ reservations expressed about the capacity of 'Directors' given their existing roles. (It was noted that this was the rationale for increase from 7 to 14 being involved).

- Population should be factored into allocations. It was noted that IMD and population was used in other funding decision-making.

- Happy with the funding allocation as someone who lives in an area where a higher allocation is proposed.

- One view was that the partnerships could work towards obtaining matched funding as an alternative to ward fund. It was acknowledged though that this sort of funding is becoming less available too.

- It was felt that there should be some flexibility to allow cross-area working and joint funding of projects.

- Some concern about the different approaches which areas/ wards might take to managing their fund, could lead to difficulties e.g. some with money remaining, others running out of money early. Benefits of local discussion/ agreement also noted.

- About the grading of the new posts:

  - Will need to be of a similar calibre to the current CA managers. They need to be highly skilled and trusted if there is to be a real impact!

  - Staff preferred over budget for ward funds.

  - Critical to have a named person.

South	- Seems complicated in relation to layers of staff. Would be easier for citizens to go direct to Councillors. Structure within Council is confusing. - Why has Arbourthorne got more money than Gleadless? High unemployment/high crime. - Should be linked to population and taken into account. Area will be affected by bedroom tax so deprivation will increase. Welfare reforms should have been taken into account. - Money should be targeted at 10 most deprived. - Mix of affluence and deprivation - Partnership working to make most of the resources. - Ward-based engagement better/more local emphasis. - Demise of the voluntary sector infrastructure. Increasing volunteering role/viable voluntary sector. Need Support. Community/ faith sector. - Small allocations. - Impact on Councillors and engagement with the local area. - Boundary divisions are artificial. - Ward focus but cross boundary working (e.g. food bank in Lowedges). - Dialogue, how can work together at area/ward level. - Support doesn't have to be financial/money - could be encouragement. But this won't pay for staff. - Limited resources propping up building rather than services. - No system for determining better value for money. - Not made decisions of best value but strategically beneficial to Council with specific reference to Sheffield Activity. - Maintenance of buildings, not people.

St Mary's Community Centre Event	- How will the Local Area Partnership be set up? Who will decide? - Need to be clear which fund pays for interpreters. - Will local people have a 'real' input in the development of the Ward based plans? - How will the Ward based structure be organised? - How will the councillors engage with the communities? - How will members of the public/residents in each area be made aware of funds available? - There should be a formal structure in place. - Next County Council and Parish Council. - Don't think same places should get larger amounts of money areas where areas that follow on from those with larger funding seem to be missing out. - How will funds and councillors be monitored? - New style Community Council meetings. - Will the level of democracy be lower than with Community Assemblies? Will we have as much say? - How will the £2k ward fund be allocated? Who will agree this? - Community Assemblies gave the equivalent of 2 tier democracy. - Will the local area partnership have a say in how the funds are allocated? - Many think the old way was best. - Who will monitor this? Will people who attended Assembly meetings find things out? - North Area Community Assembly was excellent. I am concerned we will have much less input into these new structures than we did before. We got to know the officers of Community Assemblies - will this happen now?

Q2 Do you think the proposals take account of the varying needs of Sheffield's diverse citizens and areas?
Individuals
No
As explained above not all of the most disadvantaged citizens live in what are DEEMED to be the most deprived wards and as a result disadvantaged citizens living in a more affluent ward through no choice of their own will be discriminated against based on their postcode.
Need to listen to the public, it seems to alienate some areas.
Somali groups do not get help from anyone, so small groups finish - small groups need help.
A lot of projects funded by assemblies can no longer be done e.g. bring out rubbish days, cleaning and scrubbing up grotspots.
Still giving all the money to favoured areas / i.e. propping up their vote
Not enough for SW area
I think your use of IMD values at ward level is simplistic. It takes no account of facilities used by people from all over the city. For example, Ecclesall Woods, Whirlowbrook Park, the Limb Valley and the Porter Valley are in wards which have low financial allocations, and will therefore get little or no money spent on them. You seem to think people stay in the area where they live, and so people from more deprived areas don't benefit from parks, open spaces, sports facilities, etc. outside the ward they live in.
Still giving all the money to favoured areas / i.e. propping up their vote.
Whilst money can be saved by pooling functions, the spread of resources is very poor as is the cut back in funding. By providing small grants, you effectively created an industry of volunteers across the city, bettering the lives of those that live in their communities. The value to the community far out-weighed the cost, in other words it was excellent value for money. It encouraged people to do something for others, it created community cohesion, empowered people, made people feel they could contribute directly. This has all but been taken away and yet given the restricted resources it is absolutely the way forward. it is very disappointing that the counsellors chose to cut this budget. We are back to old times where certain areas get funding and others are left to fend for themselves. Support should be available across the city, all standards should be raised and opportunities made available, not only to the more socially deprived areas. The city needs to attract more business and have areas of the city where people from outside want to come to live, not neglect them. In short I strongly disagree with this decision and feel that yet again the council is making short sighted decisions.
More services / committees should be cut to reduce taxation.
It is impossible to take into account substantially varying needs with such small amounts. The money is more likely to go into small projects that win 'beauty contests' with the councillors. It will be admin cost heavy as well.
In these small pockets it will make little impact - this is so little and thinly spread.
English don't seem to count for anything!
Balance between minimum allocation and the IMD allocation is too much in favour of the latter.
Proposals only take into account the Council's favoured areas.
Only shows that only the Council's favoured areas are important in the city.
I think that we need to totally rethink our local democracy. In Nether Edge we have a quarterly farmers market and we close the road for it! "Everybody" comes out. "Everybody" talks to everybody else. This is a model for local democracy. We need similar activities in all parts of our wonderful city.

I think it is time to flatten the Moor and change the purpose into Residential, and Commerce/Finance etc. only: with ample free parking!!!! No one can access the shops anyway, without making multiple detours round ever changing one way systems and no entry roads, to find an expensive car park, and then walk 500 yards to the nearest shop. Who in their right mind would want to traipse up and down the Moor with bags of shopping these days? Getting on and off buses and trams, like we did in the 50/60's. When we can have a leisurely day out; in Leeds at Ikea and then call back to Meadowhall to finish our day with a meal and the Cinema..... Certainly not me or any of my family, friends and neighbours.It is obvious to a blind man that the West End is now a University Campus, that West Street and Division Street rightfully caters for.

My proposal is to develop The East End - - - Attercliffe and all the land around Meadowhall - - - which is already flattened and prepared. Where there is ample free parking everywhere....... That is until the myopic planners get their greedy eyes on it and stick meters up everywhere and make all the streets no access or one way; to deter people from shopping there? Encourage high end shopping like Harvey Nicks, Selfridges, Next, Ikea, Habitat and relocate Cole Bros and people will flock to Sheffield like we do to Leeds, and job opportunities will follow. The East End is easily accessed by bus and tram, and is one long flat road with some interesting History and scenery, like the Five Weirs Walk.

IMO you need to sack all the short sighted planners and their expert who have practically brought Sheffield to it's knees, and killed any chance of having high class trade back in Sheffield by allowing all the cheap outlets which aim at shoppers with the least money.... Not a good idea... because the people with money - have cars!

Keep all the cheap shops in one area by all means - in Fargate - and have a Continental type market area there too, then at least those who don't drive will have easy access by tram and bus....As you will see.... my proposals cater for everyone.....but I don't expect you to take one jot of notice. Because I believe you have already made up your minds and that this is just lip service..... Why change the habit of a lifetime?

IMO you need to sack all the short sighted planners and their expert who have practically brought Sheffield to it's knees, and killed any chance of having high class trade back in Sheffield by allowing all the cheap outlets which aim at shoppers with the least money.... Not a good idea... because the people with money - have cars!

Keep all the cheap shops in one area by all means - in Fargate - and have a Continental type market area there too, then at least those who don't drive will have easy access by tram and bus....As you will see.... my proposals cater for everyone.....but I don't expect you to take one jot of notice. Because I believe you have already made up your minds and that this is just lip service..... Why change the habit of a lifetime?

How the monies are proposed to be distributed across the 28 wards is wholly unfair and politically based. The wards where there are non-Labour councillors - Fulwood, Ecclesall, Broomhill and others ALL have the lowest proposed funding amounts. This is the Labour Councillors putting money into wards where Labour councillors are sitting to promote their party for the upcoming local elections next year.

The so-called fairness for all approach by the Council is exactly the opposite, all wards should receive exactly the same money from the Council through the Council Tax income. Any wards which require further help due to levels of deprivation should receive money from other sources. Sheffield council should be putting it's efforts into gaining additional funding for these areas from all available sources. For example Westfield in the south-east of the city will receive £1million as part of the Big Local scheme funded by the Government.

This will enable much needed community improvements for the Westfield area to be implemented over the 10 year Big Local scheme, this level of funding is far more than SCC could ever put into this area over a 10 year period. Also SCC should be more business friendly and allow permission for development schemes such as the new NEXT store at Meadowhall and get section 106 monies from the planning permissions to help fund further developments in areas such as Tinsley which is right next to Meadowhall.

The areas include very different wards, each one has differing needs meaning that the area cannot be judged as a whole. I have said before allocating area budgets is a waste of money. The councils neighbourhood's fund should be managed centrally cutting staffing and other localised meeting expenses.

Councillors should work within their Wards gaining information at existing meetings(Tara,Youth clubs,Surgery's,lunch clubs, etc) as to what local people feel their locality needs. They could maybe hold six monthly public meetings where people could come together to hear the proposals and vote for their priorities.

The Councillor could then submit the bids to the Neighborhood's fund. The requests should be prioritised on the basis of need, benefit gained and public opinion, allocating each ward enough money for its no1 priority bid if at all possible

Dore, Totley, Bradway & Whirlow should be given a fairer portion of local funding.

Make unnecessary department heads redundant or reduce salary, eg waste, education. Reduce council salaries at the top end, stop spending money on expensive consultants and don't spend money refurbishing the town hall.

To give all areas an equal share of funding. Alot seems to have been spent on run down areasOver recent years, so unless the money is spread more evenly other areas willbecome run down too. Also I don't agree with expensive refurbishmentto Town Hall offices.

I think the labour councillors have forgotten that there are a lot of older residents living in these areas, some of them living in council housing who have worked and paid taxes over the years. Surely they deserve decent roads and footpaths etc. Children are children wherever they live and should have access decent and safe play areas.

The amounts are so small it is difficult to see what can be done with the money. Will it not cost more to administer than the amounts allocated?

Could there not be a fairer distribution taking into account how much different areas pay in rates. If you pay more rates then surely you are intitled to a greater proportion of the money that is to be allocated.Areas such as Crosspool get very little back compared to the high rates we pay to the council.also I would like councillors to be transparent. I am sorry to say that I have little faith in our council and believe that there are a lot of `deals` going on for contracts etc. also looking after their own comforts and interests. I wouldlove this lack of faith to be transformed.I am sorry but I really feel this way.

It appears that true to form, our Labour council are showing their bias towards their favoured areas at the expense of everyone else. Why for example should Ecclesall only receive £3570? I can accept that some variation might be justified but not the amount of variation shown in the plans. It would be nice to see a bit more fairness in the allocation of the money available,

Totley and the surrounding areas have a large retired community. The invisibility of this age group often leads people to assume they are muddling along quite nicely. Transport, libraries, green spaces have been formally recognised as necessary requirements for good health. To be seen to be allocated fewer facilities whether it is by funding or physical outward signs of the council saying they don't care lead to poor health, socially as well as physically. There are also young families that should be proud of their community. The council should show fairness and a listening ability.

This makes an assumption that because an area is populated by a generally more affluent socio-economic group these areas have virtually no local needs which are addressed. I think the proposed sharing out of the money is unrealistic. Also, if I've understood it correctly you will have a Local Action Team which will cost £280k per year to oversee the spending of £300k of funds - if that is the case, it is frankly ridiculous - save the £280k and either spend it on the local services providing £580k to improve the city, or just put it towards the £50m savings needed.

A larger fixed element to each area (eg £5k) and should also be based on the rateable values achieved from each area - if an area is considered as being in greater need then this should come from other budgets. Currently proposed allocation may be politically biased, Does it really need such a large staff element to enact such a small amout of expenditure - could not this work be outsources and the money spent on benefits to an area rather than overheads (I am ignoring the small administration cost)

The proposals take NO account of the non-favoured areas. They find it difficult to get ANY AID even though they may not be well off.

Some areas in Sheffield have received additional funding for years with no improvements or outcomes. I call for fair proportional spending in each area. Currently areas that contribute the most receive the least. I don't want money wasted on Town Hall refurbishments or consultants.

I would like the Formula used in assessing the needs of each area to be transparent, so that it can be seen to be fair or not.I have not seen evidence to suggest the varying needs of areas. As a floating voter,I think that Fulwood and its surrounding area gets a raw deal when it comes to council proposals. Could it be that the areas who vote labour get the most support? This is a genuine question, I am not trying to make a cheap point.

Don't give it all to the usual areas. This is what most people think. Listen to them!

Undecided
Even so called affluent areas of Sheffield have small pockets of depravation, need, and ethnicity.
This will depend on the views of the councillors fulfilling the role and the abilities of the offices. My concern is that in some areas partnership may break down depending on the support they receive.
The IMD seems reasonable when taking these proposals in isolation. In the context of the bigger picture it may have greater impact to ensure great community resources and support through library provision thus tackling diversity and inequality issues in a more creative/proactive way.
There are a small number of wards in our city who also have either a Town/ parish Council. These also have their own administration and costs, and I acknowledge that there is a separate subsidy. I feel we should have discussion on how they fit with the Wards to avoid duplication of purpose. Many residents I am aware see this extra tier as unfair as they feel they are paying twice for services.
All areas of Sheffield are diverse not just a few, some may be more diverse than others but equal distribution of monies should be considered, so that it doesn't seem that the same "favoured few" are getting more resources than other areas.
This is too big a question to easily answer!
Working class Unemployed Problems with the inner city and the tower blocks where they live.
To win support for Labour increasingly means from the whole city. There are few "safe" seats and likely to be even fewer. Favouring the less privileged parts of the city is party policy but can look like neglecting the rest. The policy must be seen to be fair e.g. with hedges cut, potholes filled and the environment cared for throughout the city. Better off wards are likely to contribute much more in proportion to the council budget and can expect some fairness in the outcome, e.g. expecting areas which may have more gardens to pay some £60 for having green waste collected is the same as putting their council tax up by £60!
Don't understand the stats/analysis.
Possibly feel too much spent on our town's 'diverse' citizens.

Group/Organisation Response
No
The money, since it is such a small pot of money needs to be more targeted on the 10%-20% of most deprived communities in Sheffield to have any genuine effect.
Sheffield's diverse population is a cause for celebration. This should not lead to favouritism over groups not in already identified hotspots.
Weighted in favour of certain ethnic and deprived areas - no method of measurement can decided these preferences. Share and Share alike. Why have assemblies at all? Councillors should make all these decisions - that is why we elect them.
The transfer of what were previously seen as discretionary funds away from some areas to others where they may be used to carry out activities that should better be supported from central budgets means that the local discretionary element that was previously considered reasonably fair is now weighted towards parts of the City that already receive a boost from transfer funding through the current taxation system better be supported from central budgets means that the local discretionary element that was previously considered reasonably fair is now weighted towards parts of the City that already receive a boost from transfer funding through the current taxation system.
The proposed structure will not work. i) A limited number of officers cannot cover the work done by previous CA staff. You are setting them up to fail. ii) Elected members do not have the time to do the work. For example in our ward, Gleadless, two of the three councillors work nearly or fully full time iii) The money allocated to each ward is derisory and will not have any effect
Undecided
We believe that a totally independent panel should be in charge of this to make it a fair process.
Where there is a formula for allocating funding for each ward, we agree with the approach that bases funding on the index of multiple deprivation since this recognises needs in an area. However, given the very different populations in different wards, the formula also needs to reflect the population size of each ward.
In the future the Council will be dependent on groups like ours to do tasks in the community such as litter picks, tree planting and so on. We cannot do those things without insurance which the Assembly has helped us with in recent years. Unless you find a way to help us with these costs we will simply have to stop giving the support we do. Either that or you get your lawyers to find a smart way round the problem. Your choice.
I think the proposals probably do take account of the varying needs of citizens but it's difficult to say from the information.

Event	Response
North (Ecclesfield)	• Council not very responsive. e.g. overhanging trees • Area groups should be able to take account of people's needs - everyone has the same opportunities as an individual or an area to be heard. • Funding allocations disadvantage little groups. • Areas like High Green get a lot of money for a tiny proportion of High Green that has deprivation. • Does the "IMD" take account of rural deprivation and the elderly? • What is meant by "diversity"?
North East	• Certain groups won't join in with these sort of community ward-based structures. • Need to advertise free things. • Possibly an issue for disabled people. • Proposal being targeted means its addressing needs of diverse citizens and areas. • Using IMD index was a fair approach and it is independent. • Not sure if IMD is a fair approach and is independent • fear of funds being allocated in isolation of the community and not being consulted through the councillors' or monitored
South West	• Wrong question being asked. • Proposals do take account of varying needs by using IMD but must stress IMD is wrong measure for local working. Doesn't address multiple deprivations. • Do not take account of diversity within each ward. There are different needs, aspirations and facilities/ pockets of deprivation within wards. • This budget should not be weighted as needs are across all areas. Other money available for areas with high deprivation. • Use of IMD divisive. • Should take account of other aspects than IMD - it's not inclusive

	- What did decision-makers envision allocation be spent on. For example in Ecclesall what will £1,570 be spent on? - Equalisation is not fairness (deprivation Fulwood and Burngreave is not like for like). - Allocation does not encourage local working. - This proposal goes too far. There should be a link between deprivation and the funding to address deprivation. The link to deprivation should be more explicit. - All areas have needs. Is this funding about supporting engagement? If it is, every area should have a similar amount. - Aren't other areas getting additional funding from other sources because of "deprivation". - Is the overall budget too small? - Local leadership. - Need to devolve more in order to say taking account of Sheffield's needs and areas. - Such a low budget can't meet the needs of all. - Figures being used don't give a clear picture. - Doesn't work for all areas because the difference in needs is so great. - Could be managed to work if Cllrs are really in touch with the citizens. - No because this system doesn't devolve decision-making to the local level. - People not involved means no positive impact in terms of cohesion. - Should be an equal amount per ward, particularly if to support local democracy and involvement. - Not balanced in terms of the funding allocations. - Money allocated to areas that don't help themselves. Unfair that areas that pay most in get least out. - Limitations to the ward structure.

	• There's a political aspect to the funding allocation.
North (Stocksbridge)	• Useful way of using the remaining budgets/grants - it needs communicating well throughout the city in future. • It will be important that people in the local areas know what they can bid for. • It is a good strategy to use the IMD, e.g. Burngreave where they have more social issues does need more resources. • Equal distribution across Wards/Distribute on population. • Unbalance, shouldn't be targeted at deprivation. Domino effect in accessing funding and provision of facilities
South East	• Divide equally or based on population. The amounts are too small/ can't solve deprivation. • Should be differential. Imbalance between unemployed and working. • Areas change constantly/ changing demographics. • People can work the system so money doesn't go where it needs to goes to usual suspects. • Accountability of councillors in "safe seats" – won't be voted out. • "You choose" worked well - small groups made presentations in public arena. • Ward Councillors to be more innovative. • Addressing older population's needs • How to engage hard to reach/ people who don't participate. • Ward Councillors have a fair mechanism. • Lead officer will drive plans forward.
East	• Can some of the larger organisations – could they be funded upfront? • Large Organisations are in the same situation as small organisations. • Regarding allocation linked to IMD in favour of deprived areas – not based on need. • Concern – amount left for areas won't touch the issues in some

	areas. Structure doesn't allow same level of influence re impact on mainstream services.
	• Community expected to take on more responsibilities from the hospitals (Carers – early discharges).
	• Dialogue needed between hospital and area panels to consider how it would work.
Central	• Needs to take into account population.
	• Specific needs of neighbourhood level rather than ward level.
	• Greater sensitivity in decision and allocation.
	• Need to factor in total population in each ward.
	• Some concern also about the collective impact on individuals from these changes and benefit changes. Many people are struggling to survive on a day to day basis and will have less time/ energy for involvement in community issues.
	• Some areas have more active CA participation already.
	• 'People' should be involved in the Local Action Partnerships – they should be 'public' meetings.
	• It will be helpful if people know what approach 'members' might take to include 'people' prior to elections.
	• Communication is going to be key in the model. Don't rely on internet and social media. – Use the local press, newsletters etc.
South	• The way the money has been split hasn't taken into account the diversity of Gleadless Valley.
	• Given too much information to make it complicated.
	• TARA has concerns they can only make proposals to Cabinet Minister rather than make decisions.
	• Harder for people to have their voice heard so system needs to be simplified
	• People who know their Wards best are people who live there but what about transient people?
	• Mixed communities/supports ethnicity.

St Mary's Community Centre Event	- Rich v poor. - All areas have needs. Small groups see people with problems too. How will this benefit them? - Is there a potential for wards to fund joint work if deemed beneficial - or will it be only funding solely benefiting their ward? - All areas have needs!!! Not all needs are the same. It should not be divided into different sized pots!! - Could TARA residual levy be allocated to areas who have reduced/no TARA representation to carry out similar TARA responsibilities? - Local development forums are currently the focus points in many are areas are doing TARA work but receive no recognition or funds. - Parish Councils should receive more funding to enable them to carry out more duties currently carried out by Sheffield. Parish Councils are the "grass roots" - Actively involving young people in decision making and more partnership working between structures for young people's voice in the city and councillors/ ward structures. - IMD should not be taken into account. It is at best a guess and at worst a reason to direct money where "councillors" want to direct it. It causes division (and to some extent discrimination). - Have the details of this meeting been sent to PARISH COUNCILS? - Reinstate Parish Councils in the areas they previously existed.

Q3 Is there anything else you would like to say about the proposals or any other ideas that you would like to share?
Negative
The animal is dead, please let it rest in peace - rather than constantly flogging it
It's understandable that things have to change given the large cost savings that need to be made. However, I imagine that the Council is awash with information about community needs and rather than spending £280,000 on staffing a unit, why not put that money into community initiatives which could address issues which have already been identified by public health, health & wellbeing boards etc. It seems like local involvement for involvement's sake, rather than considered and systematic use of very limited funds.
Only to repeat that the sum is so small that very little will be achieved by it.
The idea of having miniscule - by reference to the need in the City - pots of money in the hands of just a few ward councillors - and the cost of support from staff makes this a very inefficient way of addressing need in the city. The money would be better spent supplementing voluntary sector grant aid in the existing structure for allocating this, according to city wide priorities. Alternatively it could be rolled up into a council department that is experiencing budget cuts to a service with core need.
City Council should reallocate money to services like libraries, sport and leisure and not spread it thinly and potentially wastefully.
Community Assemblies worked; are you just changing things because they were created by the LibDems? Wards are too small, and you're increasing bureaucracy by increasing from 4 CAs to however many wards there are. And you're losing local knowledge within the council by moving the council officers from CAs to a central team.
Positive
Given the budget constraints, these proposals seem sensible.
An intelligent response to the necessity to radically reduce the available funding.
Other
It's run by the Community Assemblies by very clever people more clever than me.
Don't leave it up to the Councillors. Make sure meetings are held so the public can pass on ideas.
Make decision making more transparent.
Bring back local accountability, such as Parish Councils in the areas they used to exist - allow some to raise a precept to be used for the community use.
Keep to ward areas, better publicity and advanced agendas to encourage attendance.
Just curious to know why NW and W don't feature as areas.
Small organisations need help as they don't know where else they can apply for funds and so on.
Small groups and individuals need to be given info and not all have access to the internet.
Targeting should be extended to other areas of policy/services, such as Activity Sheffield.
The issue that is always raised in one of fairness whether this relates to national or local level, and this again has raised its head. I would suggest that all wards are allocate an equal distribution of monies, with a special pot held centrally that all areas can make an application for stating their special need thus covering any special needs in target areas. I feel it is crucial even the poorest areas are given the opportunity to take control over their lives and I believe such a scheme would enable them to do this.
I don't think the wealthy parts of the city need any money ie Fulwood, Ecclesall. Is not this a waste of money?
Ecclesall/ Fulwood less than the stated minimum £2000 allocation - why?

Upperthorpe used to be a good area to live, but now it is overrun with alcoholics and drug addicts and burglars. And nothing seems to be done about it. (No police patrol)!
I grew up in Wath-on-Dearne, believing that Sheffield was run in a decent and even-handed way, but I am afraid I am now in need of being convinced of that.
Valuable resources should be most wisely spent for they come from ordinary citizens paying their dues. I was brought up with the ethic that civic duty in local and central government meant an obligation to treat public money as prudently, if not more prudently, than one's own personal money. (Indeed, my father served as an official in local government (retiring in 1979) and he went back in his own time to make sure the books balanced.) Rate arrears were kept under tight control by well-run councils.
What would the councillors and officials of those days think now about the attitude driving the area policy in the city of Sheffield? I think I know.

Group/Organisation responses
We at Firth Park Advice centre would hope that when allocating funding to the ward the group will consider funding volunteers at the centre. I would note that in 2012/13 we generated £1.9 million pounds for the wards of Firth Park and Shiregreen in benefit claims and debt wiped, and good value for money for the £5000 for the community assembly grant we received. Staff and volunteers advised 1,900 people on 6000 issues. We now have a 50% cut in paid staff, and are even more dependent upon the work of our wonderful volunteers from the community. It is also a great example of a community helping itself.
We would like to see an independent body overseeing the allocation of funding, not local councillors.
Citizens are being deprived of resources because they behave well. If we have a special need we should go to our local councillor for an answer.
The success or failure of this plan will depend on communications to all stakeholders and should be a priority.
The partnership working and the partner panels were key to the success of the community assemblies. The new Local Action Partnerships needs be able to replicate this; The Local Action Plans will provide the focus for the partnerships and this will then determine the most appropriate partners to be involved. This will ensure organisations can also make best use of their staffing resources.

Event	Response
North (Ecclesfield)	- How joint funding e.g. Parish councillors e.g. meet up share resources e.g. premises. E.g. 4 meetings per year - offices helps. - If it works - all for it - Extra bus service from High Green area circular route to include Burns Cross. - Openness and accountability should be the fundamental principle. - Want to get hold of someone easily and have public opportunity for questions and feedback on decision. - Refusal for grit bins when volunteers were offering to clear paths/drive to school. (Cllr Gary Wetherall will take this point tog) - Transport in rural areas is vital. Better communication between "areas" and Parish Councils. - Why sexual orientation is considered important enough to be included in the questionnaire?
North East	- Really like ward based meetings - This is an ideal opportunity for ward councillors to engage with the community and make decisions on the ward fund with the whole community of that ward. - Certain councillors need to be more active in their community. - Names - instead of the Local Action Partnership should be Local Area Partnership. Local Action Plan should be Local Ward Plan. - Keep blogs going. - Tapping into funding - ensure 'grassroots' are included and priority given.

South West	• Community Assemblies cease to be at end of April but new proposals in Sept. What happens in between?
	• The danger of small centred teams is bias towards favoured areas.
	• Amounts too small for any meaningful plan.
	• Loss of interest.
	• Lack of public engagement in proposals.
	• Signal that local action and local involvement does not count, increased centralisation. Disconnect with taxpayer.
	• What's the incentive for councillors to work on this? Not enough money. "Power is money, money is power".
	• No working person can attend central event, only retired people.
	• What will happen when public are upset when there's nothing left? Need to focus on the priorities. Is this a priority?
	• How is the new structure going to influence? (Particularly service delivery).
	• Local influence of services is important.
	• Residents will struggle to understand the role of local councillors if they have no decision-making role (particularly in a Cabinet Style system) (p)
	• Less democratic than the assemblies because Councillors do not have decision-making powers.
	• How will members of the public be contacted about meetings etc as not all use the internet - there is a need for publicity.
	• Police are dropping to 6 areas in 2016 so there will be a mismatched with the 7 areas in the proposal then.
	• The information provided about the proposals is unclear and confusing.
	• Lack of key officers' contact details within the proposals so that people could speak directly (e.g. VR and KR)
	• How will existing forums like Crosspool be formally linked/

	constituted into the new structures?
	• Will they need to restructure to fit proposed areas/establish a direct relationship?
	• Need a formally constituted body for the ward so that it can consult with residents.
	• Divide ward allocations equally and distribute other budgets using IMD. All wards need very basic services like crossings, doesn't relate to deprivation.
	• Concerns about year-end ward spending unnecessarily. If all held in one pot it could be bid for and prioritise its spending more carefully and effectively.
	• £2k per ward is way too small a base figure.
	• There will be a loss of commitment and capacity to grow local forums without the staff to support it.
North (Stocksbridge)	• Need to make use of existing groups and organisations eg 'In Bloom' and link in with them to publicise the new 'ward fund'. Especially as Community Assemblies have not been well attended.
	• Stocksbridge has a good range of community groups.
	• One person noted the low turnout at this meeting and thought there was a lack of publicity.
	• Lots of different groups to get info to about the Ward Fund, eg school councils. Need to involve/include young people.
	• Support Community Transport/door to door travel
	• Idea - Top up ward allowance with share of staffing budget and give it to Parish Council to fulfil role and fund secretarial support.
South East	Expertise in Central Team that can tap into.

East	- Going to create extra work - Direct access to councillors – need maintaining (quarterly) - Acknowledged appreciation - Community Assemblies teams (officers & managers). Qualities: - Organise - Unsnag - Support - Develop relationships - Maintain relationships - Important to meet members. Must remain visible.
Central	- Central area very different – varied wards. North East more similar. - Ward meetings very useful when they happen. - Area level has more voice – some benefit. - Feels wrong to have £280k to run £300k grants. - Staffing levels feel very low. - Really value information from Community Assembly team – informing of events etc. Sometimes across boundaries. - Social media very important. - Some concerns about too high reliance on social media. Colour contrast – needs to be accessible – criticism of SCC website. - Criticism of Streets Ahead's communication. - Councillors are stretched and need support. - Really value work of Community Assembly staff, important to express it - Maybe should have fewer, better supported Councillors. - Worry about increased workload on Councillors. - Many community activists saying 'why do I bother?' Leads to

	reduced participation.
	• A lot of community/ public capacity – need to tap into this.
	• Liked "How Your Area Works". Really miss them.
	• Want events calendar that everyone can add things to.
	• Meetings need more publicity.
	• Want Local Area Partnerships to be observed or public.
	• Recognise sometimes need confidential discussions sometimes. Communicate. Social Media but also.
	• Involve libraries in disseminating information and sharing information. Make libraries more of a community hub.
	• Electronic noticeboard.
	• Better use of local radio (hard to reach people who don't use IT)
	• Process to be revised (June 2014). How are aspirations (services holding to account, working with Councillors to local area) working
	• Knowledge and understanding of each ward/ area is vital and to what extent this could be built into job descriptions or person specifications. Or at least some attempt to match e.g. local knowledge might be seen as desirable in the person spec.
	• It was also noted that wider knowledge of more than one area can be beneficial in terms of development (personal).
	• In terms of affordability of the team/ staffing structure. One possibility missed was whether wards like Walkley and Crookes could be joined together as they are part of a community.
	• Hearing what's going on in adjoining areas will be helpful – it can be inspiring!
	• Like to see a 'council structure' chart available so that people can see how the proposals fit. 'Plain English'!
	• Is it a good use of officer time if they have to do their own admin? Structure needs to allow for support
	• "The fact that the team will cost £280,000 makes me feel angry, as only a bit more money for every new 'area' in Sheffield."

	• City-wide issues and local issues.
	• Mentors and advocates to support attendance at meetings (PA support elderly/ interpreter) to not discriminate.
	• This arrived too late to attend the local event. How about giving local plans etc some influence over main Council funding, e.g. schools, roads, leisure, and not just this tiny sum.

St Mary's Community Centre Event	• How do we get the accountability right?
	• Will we get to know anything!
	• Simplify things so ordinary folk can understand it all.
	• Ethnicity on forms does not take account of Group response. Yet another form not properly constructed.
	• Small groups are ignored in favour of the larger groups who don't pass info on…
	• Will the Council ignore this consultation as usual?
	• How can local action plans work jointly with young people's action plans and the plans of local forums to ensure consistency and meaningful involvement?
	• I hope there will be cross-boundary working between wards with resources shared for cross-boundary groups.
	• Not everyone has or uses internet, so how will they know any outcomes?
	• Not all attendees are paid staff from organisations and attend at own personal expense. How many of paid groups have given their feedback today!
	• Give every area an equal share of the pot. All areas have some "deprivation" and similarly all areas contain people who have plenty of disposable income.
	• How are you going to ensure appropriate feedback and accountability of your actions?
	• Savings into spending money.
	• Lots of people do not use Social Media! How will meetings be publicised. Not everyone reads the Star. Local notice boards are well read. Will you listen to suggestions made at meetings? You are making a good start with meetings such as this at Bramall Lane.
	• On the other side, social media is a growing trend and a lot of people are now using it. It's about getting the right balance to ensure you meet as wide an audience as possible.

79 | P a g e	• Meetings need to be balanced. Older people - no job. Afternoons and evenings for those who work full-time. One day as a drop-in to share for those on shift work. • Better promotion. Less jargon. More user-friendly ways of accessing information. • Publicity strictly aimed for young people - young people's website. • Is this meeting/roadshow just a front? Will you say "we consulted" and then go and do what the Councillors want, and ignore the people? • Will a report be made public before consideration? Will it be considered at a public meeting? • Can housing levies (money) be transferred to areas that have no TARA representation to do the housing issues work that would normally be carried out by TARAs. As Forums are currently doing this with no support/ money. • Council in charge of a council. • The majority of the current council is from the north of the city, Is this why their 'favoured' areas are getting most of the money? • How to share information from one Ward to another - common issues/topic • eg disability carers. All areas of topic. Who to share? Responsibility to share info. • Interpreters/ language translation. Hard to reach groups etc. • Why are you not willing to allow the people who provide the money to have input in how it is spent? It is our money city council does not have money. It takes money from residents to spend across the city.

General Comments

With reference to the 'proposals of the future of communities' please could you provide details as to how the IMD Allocation for each of the 28 wards has been calculated? I understand from the information provided that the allocation is based on the overall indices of deprivation but no calculus has been supplied for the public to work this out. In other words, Burngreave has been allocated an IMD Allocation of £15,359 how has this figure been arrived at?

On a separate but related point as I understand it Central Government via the Office of Civil Society funds a number of community organisations (Community First) in different areas across the city. While these projects are 'centrally funded do the proposed funding allocations (IMD Allocation) take into consideration funding from Central Government? Burngreave Community First group for instance has been allocated a budget of £50,926 (2013/14) yet the area will receive from Local Government £15,359. Finally to what extent do the aims and objectives of the Local Area Partnerships differ from these community development foundation initiatives? as they appear on the face of it to have a very similar remit.

Without this information it would be almost impossible to state whether or not such proposals with regard to funding arrangements are fair or reasonable.

I have been reading "The Future of Community Assemblies Consultation" and part 6 onwards about Ward Fund Allocation concerns me very much so I would like to ask one or two questions if that is ok.

It reads as though the Councillors are being given too much power when it comes to how this funding should be shared out.

You state in 8 and 9 about local people and Councillors getting together to develop ward based Local Action Plans, agreeing key priorities for their area, and this will be known as the Local Action Team.

We have our Stradbroke Tenants Assc I class them as our Local Action Team and they apply for funding for the needs of the Community, we never hardly see our Councillors and if we do it's usually at GMs or AGMs and it's Tenants Assc that sets the meetings up with them, so personally I feel it is a waste of time, or are you thinking of doing away with Tenants Associations, remembering that TARA's are all volunteers and don't cost anything for their services.

The people that play a big part in getting things done in our community are the Tenants Assc not the Councillors, it's hard enough getting local people to go to General Meetings or even surgeries, so I don't think they will be getting together with the Councillors to develop a ward based Local Action Plan, and Local Action Team!

Personally I feel it should be an impartial body of people who distribute the funding not the Councillors, it's just a way of trying to illuminate any favouritism.

TARAs and local groups should be informed of a spending plan for their community to make it easily accessible to apply for funding, and it gives people a chance to have their say in where the money goes.

What happens if a Councillor sits on another Committee, and the committee decides to put in for funding and the Councillor declares an interest, and then a Tenants Assc puts in for funding for the Community from the same pot who does the Councillor favour, does he/she toss a coin or is it shared?

If a Ward Councillor has had grievances with a particular Tenants Association in his/her Ward would this make them bias against the Tenants Assc when they apply for funding and continually keep turning them down because of this.

To me it gives the Councillors too much power. What would happen if it came blatantly obvious that a certain Tenants Assc was being refused funding time after time where do they stand on this and who will govern over the Councillors.

To me you have already got a good set up in place and that is TARA's
I think that what you are proposing is not workable, most
Councillors have got too many irons in the fire, and do not always
have time to involve themselves in one specific project like TARA's.

Thank you for sending me this updated information.

The amended proposals have addressed many of the concerns I had about support, communication networks which would be lost when the assemblies were abolished. I think the approach of using the IMD to allocate funding is fair and justifiable.

My only suggestions now relate to the names of the new bodies because I think it could be clearer. The proposed names could create confusion. The names should reflect the difference between the Wards and Areas.

1. Local Action Partnerships – given that this is to support each 'Area' (and network with the 4 Wards etc) perhaps a better name would be for example the 'Area Partnership' prefaced by which area it is for example the 'North East Area Partnership'.

2. 'Local' is used in relation to both the 'Areas' and 'Wards' and I personally just think it is confusing. The 'Local Action Plans' could simply be 'Ward Action Plans' prefaced by the individual ward e.g. 'Brightside and Shiregreen Ward Action Plan'.

3. 'Local Action Team' refers to the centralised administrative support and networking within each 'Area' (4 Wards). Perhaps a better name would be 'Area Network Team' for example 'North East Area Network Team.' This reflects their networking/support role for all 4 Wards within the Area.

The NECA blog was well used and I would very much like that to continue, just with a name change. The information on there is very useful and I wouldn't want to see that lost. It is a good reference point.

Also, the consultation that was done via the CA's before Christmas to update local priorities, will this still be collated and published? It was more or less on hold last time I asked. It would be such a shame for that work not to be written and used as it is the most recent data for the area. It would also provide valuable supporting documentation for funding applications (as the last consultation report was 2010).

I agree with the new proposals for the Community Assemblies. I actually believe the £300,000 is too much.

I am writing in response to the consultation to ask if you have considered holding an on-line assembly?
Sheffield has a thriving on-line community, for example at www.sheffieldforum.co.uk if anything, they are arguably too busy at it.

Obviously there are significant sections of society who cannot or would not use such a facility and mechanisms would be needed to take them into consideration, and if relevant matters are to be properly discussed then appropriate mechanisms would be required to prevent abuse, but such a system would have obvious benefits and advantages.

The Local Action Partnerships will just be a re-hash of the existing structure for council-controlled pseudo-community groups to which the council falsely cede representative status to their puppets.

As for the allotted budget, we must not forget that, according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation figures, not only has Lowedges continued to decline from 1998 (and despite the so-called Objective 1 funds allegedly ploughed into the area) but from 2007 that decline has accelerated.
However, since the Ward boundary changes, Lowedges is now included with Beauchief, among the richest areas in the city.