

Ward Funding Scrutiny Review

Feedback from Consultation with Ward Councillors

Total Responses Received = 19 (40%)

- 9 New Members
- 4 Executive Members
- 3 Group Leaders
- 1 Member of the Scrutiny Task Group

Responses by Group:

- 6 Labour Responses = 40%
- 4 Conservative Responses = 28%
- 9 Lib Dem Responses = 75%
- 0 Green Responses
- 0 Independent Responses

Responses from 13 Wards = 62%

- 4 Single Cllr Wards
- 7 Wards with 3 Cllrs of same group
- 1 Ward with 2 Cllrs of same group
- 2 Wards with 3 Cllrs split between 2 groups

Stage 1 Responses - 'Identifying Ward Priorities' = 19

In response to the early feedback:

4 Cllrs Agreed - New people in new roles (Cllrs & officers) so lack of local knowledge

3 Cllrs Agreed - Officer responses not always timely and helpful – need to keep chasing

1 Cllr Agreed - Difficulty accessing and interpreting ward profile information

Stage 2 Responses 'Ward Committee Meetings' = 19

In response to the early feedback:

1 Cllr Agreed - Specialist officers not attending ward meetings when required

2 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs do not collectively agree a date the meeting

2 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs do not respond to emails or telephone calls

2 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs habitually choose the same style of engagement resulting in low attendance from residents

Stage 3 Responses 'Ward Funding' = 19

In response to the early feedback:

- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Cross Ward funding – how to make it work - Joint commissioning is great but huge resource & management issues
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - City wide organisations badgering wards
- 1 Cllr Agreed - How do voluntary organisations feel about the new process of applying for ward funding
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - How to proceed when there is no collective agreement on how to spend the ward money
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - How to Cllrs maintain contact with funded groups to ensure accountability / value for money
- 4 Cllrs Agreed - Information on costings for schemes - some schemes turn out to be so complex that they appear to break the system

Stage 4 Responses 'Ward Action Plans' = 19

In response to the early feedback:

- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Lack of tracked progress makes it difficult for Cllrs/officers to keep partners engaged
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Too much talking without any action (relevant to all stages of the process)
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Timescales for schemes are not always clear

Stage 5 Responses 'Ward Team Meetings' = 19

In response to the early feedback:

- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs struggle to identify mutually convenient meeting dates
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Officers struggle to set meetings up due to lack of Cllr engagement
- 0 Cllrs Agreed - Difficulties working with Parish/Town Council
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Ward Teams are not representative of the community
- 0 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs regularly miss their ward team meetings

Stage 6 Responses 'Feedback top Residents' = 18

In response to the early feedback:

- 3 Cllrs Agreed - Need to improve the way we communicate with residents
- 3 Cllrs Agreed - Lack of understanding of who can get information on notice boards and the internet etc

Responses to 'Roles' Section = 19

In response to the early feedback:

- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs not understanding their role
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs have not got the time to fulfil their role
- 2 Cllrs Agreed - Not all Cllrs have the necessary skills

2 Cllrs Agreed - Confusion of roles

2 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs awareness of supporting information/documents and access arrangements

Responses to General Section = 19

In response to the early feedback:

1 Cllrs Agreed - How do we align other council processes to enhance community projects e.g. 106 payments & play capital scheme

3 Cllrs Agreed - Poor joint working with other teams across the council

4 Cllrs Agreed - Unaware of other planned CYC work scheduled for wards

8 Cllrs Agreed - Delays in officer responses from other council teams e.g. Highways Team

3 Cllrs Agreed - Not enough officer resource to support the system

4 Cllrs Agreed - Cllrs unsupportive of the model and processes

2 Cllrs Agreed - We need a forum for Cllrs to share good practice