

Appendix 5

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

I do NOT consider this to be a Consultation Questionnaire.

Why? Decisions have already been taken and the wheels set in motion. Park Ward/Sincil Bank is not an area that others can get to, even if they wanted to. No one person is aware of the problems in each area of the City.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

Has anyone actually looked at what the Neighbourhood Teams do? I live on St. Giles, and I know just how much each of the Team members do for the communities they now cover. Noel Tobin is the contact point with other agencies as well as all the Council Departments. The Estate Caretaker is known by the residents, and helps with financial problems by giving information on pathways. She also has a finger on the pulse of those who have mental and physical health issues. Residents trust her, and she is often a liaison between residents and the Police/PCSOs.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Once the main contact with the Council and agencies has been severed, the Neighbourhood Boards will find it increasingly difficult to keep going. It is all very well to rely on volunteers, but they need a strong figurehead who has open access to the Council and agencies. This will be lost!

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

Quite apart from the assumption that everyone has, or wishes to have, access to computers and the web, it is not easy for each individual to try and find information from so many sites. The time involved will also be a huge negative. Again, Noel Tobin is the contact for so much information for the St. Giles and Ermine areas.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

The Boards need help, and the best way to administer help, is by the Neighbourhood Teams. These Boards have taken time and commitment to set up and get going. That will all be thrown away and cannot be got back.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community

groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

I am a resident, and a volunteer with EPOC (Early Presentation Of Cancer). As a small group, we have lost our paid workers, but still manage to continue with giving cancer information on St. Giles and other areas of the city and wider communities. Our volunteers are all getting older, and can only give a short amount of time, as we all have lives and families. Although we are in contact with other groups and voluntary charities, they also need support. Volunteers are a limited resource, and not so many people wish to be volunteers as they have jobs and families.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

Our Community Caretaker already does far more than just reporting and monitoring environmental issues. Please note my comments above.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

The Neighbourhood Teams cover very large areas, and they are central to the areas they cover. Those who need their help and services, know that they can be found within their own communities, and understand their problems. A central office in the Council Offices cannot possibly understand the needs and requirements of each community!

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the

public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

At the moment, the offices on St.Giles are known by the residents, and utilised by them for Benefit Advice, Councillors Surgeries, Housing contact, various trainings, meeting rooms and spaces as well as the hundred and one other issues that arise in the community. The PCSOs are housed in the office space, and residents know they can report and contact representatives of the Police Force. Our local Councillors attend the office on a regular weekly basis. All of this information can be found in the Team office. Each community needs to know that they can contact their Team in a central place, and get a response, and help.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

As I stated at the start of this questionnaire, THIS IS NOT A CONSULTATION DOCUMENT. This is just ticking boxes as decisions have already been made, and all of this question and answer is a total waste of time. I expect that no one will even read the comments, this will all just be 'filed'.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

It is YOU who should be letting us know what will be available, and just how we will be able to motivate people, especially once the guiding light has gone.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

We at EPOC rely heavily on information from the Neighbourhood Team to let us know where our information is required/requested. We also rely heavily on them for other information of available funding. One person who we don't know, and who doesn't know us, cannot possibly have their finger on the pulse of all the areas and communities. EPOC, and residents, have faith and trust in our Neighbourhood Team, as we have been working with the Team for 10 years.

I can see no reason why the contact person should be based in Sincil Bank, as it is out of the way and off the bus routes.. The Council has plenty of office space in the Central Market that could be better used, as well as being more central and accessible for all the Lincoln area. There are after all bus routes that connect with the central area of the city.

I do understand that finance needs to be saved as grants from Government have a been decimated, but cutting out the Neighbourhood Teams is so short-sighted, it beggars belief. It will cost so much more in the long run when problems in Lincoln get out of hand. It will then need another 10 years of dedicated work by small teams of dedicated people to even get close to where we are now. Re-think the priorities! **A small saving now, or a huge spend a few years down the line.**

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

I would just reiterate: -

THIS IS NOT A CONSULTATION DOCUMENT OR SURVEY!

This is just ticking boxes!

This e-mail was not received by me until late on Friday 23rd December, but so few people who it will affect, have even had any idea that this is happening. It is the most vulnerable who are at serious risk..

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

I feel that this is a backward step for the City as the work in Abbey ward has been incredible and is very likely to lose focus once a Neighbourhood Manager is not in place.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

Again, this is concerning without the presence of a team for the area and an office base. Signposting and local intelligence has been invaluable and the coordination of all the organisations working together for the benefit of the area will be sorely missed.

If this proposal is to go ahead, we need to maintain some COLC support to keep the neighbourhood boards active.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Would be happy to host and attend the meetings with support from the Council.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

I feel that Abbey Access Training could help to play a role in this by having more support sessions in the centre and support from the council to help us signpost individuals to support.

We have for some time discussed the potential for extending the lodge to provide more room for the police and Neighbourhood team to be in our building which could reduce resources and overheads.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

As, above happy to support in some way.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

As above, happy to discuss how we can support this

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

This information is useful and will be missed in terms of informing us of the local issues. We are able to use this information in a variety of ways in our centre to inform us of the provision we deliver.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

This would make sense.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

We do not currently use the building as we are also located in the ward. As detailed above we are happy to discuss a plan for moving some services to Abbey.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

As above

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved. <u>We are keen to hear what that might be</u>
Response: As above
Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?
Response: Potentially reduced referrals and collaborative working without the Neighbourhood teams.
Do you have any other comments you wish to make?
Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response: This would mean that the reduced resources are concentrated in a single area and therefore more likely to deliver positive outcomes. However there will be a negative impact on the areas where the service is withdrawn from. Vision 2020 includes priorities around reducing inequality and enhancing spaces and a reduction in the budget for Neighbourhood working would appear to contradict this strategy. Careful consideration will need to be given to how this reduction is communicated to the communities affected.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

Training opportunities are few and far between and any work that enhances the skills of individuals living in deprived communities will be a positive. These opportunities should be tailored to employment opportunities that actually exist. Training in Childcare and the provision of more affordable child care for working parents would fill a gap and remove a barrier that currently exists to prevent parents working

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

This work can be undertaken by PPASB and Tenant Participation team. I don't know enough about the detail of the Neighbourhood boards to comment on the frequency or format of the support.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents

and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response: In addition to the online route we should make use of the other community hubs such as Libraries and Health centres. Could there be a community notice board at local shops? Elected members and council publications will also be important elements in the network of information and signposting

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response: Great opportunity for local people to build up experience and confidence

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

All council staff and members who go out into communities should report environmental issues. A comms campaign encouraging local residents to report online is being undertaken

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same

functional area.

Response:

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building; Moorland Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

The welfare team have concerns about the potential closure of St Giles Matters and Moorland Community centre where popular and well used advice drop-ins are currently held. Having said this - there is also high attendance for advice on Birchwood where the sessions are held in the community hub run by Learning Communities so it is possible that alternative venues might work just as well. The Neighbourhood Managers and admin staff currently offer huge support for the Welfare team and are key in signposting customers who need advice on financial or benefit matters.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

The welfare team have concerns about the potential closure of St Giles Matters and Moorland Community centre where popular and well used advice drop-ins are currently held. Having said this - there is also high attendance for advice on Birchwood where the sessions are held in the community hub run by Learning Communities so it is possible that alternative venues might work just as well. The Neighbourhood Managers and admin staff currently offer huge support for the Welfare team and are key in signposting customers who need advice on financial or benefit matters.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response: ***The Park Ward/Sincil bank area of the City is very close to City Hall. We question why this area is seen as more relevant for help than the areas of longstanding deprivation in our City. Given our experience of poverty issues, if NW were to concentrate on one area we would support St Giles as the choice.***

Will withdrawal of offices and officer presence on St Giles/Moorland result in a breakdown of communities and the development of 'no-go' areas?

Reliance on Neighbourhood boards and 3rd sector groups can lead to problems and this has been the case in the past.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response: ***Poverty is not always linked to skills/employment. In-work poverty is on the increase and a job is not enough to alleviate the issues of deprivation. This policy seems to be too closely aligned to central government priorities and aspirations of people who do not understand the real issues that affect people in poverty***

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response: ***Housing; PPASB***

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW

service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response: ***This will be a real challenge. Access to IT is one of the main reasons that people currently connect with the Neighbourhood offices. Many people in these areas have very low levels of literacy and need help to access information. There are also significant numbers of people who do not speak English as their first language. Both of these groups rely heavily on the support offered by people in a face to face environment, rather than material which can be accessed online***

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

No Comment

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

No Comment

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

We don't feel qualified to answer this question

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response: ***Could there be a conflict between the COLC role of Landlord to those in LA Housing and the role of Community Manager/Connector?***

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building; Moorland Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response: ***Belmont Street is so close to the city centre that we feel it is a waste of resource currently. In the other 2 areas we do not feel that there are sufficient alternatives for people seeking advice and access to services such as the community larder. Where will people go for help? The current Welfare advice sessions which operate in St Giles and Moorland are very well attended indeed and we have real concerns that communities here will slip through the net.***

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response: ***No comment***

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response: ***We can still offer services where there is a facility to do so but we are concerned that if relationships breakdown between the communities and the council, that this support will not be sustainable***

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response: ***We are concerned that our service users are extremely vulnerable and that, particularly in St Giles, people will have no support in a format that they can access. Currently local residents use and rely on the NW offices and officers.***

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

I am uncertain that current staff within the service will have the necessary skill set and experience to achieve the aim. Project management skills and working with capital schemes do not seem to have been a focus on NW remit in the past.

Resources available from other services likely to be called upon for the proposed regeneration need to be considered and understood.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

This seems more customer service and sign-posting than 'regeneration'. Whilst the two could be done simultaneously, it may be better to focus on one.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Minutes from neighbourhood boards have never (to my knowledge) been published or publicly available. This limits any real engagement the 'community' can have. Committee Services may be best placed to support ward-based quarterly councillor surgeries where issues can be minuted and responded to by members.

The Recreation Officers will be recommencing user group forums at all 5 Community Centres in the next few months. This may provide a forum for other services to engage with communities.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.
We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

Online access may be challenging to replace, although presumably LCC Library Services provide some access and this was possibly a duplication.

Housing Services seem to provide better resident information now and this could be increased to compensate in some situations.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.
This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

I am unaware of any groups this would impact on.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.
As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

I have attended many NW Board meetings. They often have very few residents (with the possible exception of St Giles). Minutes are not available online, which seems odd if we wish to engage with communities. Often they talk about minor issues that should be reported through other mechanisms (e.g. dog fouling).

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

There seems to have a duplication in work undertaken by Housing Officers and Community Services functions.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

My understanding was that we were now expected to work 'cross-departmentally' anyway, so it doesn't seem that relevant. However, it would seem to make sense to site with Regeneration.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building; Moorland Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

There will be an impact on these buildings. I'm unclear what other service providers will be available in the respective areas. LCC Surestart provision may be an option.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

This seems reasonable.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.
We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

The Recreation Team will continue to engage with residents and undertake regular (quarterly) user group meetings with Community Centre hirers. These could include residents with minutes published online.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

There would be an impact with the vacation of the Moorland Community Centre office. This could however also be an opportunity to locate a 3rd sector provider.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

No.

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

Alice Carter – Abbey Ward resident/member of Action LN2

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

I agree that a more focussed approach to work within a neighbourhood has the potential to have more impact and benefit to that community. As a resident of the Abbey Ward area I would obviously prefer this area to be the chosen location. I would like to see evidence of why Park Ward has been chosen as opposed to Abbey Ward and the other communities currently served by neighbourhood working. I also would like to know if the areas being withdrawn from City of Lincoln council neighbourhood support will be monitored to ensure issues which have previously been supported and managed by neighbourhood working do not increase/reoccur.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

I believe each community has separate issues and to assume that lifting people out of poverty should be the sole focus should not be decided by the council but by the community themselves. Consultation is required. I agree that focus on one main issue is important though.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

I think relevant council areas/representatives should be invited to attend the neighbourhood boards as and when the community sees fits and according to issues that are present at that time.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

I think it would be valuable for community groups to be offered access to services such as a level of free printing and the ability to use the council communications and marketing team for certain events and campaigns. Can drop in sessions be organised at certain community venues offering community members without access to internet etc the opportunity to talk to council representatives?

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

I think there is potential for community groups to become self-sufficient however monetary factors such as the ability to fund printing, office supplies etc will be a barrier to many groups, particularly smaller groups. As above, can something be organised within the council to assist this transition?

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

Action LN2 is a group where residents can volunteer.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

I have voiced my concerns over the community caretaker role over the past year and its lack of real impact and thus agree with its removal. A new role would be more beneficial in going out and engaging with the community, spending time understanding residents' needs, informing them on services etc.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building; Moorland Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

For the past few months due to lack of staffing the Belmont Street office has often not been open. I feel the service offered by the office was valuable however the inconsistency of its opening hours has meant that people have learnt to 'live without'. However if Abbey Ward were to be fully invested in by the restructure I feel the office could quickly be back to its full potential.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

Action LN2 offers residents the ability to volunteer, we support the neighbourhood board where possible, however being a group of working professionals means meetings held during the day are difficult for us to attend.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

Action LN2 would miss the support and advice offered by the Abbey neighbourhood team, especially the knowledge of what is going on in the community and the connections and contacts they have. The loss of such a service to the area is undoubtedly going to impact the community. I feel Abbey Ward has improved since I have lived here and fear this could now be jeopardised.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

Whilst this may result in greater impact over a shorter period, the withdrawing of the service from communities (particularly the Ermine) where there is no other cohesive community operation and where the area has been consistently underfunded would be highly damaging. It would be unlikely that it would be possible to continue the work of the neighbourhood board without some professional input. This is yet another project that comes for a short time and is then withdrawn.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

It is a good proposal in theory, but the impact will only be felt on a relatively small number of communities and people. The negative impact of the Council withdrawing from communities will be felt over a long period and leave many people without a local service, opportunities or access to advice.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

It is not clear in your consultation paper how this can happen. The Ermine needs consistent input to deliver real change and this will not happen without sustained support to bring together the various parts of the community. Before the team started working on the Ermine, provision was fragmented and my experience (18 years on the estate) is that the input from the Neighbourhood team is crucial in facilitating effective community provision and cohesion.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

There is limited provision on the Ermine for access to advice, benefits information etc. Your assertion in the document that the Sudbrooke Drive Community Centre is a good local facility is incorrect. This building has never been anything but a place to hire a room and although some initiatives have been proposed to develop it, each time, funding has been diverted elsewhere – a consistent story on our estate, and it seems one that with your proposal will continue. It is difficult to see how the Council can promote access to suitable and relevant electronic resources without having staff working at ground level.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

Who will co-ordinate this work? How will they be resourced? Again experience locally shows that the structure will collapse very quickly without proper support, funding and guidance.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

You need to define what you mean by voluntary and community groups – it is a fine idea, but in a community like the Ermine, where no support or funding over many years has led to a lack of infrastructure it is not going to work. Have you undertaken a survey in each area to find out what might be available – I rather think not.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

The community caretaker role has been crucial in helping the estate and local people to take more pride in the area, has run a number of awareness schemes for children and adults and has helped to facilitate working relationships with a variety of different agencies. This would be much missed locally and seems to suggest that the Council has little or no interest in local environmental issues.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

This may make sense organisationally, but it would seem to be fairly remote from local issues and people and lack proper local accountability.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

This will have a huge impact on people who currently use St Giles for personal support and advice – what might replace this? The office is a local resource which is the hub of the community and is trusted and respected – why would you want to take that away and replace it with nothing?

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

As mentioned above, the Ermine estate has had little or no developmental funding or input for many years, and the impact of neighbourhood working has begun to redress that situation and build confidence in the local community. I think it is very unlikely that it will be workable for a voluntary group to manage the action plan that has recently been put into place – this is potentially very wasteful of a lot of local hard work.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.
We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

As a church community we have been active in supporting community development as far as we can, but our time is limited and we would not be able to put in the amount of time and effort required to undertake your proposal. This needs proper funding and dedicated staff – which we do have at the moment in the neighbourhood team. We will of course do all we can to support the community but are very concerned at the negative move that these proposals represent for our community.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

It will require a lot of effort to rebuild confidence and energy once neighbourhood working is removed, and I cannot see at the moment how this might be picked up again. We have worked very closely with the team on community development and can easily point to the very positive outcomes that their work has had on the estate, both in terms of facilitating access to resources and ensuring a holistic approach to community development on the estate.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

I am unconvinced that comments such as these will have any impact whatsoever

on a scheme that seems to be already in place. The withdrawal of Neighbourhood Working from the Ermine estate takes away another opportunity for local people and fits into the pattern that people have seen over many years of promises made and funding promised only for them to be withdrawn in favour of other communities after a short period. Who will now deliver the estate action plan?

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

It is difficult to fully comment because there is no detail about what that regeneration scheme will look like. My view is that Park ward does need some work taking place but I would also state from a Policing perspective wards such as Abbey are in equal need. The key for any scheme is what will the legacy be that is left behind because if I have interpreted it correctly these will not be long term schemes.

Having said all the above the Police would naturally welcome regeneration of any area of the City if this will impact upon crime, disorder and deprivation.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

Again we would welcome this, but there are no specific details how this will be done. It should also be noted that other wards in the City have equal if not greater issues around employment etc.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

As the Police we sit as a partner on the Boards representing a Public Service this we would continue to do if the Boards continue. Some of the Boards also set the Neighbourhood Policing Priorities and where boards continue and this is the case

we will continue to use them in this manner. For the Boards to continue to set the priorities we would require them to meet quarterly, if the Boards ceased we would return to our old structure of Policing panels for areas.

As a Police Service we would give the same support as we currently do to the Boards and for them to be effective Housing, Public Protection Team, community services i.e refuse collection/street scene and whoever is responsible for community cohesion within the council would need to attend.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

I think this will be one of the biggest losses of Neighbourhood Working particularly where the offices are based. For the most vulnerable and hard to reach, experience will show that these people will not access services via the internet etc. The Police will also be losing 2 offices in the community the public can access, with the loss of St Giles office and Belmont Street. We will be able to hopefully mitigate the loss of St Giles by moving to the North Fire Station which is hoped to take place in the summer or autumn subject to approval by the PCC.

The loss of a local base to work will also reduce our time on the area due to travelling from main stations, we will try and mitigate a reduction in access by surgeries in the community that public can use to access us. We would welcome other council services to join us at those surgeries.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

This is not something the Police can really respond to other than I believe the Council will still have to make some commitment to supporting the Boards in at least the short term if they want them to continue.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and

support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

Not an area the Police can comment on.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

I believe that not having an individual reporting environmental issues will mean that we see a decrease in issues being reported and estates becoming untidy and when fly tipping occurring it not being cleared in a timely manner. I believe that certainly on Local Authority Estates this is something that Housing should take a greater management responsibility for and they should be the ones who monitor compliance with getting things such as Fly Tipping removed by contractors. There is not enough information on what the new role will specifically do other than very strategic objectives to be able comment further on the change in role.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

If this is going to be the focus of the new team then it would seem to make sense, for the Police it does not matter who manage them it is more about what they do.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the

public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

The loss of the North and Centre buildings will have a significant impact on Policing, visibility and accessibility in the communities of Glebe Ward and Abbey Ward.

In the medium term there is a plan for the North Team who currently use St Giles to go to the North Fire Station which is still on the St Giles along with the rest of the North Policing Team. This is subject to PCC approval in February 17 and if approved likely to happen around the Summer/Autumn 2017. This will mitigate the loss of the St Giles Office. In the short term the team though will have to move to the North Box on Riseholme Road and due to the time it takes to walk from the North Box it will mean a significant reduction in time spent on Glebe Ward patrolling. We do not have sufficient fleet to give these officers access to vehicles.

The Abbey team that are currently based at Belmont Street, in the middle of the ward, will have to return to West Parade Police Station. Again this will significantly reduce the amount of time they will be able to spend on Abbey Ward due to travelling times from the station. This will particularly affect the northern side of Abbey Ward. Again due to no fleet being available they will have to walk to be on their area or use other transport such as bikes. In the longer term this may necessitate us thinking about how we draw the boundaries teams are responsible for, at the moment we are ward based but may have to move away from this due to where our new operational bases will be.

To mitigate the loss of local public access to our services we would plan to hold open surgeries in other public buildings and would welcome for these to be joint surgeries with other services such as the ASB Team, Housing etc so that people who cannot access City Hall or use internet etc could still access services locally.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

I would like to see a plan from the Council in more detail about how they will mitigate the removal of Neighbourhood Management. At this moment in time in terms of the community cohesion group that sits at the Council in my opinion this is too narrowly focussed around a few issues and needs to widen its perspective if it is to pick the Community Cohesion work which Neighbourhood Management does. I would also like to see a plan how services will change the way they are going to work to address issues such as environmental factors and improve accessibility to

the public.

Specifically for the Police we would want to know as soon as possible what date it is planned to close the offices so that we can make arrangements to re locate our staff and inform them of these moves.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

The Police will of course support the City Council in any proposal it puts forward and understands the financial constraints they are under, we would welcome the opportunity to discuss in more detail how we work as agencies to mitigate the loss of Neighbourhood Management and ensure the good work they have done on areas such as St Giles, Abbey and Moorland is not lost.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

As outlined above there significant impacts on our service due to the offices being used as operational bases for our Police Officers and PCSOs.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

As a service we would support this approach in the Sincil Bank area. This area has suffered in the past due to high levels of anti-social behaviour surrounding issues such as on street alcohol and substance misuse.

This area suffers greatly in respect of issues such as fly tipping, bin presentation and waste related issues.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

We support the reduction in the scope of the service as we encourage direct contact between communities and our officers. This often delivers benefits such as allowing us to capture the correct information, ensuring service requests are handled quickly and able to offer immediate case updates in many circumstances.

A personal opinion on the 'in-to-work' emphasis would be that there is already a wealth of organisations doing this and it would not change the nature of that area. We accept that this area is a transitional one, due to the nature of the area (poor quality housing, poor quality street scene etc) and therefore lifting people out of poverty (whilst clearly the right thing to be doing) would serve to see those people leave the area without the afore mentioned area based issues being addressed, which would ironically be the reason that they left. The quality of the housing would remain poor and the look and feel of the area would remain the same.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities

as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Our service area could not adopt additional responsibilities but we would continue to work directly with communities to tackle the issues that cause them to contact us.

As above, additional benefits are brought about through direct contact with the correct departments.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

Throughout 2016 customer satisfaction return data showed just 3 people recorded having contacted a neighbourhood office first, out of over 300 returns.

There is no evidence within service to suggest any impact, with the majority of requests coming direct over the phone (to a dedicated team and number) or through the website.

Neighbourhood groups will continue to exist and can be supported by members and officers in various departments. It is often the same people at residents groups as can be found in contact with neighbourhood boards and management.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

The council could seek to offer training in basic administrative skills (through work based learning or willing teams) as a hook to engage people in volunteering. If the

training offers experience then this could also lead to references (including references from chairs of the board etc?). Could also offer use of a council owned piece of IT equipment (aware this comes with risks), that is not networked but with basic office package and email functions...which they could also use for things like creating CV's etc?

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

A focus on seeking out funding to support ambitious community projects.

Work to support various service areas in delivering initiatives (as identified by service needs, data and information) that they otherwise would not have the time to deliver.

Identify issues where no service exists to resolve such as the large number of smashed and broken tv cable boxes on the front of properties, seek out new ways to fix the problem.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?
Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response: We are concerned that the good reputation and standing of CoLC within the neighbourhood communities served could be badly affected by concentrating all efforts on the Sincil Bank area. This could also leave other areas falling still further behind in terms of access to services and good communication with the council, two factors which could lead to increased poverty and alienation from services.

We would also argue that the Sincil Bank area has easier access to a wide range of voluntary and community sector agencies already, with a number of agencies and their projects being based in this area. Very few voluntary sector agencies operate a Ward-based outreach and this has been a great strength of the neighbourhood working approach – giving ease of access to agencies to engage with stakeholder within local communities and the communities themselves.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response: We think that under these proposals, there could be an inequality across the city in the future, in terms of how easy it would be for people to access the support they have been used to getting from the neighbourhood teams, and this could come down to postcode.

Whilst we agree that community working and leadership has to be delivered in a sustainable way and through the communities themselves, we feel that paid staff are a key part of that leadership in any setting, especially if work is to grow and flourish and be inclusive of all members of a community. Neighbourhood teams have been key in providing this leadership and empowerment at a neighbourhood level and this has contributed to the success of many community projects.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response: We find this a very difficult question to answer, and we believe that most members of the public would find it hard, too. People who are not part of the Council and its structure are not always aware of the most appropriate teams to approach. This is another great strength of NW, in that by being part of CoLC, Neighbourhood Managers can access very easily the most appropriate colleagues and partners and invite them along.

We think it would be difficult to parachute new people in to neighbourhood boards and retain the trust and the good joint working that has been built up on the estates over many years. It could lead to fragmentation and a lack of communication. At worst, links between the CoLC and the neighbourhoods could be lost entirely.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response: Although many of our services are also web-based we acknowledge very strongly the importance of personal interaction, especially for some of the poorest in our community, who may be at a disadvantage in terms of access to IT and the skills to use it. Relying on ICT could penalise the elderly, those of a different nationality, those with low literacy levels, etc Also, many website, eg .gov are extremely difficult to navigate and people often need support in interpreting the information they find on them. ICT is a tool in delivering services, but is not the answer in terms of signposting. A physical presence in the communities and access to drop in sessions and paper-based information is a real strength at present. We are concerned that to remove this would be a retrograde step..

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response: We would urge great caution about replacing paid roles with volunteers

and assuming that this will be a quick and easy process. It has not proved so with libraries and we would also have a problem with the idea of job substitution, ie advertising for a volunteer in place of a paid member of staff. As an accredited Volunteer Centre, we believe that volunteers bring added value when working alongside paid staff in certain settings. It is not a good approach to imagine that people from an area where a service has been pulled will automatically want to volunteer in that capacity. On-going support, training and direction also need to be built in to supporting volunteers – so volunteering still comes with a price-tag attached, in terms of adequate resourcing with equipment, materials, input, etc – if it is to succeed long term.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response: Relatively few voluntary and community organisations work specifically at a neighbourhood level. They also have capacity and funding issues and needs. Whilst we have training materials and could facilitate communities to develop skills, for example, we would not have the capacity to support the level of service that would be lost by NW. I would suggest that this would be true of most voluntary sector organisations. Our Volunteer Centre service is available to everyone in the community, so we could support residents to become more active – but this would be done on a citywide basis and we would not be able to focus on particular wards on our current levels of staffing.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response: The loss of Community Caretakers is already starting to have an impact at neighbourhood level, with some groups struggling to find an alternative. This is a case in point where a volunteering role is not a good alternative. It is not a particularly attractive role and it carries with it a large amount of responsibility which a volunteer would not always want to shoulder. Where groups have someone who would be prepared to take this on, that is great, but for those who don't it is a real challenge and could mitigate against some groups being able to carry on meeting. This again mitigates against some of the most needy in society at a time when the council is seeking to improve quality of life, eg for the elderly &

disabled.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response: It seems to make good sense to bring teams into one Directorate, However, if this happens, the council needs to take care that efforts are not just targeted at economic outcomes and drivers, but the real needs of local communities. It does not seem a natural fit for the NW teams, but then we do not have a great knowledge of the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration, so it is difficult for us to comment.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response: We have great respect for the NW teams and link to them a great deal and especially to the St Giles Team, that has been very proactive. We think it would be a huge loss to the St Giles area if that building and facility were to be removed. We think the local community would be put at a great disadvantage. The same may be true of Moorlands, but we have less experience of working with that team. Alternatives are in place for the Belmont Office, with Abbey Access Centre being close by.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or

other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response: This seems to be a very tight timescale and leaves communities little time to respond in terms of neighbourhood boards, etc. We could support in spreading the message and pointing people towards other services, offering one-off facilitation session, etc, but we could not commit to carry out intensive work in these neighbourhood areas. We would very much miss opportunities to link to the local communities without the Neighbourhood managers.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.
We are keen to hear what that might be

Response: We think it will be an uphill struggle to recruit new people to neighbourhood boards at such a time of transition. We will of course give all the support we can, but recognise the immediate issues.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response: Yes, especially around Foodbank services, with the loss of the St Giles Matters building where people can get vouchers. The NW teams are currently excellent at letting people know about our courses and volunteering opportunities and help to extend our reach across the city. They also point us towards community groups who may need our support and get us involved in events. They are an invaluable service that we would greatly miss.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response: Whilst we understand the pressures facing the council at this time, we are very concerned about the potential loss of the current NW arrangements and the impact of this on communities, and local voluntary and community groups across the city.

We also regret that we were not able to support the consultation process in terms of taking this out more widely to the voluntary and community sector via our

networking meetings and email distribution lists. However, we are grateful for this opportunity to have input and would welcome further discussion if this is seen as appropriate.

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response: Personally I believe that momentum is important when working within the community. My worry is that if you pull out of each of these areas you'll find it very difficult to get back up to speed if the plan changes and you decide to come back to one of them because of a low yield in your chosen area.

On another note, our church (Ignite Elim Church) is one of very few community based groups in our area. I am aware that during 2017 one or two of the other groups may also cease. My concern is that we would be the only group left working in the area and may end up losing the use of the building if the cost running Moorland Community Centre begins to further out way the benefit of keeping it open. We, as a group, would have nowhere else affordable to go, and no other community based groups with which to bunk up with.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response: I think that scaling back from areas that we can have little impact in is a wise process, specially if there are other groups hitting other areas that you may be focussing on.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response: Residents are important, as they are the guys that we are trying to help. I'd also recommend the groups that are actually based in each area.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The

Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response: I know that the Neighbourhood Team on Moorland act as the contact between the council and the community. This is very valuable asset to both sides of the divide. Many people like to talk to a face, and it's even better when it's someone we trust.

The council and the residents will both be losing out on a great communication tool.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response: As far as I'm aware, the main groups attending the neighbourhood board in Moorland were outside agencies and council groups. I think there was maybe one or two locally ran groups that attended. It might be good to see how we can run this slightly differently. I'm guessing that the outside agencies that were in attendance here would have been in all of the boards. Maybe you could have central board that you invite all of the groups to? This would mean less repetition for already busy groups and agencies, and better snapshot of the city as a whole.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response: As a church we are already working on this and often get asked by the neighbourhood team to help out in areas. Maybe there could be some signposting to the services that are already on offer. On the other hand, people speak to the neighbourhood team because they know them personally. Again, to lose such a communication tool might hinder community cohesion and awareness.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response: In the past we have had very good community caretakers that have done a lot of different tasks. One of the main things that we found to be good was the events they helped to run. I'm guessing this is the part of the job that you are looking at keeping active. If so, I have no issue with it and think it may work fine.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response: I'm guessing that in the light of your department's budget cut, moving the team and highest cost to another department sounds like a wise option.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response: This is a massive issue for us, and for our community. If your plans go ahead I would really like to talk about the option of a transfer of assets to Ignite Elim Church for the Moorland Community Centre. We would be able to keep the premises in use and get funding to improve the building to get more use out of it for the community.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response: I understand that it's wise to move quickly.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response: As I've mentioned before, if our group had access to the community centre on Moorland we could easily run all of the services that have been mentioned, and more. We could also support other community groups, both with space and finances.
Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?
<p>Response: There are two main areas that this would impact us:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Our communication with the council and other groups would be a lot more difficult. 2) If we were no longer able to use the community centre we wouldn't have anywhere to work out of. Most of our services on Moorland would cease.
Do you have any other comments you wish to make?
Response: I would like to book a meeting with Simon with regards to the centre and keeping it in use.



CITY OF
Lincoln
COUNCIL



Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service
Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

I feel there is a need in all the neighbourhood areas and wonder what will happen to them if the support they currently have is withdrawn in these most vulnerable areas

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

If this suggestion is for all areas and not just the targeted area that is fine otherwise, what happens to the people living in the other areas.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Would support all the neighbourhood teams in whatever way we can.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

Many people will lose the provision of information. Suggestion you keep the job Community Caretaker. She and perhaps others like her in the other communities are the lynchpin for many vulnerable people.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

Really can't comment. To be solely relying on volunteers could be a disaster if you get strong characters.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

I guess going back to how it was years ago when neighbours helped neighbours.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners. **Please comment above re Caretaker**

Response:

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

Can't comment really but guess it would be ok

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

I know many people know these buildings as a place to go for advice, share information of problems in the neighbourhood etc.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

Very fast turn around and it will have a great impact on the neighbourhood losing their support.

<p>Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved. <u>We are keen to hear what that might be</u></p>
<p>Response: Would always support individuals and groups.</p>
<p>Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?</p>
<p>Response: Not directly.</p>
<p>Do you have any other comments you wish to make?</p>
<p>Response: I think it is a great pity if this service disappears from the various areas and think it will have a greater impact than imagined and while I appreciate money has to be saved, I wonder if there are other areas that should be looked at where money is wasted.</p>

Please respond either using the questionnaire or in writing to:

Email: simon.colburn@lincoln.gov.uk using the subject header *NW consultation*

Or by post to:

City of Lincoln Council

City Hall

Beaumont Fee

Lincoln

LN1 1DB



Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

I am all for Park Ward/ Sincil Bank area being regenerated and for the Neighbourhood Working Service to concentrate on that area but it is a shame when this service has to be cut in other areas for this to happen.

I have lived in the Sincil Bank area for nearly 41 years and something needs to be done about the negative comments that are often seen in the press and on social media. I myself see many advantages to living here. Proximity to transport links and schools being two advantages.

All areas of the city have quite a lot of similar problems and it will be a difficult decision to pick an area.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

It would be great if people could gain further skills to help them get back into employment but how this can be done without incurring great costs I'm not sure. It would be interesting to hear more about how this proposal would work. Getting the community working together to take pride in the area they live so issues such as litter , flytipping and antisocial behaviour would be on my list of issues to be dealt with.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

I think that some of the neighbourhoods and communities could well carry on without the NW service but some support should be given. A physical presence would be great but at least a monthly report by email to a contact from people concerned on issues raised which could vary from meeting to meeting.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Many people still do not have access to the internet at home and will probably miss out on information etc without the NW service. More Community notice boards are needed with local community groups having access so that both Council information and local community events can be shown. As far as I am aware there are several Community Groups in the city. I myself as part of the Sincil Bank community and a willing volunteer (RiverCare and Litter picks) would willingly work with the council voluntary if it meant local people getting correct and useful information. The Sincil Bank Area has two Facebook groups on which local activities and other events from other areas are advertised.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.
This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

The withdrawal of administrative support for groups may cause a great problem. It is not always easy to find people with enough skills for administrative work in volunteer groups. Going through the VCS may help as quite often people are looking at volunteering as a way of gaining more experience to help them back into work. I have found in my experience it is quite often the retired and unemployed that have more time to be involved with community work especially during the day when a great many people have to work. I'm not sure how groups can be supported 'quickly' as it would depend on how many people are committed to keeping these Neighbourhood Boards going.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

This would depend on how many voluntary and community groups feel confident to carry on without the support that NW has given. I would like to think that the Sincil Bank group would carry on regardless. We have a good residents group that hopefully would carry on and could be the Neighbourhood Board as some of the same people attend both meetings.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

I feel that many issues that were reported to the Community Caretaker can already be reported direct to the council. It would be great if every Street or small area had a voluntary Community Spokesperson that could report any issues to one person who can support by giving advice etc

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

In my opinion sounds a sensible idea that both teams would be managed within the same functional area but only if contact with the local community is as good as it is now.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building; Moorland
Community Centre; Belmont Street
office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

This question is not really applicable to me although I have visited the Belmont Street Office several times to discuss our local newsletter. It will be a great loss to some people if these buildings are no longer available.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

3 months is not a long time to have to sort out being self sufficient and to sort out administrative help and in the case of buildings closing, places to meet.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

I'm not sure what as a group we could do to help in other areas apart from promoting any Events or projects on our Facebook page for other parts of the city. I would hope that our group would carry on.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

If the proposal goes ahead and Sincil Bank is the area chosen I would be delighted. If another area is chosen I would do my best to keep our neighbourhood board and groups going. We would miss our neighbourhood manager though as he has worked very hard to bring the community together.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Please respond either using the questionnaire or in writing to:

Email: simon.colburn@lincoln.gov.uk using the subject header *NW consultation*

Or by post to:

City of Lincoln Council

City Hall

Beaumont Fee

Lincoln

LN1 1DB

Consultation responses should be received by 9am on Monday 23rd January 2017.

If you would like this consultation in an alternative format then please get in touch on 01522 873241 or simon.colburn@lincoln.gov.uk.

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

Please avoid getting rid of the North team, based on St Giles, as they are much valued.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

I am glad to hear that poverty reduction is your top priority.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Please try to keep our Neighbourhood team on St Giles.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

Online advice is important but cannot replace the in-person, on-the-ground work of the Neighbourhood teams. Please try to keep them.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

We have a lot of very dedicated volunteers on St Giles, but they would be reduced and diminished without the neighbourhood teams, which supports, enables and encourages volunteers. It is silly to believe that local people, and especially poor people, have photocopiers in their homes, easy transport and good connections, affordable access to halls or venues, and the time, money and skills to dedicate to administration to replace the Neighbourhood teams.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

There is a pattern of money being injected, people being employed, and then projects ending - and being a waste of time and resources. Please try to keep this really good service provided by the neighbourhood teams.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

Then who would do the work currently carried out by the Caretaker? This role is needed!

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

Please don't remove our neighbourhood teams from their local neighbourhood offices, where they are a much needed first point of call for local people.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of

St Giles Matters Building; Moorland

Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

Losing the neighbourhood team from St Giles matters will be a big blow to the local community, who could not and would not travel across the city to access support. Please keep the neighbourhood teams in their local offices.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response: The neighbourhood teams are needed, and their work could not be replaced by community groups. Please don't withdraw them at all.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved. We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

The groups that I am involved with would be in danger of collapse without the support of the neighbourhood team - to think that we could not replace what they do is completely absurd!

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response: Yes - there will be no local support available to us. We will struggle with local publicity, and essential printing and photocopying which currently provided by the Neighbourhood office; we would lose our best local source of advice, networking and information. This would have a significant negative impact on our work, and it may be lost to St Giles altogether.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Our neighbourhood teams are vital. Please don't take them away.

Please respond either using the questionnaire or in writing to:

Email: simon.colburn@lincoln.gov.uk using the subject header *NW consultation*

Or by post to:

City of Lincoln Council

City Hall

Beaumont Fee

Lincoln

LN1 1DB

Consultation responses should be received by 9am on Monday 23rd January 2017.

If you would like this consultation in an alternative format then please get in touch on 01522 873241 or simon.colburn@lincoln.gov.uk.

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

This is a vast reduction of service and sends out the message that everywhere else does not matter. Instead of just focusing on one area, surely it would make sense to reduce the number of objectives to 1 or 2, and then focus on those objectives in say 3 city areas. This could be done with a reduced staff but still provide focus where needed.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

I completely understand the need to lift people out of poverty. However, is this objective not equally valid in other areas? Moorland and Birchwood both feature very highly nationally as deprived areas and surely need some ongoing support towards this same objective.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

"As far as practical" – what does that mean?? Without the structure and support that NW bring to local boards, they will either fall apart or run the risk of being driven by the agendas of dominant partners or individuals. They still need a central source of guidance.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

As a board member for Birchwood and Moorland and in my role as editor of community magazines in both areas, I see the NW playing a pivotal role in making info available to all, signposting people in the right direction and being a one stop shop for residents. I try and support them in that objective through the magazines. Not everyone is on line or has access to a phone – they need somewhere to turn when help is needed.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

Admin support could indeed be sought by volunteers going forward although history and experience tells me this will not be easily found. However, this in on way means that groups are fully sufficient – they need the advice, knowledge and contacts that NW are able to provide.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

The number of active residents is still very low in both areas that I am involved with, despite many efforts including by NWS to increase numbers. There will always be a small number of residents willing to step up and donate their time but not to replace the role that the Council should be playing, but to work alongside key partners to meet jointly agreed aims.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and

instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

No comment – not enough known about this role

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

Surely Housing are concerned with just that, what about the myriad of other issues that NW deal with every day? What about objectives on poverty, elderly, young people, does all this just get lost?

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

It is clear that people do not wish to travel to seek help but will visit locations on their doorstep. By making the building less accessible, it is obvious that this will result in less groups meeting there, meaning less residents attending – and therefore setting the wheels in motion for a self-fulfilling prophecy where we see a centre closed due to lack of use.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

How can you set a timescale so definitively when there is no plan to go with it? There are no options to discuss in this proposal, no plan for the future and no details as to what might happen next to 7 of the 8 areas. With that in mind how can 3 months possibly be long enough??

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

At present I provide a communication tool to get information about the Birchwood/Doddington Park areas (8k homes) and the Moorland/Boultham areas (7.6k homes) from groups/partners directly to residents. I work closely with and support NW South as part of this. I will obviously continue to develop the relationships I have built with local partners and will look at providing residents with as much info as possible through both publications. However this has always been as an independent, resident led publication, with limited council financial backing.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

As a board member there are immediate impacts to the structure, running and ongoing maintenance of both boards so need clear direction immediately. As Buzz editor, there is a small budget impact if funding of half a page in each issue is withdrawn, but the bigger picture of how the magazines support the community and how the magazines work without the support of NW and with the council going forward needs careful consideration once a plan for the future and realistic timescales have been finalised.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

As a former Birchwood Big Local partnership board member, I have seen first-hand how long it has taken to get a small group of volunteer residents all steering in the right direction and that is with considerable help and input from partners, most especially NW. Without that support, there would be individual agendas, no structure and no guidance. That is the danger in many areas without some kind of NW remaining in place, albeit in more of an advisory role. Perhaps 3 NW

Managers are still needed, with one central admin facility?

I would like to have seen – or still would like to see – consultation face to face with board members and the wider resident community, more options open to discuss and far more detail around what happens next. I would be happy to contribute to any such discussions.

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

Please find attached my response based on experiences of working within the Neighbourhood Team over the past thirteen years and on discussions with the three neighbourhood boards that I support within the Central area of the City

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

My personal opinion is that the service has become too diluted over the years. In my experience of working across many different neighbourhoods over the past thirteen years, it was most effective when working in a targeted manner.

Residents from Sincil Bank obviously welcome the proposal of targeted support in their area, however partners and the community feel as though they can provide a more compelling argument for intervention in their areas. I do believe that a stronger narrative is required to demonstrate the need for intervention in the Sincil Bank area. A question raised by the Abbey Board is most pertinent, is the work of the N/W service and Regen Team coterminous. This is a fundamental question that requires further exploration as the relationship between the two teams is not outlined with the proposal

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

Building on my previous response, I welcome the direction of addressing specific issues that can be measured. Before finalising the role of the team, further conversations are required with third sector organisations and statutory partners to ensure that we maximise the impact of our work in the area.

How will this approach work in partnership with the work of James Wilkinson, could there be the potential for duplication?

Can the relationship with Econ Dev/Community Cohesion be reviewed.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

How will Council services still support neighbourhoods? This needs making clear as part of any exit strategy and could provide a real opportunity to demonstrate how we listen to our communities.

Could this be done by exploring alternatives structures in neighbourhoods as there still needs to be a vehicle where communities can debate issues of concern and be in touch with those that make decisions.

<https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/services/community-and-volunteering/your-local-area-and-ward/>

Southwark Community Councils - <http://www.2.southwark.gov.uk/communitycouncil>
<http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/g5443/Printed%20minutes%20Wednesday%2007-Dec-2016%2019.00%20Bermondsey%20and%20Rotherhithe%20Community%20Council.pdf?T=1>

As part of the consultation process, Bracebridge Neighbourhood Board were really keen to continue the work of the board, however they did articulate that a small amount of support would be required in the form of funding printing costs and administrative support. Also key to any new model would be the support of services within the City Council. Bracebridge Board identified an ongoing dialogue with the following services as essential:

- ASB
- Housing
- Community Services

Third sector organisations would be keen to support a new (reduced costs) approach to neighbourhood working. Could this be explored further:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/2010-to-2015-government-policy-localism/2010-to-2015-government-policy-localism>

From discussions with the Neighbourhood Boards, there did appear to be a lot of fear neighbourhoods would deteriorate and that it would have a large impact on the reputation of the Council. Many were concerned at this loss face to face contact with Council services

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and

websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response: My real concern is that we are aware of many vulnerable people that will not access information online. I also believe that many issues will go unreported and therefore intervention will only be possible once at crisis point. I also believe that many areas have received information in their locality from public services over twenty + years, further thought is required to the exit strategy.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

The review of Neighbourhood Working provides the perfect opportunity to review decision making in neighbourhoods. Support (finance) could be allocated to third sector organisations to support residents play a part in decision making locally.

The Bracebridge Board identified that with a small amount of support, the work of the board would remain. A central Admin working could support the existing boards to continue.

It would be more realistic to have a 6-12 month succession strategy in place, to identify and support required and enable further discussions on how this support could be funded. If done correctly, this could secure the long term future of the neighbourhood boards without the long term financial investment of neighbourhood working.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

The proposal states that this new model will “allow the voluntary and community sector together with residents to take the lead in communities”.

What support (financial or other) will be available to VCS organisations to aid this transition?

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

Although fully supporting this transition, the appearance of an area (fly tipping, litter etc) often remains the number one priority for communities. How can Community Services be supported to engage with residents/community groups?

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

I have answered this question earlier in the consultation. Further thought is required to define the relationship between the regen team and Neighbourhood Working. Is it two separate areas of work?

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building; Moorland Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

One of the areas of most concern is related to the loss of public space. Abbey residents highlighted that Belmont Street has been the focal point for advice and community activity over a number of years. This is also coinciding with Developmentplus moving away from the area.

The Police also highlight concern regarding the Abbey team moving away from the area. Abbey has the highest crime rate in the county and this proposal would definitely see a reduction in the time that the team were about to patrol the area.

Could further conversations take place with Lincs Police/COLC to see how a presence could be maintained in the area?

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas.

Response:

Again this has previously been answered, if we are going to develop an exit strategy that still offers support to the seven neighbourhoods, further conversations need to take place. I would say that a more realistic exit strategy would take up to 12 months

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

The Council has previously made brave decisions in continuing to fund a neighbourhood programme. Central Government funding for the programme ceased in 2010, however many Local Authorities maintain a commitment to their neighbourhoods using existing structures. My personal opinion is that we the N/W service has often been seen as the Councils commitment to neighbourhoods, if this is to be removed, we need to give thought to how council services will work in a neighbourhood way.

This proposal does give the opportunity to take a fresh look at how we interact with the different communities in the city. I would have grave concerns if we were to simply out of the seven neighbourhoods, the responses receive highlight the impact that this will have on our reputation and will have a detrimental impact on vulnerable neighbourhoods.

The IMD highlights that some of our poorest neighbourhoods are falling more behind, the 2015 saw an area of Birchwood falling within the top 1% of deprivation for the first time. My concern is that more work is required if all of our neighbourhoods are going to feel a part of the exciting developments taking place across the City Centre.

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

I can only comment directly on the Moorland Neighbourhood Team but I would be concerned that the role played by the Neighbourhood team will be lost. The team is an essential point of contact for residents, needing advice, signposting as well as their role in co-ordinating, communicating with and bringing together the different agencies offering services and providing support to residents. They are also able to identify any issues arising in the area that need to be addressed either directly or by referral to other parties. This is an area recognised as being in the top 2% of deprivation nationally and for the council to withdraw their face to face support from the estate I believe is short-sighted and will have a detrimental effect on the residents and the city generally.

I am sure that the neighbourhood teams covering other areas provide an equally important role in their support.

I note that if the regeneration scheme in the Park/Sincil Bank area does not go ahead it is proposed to that the scheme will go ahead in the area of greatest need and where the greatest impact will be achieved but there is no indication in the report on how these factors will be evaluated therefore will there be another consultation on any such decision?

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response: I agree that the objective of lifting people out of poverty through equipping them for employment should be a key objective, however employment does not always lift people out of poverty given the type of available employment. In addition there are people who for health or other reasons are unable to maintain regular employment. Ensuring there are strong support mechanisms for those who continue to face poverty is an issue that the team and the council need to continue to try to address.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is

still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

I do not consider that I am qualified to identify what teams within the council are able to contribute to the neighbourhood boards as I do not have sufficient information on roles and skills within teams. I would have expected that the consultation paper would have included proposals on how the council could best continue to support neighbourhood boards as you will have details of what the existing neighbourhood team focus their resources on and I assume you also have criteria for measuring outcomes.

My instinct is that other teams will not have the capacity to take on additional responsibilities effectively. Also the benefit of the neighbourhood team is that they are on the ground and will either be able to deal with issues themselves or will know who best to refer issues to whether this is other teams in the council or other organisations. This co-ordinating role is unlikely to be covered by other teams so issues may not be addressed which will be to the detriment of the local residents.

Bringing together the different agencies/voluntary organisations which work in the area and to be able to identify new agencies/voluntary organisations working within the local community will not necessarily be picked up by people working in City Hall. In my own case as the volunteer co-ordinator for the Lincoln foodbank distribution Centre at Moorland Park Methodist Church, Skellingthorpe Road my involvement in the Moorland Neighbourhood Board was as a result of a direct conversation between the Lincoln Foodbank Project Manager and the Moorland Neighbourhood Manager.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

Local people know that they can visit the Moorland Community Centre to obtain advice and signposting so my view is that without this presence you will not be able to maintain provision of information and signposting as I am not aware that any other agency/voluntary organisation in the local area would have the resources/capacity to fulfil this role.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become

fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

I am not aware that any other agency/voluntary organisation in the local area would have the resources/capacity or over-view on the work of other agencies/voluntary organisations to be able to effectively provide administrative support and be able to co-ordinate issues to be brought to the Neighbourhood Board.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

Other agencies/voluntary organisations working in the area are focussed on supporting those residents using their facilities. They do not have the wider access, engagement with residents in the area. The advantage of a neighbourhood team is it can bring together all the different groups plus residents representatives.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response: Having a Community Caretaker working locally means that environmental issues can be identified and hopefully addressed quickly as there is a local focus. To be able to comment on the proposed alternative more information needs to be provided by the Council on how the new role will function.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response: I am not in a position to comment on this.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building;

Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

We do not use the building so I cannot comment directly on this.

However, my concern would be that both the Neighbourhood Team and the Benefits advice surgery held in the Moorland Community Centre are able to issue Foodbank vouchers. Where residents are eligible to receive a foodbank voucher but are not supported by an agency this is an essential service to be available locally. In 2015 Lincoln Foodbank set up a number of additional foodbank distribution centres close to areas of high deprivation, namely Moorland, Birchwood, and Park/Sincil bank to enable easy access for people without transport who therefore would have difficulty travelling distances to collect food parcels. Likewise being unable to obtain food vouchers locally could result in people not knowing that they are eligible to receive a food voucher; not knowing where to go to obtain a voucher; or being unable to travel to get a voucher and so in any of these scenarios the result is they go without food.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response: It would appear that the Council has not developed any plans to reduce the impact of withdrawal. I would have assumed that the Council would have articulated the support arrangements that can be covered by other council teams and then have face to face discussions with key agencies/volunteer groups as to how they may be able to assist. I would therefore have expected that as part of the consultation process meetings would be held with both agencies and residents representative with opportunities to ask questions of councillors, council officials, so that a deliverable alternative solution could be articulated which then might enable more neighbourhood teams to continue in some form. I would suggest that this still needs to be done and therefore withdrawal of the current arrangements within a 3 month period is unrealistic and would need to be 6 to 12 months.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be

supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.
We are keen to hear what that might be

Response: Given the timescale of the consultation exercise it is not possible to respond with any proposals.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

My concern is that both the Neighbourhood Team and the Benefits advice surgery held in the Moorland Community Centre are able to signpost those in a time of crisis to the Lincoln Foodbank and also issue the Foodbank vouchers they need to access the service. Where residents are eligible to receive a foodbank voucher but are not supported by an agency this is an essential service to be available locally. In 2015 Lincoln Foodbank set up a number of additional foodbank distribution centres close to areas of high deprivation, namely Moorland, Birchwood, and Park/Sincil bank to enable easy access for people without transport who therefore would have difficulty travelling distances to collect food parcels. Likewise being unable to obtain food vouchers locally could result in people not knowing that they are eligible to receive a food voucher; not knowing where to go to obtain a voucher; or being unable to travel to get a voucher and so in any of these scenarios the result is they go without food. The neighbourhood Team and Benefits advice surgery also signpost residents to agencies to help them sort out the underlying problem and reduce reliance on short-term crisis support.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

This consultation appears to be a fait accompli. The 4 week consultation period covered the Christmas/New Year period so it has given very little time for discussion either within organisations or within Neighbourhood Boards. Many of the questions in this consultation are asking agencies what they suggest which gives the impression that the Council has no plans on how they can continue to support the most deprived areas of the City. The proposed option states that a strength/Benefit will be it 'allows the voluntary and community sector together with residents to take the lead in communities' and the whole solution seems to rely on this and therefore I would have expected the Council to be far more pro-active in engaging with the Neighbourhood Boards and the voluntary and community sectors.

Sheila Downie
Volunteer Co-ordinator
Lincoln Foodbank Distribution Centre
Moorland Park Methodist Church
Sheilad577@btinternet.com

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

Currently the service is spread too widely across the city therefore it is difficult to expect progress and see changes in areas that need dedication but don't receive it due to lack of staff time which is often beyond their control. However by shifting the focus to one area, raises issues and questions from the areas that will lose valuable resources that are vital in area. However it is unjust on the remaining 7 areas which will be 'abandoned' with what would seem to be little support. As someone who works and volunteers in the Abbey Ward area it is extremely clear that without the Neighbourhood Manager many projects and groups would not have been founded, be any where near as successful as they are or have the resources to do what is so important in areas like Abbey Ward without the services, support and unwavering dedication of the Neighbourhood Manager. It is understandable that other areas in the city are in need of more attention than others, but it is clear that Abbey Ward has made so much progress as a neighbourhood and this is due to the NW workers, yet it still has a long way to go. Furthermore it will also generate fear among residents, many local residents report that there is a lack of community spirit and if the NW workers were taken away the area would change completely due to this lack of support.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

There are many current issues that still require a high amount of dedication, such as littering, flytipping and anti social behaviour and this proposal implies that these issues will be pushed aside. Although it is obvious to point out that lifting people out of poverty is an extremely important it could be argued that this is not technically the role of a NW worker. However believe this is a scheme that needs to be enforced in the areas.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

It is clear that current services provided by the council are not reliable nor effective for the community's needs. There is a need for more community cohesion with these services and the local residents. Furthermore the resources are scarce as it is, taking away the NW teams from areas will break this down completely. There are many things that need support from different facilities in the council and this cannot be completed by residents alone.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

It is important to residents that they are offered more than just some internet information; some people still do not have access the internet. It is clear that often people need a conversation, be this over the phone or face to face. Response over email does not always cover this and cannot sufficiently solve problems. There is a need for a support system within neighbourhoods. Additionally resources (that are already thin on the ground) such as notice boards and more importantly the neighbourhood offices will be taken which will therefore lead to a lack of knowledge in the community. This will not encourage people to take part in community and eventually any community spirit will likely be wasted and fade with time. This would be a shame to many communities without the NW teams.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

It is very clear that without the NW teams the neighbourhood boards would completely shut down, the support is needed here to drive people into making a change or taking part. Administrative support would be appreciated by these groups, a solution would be that resources are shared.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

It would be important for existing community groups to support and share each other's resources yet still remain self sufficient and independent. Many of these groups have the resources needed but do not have the funding to provide the support, a solution could be that groups are provided with funding to support other groups and keep the network running.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

It is questionable in many areas whether this particular role is needed anyway, issues focused on by the Community Caretaker such as flytipping need to be reported by the residents. This would create awareness of the issues and if more information and support was provided then people would be willing to report them.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

The Belmont Street Office is an asset to the Abbey Ward community, although it has not been available to be open all the time, this has been proof that its needed more than ever if used to its full potential. The loss of the office would therefore lead to the loss of police presence in the area, this could generate fear among residents and mean cuts to the amount of time the police could spend in the area.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the

Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

This is an extremely short time scale which leads to the 'what happens next' questions from the areas. It yet again creates feelings of abandonment from the areas which have not been targeted. The outcomes need to be something that is shared with the residents and people impacted along this process.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

The current community groups will support and assist each other in what they can but it would be impossible for these to provide the support of the NW team. It is unacceptable to leave these groups without support in some shape or form.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

As mentioned before by taking the NW out of certain areas, all community groups and members/residents will lose valuable resources and people. The proposal seems as if it is pulling away from certain areas and leaving them to sort out things themselves. There is definitely support needed for this to work smoothly.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

Is Park Ward also the area of greatest need? If not then would it not make sense to focus resources where the need is greatest.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

Need to ensure there is a clear understanding of what individuals in the area want for themselves, and that if members of the community acquire new skills, then they need to see that this will lead to (better) employment.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Withdrawal needs to be over a long period and not too pre-determined. Some areas might need more ongoing support than others, particularly Abbey where it is likely the population is more transient. There needs to be the opportunity for ongoing support for groups, but limited to signposting and advice, rather than active involvement.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

There should be some ongoing support for Neighbourhood Boards to encourage them to become the signposters and voice of the community. Also utilise community centres (where they exist) to provide information, work with GP surgeries, libraries, schools etc to create sustainable ways of signposting.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

Again, there needs to be a change in emphasis over the period of withdrawal. Encouraging people to take on administrative roles in the community could perhaps lead to some sort of 'community certificate' (perhaps like the students' union volunteering scheme) so people have something of value which will help them get employment. Is this something VCS could develop?

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

See above

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of

the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

Encourage community groups to monitor and report issues. Ensure correct signposting is available to these groups – develop the City of Welcome to become community facebook and linked website pages as the go to place for support.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

Makes sense – but need to ensure in the longer term this doesn't exclude areas like Carholme where natural evolution of the area could see need transferred to this area.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building; Moorland Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

There needs to be an accessible space in every community to enable people to come together to help maintain community facilities. Work with shops, pubs, anyone who has a presence to provide space for signposting/information.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas

and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

This is too soon – needs at least a year of some support, if the council wants to leave a sustainable legacy.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

If the controlling migration bid is successful then the community cohesion officer could offer support in those areas where there are new communities.

Perhaps also maintain a fund for all communities to bid for v small amounts (e.g. max £50-100) to help with newsletter printing, venue hire for community events, refreshments etc. – small amounts demonstrate support.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

This biggest risk is that in having a very narrow focus issues will displace into adjacent areas, particularly where there are already similar issues.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

See covering email.

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

The consultation is only on the proposed option, and I would suggest it may have been better to consult on more than one option, a choice from the point of view of others can only be a good thing. This current consultation leads to the assumption that this may already be a done deal. The consultation also requires several assumptions to be made. The current proposal is not for a NW service but more a new team.

Given the current financial restraints a reduction to the number of areas covered may be a good thing, but I feel that a reduction to just one area is the wrong decision. The current budget has been cut by just over half but there is no proposal to half the areas. More focused working would be welcome, but a withdrawal from seven of the eight areas may not be the best way to go about things, and may serve to undo all the work that has already taken place. I would have favoured a less dramatic shift, rather than withdrawal from almost all areas. It is very much looking like a case of all or nothing, and I am concerned what will happen moving forward to any area not covered.

What will determine where the greatest impact can be achieved? Has each area been considered on its own merit, and will the views of partners, other organisations and residents been taken into account if Sincil Bank is not the favoured option? Are there any longer term plans, yes regeneration work is planned for the immediate future, but what about the longer term?

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

I would agree that greater concentration on fewer priorities would be a good thing, and that currently the service is spread too thinly over trying to deliver on many issues. Concentrating on reducing unemployment and upskilling would be welcome, and I would suggest that this be a starting point rather than committing to one topic or focus of work. Perhaps it would be worthwhile setting a new priority

or topic of work after an agreed timescale (18 months/2 years for example), allowing the team to address one priority followed by another. If working in such a way I would suggest that the same priority and to a great extent, the same work, could be undertaken on each area the service were to cover. Any one project relating to the priority of reducing unemployment and upskilling could be rolled out in any and all areas covered as this would be a priority for any deprived area. There can only be so much work that can be done under any one priority whilst continuing to work with partners and other organisations and I would suggest that any priority be time specific allowing work to be done to improve other areas of deprivation, setting one priority after another.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Which teams and services will do this?

Whilst there has perhaps been an increase in duplication in some areas of work I would suggest that the proposed new neighbourhood working team would not have the capacity to do this for each of the areas to be withdrawn from. I would suggest that neither Housing Officers nor the Policy Team would be able to do so either.

One possible solution is that the councillors become more active in the area which they cover, holding more frequent drop in sessions/surgeries and that they be supported by Democratic Services in doing so. This may allow residents to continue to be involved in decision making but I fear that residents wouldn't look for or be able to access the current support they receive in this manner.

I fear that without formal structured support the neighbourhood boards will collapse and that other partners may not be willing or able to provide the administrative support necessary in order for them to continue. I would suggest that someone to pull these meetings together, take minutes and circulate reports would be necessary and, and again wonder whether Democratic Services may be able to bridge this gap, if NW were unable to do so. I would suggest that NW could support the boards for any area they cover, and my suggestion would that this would be three boards, for three areas. I believe that with structured support some boards may continue, and this would continue to benefit local communities. Unfortunately those that are not well established or long running will no doubt fold leading to less partnership working, gaps in delivery and ultimately a poorer service to the community.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote

the campaigns of other organisations in the community.
We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

I believe that there will be a reduction, the numbers of people assisted by NW shows the genuine need for provision and in all honesty I don't think you can prevent this unless the area is served what by what is effectively a community hub. Not everyone has internet access or even a telephone, and where are these residents going to go? Many areas have seen a reduction of outreach services, such as CAB, and many residents do not have the money, or are physically unable to get into City Hall to source help. Whilst many of the libraries provide access to the internet, where advice can be sought and job searches undertaken, I am not aware of any other service or organisation that provides a telephone which is free for residents to use to be able to seek advice or sort out problems such as repairs, income, debt and doctor and hospital appointments.

Provision for internet access, telephone assistance, further advice surgeries, and access to food vouchers will need to be established under the current proposal.

Many key services have stopped delivering locally because of the financial restraints they face. Are we going to consider provision of space for such surgeries and information providers free of charge to ensure that people can still access the advice and support needed? Can we arrange for further organisations and agencies to become referring agencies for things such as food larder vouchers? Is there a willingness from partners to become referring agencies?

Could we facilitate placing the public use computers currently in each NW office in community hubs allowing resident's access to the same on line services available at city hall? This might at least go some way towards bridging the gap that will undoubtedly appear. Can we "gift" funds to neighbourhood boards for future delivery of projects/grants/ to ease the withdrawal of the service?

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

I believe that this will be very difficult on a volunteering basis from within the community. Many groups struggle to recruit volunteers, and this could be an onerous task to ask of a volunteer. Learning communities may feel able to do this, as may the local churches? If a volunteer were to be recruited (and retained) the problem may then be who will meet the cost of all the printing for the boards, and there tends to be a lot of it! I suspect that few would be willing to increase their

own costs for this purpose.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

The honest answer to this, is that I don't know. Recruitment and retention of volunteers is always going to be difficult. VCS may be able to assist, as may Learning Communities. Many volunteers come with their own agenda and if and when these issues are resolved they often leave feeling that they no longer wish to participate.

Ignite church have a number of volunteers, and whether any of these would wish to, or are able to assist here I am unsure.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

The team have seen a reduction in the ability to deliver on such areas for some time given the vacancies within the team. I would suggest that residents, Mobile Caretakers and Housing Officers are able to pick up such issues on the council areas they cover. There are also already Contract Monitors in place that should be able to identify and deal with issues as they are about and about. Between these roles any issues on council owned land should be easily identifiable and dealt with as necessary.

I would suggest that the one positive thing about the proposed service is that there will be a Community Connector, although I would prefer to see a "Project Officer" in its place. There is an obvious need for a role between that of the manager and admin assistant, and while there is no JD I assume that this will be a project based role, which may have been long overdue and benefit delivery in any proposed area.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the

Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

This may make sense in the short term, but once regeneration is completed where would the team sit? Assuming that NW does not stay in one area long term will it make sense for the team to sit with DHR? Should it not perhaps sit with CX alongside the policy team who deliver the strategic aims for the council in respect of poverty and cohesion as the team move to whichever area it needs to deliver in? This would also enable closer working and increased impact in delivery of the council's anti-poverty strategy and make more sense in my opinion.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

This will be sorely felt, and in particular at St Giles, where many community groups come together. Many groups have faded away because they simply cannot afford to pay for room hire. The disappearance of these groups will not doubt have a huge negative impact on the community. These groups offer support and activities to vulnerable people who otherwise would be isolated and lonely. What is effectively proposed is the removal of support services and nowhere for community groups to meet, thus removing these also?

All locations, in particular St Giles and Moorland have a number of advice surgeries facilitated by the teams, these include welfare advice, housing surgeries and police surgeries. I fear that without the use of these spaces this provision may also fade away further impacting on those most vulnerable and in need of support. This is not to mention those who call in on and as and when basis for help, guidance, support or to make use of the phone and computer access.

Are we able to "gift" the public access computers to other service providers, such as the libraries to ensure that people are not completely without an onsite link to the council? Have we considered where these other groups may meet or run from and at what cost? Are we able to provide a period of free use to those buildings where key holding is available to allow time for alternative arrangements to be

made if and where possible? Will a reduced rate for room hire be offered to lessen the impact to assist in maintenance of such groups?

I fear that the impact on the communities concerned will be more wide spread than anticipated. Will the withdrawal of NW from Moorland Community Centre impact of the longer term future of the centre. Will it continue to offer the facility for bookings, or will this run at such a loss that the lack of income from the NW team in respect of rent may mean that the centre is no longer viable?

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

I would suggest that the current proposal means far more withdrawal than anticipated and therefore a period of 3 months will not be long enough to do this properly. I will obviously no longer be in post and Noel and Paul will have all of this to do between them. This would be both a massive and difficult task, and I would imagine that longer would be needed.

I accept that where a withdrawal of any service is expected or planned that no matter how long you propose to take to do this it will never be long enough from a partner or resident point of view, but as far as staff are concerned and being able to undertake what is expected of them, I would suggest that a period of perhaps 6 months would be more realistic.

I would give consideration to my suggestions previously made in respect of surgeries, public access computers etc. etc.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

N/A

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

Probably best to not answer this!

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Several:

I appreciate the budget cuts and accept that money doesn't stretch, but I would have considered more than one option. I would also suggest that Noel, Paul and I may have been able to come up with viable options if we had been given the opportunity to do so. Between us we have a deal of knowledge and experience and this could have proved helpful.

In an ideal world the team would grow and we would further support other communities focusing on fewer priorities with more staff, but given the budget cuts I see the team working differently to the proposed option. My suggestion would be to have the following:

One Neighbourhood Manager
One Project Officer
Two Administration Assistants

These would serve three areas, which considering the current proposal, would be, Sincil bank, Birchwood and one of the two Ermine estates. I would chose these areas given the length of time assistance and support has been made available to them and that they have already been identified as deprived. I am concerned about Birchwood, this is a newer area of deprivation, there is lots of work that could be done to benefit the area, the board is a new board and not well established. There has been the development of the community hub and this would be an ideal time to concentrate efforts in the area. Lots of good things are being done by partners, but I would argue that NW could facilitate more and do more good. The area is crying out for intervention and I believe NW need to be in the area. I had been making plans to do part of my working week in Birchwood, but this has halted given the review.

I would not add an apprentice to the current suggested team. The difference in salary between admin and apprentice is negligible, but the difference in the roles is something to be considered. Admin's can undertake everything in the current JD and can lone work. They can also key hold, an apprentice can do nether. I would also suggest that the new changes and working would prevent the support, guidance and mentoring needed for an apprentice.

I am concerned that community groups are being sought to take over the work of the team, and worry that what has already been done will slowly fall away and areas will become "no go zones". Many of these groups are already facing cuts of

their own and there is always a struggle recruiting and sustaining volunteers, if we are fortunate enough to have volunteers in place they would surely need some form of formal support.

I feel that the withdrawal of the service from areas will see higher deprivation levels, and that there will be a greater impact of another sections within the authority. Rent areas will increase as fewer people are able to access support and guidance, if the surgeries are no longer able to operate there may well be a reduction to the level of benefits taken up by those entitled to them. There will be a greater demand placed on Customer Services and Housing Officers as residents look to those to help where NW would have done so previously. There would be a greater demand placed on Democratic Services if the councillors were to try and bridge the gap between residents and the council, although some may argue that ward councillors should be more accessible to the community and play a more active role within those they serve.

I believe that more work needs to be done working out any exit strategy and that a proposed job description is needed to appreciate the differences to the proposed way of working. It sounds more like a regeneration team than a NW team.

I hope that the service is not lost, and that the team can continue to deliver good work in those areas that most need it. I fear for the future of our most vulnerable communities and fail to see how this proposal fits with the new 20/20 vision. Surely reduction of the service who work to make communities feel safer and to protect our poorest and most vulnerable communities is contradictory to this vision? The loss of NW would be a mistake that would undoubtedly show itself in our poorest and most deprived communities making it all the more difficult to help them in the future when this mistake is realised and the decision to withdraw questioned.

<p>Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service Consultation questionnaire</p>
--

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

Would it be more beneficial for one team to have more of a city-wide role where they are coordinating VCS organisations? Tasks may include auditing VCS provision to ensure they are delivered where they are needed and without overlap, engaging further VCS partners to provide work on the ground and then liaising with them and to support securing further funding and possibly providing host agreements.

As a charity community project in Lincoln, I found it very beneficial to draw on networks and local knowledge provided by the NW team. The NW teams were very useful in identifying suitable areas for the project.

Park Street / Sincil Bank undoubtedly needs regenerating. Have you fully explored potential delivery partners in this area before dedicating one COLC team? For example, Sustrans has a wealth of successful & innovative experience engaging communities in regenerating their neighbourhood:

<http://www.sustrans.org.uk/our-services/what-we-do/engaging-communities>

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

COLC may need to be more flexible according to need which may vary with area and over time. Therefore it may be that all teams within the council can be called on to support and contribute to the neighbourhood boards in a variety of ways.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

Maintaining a Neighbourhood Working Facebook page to cover all areas of the city would be useful with some publicity to raise awareness of its existence.

Existing community noticeboards handed over to Neighbourhood Boards for their use to signpost/promote.

Roadshows taken to areas according to need.

Residents with poor literacy / English skills and a genuine lack of internet / phone access should be recognised.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

Would it be possible for any 'volunteer' to have use of COLC resources such as printing / paper / phone?

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

I have attached a one page overview document setting out the main aims of my project in Moorland.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead

create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams. Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

This new role may work well in the city-wide scenario I proposed above.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration. Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of

St Giles Matters Building; Moorland

Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

Community projects benefit hugely from being based within the community they work with. A central space has potential to increase community cohesion and to enable a variety of beneficial activities.

I currently have use of the office at Moorland Community Centre and space in the storage container to store an already large number of resources.

Projects require resources and so also require spaces to store things and operate in.

COLC making some provision / support with this is likely to encourage and motivate local community projects. This may take the form of discounted booking fees for local residents delivering project activities (eg Neighbourhood Board Meeting) & providing free/discounted storage facilities in each community.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

I am confident the South Neighbourhood Working Team will ensure myself and the project is taken into consideration in this situation. Discussions have already taken place & potential measures identified in light of this possibility thanks to the efficiency and commitment of the NW Team.

It would be useful to have a clear list of contacts / structure set out to enable me to find the right people to contact within the new structure and COLC in general.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved. We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

Please see the attached document setting out the main aims of my project, one of which is to motivate & support residents to make decisions about how the project is delivered in their community.

However, as you will be aware, funders often place strict requirements upon projects including specific aims, objectives and places. For example, 90% of people benefitting from The Moorland Local People Project are required to live in a small area identified within wider Moorland.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

The potential of losing office space and storage in the area.

The loss of the valuable contact/information/local knowledge of the South NW Team.

The NW Manager has been a valuable link securing permissions to use places and hold activities and generally promote the project with COLC.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Please respond either using the questionnaire or in writing to:

Email: simon.colburn@lincoln.gov.uk using the subject header *NW consultation* Or by post to:

City of Lincoln Council

City Hall

Beaumont Fee

Lincoln

LN1 1DB

Consultation responses should be received by 9am on Monday 23rd January 2017.

If you would like this consultation in an alternative format then please get in touch on 01522 873241 or simon.colburn@lincoln.gov.uk.

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response: the emphasis on lifting people out of poverty is welcomed, but it also needs to be accepted that the reduced resources across the city will inevitably impact on the Policy Team's ability to effectively roll out some A/P projects in other places.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response: This response doesn't fit a question exactly – so I have put it in here!
On P15 of the proposal you note that there is “corporate focus on some thematic elements of community cohesion”

On P 29/30 you say “City council has a published community cohesion strategy... and that there is resource in Policy to deliver these which will remain in place”

You need to make it much clearer that this resource is only there until March 2017 unless we are successful in getting the funding to extend the position by 2 years. It currently implies that the resource will remain the same – however following recent changes in resource in Policy, this is highly unlikely to be true without the additional funding – we should not mislead members on this. It may not “remain in place “

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The

Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.
We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response: The policy team has had a (very recent) reduction of 20% of its core staff (excluding temp positions) and as such is going to have very limited time for additional data provision over and above that provided in the Lincoln City Profile and the Poverty Profile, which will both continue and be available on line.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.
This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.
As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.
Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:
Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?
Response:
Do you have any other comments you wish to make?
Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

/

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

I would also suggest an emphasis on Mental Health & Wellbeing. The services we provide show this is equally a key reason why individuals are not moving into employment due to their Mental Health.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

I think it has been recognised that admin support in supporting the Boards will be crucial. To continue the relationship between Neighbourhoods and the Council regular attendees from departments such as housing, ASB Team, Environmental Services (fly tipping/dog fouling) is essential.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice

and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

Newsletters have been key in Abbey Ward and are very much valued by residents who aren't so computer savvy. A community focused, city wide newsletter broken down into areas maybe a thought.

Utilise local charities and group noticeboards, websites and Facebook pages.

Make City Hall Website more user friendly,

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

Maybe local charities/organisations in each of the areas would commit to donating "Admin Support" on a rota basis throughout the year to the local Boards. Developmentplus would certainly be willing to do this.

.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

developmentplus would be willing to support Boards City wide with appropriate training to ensure sustainability through our "Community Work Skills Course". This could be done in 2 ways, a set monetary figure allocated to each area where Boards can select what training they require (Roles & Responsibilities, Running a meeting, recruiting volunteers etc). I would put an estimated figure of £5,000 for each Board to utilise over the course of a year, Or for one year a Development Worker could be recruited working across the City providing full support to each Board with a view of stepping away when each is sustainable. We could support the recruitment of volunteers in key roles such as admin, provide bid writing/funding advice along with any necessary training required through our "Community Work Skills" Course. A role such as this would amount to an

estimated figure of £40,000 for a year including management fees/on-costs etc.

For both suggestions a more detailed budget can be put together if required.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

One of Abbey Wards successes is the "Street Warden" style programme of reporting issues to the Council so essentially the removing of this service via the NH Team shouldn't be a problem. The Ward also successfully runs a number of resident led initiatives such as litter picks etc, the introduction of a project focussed role will only enhance the amazing work taking place in the Ward.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

Personally I think the two areas should fall under different Directorates, the two approaches are very different and the danger of being amalgamated into one would be high if under the same team. They require their own identities, at times they may even clash over opinion, what the regeneration team may think is appropriate for the lives of individuals may be very different from a Community Cohesion/NH Team view.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building; Moorland Community Centre; Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

If Belmont Street closes the Ward will lose front line services, that face to face contact with the Council that some struggle to get via the internet/telephone. And Police provision will have to relocate.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

I think this needs to be reviewed when the Ward is clear what commitments the Council will make to them regarding support. The Board will then have a much clearer idea on whether 3 months is realistic.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

Please see above, both suggestions can be tweaked and adapted accordingly based on the sole requirements of the Boards.

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

No

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

No

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

I can see the merit of a focussed piece of work and understand the context outlined in the paperwork. However, such a radical reduction in service across the rest of the city needs very careful planning. Please don't just walk away.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

NW has offered a fantastic channel for local communication, access to services and advice. Its loss will itself risk a significant impact and the creation of areas of need that the current provision has mitigated against.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response: Benefits support and advice, youth services, police, mental health services, social services, housing and highways. Not all these are currently part of the NW scene in St Giles but they'd help us to get a feel for the local issues and ways we might be able to support delivery of local services. Neighbourhood Boards could perhaps evolve a working method to focus on different issues at each meeting. Monthly board meetings are the right frequency, especially as not all members can attend all meetings.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

The poorest and most vulnerable members of the community do not have access to on-line resources. New computers have recently been installed at St Giles Matters to enable people to register for benefits which cannot be accessed any other way. Withdrawal of this facility will potentially increase levels of poverty. Accessibility of advice in person through the Neighbourhood Office is one of its largest benefits.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

If the proposed new way of working is approved Neighbourhood Boards would benefit from targeted short-term support in finding the best way to become self-administering. My fear is that they would not all have sufficient capacity to continue.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

The Parish Church seeks to support the St Giles community to the extent that our limited resources (human, material and financial) permit. We are ready to engage

in whatever process emerges from this review to support the life of St Giles.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

The Community Caretaker has had a beneficial effect in promoting care of the neighbourhood, especially in dealing with fly tipping. Improved publicity locally of how to report issues would be important in the long term.

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.

Response:

I'm not sufficiently aware of the implications of this to comment.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response: St Giles Matters is a busy hub providing ready access to resources and advice. It hosts a variety of service providers, a ward councillors surgery and is known locally as the place to go for advice on a range of issues. The police are based there too. Withdrawal of all this will create a sense of being abandoned. Great care will be needed to find a new way of providing access to these services locally. The Neighbourhood board should be supported in reflecting on this huge strategic loss as it plans for the future.

<p>Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.</p> <p><u>We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and</u></p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Board (assuming it is viable enough to survive the service withdrawal) must take the lead and it should be provided with specific, targeted support in reflecting on the issues the withdrawal will create and how to address them so that a realistic and timely plan can be evolved. I don't think that can be achieved in just three months.</p>
<p>Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.</p> <p><u>We are keen to hear what that might be</u></p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>As vicar of St Giles I am a board member. I am ready to support the board as it works this through.</p>
<p>Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?</p>
<p>Response:</p>
<p>Do you have any other comments you wish to make?</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>This is the first I've heard of any proposal for major restructuring. Whilst it might have been in officers minds for a while it is very new to the local community so my plea would be that we have sufficient time to work through its implications and formulate plans.</p>

--

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

I believe that reducing to just one team will have a detrimental effect on the areas on most need across the city. Putting all the focus on to one area means what help and support will other areas receive. I appreciate that we have to look at the most effective way of dealing with the constraints but the removal of services will leave people vulnerable.

If it is reduced to one team those areas without direct support who will be there to deal with those critical issues affecting the area. The current neighbourhood teams reduce the amount of issues and problems especially low level going to City Hall and Councillors and therefore are the Council ready for this impact. Furthermore if they are not things could get worse and problems could spiral.

If the team is being reduced to one could there still not be a service they can access that supports all of Lincoln in which it helps through a phased exit and helps build skills in order for people to still feel confident to deliver for their community.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

I agree that lifting people out of poverty is a good objective and providing tools to do this is positive however millions is spent each year trying to get people back into work with limited results. There are many third sector providers trying to support individuals with small amounts of funding whilst large training providers are taking all the money and having minimal effects.

I feel that Neighbourhood Managers are not the people to be doing this type of work as it is other everyday issues that concern families and the environment they live. Neighbourhood Managers are a fantastic conduit between the people and the policy makers. Removing this arm could cause less involvement between the

people and the council – is this what you want?

If the council want to support people out of poverty through skill acquisition and employment then greater engagement needs to take place with organisations best placed to do this. A more strategic approach to greater understanding of the problems may help and putting any resource into supporting this throughout communities and not just one.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

Who will do this and how? Why is this consultation not being done in line with a review into everything that supports communities such as housing. If there is an apologise but removing people from the ground in most areas will be seen as unsupportive. I think that targets should be set for areas so there is an outcome to the work rather than an open work programme. If the target is to reduce unemployment then set that as a target for the team in the areas. This will soon see people work together including the local community to create a stronger community.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

The council like many other organisations need to innovate and make things more accessible. The creation of apps and use of social medias should support work and help with identifying problems and problem solving. Signposting someone to a website is neither here nor there, the trusting relationships that can be built up and with a lack of skills in certain areas do people know how to access and where.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become

fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

I would imagine that many of the areas would welcome administrative support due you are going from an environment of it all being done for them to nothing being done for them. This links back to a phased approach so that residents are supported and in 1, 2 or 3 years time are capable of leading from the front.

The administration that is being suggested should be used City wide to support people through organising meetings etc.

Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.

As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.

Response:

As always the community and voluntary groups will feel like they will be shouldering the workload left behind by the Council. Groups will need support to ensure that they can meet the needs of the local residents as suddenly they could become to people what the neighbourhood teams were. Are the groups ready to take on that sort of workload. Furthermore with the neighbourhood teams reducing the issues going to City Hall who becomes the community groups link to the council.

It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.

Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.

Response:

It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.

Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same

functional area.

Response:

It makes sense that it sits within the same directorate however how clear are people's roles as I imagine that people currently doing some roles will get extra work due to the removal of a team in that area. Are the staff capable of delivering the outcomes and being able to support those in need.

The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of
St Giles Matters Building;
Moorland Community Centre;
Belmont Street office.

Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.

As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that impact.

Response:

Are the council ready to field all the additional calls and communications from the local community because we are not as a community organisation.

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

There seems to be a lack of planning in regards to the impact on that community. To have this support and then not to have this support seems quite drastic even if the CoLC are one of the only councils to still commit resources to neighbourhood working. Residents may not have the skill set to take up the reins straight away and need time to develop as there has been no need to in the past.

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

I fear that the resources we have in one of the areas we work with is going to get bombarded with different requests due to the nature of their work. This is not something that is planned for or do we have resources to be able to support. We want to support as an organisation but this cannot be done for free and I think is unfair on the third sector to pick up where the council left off.

We are always keen to work with the council and will always support a better way of working but I do not believe that this is the correct way. Personally I believe that providing targets for neighbourhood in which the community organisations buy into as well can create improvements within each community rather than an open ended work programme.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

Review of the Neighbourhood Working Service

Consultation questionnaire

It is proposed to reduce the service to one team focusing intensely in one area of the city only. If the council moves forward with a regeneration scheme in the Park Ward/Sincil Bank area then it is proposed that will be the targeted area. If not, the scheme will be based in an area of greatest need, but also where the greatest impact can be achieved.

Views on this would be welcome as part of this consultation process.

Response:

Focusing on one area could provide opportunities that may not otherwise exist. For example, a 'Community Shop' in the Park Ward/ Sincil Bank area could provide a whole host of facilities aiming to 'Let's Reduce Inequality' in line with Vision 2020 – for example, low cost food and household commodities (for example, <http://www.community-shop.co.uk/>) , as well as potential access to free IT provision – so that customers can, for example, apply for benefits (such as Housing Benefit, Universal Credit) online – as well as updating their CVs, enhancing their IT skills and thus employment opportunities. Potentially a community hub model could accommodate an extension of The Network project for the NEET group.

The 'Digital Inclusion' agenda links in with numerous projects under Vision 2020 – such as Channel Shift, Access to a range of financial products, Working with training providers/businesses/partners to increase opportunities for local people to access training and employment.

It is proposed to reduce the breadth of issues dealt with by the neighbourhood working team on a daily basis to ensure the resources we have are focused on where we can have greatest impact. It is proposed that this would specifically include an emphasis on lifting people out of poverty through offering them pathways into skills acquisition and ultimately employment.

Your views are sought on this and what issues the team should focus on

Response:

It is understood that there is a proposal to re-allocate the 'Skills' agenda from the current remit under Regeneration. I propose that the Skills agenda would sit well under the AD Strategic Development as this links into anti-poverty, employment opportunities etc – subject to the relevant capacity being available within this AD area. Projects which provide skills and enhance employment opportunities meet the 'Let's Reduce Inequality' strategic priority under Vision 2020.

Providing skills and employment opportunities is absolutely key in reducing benefits dependency (another project under Vision 2020), and in turn improving the job market and climate through such projects can assist 'Let's Drive Economic

Growth' in the City.

While it is proposed that the NW service will pull away from 7 of the 8 areas it is still proposed that Council services will support neighbourhoods and communities as far as practical.

We would seek your views as part of the consultation on which teams you would like to contribute to the neighbourhood boards, in what format and how often?

Response:

The level of Community Cohesion to be provided, and by whom, needs consideration. The current Community Cohesion Officer role working in the Policy Team is due to end on 31st March 2017, although a bid is being made to the Controlling Migration Fund regarding this role to be potentially extended.

Community Cohesion is within the remit of the Policy Team which would appear to be the place where this best sits, but the level of community cohesion initiatives which can be provided are subject to capacity. There are essentially two key elements to Community Cohesion – the 'strategic' element which sits well in the Policy Team, but also the 'on the ground' delivery.

There is a much more information available electronically than ever before. The Council and many other organisations now have websites with a range of advice and websites like Lincs2advice.org.uk provide an invaluable resource for residents and practitioners alike. However there is a potential that withdrawal of the NW service in some areas will lead to a reduction, or a perception of a reduction, in the provision of information and signposting (particularly for those without internet access). Additionally there will be a reduction in the resource available to promote the campaigns of other organisations in the community.

We would welcome views as part of the consultation on how we can maintain provision of information and signposting in communities.

Response:

As previously mentioned, the Digital Inclusion agenda is key. Much work has already taken place on this by City of Lincoln Council, in partnership with Jobcentre Plus (i.e. 20 self-serve PCs in City Hall) as well as delivery of a 'standard partners desktop/home screen' to try and ease access to these facilities to citizens and promote the digital agenda across a range of partners and stakeholders. The 'Digital Champions' concept is also up and running, whereby volunteers and work experience placements support citizens in accessing services online and helping them develop their digital skills.

The proposal in moving out of 7 of the 8 areas we currently work in is that we will also withdraw administrative support for groups in those areas including the Neighbourhood Boards.

This consultation seeks views on how groups can be supported to quickly become fully sufficient and what options there might be available to allow administrative support to be provided on a volunteering basis or from within the community.

Response:

<p>Over the years neighbourhood working teams have helped to identify, recruit and support residents, enabling them to play a full and active role in a neighbourhood board.</p> <p><u>As part of the consultation, we are keen to hear how voluntary and community groups can further support residents in areas where neighbourhood working would no longer operate.</u></p>
<p>Response:</p>
<p>It is proposed to move away from monitoring and reporting environmental issues as a specific job role and therefore delete the Community Caretaker role and instead create a role focussed on supporting and delivering projects across all of the team's work streams.</p> <p><u>Views are sought on this and how this role should function in supporting communities and our partners.</u></p>
<p>Response:</p>
<p>It is proposed that if a regeneration area is established then the neighbourhood working team would focus in that area. Should a regeneration area be established then the responsibility for delivery of the regeneration projects sits within the Directorate of Housing and Regeneration.</p> <p><u>Views are sought on moving the NW service into the council's Directorate of Housing and Regeneration so that both teams are managed within the same functional area.</u></p>
<p>Response:</p>
<p>The neighbourhood working teams are the main occupiers of St Giles Matters Building; Moorland Community Centre; Belmont Street office.</p> <p>Under the outline proposal (withdrawal from 7 of the 8 current NW areas) it is likely that some or all of those buildings will no longer be open and accessible to the public and other agencies in their current format.</p> <p><u>As part of this consultation we seek the views of those that use the buildings on the impact this may cause and mitigation that may be put in to place to reduce that</u></p>

impact.

Response:

Under this proposal, withdrawal from those areas no longer served by the Neighbourhood Working team would commence shortly after the Executive decision and be completed within 3 months of the decision.

We seek your views on the timescale of this withdrawal, what measures we, you or other agencies could take to reduce the impact of withdrawing from those areas and how those neighbourhood boards, community groups and

Response:

Is there anything that your group or organisation can do to support the refocussing of the service or reduce the impact of the withdrawal from areas? This might be supporting neighbourhood groups, boards or residents to be more involved.

We are keen to hear what that might be

Response:

Are there any specific impacts on your group or organisation or your members or service users caused by the refocusing of the neighbourhood working team under the current proposal?

Response:

Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

Response:

