

Interview – Derek Macnab (Director of Neighbourhoods & Deputy Chief Executive) 07/10/14

1. Imbalance – there is a lack of consistency with approach between panels e.g. Housing is busy and cyclical work but not necessarily a good use of its time while planning is scratching around for things to do and cancelling meetings.
 - A rebalancing across the panels would be good
 - The current structure is good as it allows new members/current members to get engaged in O&S
 - It allows members of Cabinet/those with aspirations to develop chairmanship skills and experience of holding meetings
 - It currently absorbs a lot of Officer time
 - There is a lack of public awareness and engagement with the panels/meetings
2. In favour of it due to the efficiency of it
 - It's easier for staff to engage with due to it being more logical and better to understand
 - Less need for the amount of staff to attend meetings
 - Better engagement between Chairmen of panels and Directors
 - Better alignment with services
 - Forces people to prioritise what is on each work programme
 - Cost saving (Chairman receives responsibility payment + the meeting allowance for officers to attend meetings – would be lessened if one less panel).
3. Would not like to go back to 3 O&S Committees as did not feel it worked well as it was fragmented.
 - T&F panels can be set up if work is too great (re: proposed new structure)
4. No worries about impact of changes. Would be concerned if things stayed exactly the same.
5. More effective scrutiny and making a difference (e.g. evolve discussions in to more practical outcomes and changes made).
 - More public engagement (what matters most to local people)
 - Energising of the main O&S Committee.