



**Report of the Director of Neighborhoods & Housing Department**

**Inner North West Area Committee**

**Date: 7<sup>th</sup> August 2006**

**Subject: Well-being Budget Report 2006/07**

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**ALL**

**Specific Implications For:**

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Council Function

Delegated Executive Function available for Call In

Delegated Executive Function not available for Call In Details set out in the report

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

At the Inner North West Area Committee of 29<sup>th</sup> June 2006 Members requested a special meeting to deal with the allocation of the remaining well-being budget, along with a suggested framework for allocating resources. There is £176,287 capital and £29,458 revenue remaining for 2006/07 allocation.

This report outlines how the well-being budget has been spent so far, and explores how the remaining budget could potentially be allocated for 2006/07.

Whilst it is intended to develop a robust process for allocation of well-being budgets for 2007/08, the options included in this report should allow the Committee to take budget decisions this year within a framework and with some context.

**1.0 Purpose**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members with an overview of well-being budget allocations; to provide information about projects seeking funding; and to outline a framework within which the Committee could decide allocation of remaining resources.

## 2.0 Well-being budget 2006/07

2.1 The following amounts remain to be allocated;

<b>Capital</b>	<b>£176,287</b>
<b>Revenue</b>	<b>£29,458</b>

2.2 The capital budget was originally agreed for a 3 year period, from 2004 to 2007. At this stage, it is unknown whether unspent capital can be carried forward. Given pressures on the City Council's overall capital programme, there is a risk that unspent or unallocated resources will be clawed back.

2.3 Appendix 3 shows expressions of interest that have been received for the remaining **capital** budget. The total requested from these applications is **£363,947**.

2.4 Appendix 4 shows expressions of interest that have been received for the remaining **revenue** budget. The total requested from these applications is **£34,109**.

## 3.0 Current pattern of Well-being spend

3.1 Appendix 1 (capital) and 2 (revenue) show the current pattern of well-being spend for 2006/07 and previous years, both by theme (as indicated in the Area Delivery Plan, see Appendix 5), and by ward.

3.2 The main themes of the delivery plan are:-

- Community Safety – reduction in crime
- Streetscape – improvement to the streetscape and environment
- Children & Young People – diversionary activities
- Parks & Greenspace – contribute towards safe recreational space
- Community Assets – promote the use of facilities to all the community
- Regeneration – help to 'narrow the gap'
- Planning & Development – tackle area specific issues around housing and Development
- Partnership Working – help communities to become sustainable

## 4.0 Working Criteria for 2006/07

4.1 In relation to the revenue budget, Members had previously considered whether to retain a contingency while work took place to identify the most effective enforcement operations or for other purposes. Previously, a figure of £20,000 had been suggested for a contingency, if this were agreed there would be just £9,458 to allocate to projects currently seeking approval. At this stage in the year, the contingency could be reduced to £10,000.

4.2 In order to assist Members in making decisions on the remaining budget a funding matrix has been developed. All projects have been given an initial score by officers. The results of this are set out in Appendix 6 (revenue) and 7 (capital). If allocated on this basis, the potential priority order for projects would be:-

### Revenue

Project	Cost	Score (out of 50)
1 Senior Neighbourhood Warden	£1,550	46
2 Kirkstall Valley Park Feasibility	£5,000	42
=2 Additional Policing to tackle graffiti	£10,000	42
3 External Valuation of Headingley Primary School	£3,000	34
		<b>£20,000</b>
4 Older People's Action in the Locality	£2,000 (for 3 years)	32
5 North West Leeds Locality Network	£2,759	30
6 Allotment Assistance Fund	£3,000	24
		<b>£28,000</b>
=6 Space @ Little London – Project Manager	£6,800	24

### Capital

Project	Cost	Score (out of 50)
1 Educational Facilities – Burley Early Years	£30,000	50
2 Little London Multi Use Games Area	£10,000	48
3 Becketts Park Play Area (£50,000)	£50,000	46
=3 Silk Mills Play Area	£59,847	46
4 Kirkstall Valley Park	£30,000	44
		<b>£180,000</b>
5 Headingley Environmental Improvements	£50,000	40
=5 Woodhouse Ridge Improvements	£9,100	40
6 Burglary Reduction – Alleygating Fund	£15,000	38
=6 Improvements to grass verges/footpaths/highways	£20,000	38
=6 Little Woodhouse Play Area	£60,000	38
7 Al Haqq Supplementary School	£30,000	34

4.3 Members may wish to discuss whether this order reflects the Committee's priorities, or whether the order should be changed.

4.4 Members may also wish to focus on one or more of the Area Delivery Plan themes above others, which may affect the priority order.

- 4.5 Members may also wish to consider the ward balance of funding allocation, as detailed in Appendix 1 and 2, when making decisions about the remaining funding, bearing in mind the relative needs of each of the wards.
- 4.6 In addition to the above, Members may need to consider whether to agree the full application cost, or a lesser amount. This may be necessary since the total cost of priority projects may exceed that available, and rather than not funding one or more projects, a reduced amount could be agreed (discussion with the applicant will be necessary to ensure that the project would still be deliverable).

## **5.0 Forward Planning – Criteria for 2007/08**

5.1 When the well-being fund was set up, it was seen as a way for area committees to fund priority projects or to commission new projects/services that reflect its priorities. In reality, the bulk of the budget is spent responding to bids from projects.

5.2 For future years, Members may wish to consider a number of alternative methods of prioritizing the budget, including:-

**a) commissioning** - a cap on allocation to bid projects, at for example 50% of the budget, with the remainder of the budget to be used for the Area Committee to commission new projects based on its priorities.

**b) Percentage by Theme** - allocating a percentage of the budget to each priority theme. Once each theme has spent its allocation no more projects could be agreed under that theme. This is a principle which other funding streams use to allocate funds to projects.

## **6.0 Small Grants**

6.1 Since the last Area Committee a small grant application from West Yorkshire Police has been received and processed. A project summary is attached at Appendix 8.

6.2 Feedback from Members has been received, with one not in favour of supporting the grant application. For this reason the Area Committee is asked to discuss the project and decide whether it wishes to support the application.

## **7.0 Recommendations**

7.1 The Inner North West Area Committee is requested to:

- a) agree the criteria provided (appendix 6 and 7);and
- b) decide whether to retain a contingency fund, and if so, how much; and
- c) agree which of the projects awaiting a decision it wishes to support; and
- d) consider ideas for how the 2007/08 well-being budget might be allocated more effectively; and
- e) decide whether to support the Smartwater project small grant application.