



## Report of the Director of Neighbourhoods & Housing Department

### Inner North West Area Committee

Date: 8<sup>th</sup> February 2007

Subject: Well-being Report

#### Electoral Wards Affected:

**ALL**

#### Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

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

The Inner North Area Committee has approved a total of £305,093 of revenue funding during 2006/07. An analysis has been carried out on the split of this by both theme (in line with the Inner North West Area Delivery Plan themes) and by ward.

Information is also provided on 'in principle' agreements made by the Committee for project funding in 2007/08 and the impact these will have on next year's fund.

### 1.0 Purpose of the Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members with:-

- Monitoring reports on commissioned projects requiring continued funding;
- Information to assist decision making as to how future funding should be spent;
- An update on small grants approved in 2006/07.

### 2.0 Well-being Allocation To Date

#### Revenue

2.1 Appendix 1 provides a breakdown, by theme and area, of allocations made to date. This shows that the split of funding by theme is as follows:-

Community Safety	12%
Children & Young People	8%
Parks & Greenspace	10%
Streetscene	17%
Community Assets	9%
Regeneration	2%
Planning & Development	13%
Community Development	29%

- 2.2 The allocation to Area Committees for the Well-being budget has been as follows:-

2004/05	£202,729
2005/06	£202,730
2006/07	£206,785
Total	£612,244

- 2.3 Of this there remains £14,093 unallocated.

### **Capital**

- 2.4 Appendix 2 provides a breakdown, by theme and area, of capital allocation made from the 2004/07 budget. This shows spend by theme as follows:-

Community Safety	16%
Children & Young People	25%
Parks & Greenspace	8%
Streetscene	22%
Community Assets	29%
Regeneration	0%
Planning & Development	0%
Community Development	0%

### **3.0 Well-being 2007/08**

- 3.1 The Area Committee has made a number of in principle decision to fund projects over a number of years. The projects that have in principle funding for 2007/08 are listed at appendix 3, totaling £68,952.
- 3.2 The Area Committee is asked to note issues in relation to Leeds Organic Growers, as detailed in appendix 4. As this item relates to financial and business affairs of the organisation, the appendix is exempt under the Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3). The public interest in maintaining the exemption in relation to this appendix outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information by reason of the fact that by disclosing these details, the reputation of the organisation could be detrimentally affected before they have attempted to satisfactorily resolve the matter.
- 3.3 The in principle decisions do not include the following posts or projects, to which no formal ongoing commitment has been made:-

- Woodsley Road Community Centre Manager, £21,851 (see appendix 5, which is deemed exempt under the Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) for the same reasons outlined above in 3.2)
  - Planning Officer, £40,000 (see appendix 6)
  - Funding Officer, £41,000 (see appendix 7)
- 3.4 If all of the projects in 3.1 and 3.2 were supported, the remaining Well-being revenue for 2007/08 would be £56,833 based on the assumption that the same budget be allocated in 2007/08 as in 2006/07 (£206,785).

3.5 This added to the remaining 2006/07 Well-being gives the Area Committee **£70,926** revenue funding available for allocation.

## **4.0 Future Allocation**

4.1 The Area Committee may wish to consider how it intends to allocate future funding to projects. There are a number of options open to the Area Committee:-

### **4.1.1 *Commissioning***

This method of allocating funds would allow the Area Committee to more tightly control the outcomes it looks to derive/determine from the funds it has available. The Committee could, through its sub-groups, look to prioritise local issues, seeking groups or organisations to put forward project ideas to tackle these. Allocating funds in this way would strengthen the Area Committee's ability to ensure specific outcomes and benefits are gained.

### **4.1.2 *Rounds of applications***

Rather than considering applications at whatever point they are received, the Committee may wish to consider appointing designated times during the year at which it will take and decide upon applications. This would allow for projects to be considered in comparison to one another, avoiding a situation when one project may have to be turned away due to lack of funds, even though Members would really wish to support it. The down side to this method would be that some applications may require an expedited decision, obviously the Committee would need to decide how such circumstances would be dealt with. A further consideration the Committee may wish to make is to limiting the amount of funding per application, e.g. a maximum of £5,000 or £10,000 per application. This would enable the benefits of the well-being budget to be spread wider and more equitably.

### **4.1.3 *A combination of the above***

Dependent on the level of funding remaining it may be possible for the Area Committee to decide it wishes to pursue both the commissioning and application methods. If this were the case it may be appropriate to decide on what proportion of the well-being funds are to be allocated to each method, e.g. 75% commissioning and 25% applications.

#### 4.1.4 *Ward allocations*

When Area Committees first came into existence Well-being allocation was calculated using a 75% population and 25% deprivation ratio. Members of the Committee could consider whether this would be an appropriate method of allocating Well-being resources. Decision making on funding applications would then be taken only by those Members whose ward was covered by the applicant project/organisation. If Members chose to follow such a structure, based on there being £70,926 revenue remaining to spend (a combination of 2006/07 and 2007/08 funding) and a new capital budget allocation (£394,196), the following would be the amount allocated per ward:-

	Revenue	Capital
Headingley	£14,150	£78,642
Hyde Park & Woodhouse	£20,888	£116,091
Kirkstall	£19,167	£106,532
Weetwood	£16,721	£92,931

#### 4.1.5 *Maintaining the existing system*

Applications would be considered by the Area Committee at each meeting, being judged in isolation or against only the other projects applying for funding.

### **5.0 Small grants**

- 5.1 To date £7,215 has been spent on small grants, leaving **£5,501** remaining in the budget. There are, however, 6 small grants pending and if all of these are approved there will be £2,501 remaining.

### **6.0 Recommendations**

- 6.1 The Inner North West Area Committee is requested to:-

- a) Note the contents of the report; and
- b) Confirm its commitment to the 'in-principle' agreements made; and
- c) Decide if it wishes to continue to fund the Planning Officer & Funding Project; and
- d) Decide if future funding should be allocated to Woodsley Road Community Centre, and if so in what form; and
- e) Note the current position of the small grants fund.