

## LAMMIN Brenda

---

**To:** Councillors All Members; Directors Group; Service Heads; TOMKINS Julia; SHEPPARD Ian; PITMAN Roger; DIXON Trevor; KIRKLEY Paul; GODDARD Laura; HOSKIN Sean; HUSSAIN Shajatt; WOODHOUSE Danny; HARVEY-LYNCH Anne

**Cc:** LDS Committee; JONES Pat H; WOODMAN Julia; CRISTOFOLI Angela

**Subject:** City Executive Board 18 February 2009 - additional information and errata

**Attachments:** Supplement to grants report, Feb 2009.doc

NOTE: HARD COPIES OF THIS DOCUMENT HAVE BEEN SENT TO EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS AND REGISTERED SPEAKERS. SOME SPARES WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE MEETING

### Speakers

In accordance with the requirements of the constitution advance notification has been given by Councillors wishing to speak as follows: -

Item 4 (Grants) - Councillor Fooks

Item 6 (Free swimming) - Councillor Goddard

Item 8 (Waste and recycling) - Councillor Fooks

Item 17 (Corporate plan) - Councillor Goddard

Item 18 (Renewable energy project) - Councillor Fooks

### Item 1 - Apologies

Councillor Bob Timbs

### Item 2 - Declarations of interest

The following declarations of personal interest have been notified in respect of grants to voluntary and community organisations 2009/10 (item 4) :-

Councillor Price is a Trustee of the Lake Street Playgroup and Chair of Trustees for the South Oxford Adventure Playground; his wife works part time for the Lake Street Playgroup.

Councillor Tanner is on the Committee for Asylum Welcome and Secretary for Donnington Doorstep; his wife is on the Committee for Rose Hill and Donnington Advice Centre;

Councillor Bance has spoken to a number of applicants about their grant settlements, including: all of the advice centres; Barracks Lane Community Garden; Leys News; Oxford Wheels Project.

### Item 3 - Public Questions

Sarah Burton (Cutteslowe Community Association) contacted the Committee Secretary about speaking on item 4 (Grants to community and voluntary organisations 2009/10) but no actual question has been received.

Item 4 - Grants to voluntary and community organisations 2009/10

I attach a supplement to the report setting out some additional comments from area committees and revisions to recommendations .

Item 16 - Third quarter performance monitoring and targets for 2009/10

Please note the following errors in the report: -

In section Section 4 it states quarter two but should say quarter three. Also it should say there are 6 (8%) indicators within tolerance not 7 (10%) as stated.

In section 5 there are 20 (27%) indicators off target not 14 (19%) as stated. Also this heading should be in bold type.

Item 21 - Minutes

There is a section missing at the end of minute 179 (4 February 2009) as printed: -

(8) Instruct the Executive Director, City Services, to undertake a fundamental review of value for money in City Works, to include the market testing of waste collection, recycling and commercial waste against a reviewed in-house offer which will cover modernising pay and conditions in line with the Single Status Agreement, improving productivity and potential for partnerships.

The minutes for signing have been amended accordingly.

## Supplement to item 4 – grants to voluntary and community associations 2009-10

Since the production of the report, comments have been received from area committees and scrutiny (attached, with officer responses) and further discussions have been had by officers with some of the organisations concerned, resulting in revised recommendations as follows.

### 1. Change to recommendation on Community Safety Commissioning (Appendix 1 refers)

The SHOUT project currently has £19,000 allocated in the Community Safety Commissioning section. The SHOUT project was awarded a grant in 2008-09 to deliver a community safety project in Blackbird Leys. This was to continue in 2009-10, with money allocated through the commissioning process.

A recommendation in Appendix 1 requests approval from the City Executive Board for officers to commission SHOUT for this work. However, due to various problems the project started late in 2008-09. At the time of writing this report, officers felt that the project would still be delivered, however it is now obvious this will not happen, so it is recommended to reallocate this funding within Community Safety Commissioning. It is also expected that some of the funding awarded for 2008-09 will be refunded.

#### Recommendation

The recommendation to City Executive Board is for the £19,000 allocated to SHOUT is reallocated to fund a Domestic Abuse Outreach post. This will increase the allocation for a Domestic Abuse Outreach Worker from £14,000 to £33,000 and will fund a full-time post, that will be employed through A2 Dominion who manage and run the Oxfordshire Domestic Abuse Service.

### 2. Change to recommendation for Advice Commissioning (Appendix 3 refers)

Additional money to that allocated in 2008-09 was allocated to advice in 2009-10 – an amount of £65,059. Advice centres were invited to bid for this additional funding. Recommendations for this additional grant funding are shown in Appendix 3. However, in discussion with the advice centres, it was agreed that the recommendations would be revised.

#### Recommendation

The amounts for additional advice commissioning be revised as follows:

Organisation	Additional allocation for 2009-10 only (from unallocated amount of £65,059)
BBL Neighbourhood Support Services	15,510
Oxford Community Work Agency	12,250
Oxford CAB	16,750
Oxfordshire Chinese Community Advice Centre	5,039
Rose Hill and Donnington Advice Centre	15,510

Comments received from Area Committees & Community & Partnership Scrutiny for City Executive Board Consideration

Committee	Meeting Date	Comments / Recommendations	Officer Comments
North East Area	20.01.09	<p>To approve the recommendations as detailed in the report;</p> <p>Recommended to the portfolio holder that groups who are recommended to the small grant budget be informed about this in the letter sent to them informing them about the outcome of their grant application.</p>	<p>Agreed this will be actioned by officers.</p>
East Area Parliament	21.01.09	<p>Councillor Williams observed that, although the Council was in a dire financial position, it was still worth fighting hard for things that mattered. He expressed strong support for the Chinese Advice Centre and the valuable contribution it made to the well being of East Oxford.</p> <p>Councillor Benjamin added that she felt some grant applications to be linked to specific Area Committees – such as the Rose Hill newsletter and South East Area Committee; and in such circumstances she felt that it was better for the relevant Area Committee to provide funding, rather than the Council as a whole.</p> <p>Note that the grants process has been completed in especially difficult financial circumstances this year.</p> <p>Recommend that the following applications should be considered for additional funding:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chinese Community Centre &amp; Advice Centre</li> <li>• Cowley Road Carnival</li> <li>• Barracks Lane Community Garden</li> <li>• Hammer &amp; Tongue</li> <li>• Falcon Rowing Club</li> </ul> <p>Express concern that the following organisation appear to have been given preferential treatment (awarded the full amount), and ask that the level of support offer to them be reconsidered:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hinksey Sculling Club</li> <li>• Lake Street Playgroup</li> <li>• British Sub Aqua Club</li> </ul> <p>Offer the residue of the EAP small grants budget – at the end of the financial year – to go towards grants awarded to organisations</p>	<p>There were a number of applications for community newsletters and over the next year we intend to try work with the applicants to see if there are any ways they could link or share training and printing and so be more cost effective</p> <p>If changes are made to recommendations the City Executive Board will need to consider from which the adjustment will need to be made from.</p> <p>This commitment was made in 2005 by Executive Board. It will finish 2009-10, after which these groups will need to apply through the open bidding section for consideration.</p>

		<p>within the EAP area (shown in point 2 above). Note all other points made.</p>
<p>Community &amp; Partnership Scrutiny</p>	<p>22.01.09</p>	<p>The Chair emphasised that it was not the role of the Scrutiny Committee to look at individual grants allocated, rather to consider the process used and scope for improvement.</p> <p>The main points raised were: -</p> <p>The process for allocating grant funding had been much improved over the past couple of years but there were still further improvements needed in some areas.</p> <p>The Committee was told that no grant applications had been refused for technical reasons this year and this was welcomed.</p> <p>However there was a pattern of refusals of applications from BME groups. Councillor Bance acknowledged there was still some difficulty in ensuring that all ethnic groups could access funding successfully and there was more to be done on this. One of the problems with applications from BME groups as that several events were not open to all ethnic groups and therefore scored less highly than applications for events that were socially inclusive. For next year work would be done to try and bring different groups together so they could bid more successfully.</p> <p>It was noted that funding for advice groups seemed high and this was because work undertaken by advice groups tended to align closely to the Council's corporate goals. Some apparent anomalies and overlaps in funding were due to commissioning grants being allocated over a 3 year period, and where the rules changed part way through a funding spell sometimes two grants were allocated in parallel to cover different periods.</p> <p>It was part of the criteria for awarding grants was that we should not fund activities that were the responsibility of other bodies to provide, but attempts at dialogue with providers over the funding of such activities had not been a great success to date.</p> <p><u>Resolved</u> to advise the City Executive Board of the above comments and in particular that:-</p> <p>There was concern to ensure that BME groups were able to access funds as much as possible, and there was a need to look at further development work in this area;</p> <p>There was a need for dialogue and working with other bodies,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Specific BME groups will be targeted to offer help and advice within local neighbourhoods with funding applications from OCVA during the year</p>

		particularly the County Council, so that there could be a joined up approach to assisting community and voluntary organisations and the Committee would be happy to assist if that was considered to be appropriate;	It is hoped that joint commissioning with other funding bodies will be developed further during the year.
South East Cowley	02.02.09 04.02.09	<p>Recommendations noted and supported</p> <p>The Committee agreed:</p> <p>(a) To note and support the recommendations;</p> <p>(b) To pass to the Executive Board comments made by a member of the public that community groups would benefit from even token amounts of funding rather than no funding at all, as this token amount allows them to seek larger funding from other sources</p>	N/a N/a
North Area Committee	05.02.09	<p>The Committee agreed to forward the following comments to the City Executive Board, which would be considering this item at its meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2009.</p> <p>The North Area Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regretted the unacceptable recommendation to the City Executive Board that the Cutteslowe Community Association be granted £2,500 rather than the £10k requested. The criteria for the grant, fitted well with the Council's priorities on deprivation and as such felt that the proposed grant be increased. It should be noted that the reserves held by the Association were allocated and not sitting unused;</li> </ol>	<p>As part of the budget setting process, in 2004 a 2 year bid was made to Executive Board, requesting a contribution to match contribution from Oxfordshire County Council. This is what it said in the report:</p> <p>"This contribution matches funding provided by the County Council and enables two posts previously funded through the Community Association to continue. The Cutteslowe Community Development Project will be able to sustain its delivery of services in the ward which a small area survey has shown to be an area of need. Fundraising will also take place for the longer sustainability of the project and other activities."</p> <p>This report was circulated to all area committees for consultation etc. North Area Committee requested this was extended to three years. This request was considered by Executive Board and the response is stated as:-</p> <p>"The original request for support for this scheme was for two years, as part of an agreement for match funding with the County Council. While the Executive Board is sympathetic to the recommendation from the area committee it feels that any decision on extending the funding beyond what was requested should be made on the basis of a detailed report, not as part of the budget process".</p> <p>At the end of the 2 year period funding was</p>

		<p>found from a budget held in Neighbourhood Renewal. This budget is no longer there so CCA were advised to apply for a grant through the open bidding section.</p> <p>Officers feel that by awarding a grant to fund Community Development Worker post it is setting a precedent to other Community Associations who will expect the same support. Also the previous 2 year funding was given on the understanding that "fundraising will also take place for the longer sustainability of the project and other activities". However the Panel felt that a contribution could be awarded despite the restrictions on the budget available.</p> <p>Any change to the recommendation City Executive Board will need to consider which recommendation should be reduced. It should also be noted that the contribution from Oxfordshire County Council has been reduced from £10,000 to £5000.</p> <p>The proposal in appendix 1 to commission with the SHOUT project was specifically for some work they were doing in Blackbird Leys.</p>	<p>Yes, all groups awarded a grant report back on a 6 monthly cycle about how they have spent the grant.</p>
<p>Central, South &amp; West Area Committee</p>	<p>10.02.09</p>	<p>2. Welcomed the Shout Projects proposed allocation for Year 2 of £19k, as this was another project which contributed to relieving deprivation in the area</p> <p>To support the grant recommendations to City Executive Board. Various observations were made upon the report as follows:-  The size of grants, for example for the Lake Street Playgroup and the British Sub-Aqua Club related to the third year of grants awarded on a different basis by the Executive Board in 2005  Did organisations awarded grants all report back on how the grant had been spent (paragraph 18 of the annexed report refers)  Equal opportunities compliance was a lawful requirement of a public authority (paragraph 20 of the annexed report refers)  On the grants awarded under the commissioning process, the organisations should report back on their activities in terms, among other things, of how they addressed the Council's corporate priorities (appendix 1 to the annexed report refers)</p>	

5