



## Notice of meeting of

### Executive

<b>To:</b>	Councillors Steve Galloway (Chair), Sue Galloway, Jamieson-Ball, Macdonald, Orrell, Reid, Runciman, Sunderland and Waller
<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday, 30 January 2007
<b>Time:</b>	2.00 pm
<b>Venue:</b>	Guildhall

### AGENDA

#### Notice to Members - Calling In:

Members are reminded that, should they wish to call in any item on this agenda, notice must be given to Democracy Support Group by:

**10:00 am on Monday 29 January**, if an item is called in *before* a decision is taken, *or*

**4:00 pm on Thursday 1 February**, if an item is called in *after* a decision has been taken.

Items called in will be considered by the Scrutiny Management Committee.

#### 1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point, Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interest they may have in the business on this agenda.

**2. Minutes** (Pages 1 - 12)

To approve and sign the minutes of the Executive meeting held on 16 January 2007.

**3. Exclusion of Press and Public**

To consider excluding the press and public from the meeting during consideration of Annex B to agenda item 6 (Future of the City Archives Service: Progress Update) on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons, which is classed as exempt under Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

**4. Public Participation / Other Speakers**

At this point in the meeting, members of the public who registered their wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the Executive's remit can do so. The deadline for registering is **5:00 pm on Monday, 29 January 2007.**

**5. Executive Forward Plan** (Pages 13 - 14)

To receive an update on those items that are currently listed on the Executive Forward Plan.

**6. Future of the City Archives Service: Progress Update** (Pages 15 - 28)

This report updates the Executive on the recent procurement exercise for the City's archives services.

**7. Ward Committee Budgets** (Pages 29 - 32)

This report informs Members of the amount of the base ward committee revenue and capital budget allocated in 2006/7 and asks them to consider, in response to a Council motion proposed by Cllr Potter on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2006, the re-instatement of ward committee income budgets to the 2005/6 level.

**8. Reference: Financial Support to Voluntary Organisations**  
(Pages 33 - 56)

This report asks Members to consider a recommendation from the Executive Leader with regard to applications by voluntary organisations for financial support of over £5,000 from the Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding budget.

**9. Urgent Business**

Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972

Democracy Officer:

Name: Fiona Young

Contact details:

- Telephone – (01904) 551024
- E-mail – [fiona.young@york.gov.uk](mailto:fiona.young@york.gov.uk)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.

This page is intentionally left blank

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

MEETING	Executive
DATE	16 January 2007
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS Steve Galloway (Chair), Sue Galloway, Macdonald, Orrell, Reid, Runciman and Waller
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS Jamieson-Ball and Sunderland

---

**PART A - MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS****132. Declarations of Interest**

The Chair invited Members to declare at this point any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. Cllr Waller declared a personal, non prejudicial interest in agenda item 9 (Capital Programme Budget 2007/08 to 2010/11), insofar as it related to Westfield Primary School, Oaklands Secondary School and York High School, as a governor of those three schools.

**133. Minutes**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Executive meeting held on 19 December 2006 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**134. Exclusion of Press and Public**

RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during any detailed discussion of Annex B to agenda item 7 (Capital Programme Monitor Two) and Annex 6 to agenda item 9 (Capital Programme Budget 2007/08 to 2010/11), on the grounds that they contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons, which is classed as exempt under Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

**135. Public Participation and Other Speakers**

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. However, there had been two requests to speak from trades union representatives in relation to the Revenue Budget savings proposals (Agenda Item 8).

With the agreement of the Chair, representations were heard from:

- A) Liz Young, UNISON Deputy Convenor, who commented on the proposal to reduce the corporate facility time made

available to trades unions (no. CXS11 in Annex 4) and the proposal to combine the New Horizons and Community Base Day Resources (no. HAS4 in Annex 4). She urged the Executive not to recommend these proposals to Council, on the basis that CXS11 was unreasonable and arbitrary and may be in breach of the ACAS Code of Practice, while HAS4 would amount to a cut in provision of services to a vulnerable group and there were concerns that the Community Base site was inadequate to accommodate the transfer.

- B) Mark Dawson, UNISON Branch Steward, who commented on the proposal to reduce the provision of the Messenger service (no. CXS06 in Annex 4) and circulated written comments to Members. He advised against the proposal, on the basis that it would result in higher costs across the Council and disruption to Council departments. He also expressed concerns about a lack of consultation on the proposal.

**136. Executive Forward Plan**

Members received and noted an updated list of items included on the Executive Forward Plan at the time the agenda for this meeting was published.

**137. Second Performance and Financial Monitor - 2006/07**

Members considered a report which provided details of the headline performance issues from the performance monitor session held on 21 December 2006 and presented the latest projection of the Council's revenue income and expenditure for the current financial year.

With regard to performance issues, it was noted that:

- Draft Delivery & Innovation Plans (DIPs) were being produced, setting out key actions and measures for the 13 priorities included in the Corporate Strategy. These would be used to monitor future progress on the corporate priorities.
- Priorities 3 (York Pride) and 4 (Safer City), had continued to show an improving trend in the majority of performance areas, although data for some of the York Pride indicators would not be available until May. Notably, York had experienced continuous reductions in crime levels over the past six months, in contrast with the national trend.
- Sickness absence and staff turnover levels were continuing to fall, although the Council was likely to remain within the bottom performance quartile in respect of the former.
- Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) ratings for 2006 would be published in February 2007. It was expected that York would maintain its 3-star ('good') corporate CPA rating.
- Customer First statistics showed fairly high levels of performance, with the exception of telephone answering in Resources and complaints in City Strategy and Housing / Adult Social Services.

- Overall, the Council's services across directorates were either performing well by comparison with other authorities, or improving.

With regard to budget issues, it was reported that the General Fund net expenditure budget for 2006/07, originally set at £99,058k, had increased to £100,315k. Details of the revised budget were set out in Annex 7 to the report. Table 1 at paragraph 46 of the report provided a summary of departmental budgets and variations, as reported to individual Executive Members and Advisory Panels (EMAPs) in each portfolio area. This included amendments to the position in Neighbourhood Services and in Adult Social Services, which had not been available at the time of the EMAP meetings. Table 1 indicated that the increased spending pressures in service areas amounted to £4,878k. However, action being taken to address overspends, if successful, could result in the Council underspending by £229k. In respect of the variations on budget / efficiency savings items summarised in paragraph 49, it was noted that the alternative staff park and ride scheme was still subject to consultation and had not yet been finalised with UNISON as indicated.

Paragraphs 58 to 78 of the report presented a number of requests for virements, supplementary estimates and other adjustments to the budget. These included, among others, requests to:

- Release £55k contingency to reflect the shortfall in crematorium fees compared to the budget;
- Transfer £17,090 between general fund and the traded activities profit from Neighbourhood Services, relating to procurement savings;
- Vire £710k from one-off resources to help fund the costs of Equal Pay;
- Approve the use of a further £330k from one-off resources to progress the Job Evaluation project.

The Chair congratulated Members and Officers the Council's good performance in the past year, particularly on Safe City and York Pride, despite increased budget pressures.

RESOLVED: (i) That the performance issues identified in the report be noted.

REASON: So that corrective action on these issues can be addressed by Directorates and EMAPs.

(ii) That responsibility for determining the final format of the amended Park and Ride scheme be delegated to the Director of Resources, taking into account the consultation exercise currently being undertaken and considering the practical implications of implementing the amendments, as outlined in paragraph 49 of the report.

REASON: So that the revised scheme can be implemented within budget and as promptly as possible.

(iii) That the applications for supplementary estimates of £55k to be funded from contingency, as set out in paragraph 59, be approved.

REASON: In accordance with the Executive's Constitutional powers to make decisions on the level and granting of supplementary estimates.

(iv) That the transfer between general fund and the traded activities profit from Neighbourhood Services of £17,090 relating to procurement savings, as set out in paragraph 61, be approved.

REASON: This virement request is within the budget areas where the Executive is the responsible body.

(v) That the release of the £1,500k provision for Equal Pay, to fund the estimated costs as set out in paragraph 63, be approved.

REASON: The Executive is the responsible body for release of this provision.

(vi) That the transfer of £710k from the one-off resources in 2006/07 to the specific costs of equal pay, as set out in paragraph 63, be approved.

REASON: This virement request is within the budget areas where the Executive is the responsible body.

(vii) That the transfer of £330k from the one-off resources in 2006/07 to the project costs of job evaluation to cover the the period to October 2007, as set out in paragraph 65, be approved, but that further regular reports be requested on the detail of how this provision is being utilised and that Officers be instructed to make every effort to control expenditure in this activity area.

REASON: This virement request is within the budget areas where the Executive is the responsible body and the Executive also has a responsibility to monitor the budget.

(viii) That it be agreed that the balance of the one-off resources for equal pay and job evaluation be transferred to Reserves at the year end, as set out in paragraph 65.

REASON: The transfer to reserves is within the budget areas where the Executive is the responsible body.

(ix) That departments be instructed to continue to look for savings within their own budgets rather than requesting



supplementary estimates for additional expenditure pressures.

REASON: To ensure that all practicable action is taken in departments prior to seeking additional funding from the Executive.

(x) That the proposal to incorporate the £480k additional dividend from Yorwaste into the general fund reserves when it is received, as set out in paragraph 78, be endorsed.

REASON: This is a unique income source to the Council and should become part of the Council's overall resources, controlled by the Executive.

(xi) That the action currently being taken by departments to manage the overspends identified be endorsed.

REASON: To enable the Executive to continue to monitor the budget.

(xii) That the allocation of £100k of any budget year end underspend, to be distributed (as in the current year) between ward committee budgets and local York Pride actions, be approved in principle.

REASON: To enable the continued funding of ward committees and York Pride neighbourhood activities at current levels, in view of the fact that the budget is predicted to out-turn at or better than the target level at the end of the financial year.

### **138. Capital Programme - Monitor Two**

Members considered a report which informed them of the likely out-turn position of the Council's 2006/07 capital programme, based upon the information up to November 2006, and presented requests for slippage and options to fund overspends.

The current approved programme for 2006/07 amounted to £53.408m, of which £39.379m was financed by external funding, leaving a cost to the Council of £14.029m to be funded from capital receipts. The projected out-turn was £52.157m, or £1.251m less than the approved budget. Key budget variances were summarised in paragraph 8 of the report. Key implications of the programme, as reported to individual Executive Member and Advisory Panel meetings (EMAPs) were outlined in paragraphs 11 to 36. Achievements during the year were highlighted in paragraph 10 – it was noted that these should also include provision of the replacement Depot.

In respect of the City Strategy programme, the Executive was asked to consider the following options to fund a likely overspend of £410k on the replacement Depot scheme:

**Option 1** – Fund through capital receipts surplus. This would reduce the funding available for future schemes.

**Option 2** – Fund through Prudential Borrowing. This would incur an ongoing charge and interest cost to the revenue budget of £23k per annum.

**Option 3** – Fund from overage on the Foss islands retail development. This was the recommended option, as the level of overage was now expected to be £0.26m more than budgeted for.

Table 10, at paragraph 37 of the report, provided a summary of the revised capital programme resulting from the changes reported to EMAP meetings, including scheme adjustments, re-profiling of budgets and requests for additional funding. As a result of these changes, the total revised programme for 2006/07-2009/10 stood at £153.684m, of which £47.386m must be funded from capital receipts. Further details of this revised programme were set out in Annex A to the report and details of capital receipts for this period were set out in (exempt) Annex B.

Members commented that the Council had made good progress in implementing its most ambitious programme ever, which would provide tangible improvements to the City.

RESOLVED: (i) That the £99k of additional funding highlighted in the report at Table 10 be approved.

(ii) That the re-profiling of £1.61m of budget from 2006/07 to future years, as indicated in Table 10, be approved.

(iii) That the addition of overage to fund the potential overspend of up to £0.36m on the new depot, as detailed in paragraph 24, be approved.

(iv) That the revisions to the capital receipts position for 2006/07 to 2009/10, as summarised in Annex B, be noted.

REASON: To enable the Capital Programme to be managed effectively and to exercise the Executive's responsibility to approve changes to the programme.

### **139. Lord Mayoralty 2007-2008**

Members considered a report which asked them to decide which of the political groups should be invited to nominate the Lord Mayor for the municipal year 2007/2008.

The system for nominating the Lord Mayor was based upon an accumulation of points. Currently, the Labour group had 18 points, the Green group 8 points, the Liberal Democrat Group 34 points and the Independent Member –32 points. Under this system, the Liberal Democrat group qualified to nominate the next Lord Mayor.

Members could therefore choose either to invite the Liberal Democrat Group to make the nomination (Option 1) or to re-visit the procedure (Option 2). Option 2 would require a change to the Council's agreed procedure. Option 1 was the recommended option.

RESOLVED: That the Officer recommendation be noted and that a nomination for the position of Lord Mayor for the municipal year 2007/2008 be announced at the next Council meeting.

REASON: In accordance with the agreed procedure, and to ensure that the Council has the necessary leadership to undertake its civic functions.

## **PART B - MATTERS REFERRED TO COUNCIL**

### **140. Revenue Budget 2007/08 to 2009/10**

Members considered a report which presented the Council's revenue budget proposals for the 2007/08 financial year and the potential financial position of the Council in 2008/09 and 2009/10.

The proposals represented a balanced budget for 2007/08, with the following key features (references in brackets are to the relevant sections of the report):

- a) Revenue investment of £12.106m, the funding for which would be achieved through:
  - Revenue savings of £4.799m (Table 2)
  - An additional £3.416m from a Council Tax rise of 4.5% (Table 2)
  - Meeting £1.312m one-off expenditure from reserves (para. 50)
  - Additional Revenue Support Grant funding of £1.191m (Table 14)
  - An £850k share of the projected 2006/7 collection fund surplus (para. 45)
  - Other adjustments on corporate budgets totalling £538k (Annex 1);
- b) A net revenue budget of £104.538m, to be funded by:
  - Council Tax income of £64.883m (para. 74)
  - Government grant of £38.343m (Table 12)
  - Use of reserves of £1.312m (para. 50);
- c) Funding for pupil-led aspects of education, primarily schools, of £83.835m, to be met by the Dedicated Schools Grant (Table 16).5

It was stressed that the proposed budget was very 'tight' in a number of key areas. The report highlighted the following issues as likely to add significant pressure either to the 2007/08 budget or to future Council budgets:

- The deficit on the pension fund (para. 21)
- The introduction of job evaluation (para. 26)
- The future costs of waste management (para. 127A)
- The increasing numbers of elderly persons and costs of services for them (para. 127E)
- The threatened cuts in grants for 'supporting people' (para. 127F)

- The backlog of outstanding works needed to the City infrastructure; in particular, roads and Council buildings (para. 127G).

If the income and expenditure proposals set out in the report were approved, this would result in an increase of 4.5% in the City of York element of the Council Tax. The Director of Resources advised against any increase above 4.5%, as this would significantly increase the chance of government intervention. The total Council Tax increase, including parish, Police and Fire Authority precepts, would be agreed at the Budget Council meeting on 21 February 2007.

Comments were invited from relevant Officers on the points made by UNISON representatives under Public Participation / Other Speakers in relation to specific savings proposals. They indicated that:

- On CXS11, Officers would be happy to work with UNISON and other unions to monitor the effects of this saving;
- On HAS4, it was considered that the Community Base site had capacity to accommodate the transfer, but checks were being made;
- On CXS06, arrangements had been made to consult trades unions and affected staff before bringing the proposal forward. The Chair indicated that the Executive was prepared to delete this proposal.

**RECOMMENDED:** That Council approve the budget proposals as outlined in the report, in particular:

- a) The net revenue expenditure requirement for 2007/08 of £104.538m, as set out in Table 1 at paragraph 15;
- b) The Housing Revenue Account proposals outlined in Annex 10;
- c) The Dedicated Schools Grant proposals outlined from paragraph 78 onwards;
- d) The revenue growth proposals outlined in Annex 3, which include the post-EMAP amendments detailed at paragraph 42 plus:
  - Investing an additional £40k into increased investment in CCTV allowing the extension of provision into priority areas;
- e) To allow the Chief Executive, if required, to utilise in 2006/07 £50k of the proposed £215k budget for the 2007/08 elections;
- f) The revenue savings proposals for 2007/08 outlined in Annex 4, whilst:
  - Increasing TMS 02 (Debt Restructure) from £100k in 2007/08 to £146k, to reflect the one-off beneficial impact of recent changes in interest rates
  - Deleting CXS06 (Reductions to the Messenger Service, £6k)
  - Replacing CSS20 (Design and Conservation, £14k) with comparable savings secured through vacancy savings within City Strategy;
- g) In terms of the Council's reserves, to:

- Agree the use in 2007/08 of £1.312 of revenue reserves, as outlined in paragraph 50
  - Authorise the transfer of balances held on the Bellwin reserve into the general reserve, as detailed in paragraph 54
  - Endorse the adoption of a risk-based calculation to inform the Director of Resources' opinion on the appropriate minimum level of general reserves, as described in paragraph 52;
- h) The release of further funds to support the job evaluation project, as outlined from paragraph 26 onwards;
- i) The fees and charges proposals set out in Annex 8.

REASON: To provide a balanced set of budget proposals which the Council can consider in reaching its decision on the budget and the resultant Council Tax to be set for 2007/08.

#### **141. Capital Programme Budget 2007/08 to 2010/11**

Members considered a report which set out the Council's proposed capital budget for the period 2007/08 to 2010/11, highlighted capital bids from departments that had been through the revised Capital Resource Allocation Model (CRAM) process and provided options to achieve a balanced four year capital programme. Details of the current programme, the externally funded CRAM bids for 2007/08, the rolling programme CRAM bids and rolling programme scheme changes were set out in Annexes 1-5 to the report. The capital receipts forecast was set out in (exempt) Annex 6 and the proposed programme for 2007/08-2010/11 in Annex 7.

The current approved capital programme ran from 2006/07 to 2008/09. It was proposed that the 2007/08 budget process would set a programme that would run over 4 years, reflecting best practice and bringing it in line with the Council's political cycle. The proposals in the report therefore represented a 2 year extension of the current programme. If approved, they would result in a capital programme for 2007/08 to 2010/11 of £139.123m and an underlying funding shortfall of £1.6m. Paragraph 5 summarised the main areas of spend in each department, comprising:

- Children's Services - £26.m, including £12.5m investment in the new York High School;
- City Strategy - £31m, including £10.8m on carriageway resurfacing and bridge maintenance;
- Housing - £27.1m, including £19.3m on Major Replaces Allowance schemes, making improvements to 2,350 Council homes across York;
- Leisure and Culture - £12m, including £5.2m on a new 25 metre public pool on the York High School site, subject to final approval;

- Resources - £34.7m, including £33.9m on the Council's Administrative Accommodation project, centred around the Hungate site.

Proposals to close the £1.6m funding gap were presented in paragraphs 22 and 23, as follows:

Proposal 1 (para. 22) – reduce the property investment budget by £50k per annum, subject to review in the light of the outcome of the Administrative Accommodation project. This would reduce the deficit by £150k.

Proposal 2 (para. 23) – use prudential borrowing in 2010/11 to fund the residual gap left after implementing proposal 1.

RECOMMENDED: That the four year capital programme proposals presented in the report be approved, in particular:

- a) The inclusion in the capital programme of all existing approved schemes, as detailed in Annex 1 and paragraph 8;
- b) The inclusion in the capital programme of all fully funded schemes, as detailed in Annex 3 and discussed at paragraph 18;
- c) The continuation of the York Pools Scheme and Museums Lottery Scheme, as detailed in paragraph 20;
- d) The extension of existing rolling programme schemes, as illustrated in Table 2, *except for*:
  - The Ward Committees Scheme, which will be reduced by £70k per annum from 2008/09, as outlined in paragraph 16 (with a compensatory increase in revenue funding)
  - The Property Investment Scheme, which will be reduced by £50k per annum from 2008/09, as outlined in paragraph 23;
- e) The use of £250k of prudential borrowing in 2010/11, as per paragraph 23;
- f) The asset sales shown in (exempt) Annex 6, subject to the deletion of Leeman Road Bowling Green.

REASON: To achieve a balanced four year capital programme which will ensure the continuation of existing approved schemes.

#### 142. Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Prudential Indicators for 2007/08 to 2010/11

Members considered a report which asked them to recommend to full Council the proposed Prudential Indicators for 2007/08, an integrated Treasury Management Strategy Statement, and the use of Lender Options Borrower Options (LOBOs) for debt restructure purposes.

The Council was required to set Prudential Indicators (PIs) to ensure that its capital investment plans were affordable, prudent and sustainable. The PIs for 2007/08-2010/11 were illustrated and explained in Annex A to the

report. The annual investment strategy reviewed projected interest rates over the next 3 years and sought to maximise returns to the Council, whilst minimising risks. In view of the significant capital investments which the Council was set to make over the next five years, the borrowing strategy aimed to minimise the risks of borrowing large amounts in any single year by giving the flexibility to borrow in advance, taking advantage of favourable interest rates as they arose.

Currently, the Council could restructure its debts by the use of Public Works Loans Boards (PWLBs). Another potential option was available in the form of Lender Options Borrower Options (LOBO) loans, which were offered by large financial institutions such as banks and offered very cheap primary period rates. It was therefore suggested that the Council restructure a limited amount of its current short term maturity PWLB debt into lower rate LOBO debt with matching primary periods.

RECOMMENDED: That Council approve:

- a) The Prudential Indicators for 2007/08 to 200/11, as set out in Annex A to the report;
- b) The proposed Treasury Management Strategy for 2007/08 to 2010/11;
- c) The annual investment strategy;
- d) The use of LOBOs for debt management purposes;
- e) The adoption of a predetermined LOBO repayment rate of 4% for LOBOs taken out before 31 March 2008;
- f) The use of the PWLB in year borrowing trigger rate as a trigger to repay LOBO loans;
- g) A maximum limit of 10% of total debt portfolio to be funded through LOBO loans at any one time.

REASON: To enable the continued effective operation of the Treasury Management function and ensure that all Council borrowing is prudent, affordable and sustainable.

#### **143. Amendments to Council Constitution**

Members considered a report which proposed amendments to the Council's Constitution, to enable the Monitoring Officer to review, monitor and amend the Constitution more effectively in the longer term.

As part of a review of the implementation of the new Constitution, approved by full Council on 27 April 2006, a number of minor drafting amendments had been identified. Several issues had also been raised on aspects requiring further amendment in order to improve the effectiveness of the Council's decision making process. Currently, Article 16 of the Constitution required all amendments, however minor, to be approved by full Council.

In view of the resource implications of the Article 16 requirement, and after consultation with all Political Groups, it was recommended that the

Constitution be amended to enable amendments to be made by the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services (the Monitoring Officer), in consultation with the Chief Executive and, for more substantial amendments, with Group Leaders, without the approval of full Council.

RECOMMENDED: (i) That the Constitution be amended to authorise the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services, in consultation with the Chief Executive, to make the following amendments to the Constitution without requiring the approval of full Council:

- Minor drafting amendments
- Any other amendment in consultation with Group Leaders.

REASON: To ensure that the Constitution is more effectively reviewed and monitored and that the business of Council properly reflects the important issues to be discussed by that forum.

(ii) That any changes made to the Constitution be reported to the Executive, circulated to all Council Members and incorporated into an up to date version of the Constitution, which should be accessible via the Council's website.

REASON: In the interests of openness and transparency.

S F Galloway, Chair

[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 3.05 pm].



**Executive Meeting 30 January 2007**

**EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN**

**Table 1: Items scheduled on the Forward Plan which were due to be submitted to this week's meeting**

<b>Report</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Current Position</b>	<b>Likely Revised Date</b>
Parking Review	Damon Copperthwaite	Deferred	13/2/07
Quality Bus Controls	Terry Walker	Deferred	13/2/07
Settlement for LTP	Julie Hurley	Deferred	13/2/07
Park and Ride Service Provision - Options	Tony Clarke	Deferred – awaiting final report from consultants	13/2/07
Efficiency Programme, including Strategic Procurement Programme	Simon Wiles	Deferred due to pressure of work	13/2/07
Race Meeting Review	Peter Evely	Deferred	27/2/07
Acomb Library / Learning Centre	Philip Callow	Deferred pending negotiations with external stakeholder	27/2/07
Corporate Asset Management Plan	Philip Callow	Deferred due to staff illness	13/3/07
Data Protection Policy	Liz Ackroyd	Deferred to allow for further revisions	10/4/07
Information Governance Strategy	Liz Ackroyd	Deferred to allow for further revisions	10/4/07

**Table 2: Items scheduled on the Forward Plan for the Executive Meeting on 13 February 2007**

<b>Report</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Current Position</b>	<b>Likely Revised Date</b>
Parking Review	Damon Copperthwaite	Deferred from 30/1/07	N/a
Quality Bus Controls	Terry Walker	Deferred from 30/1/07	N/a
Settlement for LTP	Julie Hurley	Deferred from 30/1/07	N/a
Park and Ride Service Provision - Options	Tony Clarke	Deferred from 30/1/07	N/a
Efficiency Programme, including Strategic	Simon Wiles	Deferred from	N/a

Procurement Programme		30/1/07	
Scrutiny Report – Guidance on Sustainable Development	Melanie Carr	Deferred from 5/12/06	N/a
Amber House & Workshop, Galmanhoe Lane – Freehold Disposal	Neil Hindhaugh	On schedule	N/a
Final Scrutiny Report on Confidentiality and Transparency	Suzan Hemingway	On schedule	N/a

**Table 3: Items scheduled on the Forward Plan for the Executive Meeting on 27 February 2007**

<b>Report</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Current Position</b>	<b>Likely Revised Date</b>
Race Meeting Review	Peter Evely	Deferred from 30/1/07	N/a
Acomb Library / Learning Centre	Philip Callow	Deferred from 30/1/07	N/a
Thin Client / Competition Strategy	Simon Wiles	Deferred from 21/11/06 and 19/12/06	N/a
Children and Young People's Plan	Patrick Scott	Deferred from 16/1/07	N/a
Child Protection Policy	Pete Dwyer	Deferred from 5/12/06 and 16/1/07	N/a
Future of Connexions Service	Murray Rose	Previously on Forward Plan for Children's Services EMAP on 22/1/07.	N/a
LDF Scheme	Martin Grainger	On schedule	N/a
York Central / British Sugar Action Plan	Ann Ward	On schedule	N/a
Sub-regional Governance Framework – Strategic Housing	Steve Waddington	On schedule	N/a
Administrative Accommodation Review – Relocation of Dundas Street Ambulance Station	Neil Hindhaugh	On schedule	N/a



---

**Executive**

30 January, 2007

Report of the Assistant Director (Lifelong Learning and Culture)

**Future of the City Archives Service: Progress Update****Summary**

1. This report updates the Executive on the recent procurement exercise for archives services.

**Background**

2. In January last year the Executive received the final report of the Leisure and Heritage Scrutiny Board about the future of York City Archives. This scrutiny review was to address:
  - How the City Archive can achieve its full potential to deliver effective services to the widest possible community
  - How it can engage those currently least likely to benefit from our archival heritage: the non-specialist, community groups, and students in school
  - The key factors to be taken account of in creating satisfactory accommodation for the historic material
3. In its final report the board set out a vision for a future archives service that will be a source of learning, interest, inspiration, and fun for all sections of the community. The vision is set out in Annex A.
4. The primary recommendations of the report were that the Council should pursue:
  - i) An Archive Service for the City of York with:
    - a) robust arrangements for re-housing the city's collections underpinned by a clear specification for their care
    - b) a partnership to deliver a service capable of promoting access to the collections and delivering the vision set out below
  - ii) A process for securing such a partnership arrangement which will:
    - a) comply with all relevant procurement regulations
    - b) ensure that there is a specialist archivist provided to care for the city's collections
    - c) create a board (of users, specialists and Council reps.) to oversee the functioning of the partnership and of the city's collections and management policies

- iii) A plan to drive forward the “York Gateway” concept starting with a “history store” type service run by the Library Service, centring around a revamped local history service and providing supported access to the city’s archives collections
5. In accordance with these recommendations a procurement process has been undertaken following an open procedure and complying with European public procurement directives in respect of service contracts.

### **Consultation**

6. The vision statement and specification used in the tender process were derived from the archives scrutiny study which included extensive consultation with user groups. In addition:
- The main contract documents, the Invitation to Tender and the Conditions of Contract, were shaped in the light of comments from stakeholder groups
  - 2 meetings were held during the procurement exercise to keep stakeholders informed
  - Stakeholders were invited to participate in the presentations given by the three tenderers to the quality assessment panel
  - Consultation has been held with staff and Unison. Unison would wish to see the development of an in-house option in line with the proposed specification

### **The Tender process**

7. The invitation to tender was advertised in the European Journal on 27 February. The closing date was 4 August.
8. Tenderers were required to show how they would contribute to achieving the Councils’ vision for archives, as set out in Annex A, providing a service with the following minimum features:
- a) The Contractor will provide a repository for the purpose of providing the Service, to be located within the City of York administrative boundary;
  - b) This repository will be purpose designed and will meet BS5454: 2000 (an archival standard for the storage and display of records);
  - c) The Service will meet The National Archives (TNA) Standard for record repositories;
  - d) The Contractor will manage the whole of the Council’s current archive collection including semi-current items which are occasionally called upon for Council use but which will need to be preserved in the long term (but not including current material with a limited lifespan);
  - e) The Service will include management of the administrative records of the Council;
  - f) Collections management and collections acquisitions and disposals policies will be agreed with the Council. The Contractor will actively encourage the deposit of records and support material to ensure that the Council’s collections continues to be added to for both:
    - i) future archive purposes, and

- ii) the Council's current administrative needs
  - g) The Service will be readily accessible and will be situated close to public transport links;
  - h) Access for City of York residents will be free;
  - i) Access to material will be equitable with no preferential treatment to any particular group;
  - j) There will be free and full access for the Council and its partners;
  - k) Routine research will be undertaken for Council staff and members;
  - l) The ownership of any existing archive material will be unaffected by the Agreement;
  - m) A joint committee will be convened (the membership to be agreed between the Council and the Contractor) to monitor management of the City's collections material and to facilitate consultation with users on operation of the Service;
  - n) A programme of conservation will be undertaken for the collections after an initial assessment of them;
  - o) Any income from use of the copyright will be applied to care and conservation of the collections;
  - p) There will be no specified limit to the amount of new archival material that can be added annually but there will be special arrangements agreed for any material exceeding 5m<sup>3</sup>. New material will remain discrete within the collection;
  - q) Access for the public will be for not less than 45 hours per week (to include at least 2 evenings and weekend opening per week).
9. Tenderers were required to submit four Method Statements demonstrating their ability to meet the requirements of the Service in respect of:
- The Operational Plan: The quality of the plan and its potential to increase the number and range of archives users
  - The premises: The quality of the premises to be provided
  - Innovative Technologies: The quality of the proposals to use new technologies to increase the number and range of archives users
  - Contribution to the "York Gateway": The quality of the proposals to contribute to the wider partnership
10. The invitation to tender set out the following scoring model:

Description	Weighting
Tendered Price	5
Supplier capability, capacity, and proven operational experience including references	1

The operational plan: The quality of the plan and its potential to increase the number and range of archives users	1
The premises: The quality of the premises to be provided	1
Innovative Technologies: The quality of the proposals to use new technologies to increase the number and range of archives users	1
Contribution to the “York Gateway”: The quality of the proposals to contribute to the wider partnership	1

### **Assessment of Tenders**

11. Tenders were received from:

- The University of York Borthwick Institute
- Iron Mountain (UK) Ltd
- Audata Ltd and Océ (UK) Ltd
- Nexus Property Solutions Ltd

12. At Stage 1 of the assessment process the tender from Nexus Property Solutions was found not to comply with the tender requirements. It was therefore rejected. The remaining three were then taken forward to Stages 2 and 3 of the assessment process. The main features of their respective offers are as follows.

#### **Iron Mountain Ltd:**

13. The archive would be managed by Iron Mountain’s staff in their BS5454 store in Birmingham. Access to the archive material would need to be provided by the Council through a “History Store” type arrangement possibly within the Central Library, where the archive expertise would be based. Documents would be requested electronically and a scanned copy provided within an hour. Original documents could be requested and would be delivered from Birmingham the next day. There would, however, be an additional charge for this. Issues to note about the proposal are:

- It mirrors a tried and tested scan on demand service currently provided for the Probate Office for the electronic retrieval of wills and grants of probate
- It provides state of the art accommodation for the archives albeit in Birmingham with the concomitant risk associated with transportation. There is no conservation plan for the material built in to the bid
- It does not address issues of increasing usage or developing the service. The onus to do this would remain with the Council through the “History Store”

#### **Audata / Océ:**

14. A dedicated BS5454 compliant archive of 552m<sup>2</sup> would be constructed by the tendering consortium and operated by the contractor. The rental cost of this new facility is included in the tendered price. Two possible locations are

proposed and costed: i) Elvington, and ii) city centre. A comprehensive plan is set out to staff the archive, to open up the collections, and to improve digital access. A conservation facility is put forward at extra cost. Issues to note about the proposal are:

- Both sites put forward would require further feasibility investigations and planning applications. The requirement for the city centre site would be that the Council make the land available at a peppercorn rent. This would have implications for the Council's asset base with a consequent future cost to the Council
- Océ have considerable experience of document management and digitisation. However, constructing and running a historic archive would be a new venture for this consortium

#### **Borthwick Institute:**

15. A comprehensive plan is set out to manage the city's archive holdings within the Borthwick Institute for Archives. Comprehensive and detailed proposals are set out for providing staff, opening up the collections, improving digital access, enhancing learning opportunities, and tackling the backlog of conservation needs. Issues to note about the proposal are:
  - The tender document demonstrates a thorough understanding of the current position of the city archives. It places considerable weight on the need for the Council to determine the nature and quantity of the material currently in the City Archives that is actually archives. It proposes a two year joint project to do this before any new arrangements would begin.
  - The bid does not provide any city centre access. Responsibility for this would remain with the Council.

#### **The Financial Appraisal**

16. Stage 2 of the tender assessment process consisted of the financial appraisal of the tender and assessment of the financial viability of the organisation submitting the Tender. This was undertaken in accordance with recognised Codes of Practice for Tender evaluation by the Learning, Culture and Children's Services Finance Team.
17. The financial assessment consisted of a comparison of the tendered prices for both the annual charge of delivering the archive service and the one-off start-up costs that would need to be paid to each of the tenderers. In addition to the tendered prices the financial assessment took account of any relevant extraneous costs that the council would bear in the event of awarding the contract to a particular tenderer.

#### **The Quality Assessment**

18. The quality assessment consisted of:
  - Examination of the tenderer's Method Statements as a basis to evaluate the quality and technical competence of the Tenderer – undertaken by two Council officers and two external experts: Richard Taylor, Collections Access Manager at the National Railway Museum, and Liz Rees, Chief Archivist, Tyne and Wear

- Assessment of the tenderer's Statement of Experience demonstrating the Tenderer's proven capability to carry out the required Services – undertaken by Council officers

19. As a result of the financial and quality assessments the following scores were awarded:

Description	Iron Mountain	Audata / Oce	Borthwick Institute
<b>Price (Raw score x weighting factor of 5)</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>27.7</b>
Supplier capability and experience	6	5	9
The operational plan	2.7	7	8
The premises	6.7	7.7 *	10
Innovative Technologies	3.3	7	7.7
Contribution to the "York Gateway"	6.7	5.7	5
<b>Quality sub-total</b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>39.7</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58.9</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>67.4</b>

\* This score is for the proposed city centre building. The Elvington option would have been scored lower on this category.

20. On the basis of the assessment therefore the Borthwick's bid is the highest scoring.

### Financial Implications

21. The annual cost of the Borthwick's tender is far in excess of the current budget provision (£120,130). As such it is not affordable and the tender cannot therefore be awarded.

### Options

22. Under relevant EU procurement regulations post-tender negotiation is not permissible. Post tender clarification can take place in order to clarify how the tender price is made up and whether there are elements that could be adjusted. However, this process is not relevant in this case where there is such a fundamental affordability gap. Under the circumstances therefore the principal options available are:

- For officers to re-examine the specification of the service and to determine whether in the light of the tender prices received it may be possible to specify a level of service likely to be procured at a more affordable cost. The service would then need to be retendered



- To develop proposals for a revised in-house service

### Analysis

23. Under the first option officers would break the specification down into its component parts and consider whether there are any elements that could be reduced, dispensed with, or provided in a different way in order to reduce the potential price. This process would be conducted by officers over the next 6 months and a report brought back to the Executive. A potential outcome would be then be a retendering. At the same time any alternative options for a way forward would also be investigated.
24. An in-house solution was previously examined and rejected. A feasibility study was commissioned to determine how the environmental conditions in the current premises could be brought up to BS5454:2000 for care and preservation of materials. The brief included expanding the building to include 25% more archive storage space and 25% more viewing space in order to improve the very limited customer facilities and access and to allow for future growth in capacity for an estimated 25 years. The estimated capital cost of this work was £1.45m at 2003 prices. Such capital resources are not currently available to the Council.
25. Furthermore, it was a fundamental conclusion of the scrutiny board that despite the commitment and dedication of the Archives staff, the vision set out in the report can only be met in partnership with other bodies. It is not realistic to provide an adequate level of service with the revenue budget currently available. It would certainly be possible to resource initiatives to open up the archives to new users and to develop the use of digital technologies.
26. The following table demonstrates what some other authorities with comparable archive holdings spend (based on CIPFA 2005/6 actual spend).

Authority	Population	Holding Capacity (cubic metres)	Net Revenue Expenditure £	Net Expenditure per 1,000 Population
Flintshire	150,100	310	434,656	2,896
Herefordshire	178,800	315	352,180	1,969
Denbighshire	94,300	263	181,405	1,924
Sheffield	512,500	498	583,090	1,138
Carmarthenshire	178,000	268	175,812	988
Bedfordshire	578,900	491	543,626	939
York	183,100	334	<sup>1</sup> 167,920	917

<sup>1</sup>: The figure is higher than the budget set out in para. 21 because it includes corporate recharges.

### Other Implications

27. **Human Resources (HR):** The position for staff arising out of any new arrangements and in particular the implications for a TUPE transfer will depend on the exact nature of the service to transfer and the form and detail of any service contract offered. Detailed legal and HR advice will be needed when these issues are clearer. A TUPE transfer takes approximately 6 months from

start to the transfer taking place, so if TUPE is applicable, adequate time will need to be incorporated into any future proposal.

28. Any “history store” proposal would potentially provide additional employment opportunities within the Council and this should be managed in line with the current vacancy management procedure and current recruitment controls.
29. There are no equalities, legal, crime and disorder, or information technology implications.

### **Corporate Priorities**

30. The City Archive supports a number of Council objectives including:
  - Promote greater use of libraries and archives to ensure that they are an essential source of information and learning (CA7: Vibrant and eventful city)
  - Increase the number of people learning from the knowledge that is stored in our museums and galleries (CA7: Vibrant and eventful city)
  - Strive for excellence and creativity in educational achievement (CA2: Improve Opportunities for Learning)
  - Improve the range of opportunities for formal and informal adult and lifelong learning, and support residents to develop skills for life (CA2: Improve Opportunities for Learning)

### **Risk Management**

31. There is a risk of a negative inspection report from the National Archives if a solution is not found for the city archive within a reasonable period of time. This could result in withdrawal of public record office status which would mean that public records such as those belonging to the coroner would have to be withdrawn.

### **Recommendations**

32. The Executive is asked to instruct officers to re-examine the specification for the archives service and report back to the Executive with options.

Reason: To try to achieve a satisfactory and affordable solution for procurement of the city archives.

**Annexes**

- A. Vision for the archives service
- B. Confidential Annex: Tender price – Borthwick Bid

**Contact Details**

**Authors:**

Charlie Croft  
Assistant Director (Lifelong  
Learning and Culture)

Fiona Williams  
Head of Libraries and  
Heritage

**Chief Officers Responsible for the report:**

Charlie Croft  
Assistant Director (Lifelong Learning and Culture)

**Report Approved**    ✓    **Date**

Charlie Croft  
Assistant Director (Lifelong Learning and Culture)

**Specialist Implications Officers:**

Financial  
Richard Hartle  
Finance Manager  
554225

Human Resources  
Jo Brighton  
HR Advisor  
554366

**Wards Affected:**

**All**    ✓

For further information please contact the author of the report

**Background Papers:**

*Scrutiny of the City of York Archives Service:* Report to the Executive, 17 Jan. 2006  
Tender documents. File held by C.D. Croft

This page is intentionally left blank

### Vision for the Archives Service

This is our vision for the council's archives collections. Within the next 10 years:

- Our archives service will be making an exciting contribution to the life of “a city making history”. Telling the story of the people of York they will be for the people of York, enriching lives in all sorts of ways
- The collections will be a source of learning, interest, inspiration, and fun for all sections of the community
- All citizens will be aware of the archives, what they have on offer for them, and how they can access them if they wish
- They will be used extensively for all kinds of purposes, by:
  - school groups as part of the curriculum
  - individual learners pursuing their own projects
  - people interested in exploring their origins and their family history
  - specialist groups like the Oral History Society and community archives groups
  - local groups wanting to understand the history of their own communities
  - planners and decision makers, understanding the city's heritage
  - people worldwide interested in York
  - academics and researchers
- Far from being the preserve of the few they will be open to all and will proactively encourage new users. Staff will be on hand to help people who are new to using archives
- Materials available will be diverse: Documents, photographs, moving images, sound and oral history recordings – some will be originals, others surrogates of material from other collections. The surroundings will encourage browsing
- At least 22,000 people per annum will use the collections in person (600% more than at present). Virtual visits will be measured in the hundreds of thousands
- The collections will be housed in state of the art premises and the quality and quantity of conservation activity will be greatly increased. The direct handling of documents will gradually decrease as digitisation increases in depth and quality
- There will be an archivist with special responsibility for and knowledge of the city's collections
- They will be available for public use for at least 45 hours per week including at weekends and in the evenings
- Physical access to the collections will be complemented by a virtual “gateway” to the city that showcases our heritage. This gateway will be seamless to the user – what will matter is what they are interested in rather than what institution holds the object or document
- We will take this forward through a partnership of flagship status capable of contributing to the development of national practice, training professionals, and

attracting funding. The partnership will draw in key providers such as the Library Service, all the major museums, the University, York St John's College

- The partnership will also work with local history groups to develop the concept of a History Store that will act as a Gateway to York's Past. Based in the Central Library and building on both the local history library and the archive collections it will showcase local and family history resources. The resources will be made accessible through innovative use of ICT and staff's active engagement with users.
- Private depositors will have their collections cared for and documented in the same way as the civic collections.
- In this way virtual access to the archives collections will be possible through a whole host of locations in the city many with staff support on hand
- The archives will play a significant role in show-casing York's achievements, raising York's profile, and encouraging people to visit and to invest in York
- Ultimately the partnership may in effect form a single archive service for the city as far as the public are concerned
- The collections will be supporting the city's key priorities, not just in learning e.g. helping adults to improve basic skills, but in other areas, e.g. providing positive activities for young people
- There will be an Education Officer making the archives a valuable resource for schools and young people generally
- Staff will work in the community to support local groups and communities of interest to access the collections. Community archives and similar groups will be flourishing. Some will base themselves along side the city's collections
- Volunteers will be extensively involved in working with the collections
- The most accessed collections will have been digitised in partnership with other archive institutions in the city (and probably beyond). Paid for access to popular material will subsidise digitisation of the less commercial and will be generating revenue that will be ploughed back into conservation of the collections
- An effective modern records system will manage records destined for the Archive as well as limited-life records with a known future disposal date

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank





---

**Executive**

30 January 2007

Report of the Director of Neighbourhoods

**Ward Committee Budgets****Summary**

1. This report informs Members of the amount of the base ward committee revenue and capital budget which was allocated in 2006/7. In response to a Council motion proposed by Cllr Potter at full Council on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2006, Members are requested to consider the re-instatement of ward committee income budgets to the 2005/6 level.

**Background**

2. At a meeting of full Council on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2006, Cllr Potter put forward a motion (Ref 60) that: "...*Council request that budgets for ward committee funding be restored, making good cuts in this years budget*". The Lord Mayor subsequently exercised her constitutional authority under Standing Order 11(ii) and referred the above motion directly to the Executive "...*for an officer report on the financial implications of the proposal*". The Ward Committee budget for 2006/7 is as follows:

**2006/7 Budgets**

- 3, Revenue

For the 2006/7 budget year the revenue budget was set at £733,570. This figure was £163,890 less than that allocated in 2005/6, due to the necessity to achieve a budget savings target, and an in anticipation of approx £70,000 savings to be realised from the letting of a new warden ranger contract. When staffing and other recharges (for example, asset rentals, other directorate recharges, ongoing revenue commitments on previous ward committee street lighting schemes etc) are deducted, this gives an available ward committee spend of £376,310. In July, the Leader of Council made an additional "one-off" allocation of £100,000 available for "street level services", of which £70,000 was devolved to Ward Committee budgets on a per capita basis. Taking this £70,000 into account, the revised 2006/7 available ward committee revenue budget is therefore £446,310.

### Capital

The total capital budget was £202,000 which, when recharges were deducted, gives an available ward committee capital spend of £175,000.

### Summary

4. Taking into account the additional £70,000 which was allocated to the ward committee budget in June 2006, the 2006/7 ward committee revenue budget cut was effectively reduced from £163,890, to £93,890.

On 16<sup>th</sup> January at a meeting of the Executive, as part of the 'Second Performance and Financial Monitor – 2006/7' report (Agenda item 6), a decision was made to reinstate the £70,000, again as a one- off for the financial year 2007/8, providing the Council budget does not return a year – end deficit. The minutes of that meeting state "*(xii) That, subject to sufficient year end underspends being available, £100k be earmarked for carry forward and use for ward committee budgets (£70k) and the local York Pride actions (£30k). REASON: ...To enable the continued funding of ward committees and York Pride neighbourhood activities at current levels, in view of the fact that the budget is predicted to out-turn at or better than the target level at the end of the financial year.*"

On the basis that this £70,000 is made available, then the base revenue budget for 2007/8 would remain at the level set for 2006/7

### **Options**

5. Option One: To reflect the motion put before Council on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2006, an option is to restore the entire £163,890 reduction for the 2006/7/8 budget on a recurring, or non recurring basis.

Option Two: To restore partially the £163,890 reduction for the 2007/8 budget, on a recurring, or non recurring basis.

Option Three: To maintain the existing budget, which will give a 2007/8 budget of £733,570.

### **Analysis**

6. The amount of ward committee budget made available to members within each ward is on a per capita basis. Each ward has a different population, and therefore a different allocation. Expenditure is determined by the ward committee following consultation with residents. It is therefore not possible to analyse what impact a full, or partial re-instatement of funds would have.

### **Corporate Objectives**

7. Not applicable.

## Implications

- **Financial** the Director of Resources has stated that any decision to reinstate the Ward Committee budget cuts for 2007/8, either in full or in part, would need to be a self-balancing adjustment to the budget which has already been recommended to the Council by the Executive on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2007. Members would therefore need to advise officers accordingly on the source of the funding.
- **Human Resources (HR)** None
- **Equalities** None
- **Legal** None
- **Crime and Disorder** None
- **Information Technology (IT)** None
- **Property** None
- **Other** None

## Risk Management

8. Not applicable.

## Recommendations

9. Members are asked to consider the options in paragraph 5, and advise officers of any recurring or non recurring budget adjustment for 2007/8, together with the source of funding.

## Contact Details

**Author:**

Andy Hudson  
Assistant Director  
Neighbourhood Services

Tel No: (01904) 551814

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Terry Collins  
Director, Neighbourhood Services

**Report Approved**

**Date** 17/01/2007

**Wards Affected:** *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

**All**

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

**Background Papers:**

Council Minutes 5<sup>th</sup> October 2006.

**Annexes :**

None



---

**Executive**

30 January 2007

Report of the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services

**REFERENCE REPORT : FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS (CHIEF EXECUTIVES / CITY STRATEGY) 2007/2008****Summary**

1. This report requests that Members consider a decision referred by the Executive Leader from the meeting of Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory Panel on 15 January 2007. This referral was made in accordance with the delegation scheme detailed in the Council's Constitution.

**Background**

2. At the meeting of the Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory Panel on 15 January 2007, Members considered a report which advised them of the applications received for financial support of £5,000 or over from the Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding budget for 2007/2008.

The following resolutions were made by the Executive Leader:

- (i) To put in place four new 3 year funding agreements from 2007/8 to 2010/11 at a cost of £218,042; **referring the decision in respect of the proposed award to York CAB to the Executive for approval as this is over £50,000;**
- (ii) To put in place 3 new annual funding agreements at a cost of £31,994;
- (iii) To set aside the remainder of the budget for awards of less than £5,000 and DRR awards (without accompanying grant applications) to be delegated to the Chief Officer;
- (iv) To make awards subject to the receipt of satisfactory accounts and reports, where necessary, as set out in paragraph 45 of the report;

[(i) to (iv) above are subject to the outcome of Budget Council.]

- (v) That the existing arrangements for staging payments to Voluntary and Community Organisations (VCO's) be retained;
- (vi) That Officers review the options for making the most effective use of the Chief Executive's funding budget during the coming year, bearing in mind the commitments contained in the Local Area Agreement, and

as discussed in paragraphs 17 to 23 of the report, and that the proposals be brought back to Members in due course.

Members are asked to consider the Executive Leader's recommendation, as indicated in Resolution (i) above, to put in place a 3 year funding agreement for York CAB, at a cost of £148,697.

### **Consultation**

3. No further consultation has taken place in addition to the consultation detailed in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of the report attached as Annex 1.

### **Options**

4. The Executive can either approve or reject the proposal of the Executive Leader.

### **Analysis**

5. Members need to consider the details in the report attached as Annex 1 and make a decision based on the information therein.

### **Corporate Priorities**

6. The aims in facilitating this referral to the Executive accord with the key principles of improving the councils organisational efficiency and complying with the requirements of the Councils Constitution.

### **Implications**

7. The implications of the original decision to determine applications for financial support are set out in paragraphs 37 to 43 of Annex 1.

### **Risk Management**

9. There are no risk management implications in relation to the referral to the Executive of this matter. The risk management implications of the original decision are outlined in paragraph 44 of Annex 1.

### **Recommendations**

10. That the Executive consider the recommendation of the Executive Leader in respect of the proposed award to York CAB as detailed in paragraph 2 (i) above.

Reason: In line with Constitutional requirements.

**Contact Details**

**Author:**  
Sarah Kingston  
Democracy Officer  
01904 552030

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**  
Suzan Hemingway  
Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal  
services  
01904 551004  
Report Approved  Date 19/01/07

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)**  
N/A

**Wards Affected:** *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

**Background Papers:**

**Decision Sheet of the Executive Member for City Strategy and Advisory Panel  
15 January 2007**

**Annexes**

**Annex 1 – Report to the Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory  
Panel 15 January 2007 – Financial Support to Voluntary Organisations (Chief  
Executives/City Strategy) 2007/2008**

This page is intentionally left blank





---

**Executive Member for City Strategy and  
Advisory Panel**

15 January 2007

Report of the Director of City Strategy

**Financial Support to Voluntary Organisations (Chief  
Executive's/City Strategy) 2007/2008**

**Summary**

1. This report advises Members of the applications received for financial support of £5,000 or over from the Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding budget for 2007/2008. The Executive Leader is requested to consider officer recommendations to put in place a number of funding agreements, including three year agreements, for amounts up to £50,000 and to forward a recommendation to the Executive for an award of over £50,000. The report also considers the need for a review of future options for making most effective use of the Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding in the face of continuing budget pressures and commitments in the Local Area Agreement.

**Background**

2. The Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding budget has recently transferred to City Strategy as part of the restructure of the Chief Executives' Directorate. However, there has not, as yet, been any change of name for this budget, as the information for voluntary and community organisations (VCOs) was prepared prior to the restructure taking place.
3. VCOs wishing to apply for financial support to the Chief Executives voluntary sector funding budget have to complete an application form indicating how they meet the agreed criteria for funding and other requirements. The funding process put in place is compliant with the York Compact. Organisations with existing funding agreements also have to provide information about how they have complied with their existing service level agreement. Annex 1 sets out both the general and Chief Executives criteria.

4. In 2004/5 the Council agreed four longer term funding agreements with organisations funded through the Chief Executive's budget. These will end in March 2007 and those organisations wishing to reapply have had to complete new applications this year. The following applications for funding have been made to the Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding budget for 2007/8:
  - 13 applications for funding (linked to Service Level Agreements), of which 11 are from organisations with existing funding agreements
  - 11 applications for Discretionary Rate Relief (DRR) – of which 4 are for DRR only.
5. The total amount of funding applied for is approximately £338,540 plus DRR at a cost of approximately £15,200. The applications range in value from £250 to almost £149,000. Annex 2 summarises the applications received.
6. The budget expected to be available in 2007/2008 (subject to approval at Budget Council) is £256,030. This is the same as the base budget in 2005/2006; however, the cost of DRR tends to increase year on year and this reduces the amount available for funding linked to service level agreements.
7. The shortfall between applications made and budget available is almost £100,000.
8. This report covers only those applications for funding of £5,000 or above. All other applications, including those for DRR without an accompanying grant application, will be dealt with by the Chief Officer, in accordance with the delegated authority in the Constitution. It is intended to decide these applications by the end of February 2007.

#### **Assessment of applications for Chief Executive's funding**

9. Officers have assessed the applications for funding and have prepared summaries of each application which are available from the report author. Financial information has also been checked by officers in Accountancy. Where an organisation is currently funded by Chief Executives their performance against the current service agreement is also included in the application summary. Copies are also available in the Members' Library.

#### **Consultation**

10. Drafts of the application summaries have been sent to applicants to allow correction of any factual errors. It is acknowledged that this has, unavoidably, included the Christmas/New Year holiday period.

11. Voluntary and community sector (VCS) representatives of the York Compact Group also met with Council officers in December as part of the Council's wider consultation prior to finalising the Council's budget proposals for 2007/08. Included within this was a discussion of the level of Chief Executive's funding and the Compact Group highlighted the following comments in relation to this and the wider issues impacting on the Council's partnership with the VCS:
- Most VCOs have received no significant growth (if any) in their statutory funding for many years, and struggle to cope with ever-increasing workloads.
  - If the work of these organisations is to continue, the VCS, via the Compact Group, recommends that the VCS, the Council and other partners, must work together to secure the additional funds needed to sustain valuable services for the community.
  - An added concern for many local services is the uncertainty surrounding the new Primary Care Trust's (PCT) commissioning of services from the VCS. The Compact Group requested that the Council add its support to that of the VCS in trying to secure an early and satisfactory resolution to this situation.
12. Consultation within the Council has taken place with officers in Resources, Performance and Improvement (Equalities Officer) and Civic, Democratic and Legal Services. Comments in relation to this internal consultation are included in the following paragraphs or under 'Implications' at paragraph 37.

### **Options and analysis**

13. It is clear from the shortfall between applications made and budget availability (see paragraph 7) that all applications cannot be met. Furthermore, owing to the estimated increase in cost of DRR in 2007/8 compared to 2006/7 and previous years, it is also not possible to fund all existing awards as in previous years as there would be a shortfall of £1,260. A significant part of this increase is accounted for by the increase in rateable value of the completed Priory Street Centre; however, net rates payable have also increased across the board.
14. One future option therefore is to consider reducing the level at which DRR is paid from 12% to 10% or other lower figure. If DRR was to be awarded at 10% this would 'save' approximately £2,000 on the current cost of DRR. It would however, impact on a wide range of VCOs in the city. This option could not, in any event, be introduced for 2007/8 as no consultation has yet taken place and 12 months notice would have to be given to the organisations likely to be affected.
15. A further factor to be taken into account is that, if funding is to be taken away from organisations with existing agreements, then the York Compact

and legal advice require that sufficient notice is given, and that as a minimum this should be 3 months if the proposed reduction is likely to have a significant impact on the organisation.

16. In relation to the applications for funding received for 2007/8 a number of options for funding have therefore been considered as follows:
- A: Maintain existing awards as far as possible by 'sharing out' or 'spreading the cost' of the shortfall across all existing awards.
- Not recommended as the assessments show that there are some VCOs that can source income through charging or fundraising more easily than others; some organisations face more significant inflationary pressures than others; and, as financial pressure on the budget continues the need to prioritise between applications increases.
- B: Share out the available budget between all those applications which meet the funding criteria, including new applications.
- Not recommended as, whilst enabling new applications to be partially funded, this could only be achieved by making significant reductions in funding to other existing high priority services.
- C: Make limited savings according to the relative priority of services in relation to the Chief Executive's budget criteria and taking into account the financial circumstances of individual organisations.
- This is the recommended option as it takes into account the need to consider the relative priority of the different types of service in line with continuing budget pressures, whilst limiting the significance and impact of any reductions in funding.

### **Funding pressures for 2007/2008 and beyond**

17. The increasing pressure on the Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding budget, resulting from a protected, but standstill, budget for many years, have made it increasingly necessary to consider which are the highest priority needs that this particular budget should be used to meet.
18. The revised criteria, introduced last year, more or less retained all the existing types of activity within their remit, albeit with a greater focus on a multi-agency approach and the links with the citywide inclusion and anti-poverty agenda.
19. It has become clear however, that this approach can only be maintained into the future if overall funding budgets increase, at the very least in line with inflation. In the current financial environment the value of funding has reduced year on year. Whilst some very small organisations, particularly those without paid staff, can just about manage to continue to provide their

services on this basis, for other bigger organisations this eventually leads to cuts in services as staff have to be made redundant or premises given up.

20. This situation also, of course, makes it extremely difficult for new services to be funded, as their applications are in direct competition with existing services for an increasingly limited total amount of funding.
21. Significant changes to criteria cannot be introduced without full and inclusive consultation, and there may be other options to consider too. For example, can better coordination of citywide funding bids bring in more resources to the city ? Would additional resources put into helping organisations bid more successfully for external funding provide a greater number of organisations with more and alternative sources of funding rather than trying to stretch limited Council funding further and thinner ?
22. The Local Area Agreement (LAA), which is currently being considered by central government, includes within it commitments for all partners, to increase service delivery by the voluntary and community sector, including to:
  - consider how to achieve the most effective delivery of the priority services across all sectors
  - review existing arrangements for commissioning services and ensure these are Compact compliant, and to
  - actively seek opportunities to bid for external funding sources to achieve partnership priorities.
23. It is proposed therefore that a process of reviewing the future options for making most effective use of the Chief Executives funding budget, including the level at which DRR is paid, takes place over the coming year, bearing these LAA commitments in mind, and that proposals be brought back to Members in due course.

### **Funding Priorities in 2007/2008**

24. In the meantime, the priority for 2007/2008 is to manage the pressure in the budget with a view to a wider review that needs to take place during 2007/8. Using option C (see paragraph 16 above) as the basis for recommendations requires some degree of prioritisation. It is proposed that in relation to the organisations with existing funding, that those VCOs with 3 year funding agreements about to end, represent some of the key services in the city, without which, other organisations would find it difficult to maintain their own services.

York CVS: providing infrastructure support services for other VCOs/as well as supporting partnership working between the public sector and VCS

- York CAB: high volume free advice service – whose clients would otherwise have to pay or present at the council or other VCOs for advice
- Welfare Benefits Unit: a second tier service supporting other VCO and public advice providers and help to coordinate take-up campaigns
- York Racial Equality Network: with a key role to play in the city's approach to promoting race equality, tackling harassment and discrimination and engagement with York's growing BME population.

25. In relation to the criteria for services which are cross-cutting, help to reduce poverty and exclusion, and services which help to build the capacity of the wider voluntary and community sector it is suggested that these have the highest priority for funding in 2007/8. Whilst it is not possible to increase funding in the current financial circumstances it is proposed that these organisations should not face any reductions in funding.
26. In relation to the other funding applications being considered in this report, two new applications were received from Older Citizens Advocacy York and York Older Peoples Assembly. As included in the 'options' section of this report (paragraphs 13 – 16 above) funding new applications at any significant level in the existing financial circumstances is not recommended. However, it is also recognised that the difficulty in funding new applications is an issue that needs to be included in the review being proposed for the coming year. It is also noted that the Council's Grants and Partnerships officer is meeting with members of the Older People's Assembly in the new year to offer some assistance with an external funding application.
27. Three applications – from Relate, Centre for Separated Families and York Travellers' Trust fall in the £10 -15,000 range. The applications for York Volunteer Centre and York Community Accounting Scheme have been included within the application for York CVS for 2007/8 and beyond. All other applications fall below the £5,000 level and will be considered separately from this report.
28. In relation to the small reduction in service level agreement funding that needs to be found it is proposed that this is spread out between these remaining organisations as follows:
- Relate and Centre for Separated Families - funding to be reduced slightly from £9,500 to £9,000 for 2007/2008. It should be noted that the funding for these organisations was reduced from £10,000 to £9,500 last year.
- York Travellers' Trust funding to be retained at the existing level (£13,000).
29. York Travellers' Trust is at a vital stage in its development and sustainable funding remains a significant issue for the Trust. A research project is due to be carried out in the coming year which will hopefully help to determine the

future direction and priorities of the Trust. The Council is keen to play some part in this project and will consider the outcomes of the research when it is available. Although it is not possible to make any further increase in the coming year, due to the current financial circumstances, it is not recommended to make any reductions to the Trust's funding at this point.

30. The remainder of the budget, estimated at just under £6,000, would be available for distribution to organisations requesting DRR only and funding applications of less than £5,000. Based on the applications received and the expected cost of DRR it is anticipated that small reductions in funding are likely to be necessary across all applications.
31. In summary, the recommendations proposed above are as follows:

Award new 3 year service level agreements as follows:

- York CVS £33,321 plus DRR
- York CAB £126,618 plus DRR
- Welfare Benefits Unit £24,125
- York Racial Equality Network £29,626

Award new annual service level agreements as follows:

- York Travellers' Trust £13,000 plus DRR
- Relate £ 9,000 plus DRR
- Centre for Separated Families £ 9,000 plus DRR

The total estimated cost of all the above awards is £250,113. This leaves an amount of approximately £6,000 for awards of less than £5,000 and DRR only awards. These recommendations are set out in summary in Annex 3.

### **Recalculation of grant funding and DRR where both are payable**

32. Each £1 of 'grant' awarded (funding linked to Service Level Agreements) costs the Council £1; each £1 of DRR costs the Council 75p. Therefore where both grant and DRR are awarded there is an advantage in awarding 20% DRR and a reduced amount of grant. This gives the same value of award to the organisation but costs the Council less. The financial summary at Annex 3 shows that recalculating the financial awards in this way allows awards worth £253,957 to be made at a cost of £250,113. (See the section of the spreadsheet headed 'DRR calculations and adjustments of grant'.)

### **Payment of awards**

33. Custom and practice over the past 8 years at least has been that Chief Executive funding awards are paid out as one lump sum at the start of the agreement period, unless there are particular reasons to stage payments, for example, funding a new service which is not yet 'tried and tested' or concerns about the viability or delivery of services. However, the Chief

Executive has expressed some concern about this practice, in particular, with regard to the level of award to York CAB.

34. One of the reasons this practice has been retained in the current climate is that, some financial advantage accrues to the VCO through being able to gain interest on the funding invested, when overall levels of funding have remained static for many years.
35. Options include, maintaining the current practice for awards below a certain level and making six monthly or quarterly staged payments for others or, maintaining current practice for all awards unless there are particular reasons, as in the examples above, for staging payments. The Executive Leader's views and instructions on this issue are sought.

### **Corporate Priorities**

36. The process put in place to deliver the Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding programme aims to support the corporate priority 'to improve the way the Council and its partners work together to deliver better services for the people who live in York'. The Chief Executive's funding criteria, which focus on increasing social inclusion also support a number of the other corporate priorities, in particular:
  - Reduce the actual and perceived impact of violent, aggressive and nuisance behaviour on people in York (e.g. services delivered by YREN, counselling services)
  - Improve the life chances of the most disadvantaged and disaffected children, young people and families in the city (e.g. services delivered by Centre for Separated Families, York Travellers Trust, Relate, York CAB, WBU)
  - Improve our focus on the needs of customers and residents in designing and providing services (e.g. services delivered by York CVS, OPA, OCAY)

### **Implications**

#### **Financial Implications**

37. The proposed budget for Chief Executives voluntary sector funding in 2007/08 is £256,030. This amount is subject to approval at Budget Council on 21 February 2007. The total cost of all officer recommendations made in this report is estimated at £250,113. This leaves an amount of just under £6,000 for awards of DRR and amounts of less than £5,000 to be decided by the Chief Officer.



### **Human Resources**

38. There are no direct human resource implications arising from this report.

### **Equalities**

39. 2005/2006 saw the introduction of new equalities and diversity monitoring for VCOs funded or part funded by the Council. The results of this monitoring were brought together in an equality impact assessment for Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding in 2006/2007. This found that, in relation to the distribution of funding, race and gender issues were fairly well covered, but that there was no specific funding for disability groups and little funding for specifically age related groups. In relation to 'who receives services' there was a mixture of good and less good practice. Areas for improvement included:
- Discuss equality monitoring with individual organisations where this is not already in place and encourage VCOs to make use of existing good practice (for take up of services and for staffing / and governance arrangements); follow up individual queries with VCOs where issues need addressing.

Discussions have been held with a number of VCOs and further improvements are expected in the coming year.

### **Legal Implications**

40. The awards set out in this report are made under Section 1 of the Local Government Act 2000. Where reduced awards are recommended they are not considered to be at a level which would cause significant negative impacts on the organisations concerned.

### **Crime and Disorder**

41. There are no crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

### **Information Technology (IT)**

42. There are no IT implications arising from this report.

### **Property**

43. There are no property implications arising from this report. However, it is noted that York CAB occupy premises leased from the Council.

### **Risk Management**

44. The potential risks in grant funding external bodies range from failure of the VCO to deliver the agreed service at the appropriate standard, to the

closure of the organisation as a whole with consequential loss of funds. These types of risks have been considered and are dealt with through the application, assessment and agreement process put in place by the Council. This includes a financial assessment of the organisation and a requirement that organisations meet the relevant standards for their type of service and that appropriate insurances are held.

45. It should also be noted that funding is not released to an individual VCO until a service level agreement has been agreed and a signed copy returned to the Council. In addition, this year, due to this decision-making process taking place earlier in the year than usual, a small number of VCOs applying for funding have not completed their own financial reporting processes. They have therefore been unable, at the time of writing, to submit annual accounts and reports. In these cases it is proposed that, where funding is recommended and agreed, this is made subject to the receipt of satisfactory accounts and reports. It is not anticipated that this will present any difficulties to the VCOs concerned as there should be ample time before actual funding awards are due to be made.

### **Recommendations**

46. The Advisory Panel's advice and Executive Leader's instructions are invited in connection with the officer recommendations set out in this paper, as summarised in paragraph 31 above and in Annex 3, subject to the outcome of Budget Council. In particular the officer recommendations are to
- Put in place four new 3 year funding agreements from 2007/8 to 2010/11 at a cost of £218,042; referring the decision in respect of the proposed award to York CAB to the Executive for approval as this is over £50,000.
  - Put in place 3 new annual funding agreements at a cost of £31,994.
  - To set aside the remainder of the budget for awards of less than £5,000 and DRR awards (without accompanying grant applications) to be delegated to the Chief Officer
  - To make awards subject to the receipt of satisfactory accounts and reports, where necessary, as set out in paragraph 45 above.

Reason: This is so that the Council can enter into Service Level Agreements with the organisations funded for the provision of a range of services for the residents of York.

47. A further recommendation is that the Executive Leader give his views and instructions on the timing and frequency of payments to be made to VCOs as set out in paragraphs 33 to 35 above.

Reason: To notify VCO's promptly regarding the timing and frequency of payments.

48. It is also recommended that officers review the options for making the most effective use of the Chief Executives funding budget during the coming year, bearing in mind the commitments contained in the LAA, and as discussed in paragraphs 17 to 23 above, and that proposals be brought back to Members in due course.

Reason: This is so that the most effective use can be made of the Chief Executive's budget in the future.

### Contact Details

**Author:**

Sue Poole  
Senior Partnership Support  
Officer  
Economic Development Unit  
Tel No: 552031.

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Bill Woolley  
Director of City Strategy

**Report Approved**

**Date** 21 December 2006

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)**

**Financial:**  
Patrick Looker  
Finance Manager  
Tel: 551633

**Legal:**  
Suzan Hemingway  
Head of Civic, Democratic  
& Legal Services  
Tel: 551004

**Equalities:**  
Julian Horsler  
Equalities Officer  
Tel: 551704

**Wards Affected:** *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

**All**

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

**Background Papers:**

Applications are held in the Partnerships Support Team.  
Application summaries are available on request and can also be found in the Members' Library.  
'Funding for voluntary and community organisations 2007/2008', booklet produced by Partnership Support Team, October 2006

**Annexes:**

Annex 1: Criteria for financial support (General and Chief Executives)

Annex 2: Summary of applications received

Annex 3: Financial summary of recommendations

## GENERAL CRITERIA

Council financial support for voluntary organisations will be directed to:

- services or activities which meet defined needs in the Council's area;
- services for groups of people considered to be in special need;
- goals or activities which complement those of the Council and other organisations in the York area; in particular the Council's corporate aims and priorities
- organisations able to demonstrate the benefits of their activities to the community and to individual clients in particular
- organisations complying with relevant legislation, including equalities legislation (in support of the Council's Equality Strategy)
- Organisations able to enter into service level agreements with the Council
- Organisations able to sign up to the York Compact

The Council will not fund:

- services which it considers should be provided by other statutory bodies;
- groups working to further the aims of particular religious or party political organisations;
- the activities of individuals

## CRITERIA FOR CHIEF EXECUTIVES FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The **Chief Executive's Department** focuses its funding on services and activities which support the Council's social inclusion policy and the Inclusive City theme of the Community Strategy. The voluntary and community sector provides an extensive range of services, often working alongside the Council or other bodies to reach out to those individuals or communities who are vulnerable, facing short term problems or crises in their lives and who are at risk of social exclusion. The Community Strategy supports a multi-agency approach to inclusion focusing on reduction of poverty, access to advice, finance and other services.

Chief Executives funding is therefore focused on:

- services or activities available on a citywide basis
- services or activities which help to build the capacity of the voluntary and community sector as a whole
- cross-cutting services or activities which help to reduce poverty and enable and help people and excluded 'communities of interest' to be socially included – in particular high quality advice and counselling services which help people to overcome some of the barriers to inclusion.

Applications for funding will be prioritised according to how well they:

- meet identified needs in the city (including existing services)
- provide clear outcomes from funding
- engage with excluded or vulnerable communities of interest including black and minority ethnic communities
- work alongside the Council and other agencies in a joint or multi-agency approach
- contribute to the Council's York Pride and Safer City priorities (particularly for new funding)
- provide value for money (including financial leverage)

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary of applications received for Chief Executive's voluntary sector funding

Organisation & amount requested	Outline of service/activity	Recent funding history & any comments
<b>York &amp; District CAB</b> <b>£148,697 + DRR</b>	Free, high volume generalist and specialist advice provider to all who live/work in the city; helping to reduce poverty and exclusion through ensuring services accessible to most vulnerable groups/individuals; proactive / multi-agency approach.	3 yr funding agreement ends in March 2007 (funded at £126,618); Increase requested to help meet increased costs including salaries/volunteer expenses/rental increase. Income also from trusts/Legal Services Commission.
<b>York CVS</b> <b>£50,000 + DRR</b> <b>NB incl. Volunteer Centre &amp; York Community Accounting Scheme – previously separate</b>	Primary infrastructure organisation for VCS in the city – supporting positive partnership working & capacity of VCOs to deliver services to meet needs of residents & enabling residents to become involved via forums, volunteering etc.	3 yr funding agreement ends March 2007; £50k application includes £20k for Volunteer Centre (increase from £4,141), funding for YCAS (previously £1,035) and for CVS core (previously £28,145). C.55% income from social enterprise.
<b>YREN</b> <b>£40,000</b>	Promotes & provides independent info & support to victims of racial harassment & discrimination; helps coordinate multi-agency approach across city; facilitating involvement & consultation with BME communities in city.	3 yr funding agreement ends in March 2007 (funding at £29,626) Funding from CRE c£24.5k in 2006/7 (reduced to £14.6k in 2005/6). Accommodation remains an issue for YREN.
<b>Welfare Benefits Unit</b> <b>£25,593</b>	Second tier advice agency providing specialist advice & training to front-line advice providers & campaign work to maximise take up of benefits– helping to reduce poverty. Partnership working across CYC /other agencies	3 yr funding agreement ends in March 2007 (funding in 2006/7 – 24,125) NYCC other main funder, plus sales & training. Increase for inflation requested.

<p><b>NEW</b> <b>Older Citizens Advocacy York (OCAY)</b> <b>£10,000 + DRR</b></p>	<p>Contribution to advocacy service for older people (either individually or with groups) to help reduce exclusion; growing focus on support for older people who are vulnerable to abuse. Aim to work in partnership with range of CYC /VCOs.</p>	<p>Receive DRR (c.£100 ); have applied for funding for past few years but not awarded. OCAY successful in gaining Big Lottery funding over 3 yrs in 2006/7 – but this leaves shortfall for full service.</p>
<p><b>NEW</b> <b>York Older People's Assembly</b> <b>£21,000</b></p>	<p>OPA enable older people's voices to be heard &amp; to help them shape policies that affect their lives (e.g. in developing LAA). Help lead &amp; support older people's information fair &amp; 50+ festival events. Application for p/t office manager /outreach worker to develop local older peoples groups rather than relying on views of those able to attend city centre meetings &amp; ease burden on volunteers.</p>	<p>Have applied for past 3 yrs but no funding awarded – except for help meeting costs of Info Fair.  Have received some funding from PCT but future of this uncertain.  Have sufficient funds for current workload (for short term) for but not to sustain or develop this.</p>
<p><b>Centre for Separated Families</b> <b>£10,000 plus DRR on 2 properties</b></p>	<p>Application for contribution to cost of Family Support service which supports separated families living in poverty/disadvantage across whole range of issues; helping to overcome &amp; prevent social exclusion for children &amp; families.</p>	<p>Funding awarded in 2006/7 £9,500 plus DRR. (Funding in place since 1996/7 at least.) Income from range of sources including training, trusts, DfES, Connexions (<i>Annual Report &amp; Accounts awaited</i>)</p>
<p><b>York Travellers Trust</b> <b>£20,000 + DRR</b></p>	<p>Contribution to core running costs of service which seeks to reduce exclusion &amp; disadvantage of Travellers &amp; encourage acceptance between settled &amp; Travelling communities. YTT acts as a base for other services (e.g. PCT services) to link up with Travellers as well as a frontline service for Travellers</p>	<p>Funding increased to £13k in 2006/7; £10k since 1998/99 at least. YTT has funding of £60K from JRCT over 3 yrs. Sustainable core funding remains an issue. A research project is due to take place in 2007. (<i>Annual Report &amp; Accounts awaited</i>)</p>
<p><b>Relate</b> <b>£10,000 + DRR</b></p>	<p>Contribution to provision of counselling service to couples, individuals, families &amp; young people to build better relationships &amp; prevent family breakdown with associated risks of poverty, parenting issues &amp; social exclusion.</p>	<p>Funding awarded in 2006/7 £9,500 (funding in place at c.£10k since 1996/7 at least).  Relate relies heavily on financial contributions from clients who can afford contributions.</p>



<b>York Rape Crisis</b> £1,500	Contribution to provision of free crisis counselling to female victims of rape or sexual abuse	Funded c£1.5k since at least 1996/97.
<b>Cruse bereavement Care</b> £500	Contribution to provision of free bereavement counselling to all including young people through schools.	Funded c£500 since at least 1996/97.
<b>York Family Mediation Service</b> £250 + DRR	Contribution to mediation service, enabling separating couples to make informed choices & decisions for future care of children & other issues.	Funded £250 plus DRR – in 2006/7 (previously funded at higher level).
<b>York Women's Counselling Service</b> £1,000	Contribution to costs of provision of free counselling service for women experiencing difficulties as result of current or past emotional stress or trauma; enabling women to move on from problems.	Funded since 2000/01. (£300) increasing to £400 in 2004/5.
<b>York Muslim Association</b> DRR	Organisation aim – to provide means of social and mutual support to members – including teaching 'mother tongue' and of religious rights & services	Estimated cost of DRR - £221
<b>Yorkshire Rural Community Council</b> DRR	Organisation aim – to enable communities to improve the quality of life for all people living and working in rural areas.	Estimated cost of DRR - £879
<b>Samaritans</b> DRR	Organisation aim - 24 hr a day confidential support for people in distress &/or feeling suicidal	Estimated cost of DRR - £288
<b>York Childcare Ltd</b> DRR	To provide quality & affordable childcare for children from 6mths to 16 yrs – in particular to support lone parents and those on low incomes (via discounted fees)	Estimated cost of DRR - £1,938

**Total amount of funding applied for £338,540 plus DRR**

**(NB Cost of DRR estimated at £15.2k for 2007/8 if all awards made as in previous years)**

This page is intentionally left blank

Financial summary of recommendations (applications over £5000)													Annex 1c	
Full analysis	Grants 2007/8			Discretionary Rate Relief calculations and adjustments of grant								TOTALS		
Organisation	Funding awarded 2006/7	Requested 2007/8	Recommended 2007/8	Rates liability	DRR at 12%	Cost to Council	Total award	Total costs to Council	DRR adjusted	Cost to Council	Grant adjusted	Total award 2007/8	Total cost to Council	
CAB	126,618	148,697	126,618	8,436	1,012	759	127,630	127,377	1,687	1,265	125,943	127,630	127,209	
CVS -see below	28,145	50,000	33,321	53,724	6,447	4,835	39,768	38,156	10,745	8,059	29,023	39,768	37,082	
WB Unit	24,125	25,593	24,125	0	0	0	24,125	24,125	0	0	24,125	24,125	24,125	
YREN	29,626	40,000	29,626	0	0	0	29,626	29,626	0	0	29,626	29,626	29,626	
CRUSE	500	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
C.S.Families	9,500	10,000	9,000	7,859	943	707	9,943	9,707	1,572	1,179	8,371	9,943	9,550	
OCA Y	DRR	10,000	0	855	103	77	103	77	103	77	0	103	77	
YOPA	0	21,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Rape Crisis	1,530	1,530	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Relate	9,500	10,000	9,000	5,106	613	460	9,613	9,460	1,021	766	8,592	9,613	9,357	
Trav Trust	13,000	20,000	13,000	1,243	149	112	13,149	13,112	249	186	12,901	13,149	13,087	
Volunteer Cen	4,141	see CVS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
YCAS	1,035	see CVS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
YWCS	400	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
YFMS	500	250	0	2,442	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Childcare	DRR	DRR	0	21,534	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Muslim Assn	DRR	DRR	0	2,455	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Samaritans	DRR	DRR	0	3,197	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
YRCC	DRR	DRR	0	9,768	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Total</b>			244,690	116,619	9,267	6,950	253,957	251,640	15,376	11,532	238,581	253,957	250,113	
CVS - this includes YCAS and the Volunteer Centre														

This page is intentionally left blank