

<b>Meeting:</b>	Executive
<b>Meeting date:</b>	14 April 2026
<b>Report of:</b>	Pauline Stuchfield, Director of Housing and Communities
<b>Portfolio of:</b>	Councillor Lomas, Finance, Performance, Major Projects and Equalities  Councillor Pavlovic, Housing, Planning and Safer Communities

## 2026/27 Ward Funding Allocation

### Subject of Report

1. The 2026/27 individual Ward budget allocation is comprised of £250,000 to be allocated across the city, and this report outlines existing and potential models to inform making the split to wards. The Executive is asked to approve the method of allocation of ward funding.
2. The Executive is asked to consider the content of the report, the options presented and consider if they wish to maintain the existing model A or agree another model from the options outlined in the report taking account of the feedback from People Scrutiny Management Committee held on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2026.
3. People Scrutiny Committee was held on 17<sup>th</sup> of March 2026 with members offering a range of views from keeping the status quo (Option A) through to directly using population to bring in a true allocation per head of population for fairness (Option D). They also recommended that ward funding decisions should be published on ward web pages to demonstrate to residents how the money had been spent each year.

4. New national deprivation data was released in Autumn 2025, as well as latest population data being available and therefore the models have been updated to reflect these changes.

## **Benefits and Challenges**

5. The ward budgets provide an opportunity for ward members to deliver against locally agreed priorities through the funding of local community projects. These projects also contribute to the Council Plan priorities around Equalities and Human Rights, Affordability, Climate Change and Health Inequalities. This enables ward members to engage the community around the delivery of local priorities through building community capacity and asset-based community development. The ward budgets were designed in 2023/24 to focus more deliberately on need utilising the index of multiple deprivation.

## **Policy Basis for Decision**

6. One City, for All, the Council Plan 2023 – 27 sets out a strong ambition to increase opportunities for everyone living in York to live healthy and fulfilling lives. The ward budgets enable community capacity to be built, reflecting coproduction with residents on the agreement of local priorities and the codesign of local projects, alongside the funding of many local voluntary and community sector organisations, helping to build inclusive, strong and thriving communities. Furthermore, applications to the ward grants must demonstrate how projects will meet the four council plan core commitments of Affordability, Environment, Equalities and Human Rights, and Health Inequalities.
7. At April 2024 Executive it was agreed that ward funding totalling £250,000 is composed of the following elements:
  - allocate a minimum Ward Budget for Members to spend on priorities in their neighbourhood action plans that correspond with those of the council's core commitments;
  - introduce a second element based on need (via deprivation).
  - In addition create a single pot of funding for multiple and/or 'city wide' applications (an additional amount of £100,000).

## Financial Strategy Implications

8. The 2026/27 ward budget allocation is comprised of £250,000 to be allocated across the city and the paper outlines the existing and potential models to inform making this split to wards. The funds are a part of the council's base budget, reflecting the priorities set out in the Council Plan.
9. Currently ward budget decisions are taken in the financial year that the budget is allocated, requiring ward member approval and Director decision sign off. Each year a deadline is published, in line with the year-end financial closedown timetable, by which all member approved ward grants and schemes must be submitted for Director consideration and decision. After the published deadline in any given financial year there will be no opportunity to make decisions on ward funding until the next financial year subject to budget allocation. There will be no carry forward of any uncommitted funds i.e. where there was no published decision by the stated deadline.

## Recommendation and Reasons

10. Executive to approve:
  - (a) **Model D (7) for implementation** for the next financial year.
  - (b) Enhancement of the ward funding arrangements as outlined in paragraph 30:
    - **Structured ward funding bid programmes** held on a quarterly basis followed by City Wide Funding releases.
    - **Flexibility to carry forward projects and funding at year end:**
      - a) To continue to allow approved projects not yet started to be carried forward into the new financial year (this has been in place since 2024/25); and
      - b) To allow 20% of the year's budget to be carried over at the end of the financial year so if there is insufficient

funding for an application at year end, it can be topped up from the following year.

- (c) **Publication of all ward funding decisions on ward web pages** to demonstrate to residents how the money had been spent each year.

**Reason:** To ensure that ward allocations meet Council Plan priorities and methodologies around allocations and delivery are transparent to residents and stakeholders.

## Background

11. In 2024/25 and 2025/26 the financial allocation per ward was based upon, firstly a base split per ward by the number of councillors (£105k) and then a secondary split in each ward based on deprivation (£145k). The base amount per councillor ensures a minimum amount for each ward, which is then enhanced by analysis of depth of deprivation. It should be noted that there is an inherent skewing of the total amounts, reflecting the number of councillors per ward.
12. In 2024/25 and 2025/26, in order to allocate the £145k based on deprivation, the levels of need in all wards were assessed against the national Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). IMD scores and ranks each area, using seven different dimensions or domains, each of which is based on a basket of indicators. The data combines information from the domains to produce an overall relative measure of deprivation. IMD is released at an LSOA (Lower Super Output Area) level, and the resulting overall Ward IMD scores are an area level aggregation of this relative measure of deprivation.

<b>7 Domains of Index of Multiple Deprivation</b>	
Income Deprivation	Crime
Employment Deprivation	Barriers to Housing and Services
Education, Skills & Training Deprivation	Living Environment Deprivation
Health Deprivation & Disability	

13. The 2024/25 and 2025/26 allocations were designed with the intention of using deprivation so that those wards with the highest

scores (the more deprived wards) would have the greater funding allocations, noting:

- National and local data suggests that wards with a higher population, generally, are the more deprived areas. Therefore, if deprivation is used as the main measure of allocation, there does not have to be a further normalisation of the data by population;
- In 2023/24 an attempt was made to create a ward funding split based solely upon Council Plan indicators and EACH (Equalities and Human Rights, Affordability, Climate and Health) indicators. However, as relatively few of the Council Plan indicators are available at ward level, a model which covers all 4 elements of EACH could not be created.

14. Further deprivation information has been released whereby The English Indices of Deprivation (IoD25) measure relative levels of deprivation in 33,755 small areas or neighbourhoods, called Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs), in England. Key changes for York are that:

- The city has slightly higher deprivation: The IMD average score for York in 2025 is 11.81. A lower IMD score indicates lower relative deprivation. The score for York in 2019 was 11.73.
- Slightly more people live in our top 20% deprived communities: In 2025, 6.23% of the population of York live in LSOAs which fall into the most deprived 20% nationally. In 2019 the figure was 4.61%.

15. The Population data used in the IMD 2025 data release was based on mid-year estimates 2022, however there has been further national releases of population data and therefore the models have been updated with the release (mid 2024 estimates - released 7th November)

## **Changes to levels of funding in existing allocation model (A) based on new deprivation data**

16. Levels of deprivation have slightly changed in all communities in York, and this could mean that funding levels slightly change in

every ward. There are 4 wards in this model which have had changes of +/- £1k and the reasons for these are detailed below.

17. **Fulford Ward (increase in funding due to deprivation and population):** In between the release of the IMD data for 2019 and 2025, the LSOA E01013365 was split into E01034761 and E01034762 as the population increased, primarily, due to new housing developments. The population increased from 2,933 in 2019 to 3,644 in 2024. The new LSOAs have been scored as more deprived (2025 IMD score: 9.73 and 10.79 respectively).
18. The domains listed below show the changes in scores and national LSOA rankings, with the Crime, Income, Employment and Health domains showing relatively significant change. The data for the underlying indicators that make up the domain scores has not been released which prevents further analysis.

Fulford & Heslington		IMD Score	Income Score (rate)	Employment Score (rate)	Education, Skills and Training Score	Health Deprivation and Disability Score	Crime Score	Barriers to Housing and Services Score	Living Environment Score
	2019	4.77	0.02	0.02	4.31	-1.00	-1.98	23.12	14.89
	2025	10.19	0.16	0.08	5.60	-0.40	-0.22	17.48	13.84
Average Rank	Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Income Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Employment Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Education, Skills and Training Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Health Deprivation and Disability Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Crime Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Barriers to Housing and Services Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Living Environment Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	
Out of 32,844 LSOAs	2019 29,526	27,857	26,984	27,417	27,727	30,391	12,546	21,905	
Out of 33,755 LSOAs	2025 24,658	20,059	22,035	27,657	21,956	19,722	21,133	20,899	
Change in Rank (red more deprived)		-7,798	-4,950	240	-5,771	-10,670	8,587	-1,006	

19. **Wheldrake Ward (increase in funding due to deprivation):** The population for Wheldrake has remained consistent as it was 4,131 in 2019 and 4,157 in 2024. The domains listed below show the changes in scores and national LSOA rankings, with the major changes being in the Barriers to Housing and Services Domain.

Wheldrake		IMD Score	Income Score (rate)	Employment Score (rate)	Education, Skills and Training Score	Health Deprivation and Disability Score	Crime Score	Barriers to Housing and Services Score	Living Environment Score
	2019	4.16	0.03	0.04	2.31	-0.92	-1.74	13.25	13.22
	2025	6.96	0.06	0.04	1.74	-0.91	-1.73	32.16	17.58
	Average Rank	Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Income Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Employment Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Education, Skills and Training Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Health Deprivation and Disability Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Crime Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Barriers to Housing and Services Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Living Environment Rank (where 1 is most deprived)
Out of 32,844 LSOAs	2019	30,386	29,747	28,372	30,420	28,042	31,959	21,641	21,224
Out of 33,755 LSOAs	2025	28,286	30,482	31,506	31,904	28,624	32,836	5,269	18,490
Change in Rank (red more deprived)			735	3,134	1,484	581	877	-16,372	-2,734

20. **Heworth Without Ward (decrease in funding due to deprivation):** The population for Heworth Without has remained fairly consistent as it was 3,566 in 2019 and 3,800 in 2024. The domains listed below show the changes in scores and national LSOA rankings, with the major changes being across the Health, Education, Housing, Living Environment and Employment Domains.

Heworth Without		IMD Score	Income Score (rate)	Employment Score (rate)	Education, Skills and Training Score	Health Deprivation and Disability Score	Crime Score	Barriers to Housing and Services Score	Living Environment Score
	2019	5.09	0.03	0.03	6.60	-0.56	-1.33	15.77	14.04
	2025	2.99	0.06	0.04	2.52	-0.86	-1.61	16.00	6.84
	Average Rank	Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Income Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Employment Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Education, Skills and Training Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Health Deprivation and Disability Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Crime Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Barriers to Housing and Services Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Living Environment Rank (where 1 is most deprived)
Out of 32,844 LSOAs	2019	30,632	30,546	28,885	26,860	22,840	32,186	18,146	23,491
Out of 33,755 LSOAs	2025	32,382	30,856	32,100	30,856	27,098	32,759	21,795	26,962
Change in Rank (red more deprived)			310	3,215	3,996	4,258	573	3,649	3,471

21. **Dringhouses and Woodthorpe (decrease in funding due to deprivation):** The population for Dringhouses and Woodthorpe has remained fairly consistent as it was 11,566 in 2019 and 11,617 in 2024. The domains listed below show the changes in scores and national LSOA rankings, with the major changes being across the Housing and Living Environment Domains.

Dringhouses & Woodthorpe		IMD Score	Income Score (rate)	Employment Score (rate)	Education, Skills and Training Score	Health Deprivation and Disability Score	Crime Score	Barriers to Housing and Services Score	Living Environment Score
	2019	9.65	0.06	0.05	11.31	-0.61	-0.88	20.29	13.58
	2025	8.06	0.11	0.07	11.41	-0.46	-0.65	12.43	8.40
	Average Rank	Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Income Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Employment Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Education, Skills and Training Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Health Deprivation and Disability Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Crime Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Barriers to Housing and Services Rank (where 1 is most deprived)	Living Environment Rank (where 1 is most deprived)
Out of 32,844 LSOAs	2019	25,386	24,616	24,250	22,230	23,282	26,099	17,817	20,808
Out of 33,755 LSOAs	2025	27,104	25,792	25,848	22,728	22,311	24,102	26,886	25,933
Change in Rank (red more deprived)			1,176	1,598	497	-971	-1,997	9,070	5,124

22. There are however a number of alternative options for Executive to consider based on ward member feedback – these are summarised in the options analyses below.

## Options Analysis 1 – 2026/27 Models and Allocations

23. There are several models which could be used to split ward funding that have been suggested by ward members. These models are summarised in Annex A (Models A to E) and detailed in Annex B. This includes high level pros/cons of each option and whether each option meets policy objectives set out in EACH / Full Council (July 2023) are within the table also. Model A is the existing model with updated deprivation data. The summary of each model is:

Model	Description
Model A	Based on Deprivation. This is the same method as the 2025/26 Ward budget allocation but with updated deprivation and population.
Model B	Based on the IMD deprivation scoring for each ward. York's methodology reduces the IMD 1-10 deciles for wards into four groups A1-4. The most deprived wards sit within A1 and the least deprived within A4.
Model C	Based on the Household Deprivation figures from the 2021 Census and how many Councillors each ward has.
Model D	Based on most recent Deprivation and this figure multiplied by ward population and then figure used as % of total.
Model E	Based on most recent Deprivation and this figure multiplied by ward councillors and then figure used as % of total.

## Options Analysis 2 - Changing level of base funding

24. This option analysis shows what the allocations might look like if the overall level of funding remained the same, but that the level of councillor funding was reduced, and subsequently the level of deprivation funding was increased.
25. The following scenarios have been modelled for Model A with outputs shown at Annex C.

	Deprivation Funding	Councillor Funding	To Allocate: 2026/27	% Deprivation Funding of Total
Model (1)	£145,000	£105,000	£250,000	58%
Model (2)	£150,000	£100,000	£250,000	60%
Model (3)	£162,500	£87,500	£250,000	65%
Model (4)	£175,000	£75,000	£250,000	70%
Model (5)	£187,500	£62,500	£250,000	75%
Model (6)	£200,000	£50,000	£250,000	80%
Model (7)	£250,000	£0	£250,000	100%

26. The increase in the proportion of the funding to deprivation, means that any wards with greater levels of deprivation will receive more funding. As seen in Annex C, as you move through the models the level of funding to deprived communities increase as the proportion of money allocated to deprivation increases.
27. If the ambition is to maximise the proportion based on deprivation which is favoured strongly to reduce inequalities, then the fairest way of allocating this could be seen using population in order for equitable allocations can be made per head of population. This would present Model D (7) as meeting the required need and is the basis of the recommendation to Executive in Paragraph 10 above. The allocations across all wards arising from using Model D(7) are shown in Annex D.

28. The amounts and differences between Model A (1) and Model D (7) are summarised below:

Ward	Model A(1)	Model D(7)	Difference
Acomb	£12,230.50	£11,330.25	-£900.25
Bishopthorpe	£6,558.00	£2,727.51	-£3,830.49
Clifton	£20,065.31	£23,519.09	£3,453.78
Copmanthorpe	£5,133.33	£1,856.74	-£3,276.59
Dringhouses & Woodthorpe	£11,953.56	£9,468.95	-£2,484.61
Fishergate	£10,422.96	£9,680.89	-£742.07
Fulford & Heslington	£8,876.19	£4,758.88	-£4,117.31
Guildhall	£17,243.83	£25,331.91	£8,088.08
Haxby & Wigginton	£10,039.43	£6,080.74	-£3,958.69
Heworth	£17,272.03	£22,709.11	£5,437.08
Heworth Without	£4,180.26	£1,228.86	-£2,951.40
Holgate	£14,938.35	£15,529.71	£591.36
Hull Road	£14,080.05	£18,530.91	£4,450.86
Huntington & New Earswick	£14,329.40	£14,660.89	£331.49
Micklegate	£14,989.95	£16,545.46	£1,555.51
Osbalwick & Derwent	£8,532.22	£5,403.51	-£3,128.71
Rawcliffe & Clifton Without	£9,902.88	£6,270.61	-£3,632.27
Rural West York	£8,863.65	£5,835.98	-£3,027.67
Strensall	£9,106.11	£6,016.07	-£3,090.04
Westfield	£24,509.63	£39,585.70	£15,076.07
Wheldrake	£6,772.36	£2,928.23	-£3,844.13
<b>Total</b>	<b>£250,000.00</b>	<b>£250,000.00</b>	

29. The Executive could choose any of the options in Options Analysis 1 combined with any of the options in Options Analysis 2 as an alternative, however to maximise allocations to the most deprived populations in York as outlined above option D7 (as recommended) meets that need.

## Proposed changes to other arrangements

30. Other proposals that could be considered to enhance the flexibilities around ward funding are described below:

- **Structured ward funding bid programmes** held on a quarterly basis followed by City Wide Funding releases. This will be aligned within the York Neighbourhood Model so that funding could be directed to identified local priorities between wards. This would enable the Neighbourhood leads (current Community Involvement Officers) to work efficiently, help ward councillors look strategically at need and feed city wide bids from the ward funding activity, potentially releasing ward funds for further opportunities locally. There however would be the ability for ward councillors to opt in or out of funding rounds.
- **Flexibility to carry forward projects and funding at year end:**
  - a. To continue to allow approved projects not yet started to be carried forward into the new financial year (this has been in place since 2024/25); and
  - b. To allow 20% of the year's budget to be carried over at the end of the financial year so if there is insufficient funding for an application at year end, it can be topped up from the following year.
- As recommended by People Scrutiny **publication of all ward funding decisions on ward web pages** to demonstrate to residents how the money had been spent each year.

## Support for the Community and Voluntary Sector across all wards

31. It is recognised that proportionately some wards will be receiving a substantial reduction in funding in order for resources to be targeted to York's most deprived residents, and in those areas community and voluntary organisations may be impacted. To support them (where they operate in more than one ward) there will still remain a city wide fund of £100k into which they can bid.

32. The Council also provides additional funding routes that VCSE organisations may be able to access, subject to eligibility criteria and application windows. These include thematic grant programmes linked to council priorities, such as financial

resilience. The York Crisis & Resilience Grant Funding Scheme is available here: [York Crisis and Resilience Fund – City of York Council](#) and is accepting bids until April 20th 2026. This is expected to be an annual scheme for the current and next two financial years.

33. York specific grant funding is also available through the York Community Fund, administered by Two Ridings Community Foundation in partnership with the City of York Council, York CVS, York Together and Joseph Rowtree Foundation. The fund provides micro and small-scale grants, as well as collaboration grants, to voluntary and community organisations addressing local priorities such as affordability and cost of living, health and wellbeing, equalities and climate action.
34. Finally, York CVS provides free, practical support to organisations, including one-to-one funding advice, support with bid development, and intelligence on local, regional and national funding opportunities, with a particular focus on supporting small and emerging groups. In addition to its advisory role, York CVS supports access to funding by maintaining an overview of live grant opportunities relevant to York-based organisations and, in some cases, administering grant programmes on behalf of statutory partners. This dual role enables York CVS to act both as a gateway to funding information and as a delivery partner for specific programmes, helping to strengthen the capacity and sustainability of the local VCSE sector.

## **Consultation Analysis**

35. Consultation on possible models took place with Members at the People Scrutiny Committee on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2026 and their feedback summarised in paragraph 3 above and has been considered in the recommendations in this report.

## **Organisational Impact and Implications**

36.
  - **Financial**  
There are no direct financial implications for this report as the £250,000 ward budget will remain the same, however there might be a different allocation across the wards should the

Executive choose to agree a different option, to the current option A.

Given the Council's challenging financial position, the first call on any underspent budgets should be to offset areas that are overspending with any carry forwards only allowed in very exceptional circumstances.

Even though this report proposes allowing 20% of the year's budget to be carried over at the end of the financial year, effective budgetary control is essential to ensure council spending delivers value for money.

- **Human Resources**

There are no human resources implications from this report.

- **Legal**

There are no legal implications from this report.

- **Procurement**

There are no procurement implications from this report.

- **Health and Wellbeing**

A greater focus on deprivation within wards and utilising the IMD will enable health inequalities to be addressed more directly with partners and residents. The ward budgets support a variety of social action projects that deliver health and wellbeing outcomes for residents, helping to address health inequalities at a local level. For example, 17 of the 21 wards have identified addressing loneliness and social isolation as a local priority. Reducing the levels of loneliness in the city is also a priority within the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Public Health Officers have also expressed support for models A and E, reflecting the consideration of health deprivation data, through the IMD. This can be further enhanced through the work of the Population Health Hub and ward profiles.

As there is significant scope for this resource to be used to improve health and tackle inequalities, Public Health supports the targeting of this resource to areas with the most need. Public health also supports the use of IMD as a measure of deprivation rather than using the Census 2021 data.

- **Environment and Climate action**

The ward budgets have provided grants to voluntary and community groups that manage green spaces throughout the city, such as Friends of Groups. Grants have also been made to support the energy efficiency of community buildings, supporting the carbon reduction and climate change strategy. Allocation that includes a split based on deprivation aligns with a 'just transition' approach to tackling the climate emergency, which provides support for vulnerable groups.

- **Affordability**

The 2026/27 ward funding allocation was designed with the intention of using deprivation so that wards with the highest scores (the most deprived wards) would have the greatest funding allocations. Addressing the impact of the cost of living and poverty in communities has become a priority for many of the wards, which has seen projects funded to address poverty and destitution at a neighbourhood level. Many of the wards have funded additional advice sessions provided by Citizens Advice York for example, providing bespoke sessions in local community settings. Grants have also been provided to community food projects, helping to address food poverty and complementing the development of community hubs across the city as part of the Good Place Network.

37. **Equalities and Human Rights**

a) The Council recognises, and needs to take into account its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of a public authority's functions).

b) Consideration of deprivation data through the analysis of the IMD will provide information to help inform how equalities and human rights issues are considered by Members and residents through the neighbourhood action planning process and responded to through the codesign of social action projects. This will enable equalities, human rights and inclusion issues to be responded to more directly, enabling more equitable and

inclusive communities, where the conditions are created for all residents to achieve positive outcomes.

c) Every application for ward funding will be assessed against meeting the EACH core commitments.

- **Data Protection and Privacy**

Data protection impact assessments (DPIAs) are an essential part of our accountability obligations and is a legal requirement for any type of processing under UK GDPR. Failure to carry out a DPIA when required may leave the council open to enforcement action, including monetary penalties or fines.

DPIAs helps us to assess and demonstrate how we comply with all our data protection obligations. It does not have to eradicate all risks but should help to minimise and determine whether the level of risk is acceptable in the circumstances, considering the benefits of what the council wants to achieve. As there is no personal data, special categories of personal data or criminal offence data being processed to inform the decision in this report, there is no requirement to complete a DPIA. This is evidenced by completion of DPIA screening questions AD-04609.

- **Communications**

There are no communications implications from this report.

- **Economy**

Many of the wards fund community led economic development projects supporting the delivery of employment, training and learning initiatives and supporting the development of social and community enterprises.

## **Risks and Mitigations**

38. Whilst there are no direct risks outlined in this report, it is worth noting that allocations could go up or down for wards as a result of any change in mechanism should the Executive implement any change in approach.

## **Wards Impacted**

All wards

## Contact details

### Author

<b>Name:</b>	Pauline Stuchfield
<b>Job Title:</b>	Director of Housing and Communities
<b>Service Area:</b>	Housing and Communities
<b>Contact:</b>	pauline.stuchfield@york.gov.uk
<b>Report approved:</b>	Yes
<b>Date:</b>	31 March 2026

### Co-author

<b>Name:</b>	Ian Cunningham
<b>Job Title:</b>	Head of Business Intelligence
<b>Service Area:</b>	Corporate Services
<b>Contact:</b>	ian.cunningham@york.gov.uk
<b>Report approved:</b>	Yes
<b>Date:</b>	31 March 2026

## Background papers

Executive 18<sup>th</sup> April 2024

<https://modgov.york.gov.uk/documents/s175761/Ward%20Funding%20Executive%20Report%20April%2018.pdf>

Corporate Services, Climate Change and Scrutiny Management  
Committee 18<sup>th</sup> March 2024

<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s174393/Ward%20Funding%20CSMC%2018%20March.pdf>

Full Council 20<sup>th</sup> July 2023

<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s168967/Report%20of%20Executive%20Member.pdf>

<https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s168969/Annex%20-%20Ward%20Budgets%202023-27.pdf>

Index of Multiple Deprivation 2025 published on YorkOpenData

<https://data.yorkopendata.org/dataset/indices-of-multiple-deprivation>

## **Annexes**

- Annex A - Ward Funding Model Options A-E
- Annex B - Detailed Ward Funding Allocation Models
- Annex C - Differing % for deprivation analyses on Model A
- Annex D - Differing %'s for deprivation analyses on Model D

## **Abbreviations**

EACH	Equalities & Human Rights, Affordability, Climate and Health
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation
IoD25	English Indices of Multiple Deprivation
K	Thousand
LSOA	Lower Super Output Area