

# Report of the Strategic Director of Environment and Sport to the meeting of Bradford West Area Committee to be held on 12 November 2014

X

---

## Subject:

Allocation of Community Centre Core Cost and Community Development Grants.

## Summary statement:

This report outlines the recommendations of the Bradford West Area Committee Grant Advisory Group for Community Centre Core Costs and Community Development Grants.

---

Steve Hartley Strategic Director  
Environment and Sport

Portfolio: Safer and Stronger  
Communities  
Cllr Imran Hussain

Report Contact: Bhulla Singh  
Phone: (01274) 432597  
E-mail: [Bhulla.Singh@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:Bhulla.Singh@bradford.gov.uk)

Overview & Scrutiny Area:  
Corporate

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report outlines the recommendations of the Bradford West Area Committee Grant Advisory Group for Community Centre Core Costs and Community Development Grants.

## 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 A report setting out the basis on which the Executive devolved commissioning of Community Development and Community Centre Core Cost grants to Area Committees to increase local democratic accountability and transparency was presented to Bradford West Area Committee on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2014.
- 2.2 The Council's budget continues to be under intense pressure as a consequence of both a shrinking national financial settlement and increased demand on services due to demographic change. Within this context the Council increasingly needs to find new ways to support and empower communities to identify self help solutions rather than relying on public funding.
- 2.3 Helping to ensure that communities are safer, clean and active communities is a Council priority. The community development approach to community support can contribute to building stronger sustainable communities in the following ways:
- Develop active communities
  - Increase the active participation of residents in their neighbourhoods and communities
  - Reduce the negative impact of budget reductions within neighbourhoods and with communities of interest and people on low incomes.
  - Challenging disadvantage and inequalities
  - Stimulate innovative and sustainable local solutions to issues.
  - Build relations within and between communities
- 2.4 Community Centres may provide community support, in the following ways:
- Meeting space for community groups
  - Local base to deliver a range of services including advice work
  - Places to deliver activities
  - Access to practical resource

### **3. Process undertaken to make recommendations on the use of funding for Community Development and Core Costs**

3.1 The process undertaken was based on the framework outlined in Report taken to Bradford West Area Committee on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2014: Devolution of commissioning of Community Development and Community Centre Core Cost Grants to Area Committees. This included in relation to community development grants:

- Considering how the Expression of Interest would make a contribution to priorities set out in the Ward Plans.
- Community Development Grants are intended to support development work with communities and not for the management of community centres.
- Community Development Grants should only be awarded to organisations that demonstrate capacity to support staff using community development approaches.
- Community Development Grants should be awarded to organisations that can demonstrate an ability and commitment to deliver community development across a Ward and, where appropriate, across the Area.

The main priority of Community Centre Core Costs grants is organisations with low level of resources and without the funds to pay the full cost of running the centre without a core cost grant. Community Centres receiving a contribution to their core costs through a grant will be expected to be well run in the following respects:

- To be accessible to everyone within the local community, including young people
- Well maintained and clean facilities
- Have a responsible charging policy
- Have financial systems and controls in place
- Have a strong and responsible management committee
- To work in partnership with other agencies

3.2 Bradford West Area Committee delegated the responsibility to the Grants Advisory Group of assessing the Expressions of Interest, considering local needs and assessing any negative impact that could be incurred by not funding organisations that are currently 'commissioned' to deliver community development in the Area.

3.3 Grants will be awarded for a two year period to give organisations a degree of stability. In 2016-17 the value of the grant may alter in line with Council wide budget decisions.

#### **3.4 Grant Advisory Group Recommendations: Community Centre Core Costs**

Principles deployed to make recommendations on awards for Core Cost Grants:

1. No applicant will get more than they asked for

2. No applicant gets more than the difference between income to support the running of the centre (3.3) and the total running costs of the centre (3.1)

3. Centres whose primary purpose is not as a community facility will only receive a core costs contribution towards the running costs of the open community facility element. This will not exceed the average contribution received by centres whose primary purpose is an open community facility.

4. No applicant to receive more funding than they got in 2014-15, unless a strong reason is provided in the Expression of Interest form.

5. No new applicant will be awarded more than the average award.

**Table 1: Grant Advisory Group Recommendations: Community Centre Core Costs**

Centre/ Grant applicant	Allocation		Notes- Numbers relate to points set out above in 3.4
	2015-16	2016-17*	
Artworks Creative Communities	£4,080	£3,672	3. Primary purpose is an Arts Centre.
BEAP Community Partnership	£4,080	£3,672	5.
Frizinghall Community Association	£3,672	£3,305	1.
Equity Partnership	£4,080	£3,672	4.
Girlington Community Centre	£4,080	£3,672	5.
Grange Interlink	£4,080	£3,672	4.
Heaton Community Centre	£5,100	£4,590	1.
Lower Grange Community Association	£7,850	£7,065	Cleaner / Caretaker costs inadmissible, materials only
Manningham Mills Community Association	£4,080	£3,672	Cleaner / Caretaker costs inadmissible, materials only
Millan Centre	£3,060	£2,754	4.
Pakistan & Worldwide Community Link Ltd	£5,100	£4,509	4. This Award is indicative only and is subject to further evidence of activity
Saffron Dean	£0	£0	2. More funds were being raised by the Centre than the amount of funds required for core costs.
St Francis Village Hall	£1,500	£1,350	1.
Café West Healthy Living Centre	£4,080	£3,672	1.
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>£54,842</b>	<b>£49,277</b>	
<b>Core Cost Contingency</b>	<b>£8,158</b>	<b>£13,723</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£63,000</b>	<b>£63,000</b>	

\* The Grant Advisory Group recommends 10% reductions in year 2 to increase the contingency fund and to indicate generally to organisations that are increasingly likely to need to seek core costs from other sources in the future.

**3.6 Process applied by the Grant Advisory Group to make recommendations on awarding Community Development Grants:**

1. All the Expressions of Interest considered and evaluated.
2. The Needs of the Wards considered
3. The performance of existing organisations was considered
4. Impact assessments considered where there was the possibility of not funding an organisation, who currently receive a commission for community development.
5. All the above were considered collectively and recommendations made based on the quality of Expressions of Interest and the potential negative impact of not funding organisations who currently receive a community development commission. The successful Community Development Grants are outlined in Table 2.

3.7 The Grant Advisory Group is recommending that there are three Community Development Grant Awards in Bradford West and each of these will be expected to cover two Wards. The successful organisations will also be expected to work in partnership with the other providers to help ensure the best possible support for all communities of interest within the Area.

**Table 2: Grant Advisory Group Recommendations: Community Development**

Wards	Grant holder	Allocation		Notes
		2015-16	2016-17	
Heaton and Manningham	Bradford & District Community Empowerment Network CNET	£25,000 to £30,000	£25,000 to £30,000	Area Coordinator to negotiate.
Toller and City	Girlington Community Association	£25,000 to £30,000	£25,000 to £30,000	Area Coordinator to negotiate.
Clayton & Fairweather Green and Thornton & Allerton	Lower Grange Community Association	£25,000 to £30,000	£25,000 to £30,000	Area Coordinator to negotiate.
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>£90,000</b>	<b>£90,000</b>	
	Community Development Contingency	£10,000	£10,000	
<b>Total</b>		<b>£100,000</b>	<b>£100,000</b>	

3.8 A consequence of the recommendations of the Grant Advisory Group is that three organisations who are currently receiving a Community Development Commission from Bradford Council are not recommended for funding in 2015-17. Table 3 gives details of these three organisations and the reasons for not being recommended. Table 4 summarises the potential equality issues that may arise and which the Area Committee will need to consider in making a decision on funding allocations. Table

4 also outlines actions the Grant Advisory Group recommends are endorsed by the Area Committee to mitigate against these potential impacts.

**Table 3: Organisations who currently receive a community development 'commission' from the Council who were not successful with their Expressions of Interest:**

Grant applicant	Amount requested		Notes
	2015-16	Recommend	
Frizinghall Community Association	£24,204	£0	- Expression of interest weak. Mostly about centre based work and not community development - First 6 months performance not to a satisfactory level – track record of support outside the centre weak - Overall view that this organisation is not well placed to deliver community development support across two Wards
Manningham Mills Sports and Community Association	£24,204	£0	- Expression of interest weak - Overall view that this organisation is not well placed to deliver community development support across two Wards
Millan Centre	£32,961	£0	- Expression of interest weak – more about centre based work than community development - First 6 months performance not to a satisfactory level – track record of support outside the centre weak - Overall view that this organisation is not well placed to deliver community development support across two Wards

### Impact assessment summary and mitigation

Organisation	Issues identified in the Impact Assessment	Mitigation
Frizinghall Community Association	- Risk of closure of centre - Risk of community become 'hard to reach'	- Continuation of core cost grant/ signpost to CVS for developmental support and to seek funding for a centre manager if appropriate. - Community development work to continue in Heaton Ward delivered by another organisation
Manningham Mills Sports and Community Association	- Risk of loss of support for community in Manningham - Risk of loss of support for	- Community development work to continue in Manningham delivered by

	African Caribbean communities in the Area - Risk of loss of support for asylum seekers and refugees in the Area	another organisation. - Generic community development support to be asked to work with African Caribbean communities and asylum seekers and refugees in the Area
Millan Centre	- Risk of closure of centre  - 'The women in the area/ ward are vulnerable' and have 'cultural and religious issues'. - Women who do not speak English could lose out on learning and other opportunities	- Continuation of core cost grant/ will signpost to CVS for developmental support and to seek funding for a centre manager if appropriate. - There will be an expectation that those organisations who receive CD grants have an appreciation of starting where communities are at and this should include - where appropriate - supporting women only provision and increasing the horizons of women beyond their immediate neighbourhood.

#### 4. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL

- 4.1 The approved reduction identified in the Council budget 2014-15 relating to the year 2015-16 is included in the figures presented in this paper. The allocations will need to be reviewed in the light of any subsequent decisions that affect the 2015-16 resources.

#### 5. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES

- 5.1 There are no significant risks and governance issues arising from the proposed recommendations in this report.

#### 6. LEGAL APPRAISAL

- 6.1 This work relates directly to the Local Government Act 2000 and to the Duty of Well-being placed upon the Council to promote and improve the well-being of the District.
- 6.2 Under the Councils Constitution at Article 12, the Executive can delegate/devolve the discharge of functions to Area Committees. In discharging these functions, all decisions made must be in accordance with policies, strategies, plans or criteria agreed by the Council or Executive and within the approved budget.

6.3 Legal implications of any further devolution of budgets to Area Committees will be reviewed by the City Solicitor and any issues and constitutional amendments required will be considered by the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee for recommendation to Full Council.

6.4 It is understood that the three organisations which will not receive grant funding (**See Table 3 above**) currently employ staff who may as part of their duties carry out work linked to the purposes for which previous commission payments were received. The possibility that some or all of that work will be continued by the successful bidders does raise the question of whether one or more of these employees might be able to claim the protection of Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 ('TUPE 2006') and assert a right to be employed by any successor organisation on their existing terms and conditions of employment. This is a matter for the current and successor organisations and it is contingent on matters such as whether such people are truly assigned to business changing hands and also the nature of the business model of the successor organisation. This issue does not directly affect the Council or this decision making process unless previous funding arrangements contain indemnities from the Council to cover such matters. Absent this, then this is a commercial risk to be managed as between the current and successor organisations.

## **7. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

### **7.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

The progressive distribution of grants to Areas with higher level needs will aid the development of initiatives which reduce inequalities.

### **7.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

Resources available to Bradford West Area Committee, described in this report, and used to support Bradford West Area Committee Action Plan 2014-17 will directly support the delivery of the District's Sustainable Community Strategy.

### **7.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

Actions to assist in identifying the greenhouse gas impacts of potential projects to be funded through this budget will be undertaken. These will include a consideration of, for example, energy efficiency opportunities in purchasing new equipment or refurbishing or modifying buildings.

### **7.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

7.4.1 Community Safety issues are acknowledged as a key contributor to the quality of life in neighbourhoods. It is anticipated that a number of priorities supported through this budget will demonstrate a positive impact on community safety issues across Bradford West.



## **7.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

7.5.1 There are no Human Rights Act implications arising from this report.

## **7.6 TRADE UNION**

There are no implications related to Trade Unions arising from this report.

## **7.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

7.7.1 The grants will contribute to work in the City, Clayton & Fairweather Green, Heaton, Manningham, Thornton and Allerton and Toller Wards.

7.7.2 The devolution of Community Development and Community Centre Core Cost Grants to Area Committees will enable a more tailored provision and to more accountability at a Ward level.

## **7.8 AREA COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN IMPLICATIONS (for reports to Area Committees only)**

7.8.1 The activities outlined in this report contribute to priorities within the Bradford West Ward Plans

## **7. Not for publication documents**

None

## **8. OPTIONS**

8.1 That Bradford West Area Committee adopts the recommendations outlined in this report.

8.2 That Bradford West Area Committee adopts the recommendations outlined in this report, with amendments.

8.3 That Bradford West Area Committee decides not to accept the recommendations outlined in this report.

## **9. RECOMMENDATIONS**

9.1 Bradford West Area Committee approves the recommendations on Core Cost Community Centre Grants made by the Grant Advisory Group

9.2 Bradford West Area Committee approves the recommendations on Community Development grants made by the Grant Advisory Group

9.3 Responsibility for any contingency funds are delegated to the Area Coordinator in consultation with members of the Grant Advisory Group

9.4 To accept the recommendations on how to mitigate against the potential impacts on communities that may no longer be able to access provision at the three organisations who are currently receiving a Community Development Commission.

## **10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Bradford West Area Committee 23 October 2014

“Devolution to Area Committees” (Document AG) report to the Council Executive on 9 October 2012.

“Devolution to Area Committees” (Document AG) Called – in Decision, to the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 1 November 2012.

“Methodology for Allocation of Devolved Service Resources to the Five Area Committees” (Document CE) report to the Council Executive on 16 April 2013.

“Devolution of commissioning of Community Development and Community Centre Core Cost Grants to Area Committees” (Document N) report to the Council Executive on 22 July 2014.

“Devolution of commissioning of Community Development and Community Centre Core Cost Grants to Area Committees” (Document R) report to the Bradford West Area Committee on 17 September 2014.