

Report to: **Scrutiny Committee for Social Services and Health**

Date: **21 February 2002**

By: **Director of Social Services**

Title of report: **Community Partnership Finance**

Purpose of report: **To provide information on the reasons for the Scrutiny Committee calling in the report**

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Scrutiny Committee is asked to:

1. Note the request to call in the decisions of the Lead Cabinet Member for Social Services and Health in relation to the Community Partnership Finance report
- 

### **1. Introduction**

The Lead Member for Social Services and Health on 31 January 2002 approved the allocation of the Community Partnership Finance (CPF) budget to voluntary organisations for 2002/3. This reduced the base budget by £138,000 (30%) which had the effect of withdrawing funding from some existing organisations, reducing the funds allocated to others and not providing funds to any new schemes. The Scrutiny Committee for Social Services and Health has requested a call-in of the Lead Member's decisions on the basis of three issues in relation to the allocation of CPF. This report comments on these three issues for consideration by the Scrutiny Committee.

### **2. The Principles of the Compact with the voluntary sector, although not yet fully developed in East Sussex (but well established nationally), have not been followed.**

- 2.1 The development of a Compact between statutory agencies and the voluntary sector is being lead by Social Services. It sets out a number of principles designed to improve partnership working between the two sectors. The Compact is still in draft form and an officer of the Department has been given the task of progressing this work. However a key principle within the draft Compact is that "the statutory sector will aim to keep the voluntary and community sector informed of any changes within its funding criteria and priorities, and will consult appropriately if major changes are envisaged". The Department aims to achieve this standard in all matters involving the voluntary sector. Given the short timescales involved and the complexity of the issues involved, it has not been possible to do this as fully as we would have wished in relation to the cuts being made within the Community Partnership Finance budget.
- 2.2 However the budget process for 2002/3 whilst fairly transparent and open in terms of the overall budget savings needed within departments did not allow consultation on individual areas prior to the 18 December Cabinet meeting. The timescales for the reconciling policy and resources exercise and the process for determining the allocation of the CPF funds were so short that there was no opportunity to consult with voluntary organisations prior to this. In effect decisions on the size of the remaining Community Partnership Finance budget were not made until the 18 December.

2.3 The process for allocating the CPF budget was initiated in June 2001 before the reconciling policy and resources exercise began in October and thus before we knew that the budget was going to be cut and to what extent. These parallel processes made it difficult to carry out the consultation on the allocation of CPF funds that we have done in the past and would have wished to do in normal circumstances. The key stages of the process are outlined at Appendix A.

**3. Inadequate analysis has been carried out on the likely effect of these decisions on the operation of the voluntary organisations concerned including the loss of match funding opportunities, and potential damage to services which currently meet objectives of the County Council**

3.1 The eventual reduction of the CPF budget was £138,000 a cut of 30% of its total budget. Given this magnitude of reduction it was recognised all along that whatever decisions were made there would be a significant impact on the operation of some voluntary organisations. This was specifically identified in the report to the Lead Member for Social Services and Health on 31 January 2002 (para 2.4). This makes clear that there would be an impact on some organisations, involving potential redundancies and the possibility that some would no longer be viable.

3.2 Funding of voluntary sector organisations is extremely complex. There are a number of funding streams from all statutory agencies within East Sussex as well as a number of external sources of funding. Many voluntary organisations are funded from a number of different sources. Given the size of the reduction and the short timescale involved it was not possible to take this into account or consult with other funding agencies. However every effort has been made to minimise the impact on organisations which meet the key objectives of Social Services and contribute to their core priorities as set out in the policy steers approved by Cabinet and contained within the Council Plan. In addition those voluntary organisations that were potentially having their funding withdrawn were written to in December and given the opportunity to make representations in writing. These were presented to the Lead Member for Social Services and Health on 31 January 2002.

3.3 The recommendations as to which organisations should receive CPF funding were made by senior managers in the operational divisions in accordance with the key service priorities of Social Services. They were based on the following principles:

1. Priority should be given to umbrella organisations such as CVS' and Volunteer Bureaux who provide a co-ordinating and facilitating function for smaller organisations in their area.
2. It would not be possible or desirable to minimise the impact of the reductions by making across the board cuts to all existing grants.
3. We should lessen the impact of withdrawing funds to existing organisations by not funding any new requests for CPF monies in 2002/3.
4. Priority for continued funds should go to those organisations which provide services to people who would otherwise be eligible for a service from the department, or whose quality of life and independence is being maintained to provide intervention and preventative services which delay access to Social Services.
5. Services that do not meet the core priorities of Social Services should no longer be funded from within CPF and if possible referred to more appropriate funding streams.

3.4 We recognise and value the ability of voluntary organisations to bring resources into the County from external funders, and that these usually depend upon them contributing match funding to this from within their own resources. We were aware that reducing grants to some voluntary organisations may reduce their capacity to match fund bids for external resources and took this into account wherever possible. However notwithstanding this we clearly gave priority to those organisations that met the above criteria with the ability to match fund being of secondary importance.

**4. The Blanket ban on new applications is inequitable.**

4.1 In determining the criteria for allocating resources all of the bids were considered and in light of the financial situation and the excess of the number of bids over available resources it was recommended that no new bids should be agreed for 2002/2003.

If there had been an allocation to some of the new bids the impact on existing organisations would also have been far more severe.

David Archibald  
Director of Social Services

Contact Officer: Bob Sherwood Tel No. 01273 481252

Background Documents

- Reconciling Policy and Resources reports to cabinet 16 October 2001 and 18 December 2002 and to Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee 7 November 2001.
- Report to Lead member for Social Services on 31 January 2002
- Report to Hastings Area Committee on 7 November 2001 and 6 February 2002.

## Appendix A

### **“Reconciling Policy and Resources Key Stages”**

- 16 October: Cabinet set a £4.2 million budget cut for Social Services and asked for detailed proposals to be worked up.
- 7 November: CPF report was considered by Hastings Area Committee.
- 7 December: Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee considered list of proposed reductions including a £238k reduction in CPF (52% of the total budget) and asked Cabinet to reconsider this.
- 18 December: Cabinet agreed budget cuts including a £138k in CPF (30% of total) – a reinstatement of £100k since 7 December Scrutiny meeting.
- 19 December: Letters were sent to all organisations who were potentially having their grant withdrawn informing them of this.
- 31 January: Lead member for Social Services and Health decides CPF allocation, to individual organisations.
- 8 February: Letters are sent out to all voluntary organisations informing them of the decisions of the Lead Member.

## **LEAD CABINET MEMBER FOR SOCIAL SERVICES**

*DECISIONS made by the Lead Cabinet Member for Social Services and Health, Councillor K Glazier, on Thursday 31 January 2002 at Pelham House, Lewes.*

---

### 16. DECISIONS

16.1 Councillor Glazier approved as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting held on 5 December 2001.

### 17. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

17.1 Councillor Glazier declared an interest in relation to item no 11 on the agenda, Community Partnership Finance and specifically with regard to Animate, Rye and East Sussex Foster Carers Association. Councillor Glazier considered that his interest in these two organisations was clear and substantial and he would not be able to make decisions in relation to these applications. Councillor Glazier therefore referred the decision-making for these two organisations to Councillor Bagshawe, Lead Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources.

17.2 Councillor Glazier also declared an interest in relation to agenda item 4, Children's Services Planning in that he was a non-executive member of Bexhill PCT.

### 18. REPORTS

8.1 Copies of the reports referred to in the minutes below are contained in the minute book.

### 19. CHILDREN'S SERVICES PLANNING

19.1 Councillor Glazier considered a joint report by the Director of Social Services and the Director of Education.

#### DECISION

19.2 For the reasons given in the report to approve the approach for establishing a Children's and Young People's Strategic Partnership.

### 20. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT

20.1 Councillor Glazier considered a report by the Director of Social Services.

#### DECISION

20.2 For the reasons given in the report Councillor Glazier noted the Annual Performance Management Report.

### 21. THE CHILDREN (LEAVING CARE) ACT 2000

21.1 Councillor Glazier considered a report by the Director of Social Services.

21.2 For the reasons given in the report, Councillor Glazier decided to:

- (i) endorse the Leaving Care Policy; and
- (ii) approve the financial support that will be provided to care leavers.

### 22. EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL PERMANENCE POLICY FOR CHILDREN

22.1 *Councillor Glazier considered a report by the Director of Social Services.*

#### DECISION

22.2 For the reasons given in the report, Councillor Glazier decided to: -

- (1) approve the Permanence Policy for Children and;
- (2) endorse the establishment of 2 Adoption and Permanence Panels and a new Fostering Panel, all of which will include one or more elected members.

22.3 In order for the Panels to be established in accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Glazier also decided to:

- (3) authorise the Director of Legal and Community Services, after consultation with the Lead Member, to approve: (i) any necessary changes in the terms of reference of the Adoption Panel to reflect its wider role and any changes in its constitution; and (ii) the terms of reference and constitution of the Fostering Panel.

#### 23. PROMOTING INDEPENDENCE GRANT AND THE CARERS GRANT

23.1 *Councillor Glazier considered a report by the Director of Social Services.*

#### DECISION

23.2 For the reasons given in the report, Councillor Glazier decided to:

- (1) agree the spending plans for the Carers Grant set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report;
- (2) agree the spending plans for the Promoting Independence Grant as set out in Appendix 3 of this report;
- (3) agree in accordance with Standing Order 71.2 not to require competitive tenders in relation to those contracts above £ 35,000 (Appendix 4).
- (4) agree to allocate the schemes at Appendix 3b of the report to the base budget pending their evaluation against the criteria for the Performance Fund. Those schemes that meet the criteria will then be transferred to the Performance Fund.

#### 24. BROOMGROVE COMMUNITY CENTRE

24.1 *Councillor Glazier considered a report by the Director of Social Services.*

#### DECISION

24.2 For the reasons given in the report, Councillor Glazier decided to:

- (1) agree that if the project does not go ahead and the SRB grant is reclaimed the County Council will be prepared to pay up to £ 25,000 to cover the architects fees already incurred;
- (2) agree to the County Council, in conjunction with the other agencies involved, reviewing its role in the project.

#### 25. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

#### DECISION

17.1 Councillor Glazier decided to exclude the public and press for the next item of business on the grounds that if the public and press were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as specified in paragraph 5 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, namely, information relating to any particular applicant for, recipient or former recipient of any financial assistance provided by the authority.

## 26. COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP FINANCE

26.1 Councillor Bagshawe, Lead Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources considered a report by the Director of Social Services. In particular, Councillor Bagshawe was asked to make decisions in relation to the Community Partnership Applications from the East Sussex Foster Care Association and Animate, Rye.

### DECISION

26.2 For the reasons given in the report, Councillor Bagshawe agreed the recommendation for funding, subject to the determination of the Social Services overall revenue budget, for the following individual organisations in 2002/2003 totalling £ 5,580:-

- (i) Animate, Rye
- (ii) East Sussex Foster Care Association.

26.3 Councillor Glazier also considered the report by the Director of Social Services and the remaining Community Partnership Finance Applications. Councillors Kramer, McPherson, Neighbour, Shing, Slack, Tunwell and Webb were in attendance as local members and were invited to speak by Councillor Glazier.

### DECISION

26.4 For the reasons given in the report, Councillor Glazier decided to:

(1) agree the recommendations for funding, subject to the determination of the Social Services overall revenue budget, for individual organisations in 2002/2003 totalling £312,220, excluding substance misuse schemes, as set out in Appendix A attached to the minutes.

(2) agree the recommended allocation of community partnership finance for substance misuse schemes for 2002/2003 totalling £ 13,600 as set out in Appendix B attached to the minutes.

26.5 Councillor Glazier also decided in view of the importance of developing volunteering within the community to make the following changes to the Community Partnership Grant allocation for 2002/2003:

- (3) To increase the grant to each Volunteer Bureau from £2,000 to £3,000 namely:-
  - (a) Lewes District Volunteer Action  
(Lewes, Newhaven and Peacehaven Volunteer Bureaux)

Funding increased to £ 9,000

(b) Crowborough and Uckfield Volunteer Bureau

Funding for each increased to £ 3,000

(4) To reduce the Discretionary Budget by £ 5,000 to £ 18,072.

<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING</b>		<b>APPENDIX A</b>	
<b>AREA: Organisations that provide a service across more than one area</b>			<b>£</b>
Total funding requested £186,658		1 year agreements	35,550
		3 year agreements	<u>5,500</u>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>41,050</b>
		Contribution from –	
		Eastbourne	12,430
		Lewes	8,696
		Hastings/Rother	
		9,780	
		Wealden	
		10,144	

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Funding Requested 2002/2003</b>
		<b>£</b>
1.	East Sussex Association for the Blind (ESAB)	9,350



2.	Eastbourne & District MS Society	2,000
3.	Polish Roman Catholic Community	9,000
4.	SOMPRITI	8,000

### APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED

Report No.	Organisation	Grant in 2001/2002 £	Funding requested 2002/2003 £
5.	Parents Helpline	372	670
6.	East Sussex County Childminding Association	3,000	4,000
7.	Pre-School Learning Alliance (PLA)	26,347	41,700
8.	Relate	3,542	13,000

### APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED

Report No.	Organisation	Grant in 2001/2002 £	Funding requested 2002/2003 £	Funding recommende d 2002/2003 £
9.	Age Concern (East Sussex)	11,000	11,000	8,800
10.	Crossroads Kids (Seaford/Eastbourne/Wealden)	4,450	5,000	4,450
11.	East Sussex Foster Care Association	1,080	4,800	1,080
12.	East Sussex Vision Care	3,000	13,530	3,000
13.	ESDA (East Sussex Disability Association)	6,750	17,648	6,750
14.	Hearing Resource Centre	2,367	13,000	2,367
15.	Remap GB	500	500	500
16.	SRCC Spring into Volunteer Training	3,000	7,850	3,000
17.	SASBAH	5,603	19,110	5,603

**Sub-Total £35,550**

### APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 3 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED

Report No.	Organisation	Grant in 2001/2002 £	Funding requested 2002/2003 £	Funding recommende d 2002/2003 £
18.	Turner House – CAHA (Christian Alliance Housing Association)	5,500	6,500	5,500

**Sub-Total £5,500**

<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING</b>	
<b>AREA: EASTBOURNE</b>	£
Total funding requested £119,236	1 year agreement 21,500 3 year agreements <u>37,000</u> Total  58,500  Cross Boundary Contribution <u>12,430</u> <b>Total</b> <b>70,930</b>

(ADULTS)

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Funding Requested 2002/2003</b> £
1.	Mental Health Advocacy	33,136

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002</b> £	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003</b> £	<b>Funding recommended 2002/2003</b> £
2.	Eastbourne Deaf Club	500	500	500
3.	Eastbourne & District MIND	3,000	8,000	3,000
<b>Sub-Total £3,500</b>				

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 3 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002</b> £	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003</b> £	<b>Funding recommended 2002/2003</b> £
4.	Age Concern, Eastbourne	15,000	19,500	12,000
5.	Eastbourne Association of Voluntary Services	9,000	25,000	25,000
<b>Sub-Total £37,000</b>				

(CHILDREN & FAMILIES)

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Funding Requested 2002/2003 £</b>
6.	YMCA North Langney Teenage/Young Mothers' Group	750

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002 £</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003 £</b>
7.	Gingerbread (Hailsham & Eastbourne Group)	500	900
8.	Community Wise (formerly YWCA)	2,130	2,150
9.	Shaftesbury Society	1,000	1,200
10.	Timbers Community Group	1,940	7,800

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002 £</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003 £</b>	<b>Funding recommended 2002/2003 £</b>
11.	Open Door – Eastbourne Community Projects (PACT)	10,000	10,300	10,000
12.	Refuge (Eastbourne)	8,000	10,000	8,000
<b>Sub-Total £18,000</b>				

<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING</b>	
<b>AREA: HASTINGS &amp; ROTHER</b>	<b>£</b>
Total funding requested £309,141	1 year agreements <u>125,110</u>
	Cross Boundary contribution <u>9,780</u>
	<b>Total</b> <b>134,890</b>

**(ADULTS)**

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Funding Requested 2002/2003</b> <b>£</b>
1.	Bexhill Community Partnership	10,000

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002</b> <b>£</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003</b> <b>£</b>
2.	CAB Money Advice Centre	8,000	8,000
3.	Hastings Furniture Services	1,000	9,000
4.	Salvation Army	0	5,600
5.	St. Raphael	5,000	10,000

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002</b> <b>£</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003</b> <b>£</b>	<b>Funding recommended 2002/2003</b> <b>£</b>
6.	Age Concern, Rother	16,950	16,950	13,560
7.	ARRC (Activity Resource & Respite Centre - Rye & Rother)	6,000	6,180	6,000
8.	Battle & District CVS	4,766	10,000	3,000
9.	Cruse Bereavement Care (Hastings & Rother)	2,550	2,600	2,550
10.	Gateway (Hastings)	2,000	4,984	2,000
11.	Hastings Community Housing Association (HCHA)	5,000	23,780	5,000
12.	Hastings & Bexhill Mencap Society	1,500	1,794	1,500
13.	Hastings Voluntary Action	37,368	47,163	30,000
14.	Rye & District CVS	4,766	10,000	3,000
15.	Shelter Housing Association (SHAH)	1,000	1,030	1,000
16.	Sidley Community Association	17,750	17,750	13,000
17.	St. Matthews Day Centre for the Blind	1,000	5,000	1,000
<b>Sub-Total £81,610</b>				

(CHILDREN & FAMILIES)

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Funding Requested 2002/2003 £</b>
18.	Club 4 Kids	6,300
19.	Smart Youth Club	5,000
20.	YMCA Hastings	13,250

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002 £</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003 £</b>
21.	Bexhill & Battle under fives Association	4,750	5,750
22.	Bexhill & Hastings Gingerbread	500	500
23.	5.30 Club	750	750
24.	Bexhill Childminding Group	2,040	3,285
25.	Camber After School Club	1,530	1,530
26.	Fellowship of St. Nicholas (FSN) Fun Bus	3,000	3,000
27.	FSN Schools Out	2,000	2,000
28.	Halton After School Club	2,000	3,000
29.	Hastings & County District Under Fives Association	5,250	5,750
30.	Hastings & St.Leonards Childminding Association	2,550	6,650
31.	Kids Galore	1,300	1,450
32.	Robsack Community Group	1,000	2,000

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002 £</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003 £</b>	<b>Funding recommended 2002/2003 £</b>
33.	Animate	5,000	7,500	4,500
34.	Hastings Women's Refuge	5,000	10,000	5,000
35.	Homestart	11,000	17,595	11,000
36.	St. Judes Women's Refuge	11,500	12,000	11,500
37.	XTRAX	11,500	12,000	11,500
<b>Sub-Total £43,500</b>				

<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING</b>	
<b>AREA: LEWES</b>	<b>£</b>
Total funding requested £236,089	1 year agreements <u>44,818</u> Cross Boundary Contribution <u>8,696</u>
	<b>Total</b> <b>53,514</b>

**(ADULT SERVICES)**

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Funding Requested 2002/2003</b> <b>£</b>
1.	Barcombe Care Afternoon	150
2.	Mercread Club	
3.	Newhaven Community Development Association (NCDA)	11,880
4.	NCDA Summerhayes	9,400
5.	Seaford Hard of Hearing	750

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002</b> <b>£</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003</b> <b>£</b>
6.	Malthouse Afternoon Club	100	150
7.	Seaford Volunteer Association	1,000	500

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002</b> <b>£</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003</b> <b>£</b>	<b>Funding recommended 2002/2003</b> <b>£</b>
8.	Chailey Tuesday	200	300	200
9.	Delta Disability Group	1,500	1,500	1,500
10.	Eastgate Volunteers	2,000	5,000	2,000
11.	Furniture Now	4,250	13,855	4,250
12.	Lewes District Volunteer Action (This organisation is an amalgamation of the Lewes/Newhaven/Peacehaven Volunteer Bureaux)	N/A	30,720	6,000
13.	Lewes District & Wealden MIND (This project is jointly funded by Lewes & Wealden – see also report No.11 from Wealden)	5,000 (From Lewes)	10,500 (5,250 from Lewes)	5,000 (from Lewes)
14.	Lewes Refuge (This project is jointly funded by Lewes & Wealden - see report 12 from Wealden)	1,250 – from Lewes	7,000 (£3,500 Lewes)	1,250 (from Lewes - Reserved)
15.	South Downs Council for Voluntary Service	17,440	20,000	16,000
16.	The House (South Downs CVS)	5,618	10,000	5,618

**Sub-Total £41,818**

(CHILDREN and FAMILIES)

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Funding Requested 2002/2003 £</b>
17.	Homestart South Downs	58,400
18.	Just Ask	4,500
19.	Lewes & District Mencap Society	39,242

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002 £</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003 £</b>
20.	SNAPPS	510	700
21.	Lewes Information Shop	2,500	10,000
22.	Pippas Group	2,000	2,500
23.	Thumbs Up	1,083	4,000

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002 £</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003 £</b>	<b>Funding recommended 2002/2003 £</b>
24.	Cherish	3,000	3,792	3,000
<b>Sub-Total £3,000</b>				



<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING</b>	
<b>AREA: WEALDEN</b> Total funding requested £77,210	<b>£</b> 1 year agreements <u>25,250</u> Cross Boundary Contribution 10,144  <b>Total</b> <b>35,394</b>

**(ADULT SERVICES)**

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
Report No.	Organisation	Funding Requested 2002/2003 £
1.	Holdenhurst Centre (Age Concern)	7,500
2.	Youthability	10,360

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
Report No.	Organisation	Grant in 2001/2002 £	Funding requested 2002/2003 £
3.	Golden Cross Lunch Club	175	450
4.	Heathfield Hard of Hearing	320	500
5.	Pevensey Bay & District Information & Caring	750	700
6.	Uckfield Red Cross	310	500
7.	West Kent Relate	500	2,000
8.	Wheeldon 20/26 Club	200	450
9.	Diplocks TPA	0	10,000

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
Report No.	Organisation	Grant in 2001/2002 £	Funding requested 2002/2003 £	Funding recommended 2002/2003 £
10.	Crowborough Volunteer Bureau	7,000	7,600	2,000
11.	Lewes District & Wealden MIND (This project is jointly funded by Lewes & Wealden – see also report No. 13 from Lewes)	5,000 from Wealden	10,500 (5,250 from Wealden)	5,000 (from Wealden)
12.	Lewes Refuge (This project is jointly funded by Lewes & Wealden – see report 14 from Lewes)	1,250 from Wealden	7,000 (£3,500 Wealden)	1,250 (from Wealden - Reserved)
13.	Uckfield Volunteer Bureau	3,750	8,000	2,000
14.	Wealden Federation of Voluntary Organisations	15,375	20,000	15,000
<b>Sub-Total £25,250</b>				

**(CHILDREN and FAMILIES)**

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
Report No.	Organisation	Grant in 2001/2002 £	Funding requested 2002/2003 £
15.	Ridgewood Playgroup	145	400

<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING</b>	
<b>AREA: WEALDEN</b> Total funding requested £77,210	<b>£</b> 1 year agreements <u>25,250</u> Cross Boundary Contribution 10,144  <b>Total</b> <b>35,394</b>

**(ADULT SERVICES)**

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>		
Report No.	Organisation	Funding Requested 2002/2003 £
1.	Holdenhurst Centre (Age Concern)	7,500
2.	Youthability	10,360

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
Report No.	Organisation	Grant in 2001/2002 £	Funding requested 2002/2003 £
3.	Golden Cross Lunch Club	175	450
4.	Heathfield Hard of Hearing	320	500
5.	Pevensey Bay & District Information & Caring	750	700
6.	Uckfield Red Cross	310	500
7.	West Kent Relate	500	2,000
8.	Wheeldon 20/26 Club	200	450
9.	Diplocks TPA	0	10,000

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – 1 YEAR FUNDING AGREEMENT RECOMMENDED</b>				
Report No.	Organisation	Grant in 2001/2002 £	Funding requested 2002/2003 £	Funding recommended 2002/2003 £
10.	Crowborough Volunteer Bureau	7,000	7,600	2,000
11.	Lewes District & Wealden MIND (This project is jointly funded by Lewes & Wealden – see also report No. 13 from Lewes )	5,000 from Wealden	10,500 (5,250 from Wealden)	5,000 (from Wealden)
12.	Lewes Refuge (This project is jointly funded by Lewes & Wealden – see report 14 from Lewes)	1,250 from Wealden	7,000 (£3,500 Wealden)	1,250 (from Wealden - Reserved)
13.	Uckfield Volunteer Bureau	3,750	8,000	2,000
14.	Wealden Federation of Voluntary Organisations	15,375	20,000	15,000
<b>Sub-Total £25,250</b>				

**(CHILDREN and FAMILIES)**

<b>APPLICATIONS RECEIVED – FUNDING NOT RECOMMENDED</b>			
<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002 £</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003 £</b>
15.	Ridgewood Playgroup	145	400

<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING</b>	<b>APPENDIX B</b>
<b>SUBSTANCE MISUSE</b>	<b>£</b>
Total funding requested £25,172	New projects 3,800
Total funding available £13,600	1 year agreements 6,000
	3 year agreements <u>3,800</u>
	<b>Total 13,600</b>

**(ADULT SERVICES and CHILDREN & FAMILIES)**

<b>Report No.</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Grant in 2001/2002 £</b>	<b>Funding requested 2002/2003 £</b>	<b>Funding recommende d 2002/2003 £</b>
<b>NEW PROJECTS</b>				
1.	Community Alcohol Team (Eastbourne)	N/A	8,336	3,800
<b>Sub-total £3,800</b>				
<b>1 YEAR AGREEMENTS</b>				
2.	Sidley Community Association	2,000	2,500	2,000
3.	XTRAX Young Peoples Centre	4,000	6,000	4,000
<b>Sub-total £6,000</b>				
<b>3-YEAR AGREEMENTS</b>				
4.	Community Alcohol Team (Hastings/ St. Leonards)	4,830	8,336	3,800
<b>Sub-total £3,800</b>				
<b>Total £13,600</b>				

**To: Helmut Cartwright, Director of Legal & Community Services**

**(FAO Michaela Frost)**

*We the undersigned members of the Social Services & Health Scrutiny Committee wish to invoke the call-in procedure in relation to item 26 - Community Partnership Finance - of the meeting held by the Lead Cabinet Member, Cllr. Glazier, on Thursday 31 January 2002.*

The reasons are as follows:

1. The principles of the Compact with the voluntary sector, although not yet fully developed in East Sussex (but well established nationally), have not been followed;
2. Inadequate analysis has been carried out on the likely effect of these decisions on the operations of the voluntary organisations concerned, including the loss of matched funding opportunities, and potential damage to services which currently meet objectives of the County Council;
3. The blanket ban on new applications is inequitable.

Cllr. Mary McPherson

Cllr. Trevor Webb

Cllr. Mike Chartier