


<b>Commissioner Decision Report</b> Insert Date	
<b>Report of:</b> Denise Radley, Director of Adults` Services	<b>Classification:</b> Unrestricted
<b>Can Do Development Programme – Award of Local Project Support Awards</b>	

<b>Originating Officer(s)</b>	Brenda Scotland, Public Health Locality Manager and Esther Trenchard-Mabere, Associate Director, Public Health
<b>Wards affected</b>	All wards
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No
<b>Community Plan Theme</b>	<b>Healthy and Supportive Community</b>

### Executive Summary

The Commissioners considered a report on the Can Do Community Development Programme awards on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2015. The commissioners agreed to delegate the authorisation of the award of the Can Do community grants through local Community Assessment Panels to the Corporate Director of Education, Social Care and Wellbeing (as was). The commissioners further resolved that officers should report back at the end of the award cycle with a list of the grant recipients, reason for awards and amount awarded. They additionally requested a review of expenditure on the scheme over the previous five years and an assessment of the impact on health outcomes.

This report is to report back to the commissioners following the cycle of awards for 2016-17 being completed, providing details of the recipients and the awards by the type of award and amount awarded.

### Recommendations:

The Commissioners are recommended to:

1. Consider and note the report setting out the project awards made during 2015-16 and 2016-17 and the background report on the impact of the programme since 2009.
2. To note also that due to reductions in the level of the local authority public health grant and the need to make significant savings it is not proposed to continue the programme beyond the end of the current contract span in September 2016. The Council will, however, work with the programme providers through the voluntary sector strategy to seek continuation funding from external sources such as corporate social responsibility

funds.

## **1. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS**

- 1.1 To follow up on the previous decisions of 15<sup>th</sup> May 2015.

## **2. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 2.1 Not relevant to this report as it is delivering further information to the commissioners as requested.

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

- 3.1 Details of the report are set out in the attached report

## **4. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER**

- 4.1 Since the transfer of Public Health responsibilities to the Council in April 2013 the Can Do Community Development Programme has been funded from the Public Health Grant.
- 4.2 Following a re-tendering exercise for this service, new contracts were let, commencing October 2014 to four local host organisations. The combined current annual cost of the contracts is £92,760 which includes £20,000 for the Can Do Community Led grants. The grants awarded for each of the two year contracts are detailed in the annex and are within this allocation. The full costs for the 2016/17 programme are contained within the existing budget of £92,670.
- 4.3 These contracts cease at the end of September 2016 and The Public Health service has included the cessation of this service, including grant allocations, as part of a proposed programme of savings necessary as a result of Public Health grant reductions over the current and future financial years.

## **5. LEGAL COMMENTS**

- 5.1. Whilst officers are empowered to exercise their delegated authority in private, the specific delegation requires that a report be submitted to a Commissioners Decision Meeting at the end of the award cycle with a list of the grant recipients, reason for awards and amount awarded. This report should also include a review of expenditure on the scheme over the previous five years and an assessment of the impact on health outcomes. The Appendix to this report is a document titled "CAN DO Community Led Projects 2009-2016" and which provides the details requested.
- 5.2. The Council has a duty under the Local Government Act 1999 to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its

functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. This is referred to as the Council's best value duty. Best Value considerations have also been addressed in paragraph 7 of the report.

- 5.3. Applying this duty to grants, the Council must operate a fair and open application procedure to process a request to obtain funding. Requests for grant funding should ordinarily be measured against a predetermined set of criteria and the criteria themselves must be fair and transparent. The grant agreement should include a clear monitoring process against defined parameters in order for the Council to demonstrate either: that delivery is in line with the application and, therefore, the grant achieved its purpose; or provide clear delineation where outcomes were not achieved and the reasons for such failure are apparent. Monitoring should therefore include measuring performance against the expected outcomes.
- 5.4. This report provides the Commissioners with a performance update advising as to the CAN DO grant awards.

## **6. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1. Independent evaluation of the Can Do programme has identified that community cohesion and social capital can be significantly enhanced through local projects that bring people together for healthy activity or to learn about healthier behaviours. Ethnic minorities and women have been particularly identified as beneficiaries of this approach.

## **7. BEST VALUE (BV) IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The four locality-based contracts for the delivery of the Can Do programme have been through a procurement process that is compliant with the relevant legislation and the Council's procurement procedures most recently in 2014. A robust quarterly monitoring process is in place and providers are required to meet appropriate performance management requirements before payments are issued. Grant agreements proportionate to the level of grant are in place and grant recipients are required to account for expenditure of all and any funds advanced and to report back on the outcomes of the project supported.

## **8. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT**

- 8.1 Projects that support healthier lives also generally contribute to a greener environment for example gardening and food growing and active travel such as walking and cycling.

## **9. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The risks are primarily that the recipients of funding do not go on to deliver the project being supported. This is mitigated through the close support provided by the local community development officers and the regular monitoring of the

progress of projects. Where (rarely) there is no delivery recipients are required to return the funding.

## **10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 There is good evidence that locally based and community-owned projects can contribute significantly to reduce fear of crime in localities, for example by bringing under-used areas back into community use.

## **11. SAFEGUARDING IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 No safeguarding issues have been identified.

---

### **Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents**

#### **Linked Report**

- NONE

#### **Appendices**

- **Can Do Community Led Projects 2009-2016**
- **Summary List of projects Supported in 2015 and 2016**

#### **Background Documents – Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012**

- NONE

#### **Officer contact details for documents:**

Keith Williams, [keith.williams@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:keith.williams@towerhamlets.gov.uk) 020 7364 1523