



# Cabinet

18 JULY 2011

**LEADER**

*Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh*

**CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY CARE**

*Councillor Joe Carlebach*

**3<sup>RD</sup> SECTOR INVESTMENT FUND ALLOCATION**

This report presents recommendations for the allocation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund for from October 2011 for the areas of:

- Health & Wellbeing (adults)
- Safer Communities
- Arts, Culture & Sport
- Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety
- Environment & Community Transport

**Wards:  
All**

Cabinet is asked to approve funding allocation as set out in this report.

**CONTRIBUTORS**

CSD  
ADLDS  
DFCS

**Recommendations:**

**1. That approval be given to the allocation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund across the areas of:**

- Health & Wellbeing (adults)
- Safer Communities
- Arts, Culture & Sport
- Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety
- Safety
- Environment & Community Transport

**HAS A PEIA BEEN COMPLETED?  
YES**

**2. That authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Community Care, in conjunction with the Director of Community Services, to allocate any balance of the grants budget.**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Cabinet on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2009 agreed the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Strategy, which sets out the Council's commitment to providing funding and premises support to the local 3<sup>rd</sup> sector.
- 1.2 Specifically, the report set out how the Council's main investment programme for the sector (The 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund), would be allocated.
- 1.3 The Council supports the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector specifically through the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund (formerly known as the Main Programme VCS grants budget), although members should note that in addition to this, some 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisations are contracted to provide services from other funding streams or Council budgets and that these amounts may be significant.
- 1.4 The 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Strategy: Investment Plan sets out:
- Eligibility criteria for investment support
  - A focus on outcomes and evidencing benefits to residents
  - The proposed funding term
  - The return on our investment – expected broader activities and outcomes
- 1.5 To improve the efficiency of the application and allocation process, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Strategy streamlined the service areas from thirteen (as tendered in 06-07) to eight:
- Children, Families & Young People
  - Infrastructure
  - Economic Wellbeing & Opportunity
  - Health & Wellbeing (older people) (to be combined by 2013 with) Health & Wellbeing (adults)
  - Safer Communities
  - Arts, Culture & Sport
  - Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety
  - Environment & Community Transport
- 1.6 The strategy sets out the Council's intention to competitively tender the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund. In the past, historical funding agreements have led to stagnation in service delivery and design, and lack of opportunity for new groups with innovative service ideas to secure funding support. There continues to exist in some quarters of the sector, an expectation that funding from LBHF will be automatic; however, the process for applying and securing 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Funding means that this is no longer the case, and organisations are required to demonstrate how the services they propose will meet the outcomes as stated in the service specification. There is no guarantee of funding for groups who have been funded in the past.
- 1.7 The following service areas were advertised in 2009 with funding agreed by Cabinet in July 2010, for funding commencing 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010:

- Infrastructure – services funded for a four year term
- Children, Young People & Families – services funded for a two year term
- Economic Wellbeing & Opportunity – services funded for a two year term
- Health & Wellbeing (older people) – services funded for a three year term

1.8 This report outlines the funding recommendations made for the following service areas:

- Health & Wellbeing (adults) – services recommended for funding for a two year term, after which this budget will be joined with Health & Wellbeing for older people, and retendered as a single service area.
- Safer Communities - services recommended for two year funding, with the option for extending for up to a further 2 years.
- Arts, Culture & Sport - services recommended for two year funding, with the option for extending for up to a further 2 years.
- Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety - services recommended for two year funding, with the option for extending for up to a further 2 years.
- Environment & Community Transport - services recommended for two year funding, with the option for extending for up to a further 2 years.

## 2. CONTEXT

2.1 LBHF has a centralised corporate budget for 3<sup>rd</sup> sector services – the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund. The fund is allocated across the service areas listed above, and each service area is tendered against a service specification which clearly sets out the criteria and desired outcomes of the fund.

2.2 The ongoing allocation and management of this financial investment, including leading tendering processes, monitoring and evaluation and overall financial management of the budget is undertaken by a corporate Council team: Community Investment, which is managed through Community Services Department.

2.3 The Council recognises that the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector plays a significant role in achieving the Council's borough of opportunity vision and aspirations; adding value to the cultural, social and economic quality of life for our residents; helping to shape social and economic regeneration and contributing to civic renewal.

2.4 The Council's overarching aim is to develop an environment which enables the third sector to thrive, growing in its contribution to Hammersmith & Fulham's society, economy and environment.

### **3. THE LOCAL 3<sup>RD</sup> SECTOR**

- 3.1 The 3<sup>rd</sup> sector encompasses voluntary and community organisations, charities, social enterprises, cooperatives and mutuals both large and small. It is a diverse, active and passionate sector, where organisations share common characteristics:
- They are non-governmental
  - They are value-driven
  - They principally reinvest any financial surpluses to further social, environmental or cultural objectives.
- 3.2 Because of its diversity, it is not easy to define the sector. Organisations vary enormously in size, from small local groups staffed exclusively by volunteers, to large national charities that are household names with complex infrastructures and many hundreds of staff.
- 3.3 Over nine hundred 3<sup>rd</sup> sector representatives are on the Council's 3<sup>rd</sup> sector mailing list, with an estimated seven hundred and fifty + groups operating in Hammersmith & Fulham. Of these, around three hundred groups a year receive direct support from the Council through funding or premises.
- 3.4 The term "3<sup>rd</sup> sector" is the term now used, and is generally thought of as a more embracing term that encompasses the voluntary and community sector, but also includes social enterprises (i.e. businesses that have primarily social objectives, and whose profits are reinvested in the business rather than distributed to shareholders), mutuals and cooperatives (membership-based organisations run on a democratic basis for the benefits of their members), and other non-profit organisations.

### **4. THE FINANCIAL CONTEXT**

- 4.1 It is well known that the local authority funding is facing a very tough future – with unprecedented levels of savings needing to be found over the next three years. Following the Comprehensive Spending Review the Council now knows that it needs to save in the region of £60million by 2013/14 and the impact of this will need to be shared with the Council's external providers, including the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector.
- 4.2 The Council is making every effort to reduce costs and the Council's level of debt. Over recent years, all Council budgets have been required to identify and deliver efficiencies. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund report agreed by Cabinet in July 2010 included a £700k reduction in the 3SIF budget – representing a 16% reduction in the grants budget overall.
- 4.3 No further savings to the grants budget are proposed at this time – however, consideration to delivering further savings through the grants budget is considered prudent.
- 4.4 Officers consider it preferential to reduce the grants budget prior to allocation, rather than seek to reduce funding or decommission services during a funding

term. Therefore, the proportion of the grants budget across each service area has been reviewed, with a portion of the budget (6% from October 2011) held as a reserve. This unallocated fund can then be made available to deliver further savings on the grants budget if required, or can be used to fund additional services from the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector.

4.5 Annual uplift on the budget is requested from corporate finance with the uplift secured allocated to funded groups – usually in line with cost of living increase awarded on LBHF salaries. As stated in the Cabinet report in July 2010, inflationary uplift will not be available to funded organisations for two years (24 months) from commencement of funding. After that term, availability of uplift is dependent on the Council’s financial position. If uplift is available, organisations will be required to present the business case for any increase in their funding level. Funded organisations will be expected, as is the Council, to seek different ways of working and develop more effective systems that enable efficiencies to be achieved with minimal impact on front line services. Organisations will be expected to give consideration for how cost of living salary increases can be met through efficiencies made elsewhere.

4.6 The allocation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund across service areas is reviewed at each funding round to allow adjustments of allocations as local priorities shift. The allocation across service areas has duly been updated for the funding term commencing October 2011, with further changes to the allocation proposed from October 13 – please see appendix 1 for details.

table 1

Area	Oct 10	Oct 11
Infrastructure	11%	10%
Children, Young People & Families	17%	18%
Economic Wellbeing & Opportunity	20%	21%
Health & Wellbeing (older people)	12%	12%
Health & Wellbeing (adults)	6%	8%
Safer Communities	8%	6%
Arts, Culture & Sport	11%	9%
Environment & Community Transport	3.5%	4%
Coach vouchers	0.5%	
Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety	4%	3%
Small Grants	5%	4%
Reserve	0%	6%

## 5. SERVICE SPECIFICATIONS

5.1 The service areas retendered during 10-11 for services commencing 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011 are:

- Health & Wellbeing (adults)
- Safer Communities
- Arts, Culture & Sport
- Environment and Community Transport
- Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety

- 5.2 The draft service specifications were discussed with the sector at workshops in August and September 2010 in order to give 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisations the opportunity to shape and inform the specifications and the outcomes proposed.
- 5.3 The final service specifications were agreed by the Director of Community Services and Director of Residents Services at the end of September 2010.
- 5.4 Each specification sets out the outcomes that the Council wishes to achieve through the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund (see appendices 5a – 5d).
- 5.5 Following the launch of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund, briefings were held with the sector on each of the specifications, in order to ensure that organisations understood the outcomes being sought and the process for submitting an application.

## 6. THE APPLICATION PROCESS

- 6.1 The 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund was launched the week commencing 11<sup>th</sup> October 2010. Organisations were required to submit their application via the London tenders Portal by midnight, Friday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2010.
- 6.2 In order to apply for funding, organisations were required to submit an application on-line via the London Tenders ProContract Portal. The London Tenders Portal is a secure e-procurement internet based system which gives organisations access to Public Sector funding opportunities across all London boroughs. Organisations were required to register with the site in order to submit an application.
- 6.3 By using the London Tenders Portal system, the Council could ensure that all organisations were notified of updated information related to the fund, and could submit their application electronically and securely.
- 6.4 By the closing deadline seventy applications from fifty organisations had been received in accordance with the requirements set out in the application form and guidance notes.

Table 2

<b>Service area</b>	<b>indicative budget*</b>	<b>no. of applications</b>	<b>value of applications*</b>
Health & Wellbeing (adults)	£320,000	23	£1,061,517
Safer Communities	£225,000	18	£848,039
Arts, Culture & Sport	£355,000	14	£1,044,940
Environment & Community Transport	£150,000	10	£421,359
Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety	£120,000	7	£482,909
<b>total</b>	<b>£1,170,000</b>		<b>£3,858,764.00</b>

*\*for the first 12 months*

## 7. THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

- 7.1 The assessments were carried out by an assessment team for each service area. Each Assessment Team comprised three sections:

- Community Investment, who chaired and co-ordinated each assessment team
- Service Areas (lead officers and those from associated areas)
- Challenge officer/s

7.2 The roles of the assessment team sections

Community Investment: Expertise on organisational robustness, generic service delivery, finances, monitoring and evaluation. Ensured where appropriate, different assessment teams discuss bids which have cross-over impacts.

Service Area: Expertise regarding the market, existing provision, the types of services more likely to achieve the desired outcomes etc.

Challenge: Overview assessment – checking that statements made are supported by accurate information and evidence and that any assumptions are reasonable.

<b>The assessment team</b>			
<b>Section 1: Community Investment Team</b> assessor 1 assessor 2 assessor 3 etc	<b>Section 2: Service Area</b> assessor 1 assessor 2 assessor 3 etc.	<b>Section 3: Challenge</b> assessor 1 assessor 2 assessor 3 etc.	

7.3 Stage 1 - eligibility: Stage 1 determines an applicant's eligibility for funding and checks whether:

- the application has been completed in full
- supporting documentation is present
- that the organisation meets the eligibility criteria
- the organisation in good financial health
- the organisation is eligible for funding under Regulation 23 of the Public Contract Regulations 2006.

7.4 A financial assessment was undertaken during stages 1 and 2, including establishing each organisation's credit rating from an external company contracted by the Council to provide credit ratings for any potential provider of local authority services.

7.5 Stage 2 - assessment: A minimum of three separate assessments was undertaken – one by each section of the assessment team.

7.6 Applications were assessed against 3 overarching criteria which were graded by each individual assessor. The three overarching criteria were:

- Is the proposed service likely to deliver the specification outcomes?
- Is the service likely to be delivered well?
- Does the service offer value for money?

- 7.7 The assessment indicated whether any specific areas need further clarification. Where further information was required, organisations were asked to provide this in writing, within a given timeframe.
- 7.8 A rating was given against each criteria. These ratings were: excellent; good; satisfactory; weak or unsatisfactory.
- 7.9 Stage 3 – deliberation: The assessment team then meet to discuss the fundable applications and to make recommendations for funding based on a cluster of services which they considered would collectively deliver the outcomes as set out in the service specification.
- 7.10 The assessment method was not mechanical: an arithmetical score at stage 2 did not correlate to a recommendation of a fixed monetary amount, as would be the case if, for example, each point scored were worth £x of funding. The purposes of the scoring exercise was to feed into the conclusion subsequently reached by the assessment team – as to how the fixed amount of money available could be divided across disparate organisations and activities.
- 7.11 The scoring system was a useful benchmark to help officers make their recommendations. As a rule of thumb, organisations whose applications scored “satisfactory” or above were considered fundable, whilst those that scored “unsatisfactory” or “weak” were not considered fundable. However, the picture was further complicated by the cross over of outcomes across different applications, and the fact that organisations were not proposing like-for-like services.
- 7.12 In addition, officers agreed that there should be a level of tolerance where “satisfactory” or “good” but not “excellent” applications could be recommended for funding if a condition was added to the funding recommendation, which sought to improve the area of weakness – e.g. funding recommended subject to a revised service plan, or specific beneficiary targets.
- 7.13 In the 2007 High Court Judgement (Pettigrew, Agli Ali & Asseffa v LBHF), Mr Justice Underhill acknowledged that the grants application assessment process followed by the Council was not based on any arithmetical or precisely measured approach, and that in his view this was appropriate: *“When a funding body with a fixed pot of money to distribute has to distribute funds as between a very large number of candidates with different needs and characteristics, and whose claims greatly exceed the sums in fact available, the process will inevitably be evaluative, subjective and multi-factorial. Any numerical scoring system that may be used can be no more than a tool to give some structure to the assessment of some elements of the exercise. It also follows in such a case that the funder cannot give individualised reasons why any given candidate has received a particular sum, or indeed nothing. The most that it can do generally is to indicate the criteria applied (although it may be possible in some cases to identify any specific hurdle at which a candidate, especially one who may have received nothing, may have fallen). But more detailed reasons are simply impractical in such a situation.”*



- 7.14 Recommendations were then presented to the relevant Departmental Management Team for comments and to secure support for the cluster of services recommended for funding.
- 7.15 As anticipated the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund was oversubscribed, and it was the case that although an organisation may have submitted a strong bid, it may not be recommended due to high competition for funding.
- 7.16 Final recommendations, where this is the case, are based on which services the assessment team determine will best deliver council priorities, the intended outcomes, offer best value for money and would be the most likely to succeed.
- 7.17 Funding terms have been recommended on the basis of:
- Shorter term funding (2 year):
    - where longer term priorities for the service area are not clear – or where it is known that need or demand is likely to change during the funding term
    - For piloting innovative services
    - Where wider interdependencies will impact the service area in the near future
  - Longer term funding (up to 4 years):
    - Where longer term priorities are more certain
    - Where a service is already proven and recognised as achieving the desired outcomes
    - Where wider interdependencies support a longer term funding approach

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS – GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

- 8.1 Officers are recommending a lower level of funding than organisations have requested. In some cases, organisations will receive a reduced level of funding year on year to reflect the financial position the Council is anticipating, or where assessing officers considered that the service should strive for greater independence from Council funding.
- 8.2 Inflationary uplift will not be available to funded organisations for the initial 24 months of funding. After that time, availability of uplift is dependent on the Council's financial position. If uplift is available, organisations will be required to present the business case for any increase in their funding level.
- 8.3 Funded organisations will be expected, as is the Council, to seek different ways of working and more effective systems that enable efficiencies to be achieved with minimal impact on front line services. Back-office costs such as stationery, publicity, marketing, rents etc, will not be eligible for inflationary uplift, as organisations will be expected to follow the Council's example of seeking to reduce organisational overheads and back-office costs during the funding term.
- 8.4 Funding recommendations are detailed in Appendices 2a-d and summarised below under each service area. A full list of all applicants is detailed in Appendix 3. All applications recommended for funding are likely to contribute in a variety of

ways to the economic, environmental and social well being of the borough and support the Community Strategy.

8.5 Officers recommend that the unallocated portion of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment fund be held for any further Medium Term Financial Strategy savings that may be required. Should these savings not be required, officers recommend that delegated authority is awarded to Director of Community Services to retender or reallocate the remainder of the budget across any of the service areas covered by the fund. This can include:

- a. Allocating the budget for a discrete 3<sup>rd</sup> sector service in order to achieve specific outcomes.
- b. Use the budget to replace other funding streams for existing 3<sup>rd</sup> sector providers, where the service the organisation provides will deliver the specification outcomes. Responsibility for budget and monitoring of these services will remain with the Community Investment Team.
- c. Investing in infrastructure for the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector – which might include capital investment.

#### 8.6 Impact of the recommendations:

- 70 applications from 51 organisations were received.
- 27 services are recommended for funding. This is in addition to the 36 services funded from October 2010.
- On average, successful organisations will receive 75% of the level of funding they requested.
- 9 organisations will have a reduction from their current level of grant funding
- 3 organisations which are currently grant funded, will no longer be funded
- 13 new services will be funded
- 5 organisations will receive an increase in grant funding

#### 8.7 Likely impact in the first 24 months of funding:

- Services funded under Health & Wellbeing: in the first two years of funding are likely to benefit **1263** residents. Targeted services for people with learning disabilities, mental health needs, long term health conditions and physical disabilities. Services range from peer support, to targeted interventions for those at risk of crisis – preventing a need for more costly statutory interventions.
- Services funded under Safer Communities are likely to benefit around **8,685** residents in the first two years, with a range of services ranging from victim support and domestic violence services, which protect and support our most vulnerable residents, to preventative work in schools, educating young people on the real consequences of crime and anti social behaviour.
- Under Arts, Culture and Sport, around **45,000** people are likely to benefit from this cluster of services in the first two years alone. This is in large part due to the large numbers of residents likely to benefit from activities provided by Lyric Theatre, but also includes establishing a local cycling club, and continued

investment in the William Morris Society, ensuring this creative and delightful local museum continues to thrive.

- Services funded under the Environment & Community Transport are likely to benefit more than **7,500** residents in the first two years, with a combination of volunteer gardening, environmental education programmes and community transport services.
- Services funded under Homelessness Prevention and Home Safety aim to help avoid homelessness, and ensure older and vulnerable people remain safe in their homes. Over the first two years of funding, more than **3,300** local residents are expected to benefit from specialist advice service, plus practical handyman service.

## **9. RECOMMENDATIONS HEALTH & WELLBEING (ADULTS): BUDGET £345,000**

9.1 Applications were invited for services which would target residents (age 18-65) or their carers who:

- Live alone
- Have particular social, substance misuse, disability related, physical health or mental health needs that prevent them accessing mainstream services
- Live in isolated conditions and have no or few social networks to provide them with support
- Are not eligible for adult social care services (though not exclusively)

9.2 Organisations are recommended for funding, and collectively will support:

- Residents with mental health needs – both low level and higher needs
- Residents with mental health needs and are at risk of homelessness
- People with learning disabilities
- People with physical disabilities
- People with substance misuse difficulties

9.3 As with all service areas, the high demand for funding and the focus on achieving a portfolio of complementary services means that services are recommended for funding at lower levels than requested and officers will need to agree appropriate targets and service plans with successful applicants.

9.4 A summary of the projects recommended for funding is detailed in Appendix 2a. A summary of the assessment of each organisation who bid under this service area is detailed in Appendix 4a.

9.5 Twenty three applications were received under this service area. This report recommends that seven organisations are offered funding, with the entire budget for this service recommended for allocation.

9.6 It is proposed that one service (Opportunity for All) is funded for a one year pilot service, and all other recommended services are offered funding for a two year term (October 11 until September 13), at which point this service area will be

combined with the Health & Wellbeing (older people) service area, and tendered jointly.

9.7 A summary of the level of funding recommended is detailed in Appendix 2a. A summary of the assessments of each organisation who bid under this service area is detailed in Appendix 4a.

## **10. RECOMMENDATIONS SAFER COMMUNITIES: BUDGET £225,000**

10.1 Applications were invited for services which would address the needs of the wider population as well as those who would benefit from more specific support. Guidance was given that services should be aligned with the priorities of both the CDRP and Strategic Assessment, for example:

- Vulnerable older people
- Disabled people
- Black, Minority Ethnic and refugee communities who are at particular risk of being victims or perpetrators of crime (including hate crime)
- Women & girls at risk of crime including domestic violence
- People from disadvantaged backgrounds/areas who are at particular risk of being victims or perpetrators of crime

10.2 As with all service areas, the high demand for funding and the focus on achieving a portfolio of complementary services means that services are recommended for funding at lower levels than requested and officers will need to agree appropriate targets and service plans with successful applicants.

10.3 A summary of the projects recommended for funding is detailed in Appendix 2b. A summary of the assessment of each organisation who bid under this service area is detailed in Appendix 4b.

10.4 Eighteen applications were received under this service area. This report recommends that seven organisations are offered funding, with the entire budget for this service recommended for allocation.

10.5 It is proposed that all recommended services are offered funding for an initial two year term (October 11 until September 13), after which two further extensions of 12 months may be offered, subject to a review of the outcomes and strategic priorities for this service area, together with the performance of each funded organisation.

10.6 The outcome for providers will be either:

- Officers determine that the outcomes and strategic priorities are unchanged and subject to satisfactory performance, contracts can be extended. Poor performance may result in service(s) being decommissioned and part of the budget for the service area being retendered.
- Officers determine that the outcomes are unchanged, but strategic priorities have shifted. Subject to satisfactory performance, contract(s) can be extended but with a variance in the service agreed with the provider(s). Poor

performance may result in service(s) being decommissioned and part of the budget for the service area being retendered.

- Officers determine that the outcomes and strategic priorities require revising and the entire budget will be retendered.

## **11. RECOMMENDATIONS ARTS, CULTURE & SPORT: BUDGET £340,000**

11.1 In addition to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector Investment Fund budget for Arts, Culture & Sport, the Council has recently agreed a £2.8m investment in Lyric Theatre capital programme, which is a clear indication of the Council's support to the arts locally.

11.2 Applications were invited for services which would deliver outcomes for the most vulnerable in our community and aim to improve the overall quality of life for our residents by increasing participation in sports, arts and cultural activities, particularly by those people previously unengaged or with limited opportunities to participate in mainstream sports, culture or arts activities.

11.3 Organisations were requested to consider services which would target services to particular communities and priority groups for example:

- Areas of the borough where the opportunity to participate in sports, leisure or arts is lower than elsewhere in the borough
- Communities which have a disproportionately low take up of sports, leisure or arts activities (disabled people, single parent families, people from low income households, etc.)
- Health inequalities groups that would particularly benefit from taking up sports, leisure or cultural activities:
  - People with long term health conditions, who do not participate in sports/health activities
  - Children from deprived households
  - Residents at risk of developing health conditions (e.g. low level mental health needs, sedentary lifestyles, specific communities at risk of particular health conditions etc.) which could be averted through the take up of sports, leisure or cultural activities, and who are also unable to access (or are not motivated to access) mainstream provision

11.4 As with all service areas, the high demand for funding and the focus on achieving a portfolio of complementary services means that services are recommended for funding at lower levels than requested and officers will need to agree appropriate targets and service plans with successful applicants.

11.5 A summary of the projects recommended for funding is detailed in Appendix 2c. A summary of the assessment of each organisation who bid under this service area is detailed in Appendix 4c.

- 11.6 Fourteen applications were received under this service area. This report recommends that five organisations are offered funding.
- 11.7 In addition, officers recommend ring-fencing funding for two years to support the development of Avonmore Community Centre and Library, an initiative to transfer management and running of the Barons Court Library to a community organisation, to be established as a community run resource centre and library. With the four applications, plus funding towards the Avonmore Community Centre & Library, the entire budget for this service is recommended for allocation.
- 11.8 It is proposed that all recommended services are offered funding for an initial two year term (October 11 until September 13), after which two further extensions of 12 months may be offered, subject to a review of the outcomes and strategic priorities for this service area, together with the performance of each funded organisation.
- 11.9 The outcome for providers will be either:
- Officers determine that the outcomes and strategic priorities are unchanged and subject to satisfactory performance, contracts can be extended. Poor performance may result in service(s) being decommissioned and part of the budget for the service area being retendered.
  - Officers determine that the outcomes are unchanged, but strategic priorities have shifted. Subject to satisfactory performance, contract(s) can be extended but with a variance in the service agreed with the provider(s). Poor performance may result in service(s) being decommissioned and part of the budget for the service area being retendered.
  - Officers determine that the outcomes and strategic priorities require revising and the entire budget will be retendered.

## **12. RECOMMENDATIONS ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY TRANSPORT: BUDGET £160,000**

- 12.1 Applications were invited for services which would:
- lead to environmental improvements in deprived areas that have poor green spaces
  - increase the amount of recycling in the borough
  - create opportunities for residents of all backgrounds and abilities to participate in practical gardening projects and to learn new skills.
  - increase residents' volunteering in community environment and gardening activities
  - improve understanding, knowledge and skills about the environment, through participating in gardening/green spaces community activities and learning
  - promote greener lifestyles, improve recycling rates, improve knowledge of environmental issues, and the impact of these issues on the community
  - design out crime in open spaces and reduce environment for crime and improve spaces to reduce the fear of crime

- develop innovative and ecologically friendly ways of meeting the transport needs of socially disadvantaged and isolated groups of residents
  - promote more environmentally-friendly means of transport, such as cycling and walking
- 12.2 In addition to this, the Council specifically invited applications to administrate the local Coach Voucher Scheme, which offers subsidised transport costs for local groups (with little or no funding income) to enjoy day trips during the summer months.
- 12.3 As with all service areas, the high demand for funding and the focus on achieving a portfolio of complementary services means that services are recommended for funding at lower levels than requested and officers will need to agree appropriate targets and service plans with successful applicants.
- 12.4 A summary of the projects recommended for funding is detailed in Appendix 2d. A summary of the assessment of each organisation who bid under this service area is detailed in Appendix 4d.
- 12.5 Ten applications were received under this service area. This report recommends that six organisations are offered funding, with the entire budget for this service recommended for allocation.
- 12.6 It is proposed that all recommended services are offered funding for an initial two year term (October 11 until September 13), after which two further extensions of 12 months may be offered, subject to a review of the outcomes and strategic priorities for this service area, together with the performance of each funded organisation.
- 12.7 The outcome for providers will be either:
- Officers determine that the outcomes and strategic priorities are unchanged and subject to satisfactory performance, contracts can be extended. Poor performance may result in service(s) being decommissioned and part of the budget for the service area being retendered.
  - Officers determine that the outcomes are unchanged, but strategic priorities have shifted. Subject to satisfactory performance, contract(s) can be extended but with a variance in the service agreed with the provider(s). Poor performance may result in service(s) being decommissioned and part of the budget for the service area being retendered.
  - Officers determine that the outcomes and strategic priorities require revising and the entire budget will be retendered.

**13. RECOMMENDATIONS HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION & HOME SAFETY:  
BUDGET £128,750**

- 13.1 Applications were invited to deliver services that would support vulnerable residents who:

- i. Have particular physical or emotional needs
- ii. Live alone, or live in isolated conditions
- iii. Have no or few social networks to provide them with support or practical help
- iv. Are on low incomes
- v. Are at risk of becoming homeless or are facing a housing related crisis
- vi. May not be eligible for community service or those who do not meet the statutory criteria for homelessness

13.2 It was anticipated that applications for Homelessness Prevention would offer services which would:

- Provide an intervention for clients which prevents housing crisis, maintains and/or retains housing tenancies.
- Assist vulnerable residents (at risk of housing crisis) to remain in their current accommodation (or relocate to more appropriate/suitable accommodation).
- Secure viable housing options for homeless households not owed a statutory duty of assistance by the Council.
- In partnership with Housing Options and other providers in the borough to work towards the prevention of homelessness and number of cases presenting to the Council as homeless.
- Contribute to the reduction of the borough's homeless population.

13.3 It was anticipated that applications for Home Safety would offer services which would:

- Give people control of their own conditions and contribute to the reduction of accidents in the home and A&E presentations.
- Ensure that vulnerable residents are able to maintain their independence through improved safety and security measures.
- Provide people-centred, cost effective small jobs assistance, and help to tackle poor or unsuitable housing, enabling clients to remain in their own home - safe, secure, warm and independent.
- Contribute to the reduction in domestic fires, domestic burglaries and artifice burglary.

13.4 As with all service areas, the high demand for funding and the focus on achieving a portfolio of complementary services means that services are recommended for funding at lower levels than requested and officers will need to agree appropriate targets and service plans with successful applicants.

13.5 A summary of the projects recommended for funding is detailed in Appendix 2e. A summary of the assessment of each organisation who bid under this service area is detailed in Appendix 4e.



- 13.6 Seven applications were received under this service area. This report recommends that two organisations are offered funding, with the entire budget for this service recommended for allocation.
- 13.7 It is proposed that all recommended services are offered funding for an initial two year term (October 11 until September 13), after which two further extensions of 12 months may be offered, subject to a review of the outcomes and strategic priorities for this service area, together with the performance of each funded organisation.
- 13.8 The outcome for providers will be either:
- Officers determine that the outcomes and strategic priorities are unchanged and subject to satisfactory performance, contracts can be extended. Poor performance may result in service(s) being decommissioned and part of the budget for the service area being retendered.
  - Officers determine that the outcomes are unchanged, but strategic priorities have shifted. Subject to satisfactory performance, contract(s) can be extended but with a variance in the service agreed with the provider(s). Poor performance may result in service(s) being decommissioned and part of the budget for the service area being retendered.
  - Officers determine that the outcomes and strategic priorities require revising and the entire budget will be retendered.

## **14. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- 14.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment was conducted individually for each service area and considered the positive or negative impact regarding each service – whether recommended or not recommended. Consideration was also given to the impact of those service previously funded, who were not recommended in this round.
- 14.2 Statutory Equality Duties from S149 of the Equality Act 2010 is as follows: The public sector equality duty (PSED) states that in the exercise of our functions, we must have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited under the Act;
  - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and
  - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Having due regard for advancing equality involves:

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics;

- Taking steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these are different from the needs of other people; and
- Encouraging people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low

The Act states that meeting different needs involves taking steps to take account of disabled people's disabilities. It describes fostering good relations as tackling prejudice and promoting understanding between people from different groups. It states that compliance with the duty may involve treating some people more favourably than others.

14.3 Although the Council's duty is to consider Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership (not always applicable), Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief (including non-belief), Sex, and Sexual Orientation (known as the protected characteristics) as part of an equalities impact assessment, officers gave broader consideration to socio-economic factors of the services recommended for funding, to ensure the best possible provision of services to local residents.

14.4 As part of the application form, organisations were required to profile who their anticipated service users would be. Information was requested regarding:

- Ethnicity
- Age
- Gender
- Sexual orientation
- Disability (physical, mental, sensory impairment, learning difficulty, long term health condition, none)
- Faith
- Location (by ward)
- Other factors such as: single household; low income, single parent family; carers; substance misuse; homeless; work but do not live in the borough etc.

14.5 Officers compared the user profiles across Race, Gender and Disability for all applicants, both recommended and not recommended, to identify if any particular impact would result from the range of services recommended. While these three profiles do not cover all the nine protected characteristics, all protected characteristics was considered as part of the EIA and therefore as part of the decision that is being recommended to members in this report. Officers also considered the impact of cessation of services, currently funded under the investment fund, that are not recommended for funding in this report, or did not apply for funding.

14.6 The broader, socio-economic categories of user profiles for recommended applications were then compared to ascertain if any particular sections of residents would be adversely affected, or not identified as potential beneficiaries.

14.7 It was not felt that any section of the community would be particularly disadvantaged should the recommendations in this report be agreed, and all

sections specified under the equalities duties are expected to benefit to some extent. A good span of beneficiaries is covered by the clusters of services being tendered, with profiles of target beneficiaries reflecting the known diversity factors of the borough's population. Appendices 6 a-e detail the expected impact, positive as well as negative, for all funding recommendations made.

14.8 **Race:** The profile of potential beneficiaries of services across all service areas broadly matches the borough profile, with higher numbers of disabled people being supported under the Health & Wellbeing (adults) service area – as was expected. No negative impact has been identified.

- Health & Wellbeing (adults): 57% of users are likely to be from White backgrounds, 43% of users from BME communities
- Safer Communities: 64% of users are likely to be from White backgrounds, 36% from BME communities.
- Arts, Culture & Sport: 58% of users are likely to be from White backgrounds, 42% from BME communities
- Environment & Community Transport: 43% of users are likely to be from White backgrounds, 57% from BME communities.
- Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety: 49% of users are likely to be from White backgrounds, 51% from BME communities.
- In total, across all service areas, 54% of users are likely to be from White backgrounds, and 46% from BME communities
- In considering all services being recommended under each service area, there is likely to be a positive impact on race as the proportion of users from BME communities exceeds the borough profile. No adverse impact has been identified for any particular BME community.
- All successful organisations will be expected to meet targets regarding delivering services to targeted communities, and closely monitored to ensure these targets are met. Organisations will be required to address issues of BME, disabled or particular communities not accessing the services provided.
- Table 3 below illustrates the likely make up of users across each service area by ethnicity:

Table 3:

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>white British</b>	<b>White Irish</b>	<b>White Other</b>	<b>Caribbean</b>	<b>African</b>	<b>Black other</b>	<b>mixed</b>	<b>Indian</b>	<b>Pakistani</b>	<b>Bangladeshi</b>	<b>Asian other</b>	<b>Chinese</b>	<b>other</b>
Health & Wellbeing:	43%	7%	6%	9%	10%	6%	8%	3%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Safer Communities	37%	5%	22%	8%	7%	5%	5%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%
Arts, Culture & Sport	42%	8%	8%	5%	5%	3%	7%	5%	4%	4%	3%	2%	4%
Environment & Community Transport	31%	6%	6%	14%	9%	6%	8%	4%	4%	4%	3%	1%	3%
Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety	38%	5%	6%	3%	4%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	34%
total	38%	6%	10%	8%	7%	4%	6%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%	9%

14.9 **Disability:** The profile of potential beneficiaries of services across all service areas indicates a higher proportion of disabled people, or residents with long term

health conditions will benefit from the service, than are represented in the borough demographics. In particular, higher numbers of disabled people are likely to be supported by services delivered under the Health & Wellbeing (adults) service area, including adults with both low and high mental health needs – in particular to prevent them from reaching crisis point and assisting to prevent homelessness.

14.10 The services are anticipated to deliver a positive impact for disabled people and those with long term health conditions. No negative impact has been identified.

- Health & Wellbeing: 85% of users are likely to be disabled or have a long term health condition.
- Safer Communities: 40% of users are likely to be disabled or have a long term health condition.
- Arts, Culture & Sport: 21% of users are likely to be disabled or have a long term health condition.
- Environment & Community Transport: 49% of users are likely to be disabled or have a long term health condition.
- Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety: 61% of users are likely to be disabled or have a long term health condition.

14.11 All successful organisations will be expected to meet targets regarding delivering services to targeted communities, and closely monitored to ensure these targets are met. Organisations will be required to address issues of disabled communities not accessing the services provided.

14.12 Table 4 below illustrates the likely make up of users across learning disability, sensory impairment, long term health condition, physical disability and mental health need.

Table 4:

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Learning disability</b>	<b>Sensory impairment</b>	<b>Long term health condition</b>	<b>Physical disability</b>	<b>Mental health need</b>	<b>None</b>
Health & Wellbeing:	23%	2%	9%	5%	45%	15%
Safer Communities	5%	4%	4%	7%	20%	60%
Arts, Culture & Sport	4%	1%	8%	2%	6%	79%
Environment & Community Transport	13%	6%	14%	6%	10%	51%
Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety	2%	8%	28%	17%	5%	39%
total	9%	4%	13%	8%	17%	49%

14.13 Gender All recommended services are likely to provide appropriate levels of support to male and female beneficiaries which is reflective of the borough profile. It is anticipated that a number of services will appropriately have a higher take up by gender (e.g. domestic abuse services under the safer communities service area).

- Health & Wellbeing: 61% of users are likely to be male, 30% female. The higher proportion of male service users is due to a number of services recommended for funding which will target substance misuse and mental health/homelessness individuals – in which men are more prevalent than women.
- Safer Communities: a 50:50 split for male and female service users is anticipated.
- Arts, Culture & Sport: the anticipated profile of users across all recommended services is 49% male, 51% female.
- Environment & Community Transport: the anticipated profile of users across recommended services is 45% male, 55% female.
- Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety: the anticipated profile of users across recommended services is 32% male and 68% female. This is due to a higher proportion of female service users in Home Safety services, mostly older single women at higher risk of domestic and artifice burglary.

14.14 Age: All recommended services are likely to provide services across all age groups. Although services specifically for Children & Young People and Older People were funded in 2010, it was anticipated that a number of services under the service areas currently being tendered would also benefit younger and older age groups. This is particularly relevant for Environment & Community Transport and Home Safety services, where the service specification detailed the likely residents that should benefit from services, which included vulnerable families and individuals.

14.15 Table 5 below indicates the likely age range of beneficiaries across all service areas.

Table 5

Age	0-4	5 to 13	14 - 19 (25 if disabled)	18 - 25	25 - 49	50 - 64	65 - 74	75 - 84	85+
Health & Wellbeing:	0%	0%	4%	13%	45%	29%	7%	1%	0%
Safer Communities	0%	0%	1%	2%	96%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Arts, Culture & Sport	5%	33%	11%	9%	16%	13%	7%	5%	3%
Environment & Community Transport	6%	22%	10%	13%	17%	13%	11%	7%	2%
Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety	0%	0%	1%	4%	24%	24%	13%	15%	18%
total	2%	11%	5%	8%	39%	16%	8%	6%	5%

14.16 Faith: although all organisations were requested to indicate whether any service users were likely to be of a particular faith or sexual orientation, only one applicant indicated that this would be the case in terms of faith. All providers will be required to ensure their services are available and accessible by all communities, however the nature of some services – particularly those of a one-

off nature, are unlikely to be able to easily request and record faith or sexual orientation information of service users. No negative impact was identified.

- Pamodzi applied under Health and Wellbeing, to deliver a service to Pentecostal Born-Again Christians. However, the number of users was very low, and therefore the negative impact of not funding this service was considered low.

14.17 Sexual orientation and gender reassignment for most service areas, few or no users were anticipated from Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender communities. However, six applications under Safer Communities and one application under Health and Wellbeing did indicate some users would be.

- West London Centre for Counselling anticipate that 12% of their service users will be Lesbian/Gay/Bi-sexual or Transgender. As this service is recommended for funding under Health & Wellbeing, this would offer a high positive impact for local residents.
- Under the Safer Communities service area, the following organisations proposed to deliver a service to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender residents over a four year term:
  - DVIP - 10 out of 216 users
  - Metropolitan Police - 5 out of 230 users
  - Broadway Homelessness Support - 40 out of 400 users
  - CALM - 5 out of 480 users
  - H&F Victim Support - 500 out of 14,652 users
  - Standing Together Against Domestic Violence - 15 out of 1608 users
- transgender was included under the sexual orientation section of the beneficiary profile guidance. We recognise that sexual orientation is to do with attraction to members of the same or a different sex, and trans is to do with gender identity and not with sexual orientation, we included sexual orientation and trans together under LGBT. LGBT organisations have often organised under this term, as many of the prejudices and issues faced by LGBT people are commonly to do with 'not being' heterosexual or 'male' or 'female' in the sense historically understood by society in general. As above, it may not be possible for organisations to request and record sexual orientation information from service users. No negative impact was identified.
- A High positive impact is anticipated, as Broadway, CALM and Victim Support are likely to support high numbers of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender residents.
- No negative impact was identified.

14.18 Marriage and civil partnership: organisations were not requested to consider the profile of service users in terms of marital or partnership status. As above, it may not be possible for organisations to request and record this information from service users. No negative impact was identified.

14.19 Pregnancy and maternity: organisations were not requested to consider the profile of service users in terms of pregnancy or maternity status. As above, it may not be possible for organisations to request and record this information from service users, although in future they could use ONS data such as live births per 1000 women for Hammersmith and Fulham. A number of applications were received that would specifically target parents – Insights into Life (which was proposing a transition to parenthood service) and Urban Partnership Group (proposing a fathers parenting service) were received, which may have had a positive impact in terms of maternity and paternity. However, as other support services are available to parents, it was felt that the negative impact of not funding parenting related services was low.

14.20 Socio-economic factors: organisations were requested to consider a number of socio-economic categories in considering the likely make up of service users, in order to ensure the best possible clusters of services were available to residents.

- Single parent families: Moderate positive impact overall, as 15% of services across all services areas are likely to benefit single parent families. This is highest in Arts, Culture & Sport and Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety service areas. No negative impact identified.
- Ex offender: Moderate positive impact overall, as 7% of users across all service areas are likely to benefit ex-offenders who are residents of the borough. This is highest in Safer Communities, where one of the specific outcomes in the service specification was to support perpetrators of crime and ASB to divert them from criminal behaviour. No negative impact identified.
- Low income households: High positive impact, as 33% of beneficiaries are likely to be from low income households. As was anticipated, this is highest in Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety service area. No negative impact identified.
- Carers: Low positive impact: all services are charged with ensuring they are supporting Hammersmith & Fulham carers. A higher proportion of carers are supported through the Health & Wellbeing (older people) service area, which was commissioned in 2010 – particularly as the profile of carers in the borough indicates that the majority of carers are over 50. All service areas are likely to benefit carers to some degree, although this is 5% or less in all service areas. No negative impact.
- Victims of domestic abuse: Moderate positive impact: As anticipated, a higher proportion appear in safer communities, with specific services recommended that will directly support victims of domestic abuse. Other service areas are also likely to support this cohort. No negative impact identified.
- Children who attend school, but do not live in the borough: Low positive impact: A number of services are likely to also benefit children and young people who do not live in the borough – however this is due to a number of services delivered through schools, where it is not possible to request that

non-resident children do not participate in class-wide activities. No negative impact identified.

- Unemployed individuals: Moderate positive impact: 14% of beneficiaries are likely to be unemployed residents. This is particularly the case in homelessness prevention and safer communities services. No negative impact identified.
- Single household: High positive impact: 9% of users across all service areas are anticipated to be from single households. The proportion is highest in Safer Communities as a recommended service will target single household Eastern European residents at risk of substance misuse. No negative impact identified.
- 2% of users are anticipated to be refugees, and a further 2% likely to be asylum seekers. Low positive impact, no negative impact identified.
- A further 5% of proposed beneficiaries are likely to be people who live but do not work in the borough. However, a condition of funding will be that all beneficiaries should be borough residents – with the exception of children from out of borough who participate in classroom based activities delivered in local schools.
- Table 6 below indicates the likely profile of users across these categories:

Table 6:

Socio-economic factors	single parent families	ex offender	low income households	carers	victims of domestic abuse	attend school but non resident	unemployed individuals	single household	homeless individuals	refugees	asylum seeker	Non residents
Health & Wellbeing:	5%	6%	27%	4%	3%	0%	25%	16%	6%	3%	3%	1%
Safer Communities	4%	21%	16%	4%	18%	1%	11%	11%	11%	1%	1%	0%
Arts, Culture & Sport	28%	4%	44%	5%	0%	2%	10%	5%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Environment & Cty. Transport	15%	2%	27%	2%	2%	11%	11%	12%	4%	5%	7%	0%
Homelessness & Home Safety	20%	1%	52%	5%	0%	0%	11%	2%	2%	1%	1%	5%
total	15%	7%	33%	4%	5%	3%	14%	9%	5%	2%	2%	2%

## 14. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES

14.1 The 3rd sector investment budget for 2011/12 is £3,908,000, net of MTFS savings of £450,000.

14.2 Grant allocations are £3,707,609 with a reserve budget of £200,581 totalling £3,908,190, as detailed in Appendix 1.



14.3 Appendix 1 also details indicative funding allocations for 2012/13 to 2014/15. These allocations incorporate the additional potential MTFs savings of £148,062 for 2012/13 and £341,543 for 2013/14, identified against these budgets. These will be subject to the Council annual budget setting and MTFs Processes.

14.4 All contracts will stipulate that services are contracted for as long as the funding is available. Should funding not be available during the lifetime of the contract, a notice period will be given to the organisation that funding will cease.

**15. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)**

15.1. The Council's power to award the funding recommended in the report is contained in s.2 of the Local Government Act 2000 which allows the Council to do anything, including the provision of financial assistance, which it considers likely to promote the economic, environmental or social well being of the area. In exercising this power Cabinet must have regard to the Community Strategy.

15.2 Officers are of the view that the organisations recommended for funding are likely to contribute in a variety of ways to the economic, environmental and social well being of the borough and that the recommended funding is consistent with the Community Strategy.

15.3 Cabinet are also required to consider the general equality duties to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between the protected groups and society at large. These duties are dealt with in detail in section 14 and in the attached equalities impact assessments and should be carefully considered.

15.4 In awarding funding the Council is obliged to follow a fair and transparent process. The process followed is set out in the body of the report and officers are of the view that it has been carried out in a fair and transparent manner.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.	3 <sup>rd</sup> Sector Strategy	Sue Spiller ext 2483	CSD, Glenthorne Rd
2.	EIAs	Sue Spiller ext 2483	CSD, Glenthorne Road
3.	3SIF application pack	Sue Spiller ext 2483	CSD, Glenthorne Rd

<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	<b>NAME: Sue Spiller</b> <b>EXT: 2483</b>
-------------------------	--

**Appendices:**

1:	3SIF budget
2a:	Recommendations: Health & Wellbeing (adults)
2b:	Recommendations: Safer Communities
2c:	Recommendations: Arts, Culture & Sport
2d:	Recommendations: Environment & Community Transport
2e:	Recommendations: Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety
3:	All applicants and recommendations
4a:	Assessments summary: Health & Wellbeing (adults)
4b:	Assessments summary: Safer Communities
4c:	Assessments summary: Arts, Culture & Sport
4d:	Assessments summary: Environment & Community Transport
4e:	Assessments summary: Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety
5a:	Service specification: Health & Wellbeing (adults)
5b:	Service specification: Safer Communities
5c:	Service specification: Arts, Culture & Sport
5d:	Service specification: Environment & Community Transport
5e:	Service specification: Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety
6a:	Equalities Impact Assessment: Health & Wellbeing (adults)
6b:	Equalities Impact Assessment: Safer Communities
6c:	Equalities Impact Assessment: Arts, Culture & Sport
6d:	Equalities Impact Assessment: Environment & Community Transport
6e:	Equalities Impact Assessment: Homelessness Prevention & Home Safety