

**Grants to Voluntary Organisations 2013/14 to 2015/16
Appendix 4**

**Equality and Safety Impact Assessment
&
Feedback to Cabinet – written representations received from applications**

Equality and Safety Impact Assessment

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people’s needs. The Council’s Equality and Safety Impact Assessment (ESIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

This impact assessment is based on information given in the three year funding scheme application forms (particularly questions 2.8 and 2.9). Applicants have been invited to update this impact information having considered their recommendation. Applicants are continuing to provide feedback up to the Cabinet decision on 19 February 2013 and therefore this document is a work in progress.

Name or Brief Description of Proposal	Grants to Voluntary Organisations 2013/14 to 2015/16
Brief Service Profile (including number of customers)	<p>In August 2012, after a year of consultation, the council moved to a new outcome based Commissioned Grants Programme for awarding grants to voluntary organisations. The first grant scheme opened under this Programme was the Three Year Funding Scheme, which offers up to three year funding, where appropriate and subject to budget setting, for voluntary organisations working in the city.</p> <p>It is not possible to give numbers of customers. However, the grant applicants potentially work with a large number of residents across the all wards of the city.</p>
Summary of Impact and Issues	<p>The key concerns raised by applicants are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced support services and access to support services • Reduced support for and access to education, employment and training • Reduced services for schools • Increase in anti-social behaviour, drug related crime and domestic violence and abuse • Reduced support for and access to leisure activities <p>The largest number of negative impacts identified related to Age, in particular children and young people, and Disability.</p> <p>Another significant impact of no funding or reduced funding is it could potentially lead to some organisations having to make redundancies.</p>

Potential Positive Impacts	<p>Awarding grants to voluntary organisations potentially creates a positive impact for residents where organisations not previously been supported by the council.</p> <p>All existing grant recipients were given notice that their previous funding relationship with the council will end on 31 March 2013 and that all future applications will be considered as new. This has effectively re-set all grants. Applications and therefore recommendations have been based on current need rather than previous funding.</p>
Responsible Service Manager	Vanessa Shahani
Date	31 January 2013

Approved by Senior Manager	Suki Sitaram
Signature	
Date	<p>31 January 2013</p> <p>This document will continue to be updated until the Cabinet decision on 19 February 2013.</p>

Age - Children & Young people

Details of negative impact

From the 31 organisations who have identified impacts on children and young people, 15 applicants who have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Reduced support services for young people - includes advice, preventing homelessness, making positive life choices, meeting social welfare needs, supporting parents to provide a stable home environment, debt advice. (5 organisations)
- Reduced activities for children and young people – includes youth provision, play opportunities, sport opportunities. (8 organisations)
- Reduced support for education, employment and training for young people – includes training/work placement opportunities for disadvantaged young people (2 organisations)

16 organisations that have not been recommended for funding have identified the following potential negative impacts:

- Reduced services for schools – includes extra curricular sport, other extra curricular activities, transition support for post 16 decisions, museum services. (5 organisations)
- Reduced support services for young people – includes parenting skills, support for families with illness or impairments, support for families facing multiple issues. (4 organisations)
- Reduced activities for young people – includes sport opportunities, music/arts activities (3 organisations)
- Reduced support for education, employment and training for young people – includes volunteering opportunities, music/arts opportunities, language classes, maritime heritage opportunities. (4 organisations)

Possible Solutions

- Exploration of opportunities to continue some universal provision through transfer of properties currently used for delivery of play and youth provision.
- Support delivery, through the third sector of the Youth Contract programme – replacing targeted work with unemployed young people and dedicated annual destination sweep programmes.
- Delivery of Key Stage 4 programme, through schools, to increase the number of young people securing correct level of qualification, at the end of secondary education, to support progression to post 16 education, training or employment and reduce number of unemployed.
- Target setting with school and colleges to target provision at work with young people in 'year 11' and 'year 12' to ensure successful transition into education, training or employment.
- Redesigned, holistic family based, services delivered from seven full core offer children centres targeted at families at risk of not sustaining themselves, reducing the demand on high cost specialist services.
- Consideration of use, by schools, of pupil premium to provide additional support, specific activities including breakfast clubs, afterschool clubs, additional tuition etc, for children and young people from most disadvantaged area.
- Develop of the specification for 'Parent Partnership' activity – to strengthen the work with families. Engaging a broader range of parents with the newly developed Children and Young People Development Service.
- Actively pursue opportunities for parents to take up the opportunities of personalised budget to purchase education, health, social care, transport and other areas.

Next step:

A joint discussion between the relevant Senior Managers or their nominated representatives on the potential impact and any mitigating action

Development of detail regarding the new model of service delivery for children and family centre based services.

Action: Alison Alexander, Felicity Budgen and Stephanie Ramsey

Age - Older people

Details of negative impact

From the 10 organisations who have identified impacts on older people, 6 applicants who have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Reduced support for employment and training for older people – includes support for learners aged 60-74. (1 organisation)
- Reduced support services for older people – includes maintaining independence, advice on benefits, debt, housing, finance and utilities. (3 organisations)
- Reduced support for leisure activities (reducing social isolation) – including music and arts. (2 organisations)

4 organisations which have not been recommended for funding have identified the following potential negative impacts on older people:

- Reduced support for employment and training for older people – includes work to improve the employability of older people. (2 organisations)
- Reduced support services for older people – includes maintaining independence, advice on benefits, debt, housing, finance and utilities. (1 organisation)
- Reduced support for leisure activities (reducing social isolation) – including museum services, arts activities, maritime heritage activities. (1 organisation)

Possible Solutions

- Encouraging eligible residents aged over 65 to claim benefits that they are entitled to including the Single Person Discount and benefits that entitle them to receive the local successor to Council Tax Benefit.

Next steps:

A joint discussion between the relevant Senior Managers or their nominated representatives on the potential impact and any mitigating action.

Action: Carol Valentine, Jane Brentor (Lead), Stephanie Ramsey and Andy Lowe.

Disability

Details of impact

From the 26 organisations who have identified impacts on disabled people, 16 applicants who have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Reduced support services for disabled people – includes support for people with learning disabilities, advice services, housing, maintaining independence, combating social isolation, accessibility, counselling. (12 organisations)
- Reduced support for employment and training – includes training courses and barriers to employment.(2 organisations)
- Reduced support for leisure activities (reducing social isolation) – including music/arts activities. (2 organisations)

10 organisations which have not been recommended for funding have identified the following potential negative impacts on disabled people:

- Reduced support services for disabled people – includes physical activities, support for carers and families. (4 organisations)
- Reduced support for employment, training and volunteering – includes opportunities to serve as trustees, barriers to employment, improving employability. (3 organisations)
- Reduced support for leisure activities (reducing social isolation) – including museums, music/arts activities, sport opportunities. (3 organisations)

Possible Solutions

- Encourage eligible residents aged over 65 to claim benefits that they are entitled to including the Single Person Discount and benefits that entitle them to receive the local successor to Council Tax Benefit.
- The move towards greater personalisation, providing opportunities for many social care services to be provided in other ways. This may require market development support to grow the market.
- Health and Adult Social Care services will continue to be provided to those who are assessed with a need for services in line with Fair Access to Care Services guidance. Support will be provided to those people receiving Self Directed Support to ensure they can access the services that they require. There is a need to undertake appropriate planning to ensure there are alternative services available.

Next step:

A joint discussion between relevant Senior Managers or their nominated representatives.

Action: Jane Brentor, Carol Valentine, Stephanie Ramsey and Denise Edghill

Race, Religion or Belief

Details of impact

From the 19 organisations who have identified impacts on race, religion or belief, 12 applicants who have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Reduced support services for people from BME backgrounds – includes advice/support and counselling. (5 organisations)
- Reduced support for education, employment and training – includes ESOL classes, employability courses, community training, barriers to employment. (5 organisations)
- Reduced support for leisure activities (reducing social isolation) – includes music/arts activities. (2 organisations)

7 organisations which have not been recommended for funding have identified the following potential negative impacts on race, religion or belief:

- Reduced support services for people from BME backgrounds – includes advice/support, routes for agencies to connect to communities. (3 organisations)
- Reduced support for education, employment and training – includes language/heritage classes, volunteering opportunities, employability activities. (3 organisations)
- Reduced support for leisure activities (reducing social isolation) – includes music/arts activities. (1 organisation)

Possible Solutions

Consider action to mitigate the potential effects of the proposals, including:

- Work with BME customers, communities and groups to assess the potential impact on individuals and explore mitigation in light of the council's financial challenges.
- Targeted and appropriate publicity to explain the rationale behind the proposals.

Next Steps:

A joint discussion between the relevant Senior Managers or their nominated representatives on the potential impact and any mitigating action.

Action: Vanessa Shahani and Denise Edghill

Gender

Details of impact

From the 9 organisations that have identified impacts that could affect one sex more than the other, 6 applicants who have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Reduced support services for women – includes services having flexible opening hours, advice/support, counselling. (4 organisations)
- Reduced support for education, employment and training – includes ESOL classes, volunteering opportunities. (2 organisations)

3 organisations which have not been recommended for funding have identified the following potential negative impacts that could affect one sex more than the other:

- Reduced support services for women within vulnerable families. (1 organisation)
- Reduced support for education, employment and training – includes language/cultural classes, volunteering opportunities. (2 organisations)

Possible Solutions

- Raise key issues for women, especially later years, at Children and Young People's Trust and Health and Well Being Board. The continued arrangement for an older people's champion will maintain the profile of Older People's needs.

Next step:

A joint discussion between the relevant Senior Managers or their nominated representatives on the potential cumulative impact and mitigating actions.

Action: Carol Valentine, Alison Alexander, Denise Edghill, Stephanie Ramsey and Suki Sitaram

Sexual orientation, gender reassignment, marriage & civil partnership and Pregnancy & maternity

Details of impact

From the 5 organisations that have identified impacts that could impact on sexual orientation, gender reassignment and pregnancy and maternity, 4 applicants who have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Reduced support for employment and training for people facing multiple barriers. (1 organisation)
- Reduced support services for pregnant woman and new parents – includes advice services and housing. (2 organisations)
- Reduced support services for young LGBT people on a range of issues that for them are potentially life threatening or life diminishing. (1 organisation)

1 organisation which has not been recommended for funding has identified the following potential negative impacts on pregnancy and maternity:

- Reduced support services for new mothers.

Next Steps:

Individual Senior Managers need to consider whether proposals in their service area may have an impact on people with these personal backgrounds

Action: Alison Alexander and Stephanie Ramsey.

Community Safety

Details of impact

From the 8 organisations that have identified impacts that could impact on community safety, 6 applicants who have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Increase in anti-social behaviour, particularly amongst young people. (4 organisations)
- Increase in drug related crime. (1 organisation)
- Increase in domestic violence and abuse and less supporting for people experiencing domestic violence and abuse. (1 organisation)

2 organisations which have not been recommended for funding have identified the following potential negative impacts that could affect community safety:

- Increase in anti-social behaviour, particularly amongst young people.

Possible Solutions

- Prioritising services to support people and locations at greatest risk of crime and harm.
- Targeting and signposting of services where most in need.
- Providing clear and early information and guidance especially around friends, events and groups to encourage the development of the Big Society.
- Continuing and increasing multi-agency and partnership working, particularly in prevention services.
- Policies that ensure the most vulnerable continue to receive the required level of support.

Next steps:

A joint discussion between relevant Senior Managers as well as key partners (Police, Probation and voluntary sector) on the potential impact and mitigating action of budget proposals across the City.

Action: Stephanie Ramsay, Alison Alexander, Suki Sitaram, Denise Edghill and later with key players in the Safe City Partnership

Poverty

Details of impact – 9 organisations

From the 13 organisations that have identified impacts that could impact on poverty, 9 applicants have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Reduced access to services for people on low incomes – includes advice/support for NEETS, older people on fixed incomes and unemployed people, housing support. (4 organisations)
- Reduced access to education, employment and training for people on low incomes – includes volunteering opportunities, access to ESOL classes and training courses. (3 organisations)
- Reduced access to leisure activities for people on low incomes – includes discounts for music/arts and sports. (2 organisations)

4 organisations which have not been recommended for funding have identified the following potential negative impacts that could affect poverty:

- Reduced access to services for people on low incomes – includes physical activities targeted in areas of deprivation, advice/support services. (2 organisations)
- Reduced access to education, employment and training for people on low incomes – includes training course opportunities. (2 organisations)

Possible Solutions

Action being considered to mitigate the potential effects of the proposals include:

- Encourage eligible residents aged over 65 to claim benefits that they are entitled to including; the Single Person Discount and benefits that entitle them to receive the local successor to Council Tax Benefit, such as the Pension Credit Guarantee.
- Offering reduced charges for benefit claimants.
- Clearer guidance and signposting to alternative funding, providers and service.
- Developing partnership, multi-agency working and targeted services in priority (IMD 2010) areas.
- Encouraging the development of the Big Society initiatives in communities.
- Developing strategies and plans that prioritise support for the needs of the most vulnerable children, people and families with the most complex needs.

Next step

A joint discussion between relevant Senior Managers and partners (Southampton Connect's priority project being led by Job Centre Plus and voluntary organisations) on the potential impact and mitigating action of budget proposals across the City.

Action: Stephanie Ramsey, Alison Alexander, Suki Sitaram, Denise Edghill, Vanessa Shahani and John Connelly and later with partners and voluntary organisations

Other significant impacts

Details of impact

32 organisations have identified other significant impacts, 20 applicants have been recommended for less than their requested funding:

- Possible staff reductions / reduced staff hours (6 organisations)
- Reduction in the services they provide (5 organisations)
- Decrease in growth / unable to expand to meet demand (4 organisations)
- Reduction in leisure activities (2 organisations)
- Decrease in the amount of funding brought into the city on behalf of clients (1 organisation)
- Possible closure of the organisation (2 organisations)

12 organisations which have not been recommended for funding have identified the following other significant potential negative impacts:

- Possible staff reductions / reduced staff hours (1 organisation)
- Reduction in the services they provide (8 organisations)
- Reduction in leisure activities (1 organisation)
- Possible closure of the organisation (1 organisation)
- Possible closure of the project (1 organisation)

Feedback to Cabinet

Written representations have been received from the following applicants:

City Eye	11
Communicare	13
EU Welcome.....	14
Mount Pleasant Media Workshop	14
Solent Credit Union.....	15
Southampton Advice and Representation Centre.....	16
Southampton Amateur Gymnastics Club.....	17
Southampton Nuffield Theatre Trust.....	17
Southampton Street Pastors.....	18
Youth Options	18

City Eye

Established in Southampton in 1987, City Eye is a charity which develops and promotes film and media through a broad range of activity which includes

- Engagement with groups and individuals in the community on issue based projects of social benefit
- Training and educating people of all ages in the art and technique of digital film production
- Supporting the local creative industries (particularly through the provision of advice and guidance, training and access to digital equipment)
- Working in partnership with SCC to deliver the new arts complex project. City Eye has been engaged for 10 years with this work and is focused on the development of media facilities for access by the community in the complex. Related to this activity is our ongoing work to develop City Eye and indeed wider cultural activity, particularly in and around the Cultural Quarter, to ensure that on opening the complex is able to deliver a vibrant and engaging programme for an audience eagerly anticipating its arrival
- Southampton Film Week – after 5 years, each of which has seen the festival grow in scale and in the range of events it offers, SFW is embedded in the City’s calendar of events and activities. In 2012 SFW is conservatively valued at around £70,000, and again drew together partners from across the City and across sector to deliver a programme of over 40 events in a 9 day period.

Funding to enable City Eye’s work has previously been provided by SCC, UK Film Council, project grants and income earned through projects which is principally derived from the public and voluntary sectors. In recent times income in all areas has been reduced and in the case of the now abolished UK Film Council, has been removed altogether. The organisation has responded to these changing circumstances by closely managing its finances and taking necessary steps to reduce overheads (including relocation and downsizing of accommodation and reducing core staffing levels) whilst protecting its key outputs as outlined above.

Whilst mindful of these most challenging economic times and grateful that our work with the Council and Southampton communities has been recognized through the current grant recommendation, City Eye now finds itself unable to make further cuts to the organisation

without compromising its viability to deliver the key outputs. In particular City Eye's engagement with the ongoing development of Southampton's new arts complex and delivery of Southampton Film Week will be compromised.

Southampton's new arts complex project

In 2002/3 City Eye was invited by SCC to join a partnership which then included John Hansard Gallery and Art Asia to develop a proposal for a new arts building on the site of the old Tyrrell and Green department store. 10 years has seen much water under the bridge and for a variety of reasons the project has changed quite considerably over this time. At the core, however, has always been the ambition to offer the best facilities and opportunities for cultural engagement by the people of Southampton, to put the City on the map regionally and nationally creating an exciting visitor destination as well as ensuring that the spaces it provides are accessible in every sense for all people in our communities. For City Eye this is essential and for the project it has been understood from the outset that City Eye brings the community focus and engagement which is so essential to its success.

As a small organisation, without the direct underpinning support of the Arts Council (which does not support traditional forms of film related activity), City Eye's sustained involvement has been costly requiring significant allocation of staff and management time. The company's commitment and investment has not diminished, however, and it has been grateful for SCC's ongoing support to enable continuation of this work on behalf of the City. Its business plan, modelled on that approved by the Arts Council last summer, reflects this ongoing support from SCC. This is also detailed within the wider project documentation and is shown in the Proposed Governance Structure and Revenue Funding Sources report for consideration by Cabinet on 29 January.

The business plan also reflects a need for growth over the years leading up to opening of the complex, in common with the plans for the arts complex operating company and John Hansard Gallery. It is critical that all participants are able to continue with development of their operation and programming to ensure the success of the project. For this reason our request for funding via the Commissioned Grants programme which was based on this business plan, shows an escalation in our need for funding over the next 3 years. In 2015/16 the sum sought is £42,250 – a considerable sum of money but I believe again demonstrating City Eye's close management of finances and focus on maximum delivery at minimum cost. Again, whilst mindful of the challenge which the Council is facing, the declining level of grant recommended over the coming years critically compromises City Eye's business plan.

The path to the arts complex has indeed been long and challenging and costly for all involved in its delivery. With the project now approaching an exciting milestone - with the commencement of construction anticipated in the coming months - there is a risk that City Eye will not be able to continue its involvement and that the project will face a further set-back.

Southampton Film Week

In parallel with the arts complex project City Eye has in recent years worked with other cultural sector partners on Southampton Film Week and the Art at the Heart programme to breathe life into the emerging cultural quarter and to develop audiences, increase visitor figures and contribute to the economic viability of the Cultural Quarter and wider City.

In October 2012 the company delivered the fifth annual Southampton Film Week, a festival which celebrates film across the City and seeks to engage the broadest audience possible encouraging people and organisations to participate by showing or attending a film screening, making a film or attending an event or workshop which might inspire them too. 2012 saw the launch of SFW: Shorts, the festival's own short film competition, and has achieved International profile following its winner, Anna Cady – who we have supported in the making of previous films – being selected for Sundance International Film Festival in Utah, where she is currently rubbing shoulders with the biggest and best in Independent filmmaking. SFW through its various activities and collaborations with organisations as diverse as Awaaz FM, The Phoenix Film Society, The City Gallery and Vintage Mobile Cinema (which was located in Guildhall Square in Film Week) this year presented over 40 events and, including those who have visited related exhibitions since the week itself, will have touched almost 20,000 people.

In 2012, the £8843 cash budget (funding from Creative England, HCC Film Hampshire, Southampton Solent University and the new arts complex project) was used to secure additional in-kind contributions from across the city and beyond to create a total project valued at almost £70,000.

The festival which is of course focused on film has equally proved a wonderful way of linking wider cultural activities and has brought together music events, venues and festivals, a range of performances including theatre and dance, art gallery exhibitions and community engagement initiatives.

City Eye has been immensely grateful for the support which SCC has provided 'in-kind', by making spaces and resources available to support the festival. In particular the collaboration with SCC arts and heritage and events staff has enabled the festival to punch so much above its actual weight. Southampton Film Week has not been separately funded through the City Council but has been enabled through the Running Costs grant received by City Eye in recent years. The current funding recommendation will not enable City Eye to sustain Southampton Film Week either through the allocation of existing resources or by ensuring that the organisation has sufficient resource to apply to development activities such as fundraising.

Conclusion

The staff and Board of City Eye continue to seek opportunities to reduce overheads and to explore opportunities for external funding. The latter is frequently only possible because of the leverage which SCC funding provides to us. Our commitment to the City and to our work in all key areas of our operation is not compromised, but our ability to deliver our work in the community, development of the arts complex and delivery of Southampton Film Week is challenged by the current grant recommendation and we ask Councillors to explore all options to protect this work.

Communicare

I am writing to thank you for your letter advising us of the outcome of our grant application and to provide feedback for consideration, as requested.

Communicare in Southampton has undergone a period of rapid growth (82% in the last 3 years to April 2012) due to increasing demand, and in order to continue to meet demand for our services our costs have also increased. We appreciate that the funding situation is particularly difficult at present due to national and

local cuts, and as such we are most grateful for the award made to Communicare.

We would however wish to make it known that the decision to automatically reduce the amount awarded to us by 20% will have a detrimental impact on the ability of Communicare to respond to increasing demand and referrals. We have already taken the decision to close our Cranbury Terrace office in order to reduce our costs in light of the funding situation, and the 20% slice taken off the amount requested, plus the further 7% reduction each year, will leave us with a significant shortfall in funds that we will have to find from an alternative source.

While we have been successful in increasing the amount of individual giving thus far and hope to further develop this, and we continue to seek out additional grants from alternative sources, the automatic "slicing" of 20% of the grant amount requested (and we believe that this was a conservative request) places us at risk of having insufficient funding to be able to further grow as a service in order to respond to demand. This ultimately is likely to place Adult Services budgets under additional pressure as the majority of referrals we receive come from Adult Services as a means of maintaining independence of vulnerable adults and consequently preventing the need for L.A. intervention and funded care packages.

We accept that the decision taken to cut grants from the top-scoring bracket of applications at 20% was taken as a blanket decision across all applications without prejudice, however we believe that our impact statement may not have been duly considered. We do not wish to change our impact statement but ask that this be revisited by the team and for it to be acknowledged that the decision made to slice 20% off the amount requested will mean, and indeed already has meant, that some of our concerns outlined in the impact assessment questions will become reality.

I trust that the points made above will be considered alongside our original application and included in the responses issued to Cabinet for consideration. I thank you once again for the award made and look forward to your response.

EU Welcome

We found the 'appraisal' of our bid confusing as it said:

- a our work is needed
- b we represent value for money
- c our work is highly respected by officers

It then seemed something of a non-sequitor that the proposal was that we received no funding. Having said that I certainly realise that you are making difficult and complex decisions.

Mount Pleasant Media Workshop

The recommendation not to make a grant award to the Media Workshop in the financial year starting April 2013 rests, according to the Grant Appraisal Note that we were sent, on the following points: that we have a heavy reliance on SCC funding; a perceived lack of access during school holidays; and that we have failed to make changes to mitigate the impact of the economic crisis.

As Chair of the voluntary board of directors (trustees) I would like to identify serious flaws in this assessment, which makes me question the basis of the recommendation that you

have made.

Taking the first and the final point together, yes we do have a reliance on SCC grant funding, like very many of the organisations that SCC award to, I am sure, but the staff and the directors have made significant efforts to diversify our activity and our income for the past two years. This is evidenced in the minutes of our regular directors' meetings and our AGMs. Our strategy has been to try to maximise our earned revenue from our resource base and from courses, but due to the economic downturn this has met with limited success. The promotion of our resource base, primarily to the local voluntary sector, heavily publicised through SVS, makes our ambition to become an increasingly valued part of the voluntary sector infrastructure clear, and we are helping charities promote their services to local communities, and offering other transferrable skills like project management. I therefore refute completely the accusation that we are not making changes to mitigate the impact of the economy.

The other point that I would like to make is that while our Open Access sessions only operate in term-time due to restrictions on access at the school we operate from, this only represents a small proportion of our activity between 8%-12% of our client contact, and 3-4% of our income. All other activity, including courses held off-site, continue during school holidays. The misunderstanding of the assessing officer is clear in the response to the question "Does this application represent good value for money?" – the fact that our adult only Open Access is closed during school holidays gives us a much greater opportunity to work off-site with families and young people, 10 hours a week of staff time. Examples of holiday activity that we have recently delivered include family workshops at Sholing Valleys Nature Centre, family photography workshops at various army campuses around Hampshire, workshops with Newtown Youth Centre and workshops with families on the Northam and Kingsland Estates in Southampton (to name but a few).

The fact that the Council's officers who assessed our application seem unaware of this makes me question how much they know about us as an organisation, and therefore the basis of the recommendation not to award a grant to us next year. I would also like to challenge the fact that we appear to have been 'marked down' twice for "heavy reliance on SCC funding" and three times for "lack of holiday access / aren't open during school holidays / closed during school holidays."

With regards to the updated Impact Statement, the Media Workshop will have to close its resource base at Mount Pleasant Junior School and make current staff redundant. Due to the time constraints there will be pressure both financially and physically in winding down the current resource base and office by 31/3/2013.

I therefore ask that this assessment be revisited, and request urgently a dialogue with the assessing officer to make sure that the basis for a decision on our funding is factual.

Solent Credit Union

Solent Credit Union is grateful for the grant recommendation that you have made as it will enable us to continue offering services to the people of Southampton. However as your letter sets out, the offer is a considerable reduction on the amount for which we applied.

We have considered whether to appeal or not and think we should, because receiving a reduced amount has significant implications for the adequate provision of ethical financial services for people in Southampton. This relates specifically to the capacity of Solent Credit Union to support the delivery of Universal Credit and Direct Care Payments with the

Council and other partners, as well as providing a fully functioning financial service to people who are financially excluded.

Impact:

These reductions will more than halve our capacity and work against the economies of scale that arise from growth.

Our business plan projections predict that we will be supporting 8,000 members within 3 years, all local people and a significant number of whom will be receiving Universal Credit and have high levels of financial literacy need and support.

We believe the impact would be to significantly reduce the number of people we would be able to offer a high level of service to. As stated, this could be over 50% of our capacity and so 50% of the potential membership.

Without wanting to be alarmist, we therefore predict 3,500 people would be significantly disadvantaged as a result of this proposed reduction. The specific level of disadvantage is hard to calculate, however, nationally, it is estimated that Credit Union loan interest charge is less than half the cost of other lenders. Therefore, with our estimated revised loan book of £600,000 we would expect local people to be able to spend an additional £100,000 in the local economy if we received the full grant.

This is a conservative estimate and as you may be aware, our average interest charge of 15% APR is hugely less than Provident 277% APR, Payday Loans 1734% APR or Wonga 3378.1% APR, which suggests much larger amounts are likely to accrue to the local economy. On top of that, the reduced cost of supporting people in dire financial trouble would further benefit future public service expenditure. One of our main concerns is that Southampton Residents might resort to using unauthorised money lenders in an emergency situation, something that we would hope to reduce with a full service credit union serving the people of Southampton.

We would also like highlight the fact that amongst the organisations recommended to receive a grant we are the only one who is able to offer very practical help and support in dealing with the issues arising from the Welfare Reform Act 2012, especially Universal Credit. We are already set up and trialling 'Jam Jar Accounts' which will greatly assist members in paying their rent and bills at the same time as encouraging them to save. Therefore we would like the members and officers to very seriously consider awarding a higher amount. This would enable us to employ a full time member of staff with the necessary skills to develop and deliver a wide range of products which would benefit many vulnerable and disadvantage Southampton residents. A full time member of staff would also enable us to take on at least one New Apprentice thereby increasing our capacity and providing much needed employment and skills opportunities.

We thank you for this opportunity to appeal and very much hope that the City Council can fully support the potentially much increased impact Solent Credit Union could make to the financial health of many Southampton People.

Southampton Advice and Representation Centre

Whilst we are grateful to have received continued funding, there is a reduction which will in time have a serious impact on our ability to provide a service that will meet current service demand, let alone the anticipated increase from welfare reform.

Even if there were short term funding to help over the next few years to try and tackle the volumes of work created by welfare form, it would be appreciated.

Southampton Amateur Gymnastics Club

It's very disappointing to hear there is no recommendation for us to be considered for a grant, it will have a negative impact on the club's future, for sustainability and progress. Particularly as we have had running costs grants for the past number of years, it is already looking for this year, without the grant that it will have a huge financial impact on the sustainability of the club.

Southampton Nuffield Theatre Trust

The Nuffield Theatre has provided entertainment, education and contributed to the quality of life in Southampton for over 40 years. An important part of this has been the long term partnership with Southampton City Council and our other funders. We are at a moment of transition, growth and new developments. However, the recommendation for the next three years represents a real and genuine challenge to our evolution and continued place as the key performing arts company in Southampton.

Overview

- We understand that Southampton City Council needs to respond to a very challenging financial situation, but the proposals for arts grants are for a disproportionate reduction (26.4% versus a total reduction of 6.8%) and the majority of the actual reduction from the cultural grants is proposed to fall to The Nuffield (a reduction of £52,589 out of a total reduction of £79,746).
- The Nuffield's SCC grant has reduced by 85% (including inflation) over the last fourteen years. The company has made savings of 2-4% year on year to cover this, and last year made a further saving of £100,000 by reconfiguring its work.
- In addition to savings, The Nuffield undertook a review with external consultants last year to develop a new business model with additional trading and fundraising income replacing lost public funds. The company has invested its total reserves in changes in order to achieve the necessary additional income, but we need longer for these changes to achieve the necessary additional income.
- For 2013/14, the company had planned for a total reduction of a further £28,000 being a reduction of 12%* from SCC together with a 1% reduction from Arts Council England, 1.9% from Hampshire County Council and standstill funding from the University of Southampton. The additional 15.5%* reduction proposed by SCC cannot be absorbed by the Company without impacting on front line services which will in turn compromise our agreements with our other funders and threaten the £800,000 PA inward investment. The Nuffield was informed of this proposal on 8 January, giving the company only twelve weeks to make adjustments accordingly.
- We were not informed in advance of the assessment scoring system that has been operated and whilst we understand its objectivity, we are concerned that it does not reflect the full picture in terms of company's needs, contributions and strategy in a changing and demanding environment.
- In particular we would like the assessment team to revisit the 7/10 mark for value for money given the Nuffield's leverage of over £800,000 inward investment of public funding into the City in the current economic environment.
- The proposal for such a significant cut and its threat to the Nuffield's new Business Plan may also undermine Arts Council England's confidence in SCC's commitment to funding the arts in general and the Cultural Quarter and the New Arts Complex project in Guildhall Square in particular.

- It will be increasingly difficult for The Nuffield as the key performing arts company to play its part in the City's plans for cultural regeneration and to combat the effects of the recession if it cannot operate efficiently.
- The Nuffield employs a significant number of Southampton residents and the majority of its leveraged and earned income is spent within the city and with local businesses.
- The Nuffield is a key to Southampton's cultural provision and a delivery partner in the City's audience development and animation project. This work and the City's longer term plans for the Cultural Quarter may be compromised if the Company is unable to continue its arts and audience development activities in the crucial years ahead of Southampton New Arts Complex (SNAC) opening.
(*compared to the 2012/13 grant)

Southampton Street Pastors

We are very grateful to have been recommended to receive grants from the SCC Commissioned Grants Programme.

It is a great relief for us to see the possibility of significant income supporting our development plans for the next 3 years. With these funds we are confident that we will be able to extend the successful NTE street pastor model into youth and community contexts over the next 3 years, whilst maintaining our existing NTE and school patrols.

We note that the sums recommended leave us with a budget shortfall around 15%. We will need to devote more of our resources to looking for additional income, which may slow us down somewhat, but we remain optimistic and committed to our goals.

Youth Options

I would like to make the following representation to Cabinet against the decision to not recommend a grant allocation to Youth Options through the Commissioned Grant Programme.

Youth Options scored 66 points out of a possible 100 leaving it in band F with no recommendation of grant. Having requested the appraisal of the application there are several comments that I would like to take issue with.

1. Firstly, against the question 'Does this application represent good value for money?' the comment has been made that it is 'a high cost for work in just one area of the city', and a score of 4/10 has been given. My first issue is that there was no indication in the application criteria that the service would be penalised for being located in just one area of the city. Secondly the value for money is not diminished by virtue of being located in one area, it is in fact increased as less time and money will be spent on travelling between homes, and allows all children in the families to attend after school clubs without transport being needed.
2. Against the question 'Are the stated targets satisfactory?' the comment has been made that it is 'Not clear how many people are actually being supported', and a score of 5/10 has been given. It states quite clearly in question 2.4 of our application that 'This bid seeks to continue the project for 10 referred families per year (30 in total) in Thornhill to access the support as described in question 2.3.' Whilst we cannot be clear about exact numbers of people I think this is a sound indication. Also the question asks about satisfactory targets, and we set the following:
 - a. 80% of children will show improved school attendance
 - b. 50% of parents supported to engage with education, employment or training

- c. 80% of children show improved behaviour both in school and at home
- d. 50% of parents supported to engage with education, employment or training
- e. 100% of parents understand the changes in Welfare Benefit, and how they are affected
- f. 80% of parents report improved parenting skills
- g. 80% of families report improved parent/children relationships
- h. 70% of families achieve their family targets set at referral to the project
- i. 50% of families increase the amount of physical exercise they undertake

I find it hard to believe that these targets warrant a score of only 5/10, given that they directly relate to the criteria set out in the guidelines.

3. With regard to the question 'How well will this application meet the outcomes it says it will?' the comment has been made that it has 'Good outcomes for Thornhill, but reach is limited.' We have scored 20/30 for this question. I have issue with the fact that we have already been penalised twice in the appraisal prior to this question for only delivering in Thornhill, and I do not believe it to be fair or professional to keep penalising for the same issue throughout, especially when that penalty represents a third of the marks available for this particular question.
4. In the final section, which reflects the Officers professional opinion our application scored 20/30, and several comments were made, which I would take issue with.
 - a. Once again it is mentioned that the project has limited reach, which indicates that once again marks have been deducted for something we have been penalised for three times already.
 - b. It says that we are duplicating the work of a post recently appointed at Kane's Hill Primary School; this is not strictly true as we offer after school support, activities throughout all school holidays for all members of the family, coffee morning and regular home visits, all of which are not offered by the school. We work closely with the appointed member of staff at Kane's Hill to ensure that we do not duplicate work, and that we support the work of the school.
 - c. It also says that there are 'concerns with how this fits with the Families Matter programme – other sources of funding could be available.' We have quite clearly stated in question 2.6 that 'This project, if it secures further funding, will also support the Government's Troubled Families (Families Matter) agenda, from which approximately 600 families have been identified in Southampton.' I would also take issue with the fact that there are other sources of funding available; due to the high profile of this Government Agenda, and the amount of money allocated to it other funders are unwilling to put their funds into such programmes.

I believe that taking into account all of the above points our application should have scored a higher mark than 66/100, and would, therefore, be eligible for a recommendation of funding.