



Derby City Council

COUNCIL CABINET
16 October 2013

ITEM 5a

Report of the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health

**Voluntary Community and Faith Sector 2013/14 and 2014/15
Funding Consultation**

SUMMARY

- 1.1 As a direct result of swingeing indiscriminate cuts in the Councils revenue grants by the coalition government the Council has been responding to austerity measures for a number of years now. On 30 January 2013 Council approved the revenue budget for 2013/14, which included savings proposals for 2013/14 and 2014/15 subject to completion and consideration, where relevant, of any further consultation exercises and equality impact assessments. One of these savings proposals was a reduction in Adults, Health and Housing long-term grant funding to the Voluntary Community and Faith (VCF) sector of £493k in 2014/15.
- 1.2 It is timely to remind Cabinet colleagues that the budget for VCF grants was approximately £1.5m in 2011/12 prior to the cuts imposed by the coalition government. Following the current latest saving proposal the budget will be reduced to approximately £500k. This scale of reduction is damaging for the city but beyond local control as we try our best to protect statutory services to the most vulnerable people in our city.
- 1.3 A full consultation took place on this VCF grants saving proposal between March and May 2013. This report summarises the outcomes of the consultation and equality impact analysis, making recommendations for 2013/14 and 2014/15 funding.
- 1.4 As Cabinet lead for these services I have a high regard for the voluntary sector and the services provided through grant funding. It is extremely regrettable that the Council finds itself in a financial situation which necessitates the reduction of such services. A situation brought about by the severe cuts imposed on this Council by the coalition national government.
- 1.5 It comes as no surprise to me that the vast majority of consultees who responded to the consultation are opposed to the funding reductions. However, I must balance that position with the requirement for the Council to exist within the overall budget. The report below contains a summary of the consultation findings. A full consultation report is attached at Appendix 5.
- 1.6 Given the difficult situation we are facing, my ambition is to protect those services which best support the Council's objective to keep people independent and prevent the need for statutory intervention, as best I can within the scarce resource available. The consultation responses clearly expressed that those services directly providing support to older and disabled people and information and advice were the most

important. I have listened to these clear messages and prioritised these services. To this end, this report details a series of financial allocations to VCF organisations which I believe strike a difficult balance between services and financial responsibility. I therefore commend this report to my Cabinet colleagues.

- 1.7 Appendix 3 details the current funding and recommended future funding level for each organisation. The recommendation is that for the 39 services currently being provided:

To cease funding for 2 services from 1st February 2014
To maintain funding at the current level for 4 services in 2014/15
To reduce funding for 25 services in 2014/15
To cease funding for 8 services in 2014/15

- 1.8 When making a decision on this matter Cabinet must have “due regard” to its duties under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 which are set out in more detail in the Legal Implications in Appendix 1. In doing so Cabinet must take account of the impact the financial proposals could have on different equality groups and consider ways of mitigating or avoiding any adverse impact.

- 1.9 Suffice to say that as these services support vulnerable groups of people with protected characteristics as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. Cabinet must note that by reducing funding for these services there are negative impacts on these groups of people. To assist Cabinet to make an informed decision on these matters a full Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results are summarised in Appendix 1 and set out in full at Appendix 4.

- 1.10 During the consultation period, one petition was received from Relate Derby and South Derbyshire with 322 valid signatures. I am proposing to end the funding for Relate Derby and South Derbyshire.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 To approve the grant funding amounts listed at Appendix 3 for individual organisations and services.
- 2.2 To approve the notification to Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Group (lead funder) that the Council’s funding for the Rethink Focus Line and Derbyshire Voice services will cease from 1st February 2014.
- 2.3 To approve the serving of notice of all changes to organisations listed in Appendix 3 from week commencing 28 October 2013.
- 2.4 To delegate to the Strategic Director of Adults Health and Housing, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health, authority to adjust the recommended funding amounts, within the overall budget and delegated authority limits

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The funding recommendations enable the Council to achieve the proposed savings and support the Council to achieve a balanced budget for 2013/14 and 2014/15.
- 3.2 The serving of a minimum of 12 weeks notice allows the Council to comply with grant funding agreements and is in line with the principles of the Compact.
- 3.3 Whilst making these recommendations as Cabinet lead I am mindful of the need to protect the most vulnerable people in our communities but also discharge our fiduciary responsibility to manage within the resources the Council has available.



SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 4.1 During 2011/12 the Council approved a revised grant aid strategy for funding VCF sector organisations which contribute to the Council’s key outcomes contained within the Derby Plan.

The adoption of the above strategy led to a zero based funding exercise for the VCF sector during 2011/12. All funded organisations were served notice and had to apply for funding against new service specifications developed by commissioning officers.

As expected, the funding bidding round was five times oversubscribed in terms of value of requests against the funding available. Many organisations did not secure any funding. Whilst others had their funding reduced to contain spending within the lower budget available to the Council due to national government funding reductions.

Officers believe the current portfolio of services financially supported by grant funding is still appropriate. Moreover, the portfolio continues to support the Councils strategic aims. However, the Council continues to face an unprecedented financial challenge. Regrettably further reductions to grant aid funding are necessary to protect statutory services for the most vulnerable people in our communities and to balance the Councils overall budget.

- 4.2 On 30 January 2013 Council approved the revenue budget for 2013/14, and approved detailed savings proposals for 2013/14 and 2014/15 subject to completion and consideration, where relevant, of any further consultation exercises and equality impact assessments. One of these savings proposals was a reduction in Adults, Health and Housing long-term discretionary grant funding to Voluntary Community and Faith sector organisations.

- 4.3 The following savings in grant funding were proposed:

Service	Proposed Change	2013/14	2014/15	TOTAL
Younger Adults	Focus Line & Derbyshire Voice	£17,000	£16,000	£33,000
Voluntary Sector	Reduce voluntary sector grants	£0	£460,000	£460,000

- 4.4 The reductions to Rethink Focus Line (which provides a phone line offering support to people with mental health issues) and Derbyshire Voice (which provides an engagement and support service to support mental health service users to feedback on service issues) are being proposed as these services provide a discretionary service. In addition, the NHS is the major funder of both these services and the City

Council only makes a relatively small financial contribution to each service, of approximately 10%. The priority is to protect frontline preventative services and statutory services.

- 4.5 To achieve the required savings in 2014/15, the Council's intention is to adhere to the existing strategy and service specifications. Funding will be prioritised for those services that directly support early intervention and prevention, help prevent deterioration and assist people to remain as independent as possible within the community thereby reducing the need for statutory service interventions. The table below illustrates this:

Service Type	2014/15 Council Funding	Percent Reduction in Funding
Front Line Services	£442,635	33.8%
Non-Front Line Services	£79,602	71.1%
Totals	£522,237	44.7%

The table above contrasts the split between those front line services which directly serve people and support them to stay independent with those which are indirect. This demarcation clearly details the ambition to try to proportionately protect the front line services in line with consultation responses, whilst recognising the reality and difficulty to do so absolutely. It is recognised that with the reduced funding available this shall adversely impact on the sector.

- 4.6 The majority of the services that will potentially be affected by the budget savings are funded jointly by the Council and Southern Derbyshire Clinical Commissioning Group (SDCCG). Council commissioners have shared their intentions with SDCCG. SDCCG have indicated that there will be no changes to their funding in 2014/15. Council and SDCCG commissioners will continue working closely together in the future to adopt a co-ordinated funding approach for each VCF organisation.
- 4.7 The process used to arrive at the funding recommendations comprised three elements:
- A twelve week public consultation
 - An assessment of the performance of the organisation and services against the Council's strategic grant aid priorities. This was based on an analysis of information obtained through the annual review process.
 - An equalities impact assessment
- 4.8 The City Council does not manage the grant funding agreement for the Rethink Focus Line and Derbyshire Voice services, and is a minor funding partner providing 11% of the Rethink Focus Line total and 9% of the Derbyshire Voice total public sector funding. The majority of the funding for these services comes from Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Group on behalf of all Derbyshire CCG's and Derbyshire County Council. There is no current proposal to reduce the funding to these organisations from other partners. As such, performance assessment was not considered in the process to determine City Council funding recommendations.

Consultation

- 4.9 Consultation was undertaken with the general public, the individual organisations, their service users and other local stakeholders.
A specific twelve week consultation was held about the VCF grant funding proposal. This provided time for the general public, those organisations funded and their service users to participate in the consultation. This consultation began on 4th March 2013 and closed on 27th May 2013.
- 4.10 The main methods used to gain feedback from respondents were the online and paper based surveys. These comprised:
- An online and paper survey to organisations affected by the funding*
 - An online survey made available on the Council website to the general public and stakeholders*
 - An online and paper survey of service users of the organisations*
- * Easy read and translated versions were provided on request
- 4.11 Organisations and service users also provided their feedback via letters, group responses and specific feedback forms developed by the VCF organisations themselves. Also, where requested, face to face meetings were held with organisations and their service users.
- 4.12 In parallel with the consultation, annual service reviews were undertaken by the Council with the voluntary sector organisations. Council Officers visited each organisation to support them with the annual reviews and the consultation process. The information obtained from these reviews fed into the commissioner service assessment and was considered along with the consultation feedback when making the final funding recommendations for each service.
- 4.13 Service Funding Assessment Process
- The purpose of the assessment process was to:
- Provide a transparent methodology for assessing how well each organisation's current services fit with the Council's strategic grant aid priorities and recommending 2014/15 funding
 - Combine NHS and Council commissioning priorities with information gathered from the annual reviews (these looked at how well an organisation has delivered against its agreed objectives) and the consultation feedback
 - Prioritise promoting independence of service users and deliver a package of services to support a range of backgrounds and customer groups
- 4.14 An assessment form was developed to capture information from the annual service review and enable an analysis to be undertaken of the quantitative performance of, and qualitative outcomes from, the service to show how well it was being delivered.

- 4.15 A meeting was held with all organisations to undertake their annual review and discuss their monitoring information for the last year.
- 4.16 The assessment methodology assessed the service against how well it achieved the agreed outcomes for customers, the agreed outputs from the current service and the added value the service delivered. This provided an overall picture of how well the service performs.
- 4.17 An initial model of services and funding levels was then developed by officers based on the information gathered and analysis undertaken. This was the subject of a review to confirm the shape/profile of the model of services and associated funding being proposed. This review identified any gaps and further actions required to refine the services model.
- 4.19 The final recommended services and funding model was agreed with Adults Health and Housing commissioners, and shared with NHS Commissioners.
- 4.20 A full equalities impact assessment of the changes to these grant funded services was undertaken as part of the overall process.
- 4.21 Consultation Findings Summary

In total 30 responses from organisations were received, 596 responses from service users and 95 responses from the general public and stakeholders. In addition to the consultation surveys, one petition was received from Relate Derby and South Derbyshire with 322 valid signatures. The full consultation findings report is attached as Appendix 5.

- 4.22 The main findings from the stakeholders and public responses were:
- 97.8% of respondents said ‘no’ they did not agree with the proposal to reduce funding for the grant funded Voluntary, Community and Faith sector organisations
 - Information and Advice (97.8%) and responding to health and social care risks (93.5%) were seen as the most important services.
 - Respondents felt older people (93%) and disabled people (92%) would be affected by the cuts, but other groups would also be affected.
- 4.23 The main findings from the service users responses were:
- 99 % of respondents said ‘no’ they did not agree with the proposed reduction in funding
 - Respondents commented that the voluntary sector provides vital services to elderly, vulnerable people, the services are essential to them as service users to help maintain good health, to avoid isolation by providing (accessible) social opportunities such as attending activities to meet friends. Respondents said that these services are important to them and others who use voluntary services in several ways:
 - ❖ To make people feel part of the community
 - ❖ Getting people out of the house

- ❖ Ensuring people are not in crisis
- Information and Advice (90.7%) and access to community opportunities (90.5%) were seen as the most important services by service users
- Respondents felt older people (89.3%) and disabled people (58.9%) would be affected by the cuts, but other groups would also be affected.

4.24 The main findings from organisations responses were:

- As part of the consultation organisations were invited to tell the Council what may happen if their funding was reduced by thirty, fifty or one hundred per cent. Some organisations said they would cease to exist or not offer their services if there was a 30%, 50% or 100% reduction in funding. The table below shows the cumulative number of responses by response type, for each level of funding reduction for 39 services from 34 organisations:

Effect of Funding Reduction	Funding Reduction		
	30%	50%	100%
No. of organisation which said they would cease to exist	5 (15%)	7 (21%)	13 (38%)
No. of organisations which said the particular service would not continue	7 (18%)	10 (26%)	23 (59%)

- A main theme amongst organisation responses was that the Voluntary Sector has a vital role to play. Many organisations feel that removing their services in response to the coalition government cuts will put more pressure on Public Health, statutory Council services and other public bodies.
- Some of the main areas of concern given are:
 - ❖ People will become more isolated
 - ❖ People will lose their independence
 - ❖ There will be nowhere for people to turn to
 - ❖ Vital work that has been undertaken in the Voluntary Sector will be lost
 - ❖ Charges to services may need to be made, which could be met by personal budgets if appropriate, if not then some people may simply not have access to the services they need.

4.25 Following completion of the consultation, assessment, and equalities impact assessment, officers have analysed the information and made recommendations on future funding for the organisations involved. These recommendations are contained in Appendix 3.

4.26 Selection of Grant Funding Allocation Methodology

A number of options were considered when shaping the process on how to allocate funding to VCF organisations and achieve the required savings:

The option to go out to the sector on a new bidding round was considered. This would have involved serving notice to all currently funded groups and advertising the opportunity to bid into a much reduced pot of funding. This option was rejected as it did not appear appropriate to create a huge expectation at an individual organisation

level in the sector, when the available funding is much reduced. Commissioners are broadly satisfied with the portfolio of services currently funded and the opportunity to fund new services was extremely limited. Moreover, the commissioner view was that this process would have led to more currently funded organisations, failing to secure future funding, whilst placing a significant burden on organisations to complete grant funding applications. In a bidding process, once the bids were considered and if allocated at request levels the funds would be depleted more quickly using this approach.

The commissioners also considered the approach to allocate the proportionate reduction across all groups and services on an equal basis. However, this was rejected as a methodology as it fails to take account of priority and intelligence about services being provided. Furthermore, the method assumes such proportional reductions can take place without consideration of viability issues.

The methodology adopted was based on an intelligence led approach on current and historic information available to commissioners. The key principles detailed at 4.27 below were considered as determinants of the grant funding allocation. This methodology preserves as many services as possible which meet the criteria, albeit on lower funding levels which may necessitate reduced access to services. This methodology would also have been used if a bidding round methodology had been adopted in order to maximise the impact of funding by creating an appropriate portfolio of services.

4.27 The funding recommendation for each service was derived based on the following principles detailed below. A full narrative of the rationale considered for each service and organisation is detailed at Appendix 2.

- The service meets the Council's priorities and directly supports early intervention and prevention, helps prevent deterioration and assists people to remain as independent as possible within the community.
- The service performs well against the outcome and output measures specified in its grant funding agreement.
- The service delivers good value for money
- The service has the potential to generate income, or increase the current level of non-Council income
- The organisation adds value by bringing wider benefits to the service, e.g. funding from other sources
- The organisation has the capacity to withstand the recommended funding reduction and still provide a service, albeit potentially at a different level to that currently provided.

4.28 The grants budgets fund a range of services and activities to minority customer groups. Therefore the process followed to arrive at the funding recommendations has been mindful of equalities issues. A full Equalities Impact Assessment can be found at

Appendix 4.

Ethnic Group	Organisation (s)	2011 Census - Derby Statistics		Recommended Council Funding		Funding Above Population %
		Number of People	% Population	Value	% Share of Total	
Caribbean	Hadhari	3,405	1.37%	£21,873	4.19%	2.82%
Chinese	Chinese Community Centre	1,292	0.52%	£11,200	2.14%	1.63%
Other White (Inc. Eastern European Communities)	Boznia Herzegovina Community Association, Opieka, Ukranian Day Centre	9,751	3.92%	£39,494	7.56%	3.64%
Indian	Indian Day Care, Sahakar, Sahaly, Sathi, Sifin & Stenson Fields, 50% Hadhari Nari	10,907	4.38%	£37,436	7.17%	2.78%
Pakistani	Sahara, 50% Hadhari Nari	14,620	5.88%	£44,455	8.51%	2.64%
All		248,752	100%	£522,237	100%	

4.29 The table above details the grant allocations to BME groups in the city. The table clearly shows allocations to all groups above the population proportion (final column). For example the Caribbean community's share of the whole population is 1.37% and their funding proportion is 4.19% of the remaining grants budget. Therefore the funding above the population proportion is 4.19% minus 1.37% i.e. 2.82%. However, funding above the population level is not unexpected as for all of the main groupings a certain base level of funding is necessary to cover operating costs regardless of population size. Arguably the least well established population, Eastern Europeans, receive the highest allocation above the population profile of 3.64%. Whilst the three main black ethnic groups of people, Caribbean, Indian and Pakistani, receive a similar proportion of funding above their population profile.

4.30 Process Following Cabinet Agreement of Funding Recommendations

Rethink and Derbyshire Voice will be served with notice from 28th October 2013 providing them with a 14 week notice period. All other organisations in Appendix 3 that are recommended for reduced funding or cessation of funding will be served with notice from 28 October 2013 providing them with a five month notice period, two months longer than the three months' notice period in their funding agreement. The extended notice period will provide organisations with additional time to adapt to their new level of funding.

- 4.31 Hardwick Clinical Commissioning Group, the lead funder for the Rethink Focus Line and Derbyshire Voice services will be notified that the Council's funding for these services will cease from 1st February 2014.
- 4.32 During the notice period, officers will work with those VCF organisations recommended for funding reductions to develop new grant funding agreements based on the funding level approved by Cabinet, incorporating any necessary changes and improvements.
- 4.33 Also during the notice period, officers will work with those VCF organisations recommended for cessation of funding to support them whilst they adapt to the loss of Council funding.
- 4.34 New twelve month grant funding agreements for those organisations receiving Council funding, or joint Council and NHS funding in 2014/15 will commence from 1st April 2014.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 To continue to fund these organisations. However, this would cause the Council to over spend its available budget requiring savings to be made from other areas.
- 5.2 To cease funding all current services and go out to the sector for a new grant funding application round. This was rejected as we undertook this process against a new set of service specifications supporting adult social care priorities in 2011/12 to get the range of services we currently have. In addition, given the relatively small remaining budget a new funding round would raise false expectations in the sector and many more organisations would fail to secure any funding than the number which would succeed.
- 5.3 To reduce all services by the same percentage. This was rejected as it would not be an intelligent response to the difficult service decisions facing the Council.

This report has been approved by the following officers:

Legal officer Financial officer	Janie Berry Toni Nash
--	--------------------------

Human Resources officer Estates/Property officer Service Director(s) Other(s)	Liz Moore Steve Meynell Perveez Sadiq Ann Webster
--	--

For more information contact: Background papers: List of appendices:	Phil Bacon 01332 642740 phil.bacon@derby.gov.uk None Appendix 1 – Implications Appendix 2 – Impact, Funding Recommendations & Rationale and Mitigating Actions Summary Appendix 3 – Grant Funding Level Recommendations Appendix 4 – Equalities Impact Assessment and appendices. Available on CMIS Appendix 5 – Consultation Report and appendices – Available on CMIS
---	---

IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money

- 1.1 Approval of the recommendations in this report will result in the achievement of savings proposals identified in the 2013/14 budget consultation process for Adults, Health and Housing Directorate of £493,000 in 2014/15, leaving a remaining allocation of £522,237
- 1.2 Due to the timing of this report and the requirement to provide 12 weeks notice of variation to grant funding agreements, the £17,000 saving in 2013/14 will not be achieved.

Legal

- 2.1 The Public Sector equality duty consists of a general duty, which is set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the Act), and specific duties which are imposed by secondary legislation. The general equality duty came into force on 5 April 2011.
- 2.2 Those subject to the equality duty, such as the Council must, in the exercise of their functions, have **due regard** to the need to:
 - Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 2.3 The Act effectively broadens and extends the positive equality duties and previously found in the Race Relations, Disability Discrimination Act so it now applies to cover age, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity, religion and belief.
- 2.4 In order to comply with this duty the Council must, when making decisions, assess the impact they will have on different members of the community and where possible and proportionate to mitigate the adverse effect on any disadvantaged group. This duty can best be discharged in cases of possible significant impact by undertaking an Equality Impact Assessment, as was done in this case.
- 2.5 The equality duties do not prevent a local authority, or other public body, from making difficult decisions but they must have “due regard” to these matters in the decision making process by properly assessing and considering the potential impact of the proposed change on different equality groups.
- 2.6 The Best Value guidance requires Councils to have due regard for the reductions to voluntary sector expenditure to be proportional to Councils overall budget reductions.

The overall spending with the sector by the Council is £4,595k. The reduction detailed in this report amounts to 10.7% of that figure which is below the Council's overall budget reduction.

Personnel

- 3.1 The process provides for a minimum 12 week notice period for those organisations recommended for reduced funding or cessation of funding. This will allow the organisations to manage any personnel implications.

Equalities Impact

- 4.1 A full Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) is attached at Appendix 4. The main findings from the EIA are summarised below by protected characteristic group

There will be an impact on all equality groups from the reductions in funding because the affected services are for people who are vulnerable and these services invariably are linked to equality issues such as age, disability, gender etc. The changes in funding will therefore have an impact upon people within the following equality groups

Older People

Older people from all communities will experience some reduction in their services which include lunch and social clubs, information and advice services, day services, outreach services etc. This will impact on them by reducing availability and access to these services resulting in the potential for more social isolation. However, as a proportion of total grant funding, the older people's share has risen from 32% before the funding reductions to a recommended level of 41% after the funding reductions. This recognises the large and increasing number of older people in our community.

Disabled People

Disabled people including those who have hearing and visual impairments, people with mental health issues and learning disabilities, and people with physical impairments from all communities will experience some reduction in their services. These services include advocacy, information, advice and support, day activities, social and activity clubs, hire of mobility equipment, assistance with finding employment, befriending etc. This will impact on them by reducing availability of, and access to, these services resulting in the potential for more social isolation. As a proportion of total grant funding, the disabled people's share has fallen from 36% before the funding reductions to a recommended level of 30% after the funding reductions. This partly reflects the cessation of funding to services that do not directly support early intervention and prevention and keeping people independent in the community.

Ethnicity

Those services funded by the Council for people from minority ethnic communities, including newer communities will experience some reduction. These services

include day services, information and advice, lunch and social clubs, drop-in and outreach services, befriending, and domestic violence support. This will impact on people from these communities by reducing availability of, and access to, these services resulting in the potential for more social isolation. However, as a proportion of total grant funding, the share for people from minority ethnic communities has risen from 21% before the funding reductions to a recommended level of 29% after the funding reductions. After the recommended reduction, the share of the remaining funding for all of the major ethnic groups is higher than their proportion of the city's population. This recognises the increasing numbers and diversity of people in our community who require low level support to maintain independence.

Gender

Services specifically for women and for men will be affected by the recommended funding reductions. There are some culturally based gender specific services which include social and lunch clubs but also support for victims of domestic violence. This will impact on people by reducing the availability of, and access to, these services resulting in the potential for more social isolation and delays in accessing non statutory support for domestic violence. As a proportion of total grant funding, the share for services specifically for women has risen from 2% before the funding reductions to a recommended level of 2.5% after the funding reductions. For those services specifically for men, the share has risen from 0.2% before the funding reductions to a recommended level of 0.4% after the funding reductions.

Sexual Orientation and Transgender

The services specifically for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans people will experience a limited impact by the recommended funding reductions. These services include a community centre, direct one-to-one work, group support, help, information and support via telephone and social networking and learning and development opportunities. This will impact people by reducing the availability of, and access to, these services resulting in the potential for more social isolation, and lack of awareness of the needs of this group. As a proportion of total grant funding, the share for services specifically for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans people has not changed, remaining at the same level, 0.8% after the funding reductions.

Marriage and Civil Partnerships

The services specifically supporting marriage and civil partnerships will be affected by the recommended funding reductions. These services include a community centre, direct one-to-one work, group support, help, information and support, learning and development opportunities, support for victims of domestic violence and relationship counselling. This will impact people by reducing the availability of, and access to, these services resulting in the potential for more social isolation, delays in accessing non statutory support for domestic violence, and support for maintaining positive relationships. As a proportion of total grant funding, the share for services specifically supporting marriage and civil partnerships has fallen slightly from 3.8% before the funding reductions to a recommended level of 3.1% after the funding reductions.

Health and Safety

5.1 No implications arising directly from this report.

Environmental Sustainability

6.1 No implications arising directly from this report.

Property and Asset Management

7.1 No implications arising directly from this report.

Risk Management

8.1 No implications arising directly from this report.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

9.1 This report supports the Councils objective to keep people independent in the community for as long as possible.