

ITEM No ...4.....

REPORT TO: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES COMMITTEE – 21 AUGUST 2017
REPORT ON: COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE FUND
REPORT BY: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
REPORT NO: 247-2017

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement on the disbursement of the Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF). This is a test of change, using a Participatory Budgeting model (PB); which will involve citizens in the identification of proposals and allocation of spend. This is related to Part 10 of The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015, which aims to strengthen participation in public decision making.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Committee:-
- a) approve the proposed process for testing PB
 - b) agree delegated authority on proposed distribution of funding to the Executive Directors Corporate Services and Neighbourhood Services
 - c) agree the commitment to spend in 2017/18, with infrastructure works taking place in 2018/19
 - d) agree the funding allocation proposed to each Council Ward of £150,000

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 Funding of £509,000 was approved by Policy & Resources Committee 23 February 2017 to create a pilot Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF), to be managed locally and directed towards locally agreed priorities of a revenue nature for roads, parking, footways and other local infrastructure. This is enhanced with capital funding of £691,000, resulting in a total Community Infrastructure Fund of £1.2m, allowing a mix of revenue and capital works to be undertaken.
- 3.2 Additional costs for marketing, electronic voting, public events, training and evaluation etc. will be incurred as part of this process. These are unable to be fully quantified at this stage. A bid has been made to Scottish Government Community Choices Fund to assist with costs associated with testing the PB model.

4 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Part 10 of the Community Empowerment Act introduces the intention for public participation in decision making including the allocation of financial resources. It aims to develop engagement, increase confidence and capacity in public decision making, access local knowledge and address local concerns and priorities. It aims to promote a dialogue with a public authority and it's citizens on how financial resources are allocated to improve outcomes for their communities.
- 4.2 PB originated in Brazil (in 1989) and is a method of involving community members, usually culminating in a pre-agreed voting process, giving local people the opportunity to decide where public money is spent in their community. It is generally deemed to be most effective when used alongside other models of Community Engagement and Empowerment, as part of a wider strategic approach to advancing participatory democracy.
- 4.3 Consideration has been given to how we might establish a CIF test of change pilot scheme ensuring it incorporates robust forms of community engagement. Dundee has a strong track record of engaging with communities. This has been recognised as sector leading and the

methodology of this work embraces the principles of participatory democracy which underpins PB. There has been recent extensive community consultation through Engage Dundee, which was an extensive city wide community consultation, using the Place Standard tool. Engage Dundee had over 6,000 responses and identified issues and priorities from local people. In addition other sources of community involvement and community needs assessment, including Community Estate Walkabouts; Green Flag Assessments and Tenants and Residents Action Plans. It is planned, as a first step, to use the data from community engagement already undertaken for this pilot of participatory budgeting.

- 4.4 A cross Council officer working group has undertaken an analysis of all the data from the community engagement sources to identify possible projects. With a lead role from City Development this data will be reviewed and refined against known and committed infrastructure spend. It is intended that proposals identified to go to a community vote should not replace current budget commitments. However, consideration will be given to enhancing existing proposals or to accelerate work, if such work has been identified as a community priority. Ultimately, the final decision on works to be funded by CIF will rest with the local community. This is testing a new way of identifying infrastructure works to be undertaken bringing officers and communities together into a new form of dialogue, one which may be potentially significant in a period of limited public sector resources.
- 4.5 An appropriate model for deciding how a community will vote on potential projects will be required. An analysis of PB models at a Ward/Neighbourhood level (locality) and at a multilevel/City wide level, has been undertaken by Glasgow Centre for Population Health. Using this as a reference point and looking at other models of PB, it is recommended that proposals are developed and voting takes place both online and at a Ward level to test the model. This is the first time Dundee City Council has used a PB approach on this scale and the learning from the locality approach will be used to inform the future direction.
- 4.6 It is recommended that a uniformed approach to PB voting is adopted across all the Council Wards as this will ensure consistency and transparency. In order to honour community participation it is proposed the voting process is designed with community and officer involvement through the LCPPs. Consideration will be given to the method of voting, use of online and public events and how we include the whole community. Evidence from other models shows how this has been done elsewhere. It is recommended that neighbourhood structures are also invited, through the LCPPs, to help shape the model of the PB exercise. The LCPPS will be the vehicle for promoting and engaging the community participation. However, they will have no greater weighting or power than the wider community, who will be supported to participate and vote in the PB exercise. We wish to encourage as wide a community involvement as possible. This will be an exercise in widening the base of participation in the City and allows for a further exploration of co-production with communities.
- 4.7 A Ward based model is seen as offering greater opportunity for participation. It will encourage all communities in Dundee to get involved. However, recognition will be given to inequity and the differing levels of deprivation which exists within Wards across the city. We will target community engagement to encourage participation by people living in areas designated as the most deprived. Additional support will be available to assist those who find it difficult to get involved due to language barriers, disability, poverty or discrimination.
- 4.8 PB will be used as a new tool to engage citizens in participatory democracy and will involve the wider community including socially excluded citizens. Whilst a Ward based exercise will require investment in staff time it introduces the model of PB and allows us to test community interest and commitment. The proposed model does not set Wards against one another but allows local people to vote and to prioritise proposals within their Wards. It is, therefore, recommended that the CIF is taken forward as a Ward based pilot with an equal distribution of the Fund across all 8 Community Wards.
- 4.9 Consideration was given to applying the same formula as the Community Regeneration Fund and linking this to SIMD data. This option is not recommended mainly as the theory behind PB is that it is linked to participatory democracy and greater public involvement in making decisions at whole community level. PB is not specifically about addressing deprivation but is more about

widening citizen involvement. However, this needs to be within a context of ensuring that methods used provide equality of opportunity for all citizens' voices to be heard. It can be enhanced to look at targeting deprivation when used as a method of budget reconfiguration but when it is a top sliced budget the recommendation is for an even split. The infrastructure nature of the Fund is seen as affecting all communities across Dundee and this is evidenced in the feedback from Engage Dundee and other consultations. The recommendation is a Ward based approach with an equal split across the 8 Wards ie, £150,000 per Ward.

- 4.10 There is the requirement to ensure that PB does not replicate a small grants scheme. Evidence from other PB models is that they have been so small scale that they have just replaced community grant schemes. PB needs to effectively demonstrate the benefits of this different model, make it a meaningful and tangible exercise. The proposals must make a required impact. There is a need to prevent large numbers of small projects, which may incur design costs, make voting cumbersome and not have a visible impact. It is recommended that as a guide a minimum level of £30K and maximum of £150 K CIF is set for projects. There is a need to ensure that there is a significant level of proposals to take to a community vote. It is also important to ensure that proposal do not incur an excessive maintenance cost. The proposals need to demonstrate value for money and this may not be evident if the amount allocated is small scale. In order to achieve this it is planned to set a limit of potentially no more than 5 proposals be taken forward to a community vote in each ward.
- 4.11 In Scotland the approach to PB sits within the recommendations of the Christie Commission and the Community Empowerment Act, which support a model of decentralised decision making. For this exercise the recommendation is that decision making is devolved to the community through a voting process, with LCPP's consulted to determine if the proposals fit with Local Community Planning priorities. This will result in officer, elected member and community representative input. This model of devolved decision making will require elected members to approve the delegation of this spend to Executive Directors who will approve spend based on community votes. The result of this process would be reported back to Committee in due course.
- 4.12 This test of PB across the city will be used to help inform how both the Council and its partners discuss resource allocations with communities. It will help us learn how we promote wider consultation on budgets and how we involve communities in discussions around current and future resource challenges.

5 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 This Report has been screened for any policy implications in respect of Sustainability, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Anti-Poverty, Equality Impact Assessment and Risk Management.

An Equality Impact Assessment is attached.

6 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.1 The Council Management Team were consulted in the preparation of this report.

7 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 7.1 None.

Elaine Zwirlein
Executive Director of Neighbourhood Services

David Simpson
Head of Housing and Communities

DS/MD/EH

9 August 2017



EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOL

Part 1: Description/Consultation

Is this a Rapid Equality Impact Assessment (RIAT)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Is this a Full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Date of Assessment: 08/08/17	Committee Report Number: 247-2017	
Title of document being assessed:		
1. This is a new policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed (If yes please check box) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is an existing policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed? (If yes please check box) <input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Please give a brief description of the policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed.	This is to test a Participatory budgeting model on mainstream council services of an infrastructure nature	
3. What is the intended outcome of this policy, procedure, strategy or practice?	To raise citizen involvement and awareness in decision making about the allocation of council funds. Increase understanding about setting priorities and the allocation of funding within a budget.	
4. Please list any existing documents which have been used to inform this Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment.	n/a	
5. Has any consultation, involvement or research with protected characteristic communities informed this assessment? If yes please give details.	The PB proposal has been initially discussed with Building stronger communities group, mainly for information at this stage. This group represents people from CRA .	
6. Please give details of council officer involvement in this assessment. (e.g. names of officers consulted, dates of meetings etc)	Marie Dailly Service manager Communities	
7. Is there a need to collect further evidence or to involve or consult protected characteristics communities on the impact of the proposed policy? (Example: if the impact on a community is not known what will you do to gather the information needed and when will you do this?)	No	

Part 2: Protected Characteristics

Which protected characteristics communities will be positively or negatively affected by this policy, procedure or strategy?

NB Please place an X in the box which best describes the "overall" impact. It is possible for an assessment to identify that a positive policy can have some negative impacts and visa versa. When this is the case please identify both positive and negative impacts in Part 3 of this form.

If the impact on a protected characteristic communities are not known please state how you will gather evidence of any potential negative impacts in box Part 1 section 7 above.

	Positively	Negatively	No Impact	Not Known
Ethnic Minority Communities including Gypsies and Travellers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender Reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People with a disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Socio-economic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy & Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please state)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part 3: Impacts/Monitoring



<p>1. Have any positive impacts been identified?</p> <p>(We must ensure at this stage that we are not achieving equality for one strand of equality at the expense of another)</p>	<p>This will ensure that across the city there is access to the PB community vote to increase involvement but with additional support given to excluded groups to participate.</p>
<p>2. Have any negative impacts been identified?</p> <p>(Based on direct knowledge, published research, community involvement, customer feedback etc. If unsure seek advice from your departmental Equality Champion.)</p>	<p>No Negative impacts have been identified</p>
<p>3. What action is proposed to overcome any negative impacts?</p> <p>(e.g. involving community groups in the development or delivery of the policy or practice, providing information in community languages etc. See Good Practice on DCC equalities web page)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>4. Is there a justification for continuing with this policy even if it cannot be amended or changed to end or reduce inequality without compromising its intended outcome?</p> <p>(If the policy that shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination you must stop and seek legal advice)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>5. Has a 'Full' Equality Impact Assessment been recommended?</p> <p>(If the policy is a major one or is likely to have a major impact on protected characteristics communities a Full Equality Impact Assessment may be required. Seek advice from your departmental Equality lead.)</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>6. How will the policy be monitored?</p> <p>(How will you know it is doing what it is intended to do? e.g. data collection, customer survey etc.)</p>	<p>We will be monitoring participation levels</p>

Part 4: Contact Information

Name of Department or Partnership	Neighbourhood Services
--	------------------------

Type of Document	
Human Resource Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>
General Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategy/Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Change Papers/Local Procedure	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guidelines and Protocols	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Manager Responsible	Author Responsible
Name: David Simpson	Name: Marie Dailly
Designation: Head of Housing and Communities	Designation: Service Manager Communities
Base: City Square	Base: Mitchell street Dundee
Telephone: 434014	Telephone: 434092
Email: david.simpson@dundeecity.gov.uk	Email: marie.dailly@dundeecity.gov.uk

Signature of author of the policy: 	Date: 20 July 2017
Signature of Director/Head of Service: 	Date: 20 July 2017
Name of Director/Head of Service: Elaine Zwirlein	
Date of Next Policy Review: will be reviewed at evaluation	