

**Lancashire County Council**  
**Review of Wellbeing Grant Scheme**

**Strictly Private and Confidential**

For: *Audit, Risk and Governance Committee*  
Date Issued: *16 October 2018*



Where information resulting from investigation and/or audit work is made public or is provided to a third party by the client or by Veritau then this must be done on the understanding that any third party will rely on the information at its own risk. Veritau will not owe a duty of care or assume any responsibility towards anyone other than the client in relation to the information supplied. Equally, no third party may assert any rights or bring any claims against Veritau in connection with the information. Where information is provided to a named third party, the third party will keep the information confidential.

## Background

- 1 In 2016/17, the County Council made arrangements to provide one-off funding to a number of community led wellbeing projects. The projects were neighbourhood level schemes which were intended to help promote health and wellbeing as part of the County Council's overall public health agenda. The funding was to be provided from the Public Health budget. It was expected that the funding would, in some cases, lever in additional funding and support from other partner organisations. The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing invited suggestions from all councillors for initiatives to include in the list of schemes to be considered.
- 2 The Director of Public Health and Wellbeing subsequently submitted a series of reports to the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, outlining the objectives of the grant scheme, the mechanism for paying the grants, and the list of schemes requiring approval. An initial report was submitted on 1 December 2016 but further reports were then submitted on 9 February 2017, 15 March 2017 and 5 April 2017.
- 3 Total funding of £525,089 was approved for 103 projects. A further £50k of funding was approved to support the Sahara 'moving on' project. This one-off grant (and additional officer support) was to supplement Big Lottery grant funding to the project.
- 4 Following the award of the grants, concerns were raised by councillors about the robustness of the process followed for approving the projects and the adequacy of the grant payment and monitoring arrangements. A number of articles about the scheme had also appeared in the media. At its meeting on 14 December 2017, Full Council resolved that:

*Council is concerned about the circumstances surrounding the payment of 'Neighbourhood Wellbeing Initiative' grants totalling £500,000 in February and March this year. There was no budget provision for these grants which were paid on the recommendation of individual County Councillors and authorised by County Councillor Ali, the then Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing. There was no vetting by County Council Officers of either the applicants or the proposed purpose to which the grant would be put and it is of particular concern that almost £300,000 of these grants were recommended and authorised by County Councillor Ali himself. Council therefore resolves to ask the External Auditor to carry out an investigation into the manner in which these grants were recommended, approved and paid and report her findings to the Audit, Risk and Governance Committee for their consideration.*

- 5 The County Council's external auditors were asked to undertake the review but declined the request because of the potential conflict with their statutory audit duties.
- 6 Veritau were then commissioned to undertake the review. The audit fieldwork commenced on 13 June 2018.

## Scope and Purpose of the Review

- 7 The purpose of the review was to examine the adequacy of the systems and procedures followed to approve the award of grants and to administer the scheme. The following areas were considered:
- The process for assessing the suitability of individual projects for inclusion within the overall scheme
  - The advice provided to the Director of Public Health and Wellbeing on how the scheme should be set-up and administered
  - The decision making and approval process and whether this complied with the County Council's procedure rules and scheme of delegation
  - The arrangements to monitor the overall roll-out of the scheme and the delivery of individual projects
  - The checks undertaken on individual projects to confirm whether the grant funding had been used appropriately and the scheme objectives met
  - The reporting arrangements for the overall grant scheme and individual projects
- 8 The review did not examine the Sahara 'moving on' project as the arrangements for administering this project were considered to be adequate.

## Approach to Audit

- 9 Meetings were held with the following councillors and officers as part of the review:

County Councillor Geoff Driver (Leader)

County Councillor Azhar Ali (former Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing)

County Councillor Lorraine Beavers

Sakthi Karunanithi – Director of Public Health and Wellbeing

Neil Kissock – Director of Finance

Ian Young – former Director of Governance, Finance and Public Services

Correspondence, reports and other documents relating to the wellbeing scheme were also reviewed. The auditors would like to thank councillors and officers for their cooperation and assistance with the review.

## Health and Wellbeing Strategy

- 10 Local authorities have been responsible for public health since April 2013. The County Council's Health and Wellbeing Strategy approved by the Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Board identifies the following overarching goals, which are to be achieved by 2020:

- Better health and wellbeing – to increase the time that people in Lancashire can expect to live in good health, and narrow the gap in health and wellbeing for the population of Lancashire
- Better care – to deliver measurable improvements in the people's experience of health and social care services
- Better value – to reduce the cost of health and social care, while at the same time increasing its effectiveness by promoting collaboration and integration between health and wellbeing partners.

- 11 The Strategy describes how the provision of services will need to change in order to deliver sustainable improvements in health and wellbeing, within the resources available. The changes include a shift in resources towards interventions (to reduce demand for hospital and residential services), the promotion of individual self-care and responsibility, and improved co-operation and joint working between partners. It also identifies the need to build and utilise the assets, skills and resources of our citizens and communities.
- 12 The approach adopted by Lancashire is in line with the recommendations of the Marmot Review<sup>1</sup> which highlighted the need to address health inequalities across England by:
- Creating an enabling society that maximises individual and community potential
  - Ensuring that social justice, health and sustainability are at the heart of all policies.
- 13 The use of grants to fund public health initiatives is also a recognised method of service delivery. For example, the County Council has previously provided grants to youth groups for the hire of facilities and for the development of community groups for older people.

## **Public Health and Wellbeing Budget**

- 14 The approved net budget for public health and wellbeing in 2016/17 was £28.86m. The budget is funded in part by a ring fenced grant from the Department of Health and Social Care. The grant can only be used for eligible expenditure incurred or to be incurred each year on public health functions. The public health functions are set out in the Health and Social Care Act 2012. The grant conditions allow local authorities to pool resources with other local authorities, NHS bodies or other organisations provided the expenditure is used for public health purposes and the arrangements provide value for money<sup>2</sup>. Any underspends can be carried forward to the following year within the public health reserve.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Fair Society Healthy Lives' published February 2010.

<sup>2</sup> If payments are made out of the fund towards expenditure on other functions of a local authority or the functions of an NHS body, other public body, or a private sector or civil society organisation, the authority must be of opinion that those functions have a significant effect on public health or have a significant effect on, or in connection with, the exercise of public health functions.



- 15 The overall Public Health grant to local authorities was reduced by 2.2% in 2016/17 with a further reduction of 2.5% in 2017/18. The Public Health grant allocation in 2016/17 for Lancashire was £71.9m (reducing to £70.1m in 2017/18).

## Wellbeing Initiatives

- 16 County Councillor Ali, who was the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing in 2016/17, stated that he was keen to provide one-off enabling grants to community organisations as a way to help fund individual wellbeing projects and programmes. The objective was to help develop sustainable local services which would deliver public health and wellbeing outcomes. His experience was that many community groups and organisations were struggling financially due to funding cuts. However, he believed the County Council could act as a catalyst and help these groups to secure long-term funding and support from other sources (including other partners, the National Lottery, and town and parish councils).
- 17 County Councillor Ali discussed the idea with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council and gained their support. He also consulted the Director of Public Health and Wellbeing (Sakthi Karunanithi) about the proposal. The Director agreed that the approach was consistent with national policy objectives for public health which include a focus on developing community level resilience.
- 18 As no specific budget allocation had previously been made for the scheme, officers advised that the grants could be funded from anticipated underspends in the public health budget for 2016/17 (see paragraph 35 below). County Councillor Ali decided that councillors should be asked to help identify suitable community groups and projects within their wards. He thought this approach would be more effective than advertising the scheme more generally.
- 19 Whilst there was agreement about the proposal in principle, there was no discussion about how the scheme would operate in practice. There was no detailed planning undertaken and the actual process was not agreed. Sakthi Karunanithi thought the scheme would only involve a small number of grants but it is clear that County Councillor Ali was expecting the scheme to be on a larger scale. We have been unable to ascertain whether a specific budget allocation was discussed or agreed for the grant scheme.
- 20 A number of local community groups had already approached County Councillor Martin, who was then the Cabinet Member for Adult and Community Services, for funding support in 2016/17. As these requests related to local wellbeing initiatives they had been passed to County Councillor Ali. The requests were then forwarded to Sakthi Karunanithi and were effectively the first tranche of projects to be considered as part of the wellbeing grant scheme.
- 21 The initial tranche of projects were listed in a Cabinet Member decision report, dated 1 December 2016. Eight proposed grants, totalling £74,850 were included (see appendix 1). The report noted that the projects would be delivered jointly with other partner organisations. Learning from this approach would also be

used to inform future projects intended to build community resilience and wellbeing. County Councillor Ali approved the funding.

- 22 County Councillor Ali then sent an email to all councillors on 23 January 2017<sup>3</sup>. The email asked the councillors to identify community groups or projects which might benefit from one-off grant funding, as follows:

*I would welcome any applications from elected members for small wellbeing grants for community organisations who are doing good work in their areas. There is a small pot of monies that I have allocated and as such would be happy to discuss any such project with individual members. Please forward any applications directly to me only.*

- 23 County Councillor Ali screened the suggestions as they were received. In some cases he thought the suggestions did not meet public health objectives, were poorly defined or overlapped with other wellbeing projects. He had discussions with a number of councillors to better understand what the funding would be used for before deciding which groups or projects should benefit. No record has been kept of the projects which were not taken forward or the reasons for their exclusion. The screening was also not based on any predetermined criteria.
- 24 Some councillors suggested a number of possible projects within their wards whereas others did not respond to the request. County Councillor Ali stated that he sent a number of reminders to councillors to address the lack of response.
- 25 [REDACTED] was requested to compile the subsequent reports. County Councillor Ali then forwarded details of the chosen groups or projects for inclusion to [REDACTED]<sup>4</sup>.
- 26 Officers were concerned about the number of projects which were being proposed and the process followed to assess their suitability. To improve transparency, it was agreed that specific member approval should be obtained for the list of groups or projects chosen for funding.
- 27 A second Cabinet Member decision report was therefore prepared. The report listed 56 community groups and projects, with the proposed grants totalling £208,939 (see appendix 2). Following advice from Legal and Democratic Services, the report also included details of state aid rules relating to grant funding. Reference was also made to the grant funding being subject to conditions, including clawback in the event that the funds were misused. The report also noted that *'unlike the processes applied to other established grants such as local member grants there has been no appraisal of the organisations or projects which have been proposed. However, going forward the Director of Public Health intends to propose a framework within which any future*

---

<sup>3</sup> Discussions with some County Councillors must have taken place earlier because a number of the applications for funding were received before this email was sent.

<sup>4</sup> The community groups or organisations submitted applications directly to [REDACTED] or via County Councillor Ali.

*applications should be reviewed'*. County Councillor Ali approved the funding on 9 February 2017<sup>5</sup>.

- 28 County Councillor Ali continued to receive suggestions for funding. He then forwarded details of those projects he selected to [REDACTED]. The information supplied varied in detail. Simple checks (internet searches) were made by officers to confirm that the groups or organisations appeared genuine. Administrative work was also undertaken to obtain address and bank account details, and to set up payment details on the council's financial systems. This took time and, in some cases, further information had to be obtained from the applicants.
- 29 Further discussions were also held with officers from Legal and Democratic Services, and Finance about how to strengthen monitoring arrangements and provide additional safeguards. The Monitoring Officer (Ian Young) was satisfied that the approval of the grants was lawful and in accordance with the County Council's decision making processes. The Director of Financial Resources (Neil Kissock) was also satisfied that the proposed expenditure met the conditions of the Public Health grant and could be accommodated within the anticipated budget underspend for 2016/17. As the Public Health grant is ring fenced Neil Kissock was also aware that any budget underspend could not be used to satisfy other unrelated County Council funding pressures. Officers however acknowledged that the method of selecting the projects lacked transparency and could be criticised.
- 30 Details of the proposed grants forwarded to [REDACTED] were then listed in two further Cabinet member decision reports, dated 15 March 2017 and 5 April 2017. The decision report dated 15 March 2017, listed 34 proposed grants, totalling £234,800 (see appendix 3). As with the previous report, it was noted that the proposed grants had not been subject to any form of appraisal. On the advice of Legal and Democratic Services, the report also included some additional details about the operation of the scheme, including:
- The intention of the Director of Public Health to evaluate the effectiveness of the approved projects with a view to developing criteria against which any future projects could be judged
  - The 'recommendation' that any grants over £10,000 should only be approved on an 'in principle' basis initially. The Director of Public Health would then seek additional information from the applicants to enable the projects to be evaluated and to ensure the funding would be used effectively and deliver value for money. The applicants would also need to agree to specific grant terms and conditions, including reasonable monitoring requirements.
  - For all projects, irrespective of the size of the grant, the recipients would be required to submit a completion report, outlining how the funding had been used and what the project had achieved. The details would allow the

---

<sup>5</sup> County Councillor Ali declared a non-pecuniary interest as a co-opted non-voting member of Nelson Town Council.



Director of Public Health to assess the success of the initiative and help with the development of similar schemes in the future.

The funding was approved by County Councillor Ali. He also decided that the threshold for those projects requiring additional checks and monitoring should be increased to over £15,000. This meant that only two organisations (Acorn Recovery and Pendle Leisure Trust) were required to submit additional information and sign legal agreements.

- 31
- The final decision report, dated 5 April 2017, listed five proposed grants, totalling £6,500 (see appendix 4). These projects had been omitted in error from the report dated 15 March 2017. The funding was again approved by County Councillor Ali.
- 32
- None of the decisions were subject to call-in. The decisions were also made in accordance with the County Council's scheme of delegation which allowed Cabinet Members to make financial commitments within the budget framework and to approve grants to outside bodies (unless approval was specifically delegated to a senior officer).
- 33
- Payments were processed once all the required information had been obtained from the applicants to enable them to be set up on the creditors system. The payments were charged to 'Public Health - Support Other Expenses' and split across financial years, as follows:

	£
2016/17	343,045
2017/18	179,544
<b>Total</b>	<b>522,589</b>

- 34
- Two grants, totalling £2,500 were not paid because the intended recipients failed to provide the required information (see appendix 5). The payments made in 2017/18 (excluding the grants listed in the report dated 5 April 2017) were covered by an earmarked contribution to the Public Health reserve (funded from the 2016/17 budget underspend). The grants approved in April 2017 were funded from underspends in the 2017/18 public health budget.
- 35
- Budget monitoring reports from December 2016 onwards, showed an expected underspend on the overall public health budget for 2016/17. Even with the inclusion of the wellbeing grant payments noted above, the Public Health grant was not expected to be fully spent. The overall public health budget outturn for 2016/17 was £24.66m<sup>6</sup> representing a net underspend of £4.2m.
- 36
- Letters confirming the grants were sent to the community groups and projects in April 2017. The letters set out a number of conditions, as follows:
  - The funding should only be used for the agreed purposes

<sup>6</sup> Representing expenditure of approximately £109m less income of £85m (plus adjustments).



- The County Council could request information about progress, and the grant recipient should provide this information without delay
- The County Council could ask for information and evidence to show how the funding had been spent, and the grant recipient should provide this information without delay
- The grant recipient should immediately inform the County Council if there was a delay in starting the project, the project could not be completed or the project objectives could not be achieved
- The County Council could recover the funding if the project was unduly delayed, the project was not completed, the funds were spent for other purposes or information was not provided when requested
- A project completion form should be returned to the County Council within 28 days of the scheme year end (31 March 2018)
- All receipts and records relating to the project should be kept for a minimum of seven years

37 The recipients were required to sign the letters and return them to the County Council, to confirm acceptance of the grant conditions. In the majority of cases, payments were made before the letters were issued to the grant recipients.

38 A number of grant recipients also failed to sign and return the letters. Reminder letters were therefore sent in December 2017 and May 2018. At the date of this audit, 12 grant recipients had still not complied with this request.

39 Reminder letters were also sent in June 2018 to those grant recipients who had failed to return progress reports or project completion forms. At the date of this audit, details had only been received from 57 of the grant recipients (56% of the total).

40 Officers were only expecting a small number of projects to be put through for approval. Sakthi Karunanithi stated that he became increasingly uncomfortable as the number of projects continued to increase. Officers felt that there was a political desire to ensure the scheme was a success. Officers also felt under pressure to deliver the scheme quickly. The auditors were given different reasons for the apparent urgency. Whilst no explicit deadline was given there may have been a desire to complete the process before the year-end or the beginning of the pre-election purdah. Councillor Ali accepted that the process ideally should have started earlier but he was waiting to see confirmation of the budget underspend. This only became known in November 2016. The Public Health team was not set up to administer this number of grants and therefore lacked the necessary resources and experience to ensure suitable controls were in place. ██████████ stated that it felt unplanned and rushed.

41 The email sent by Councillor Ali to other councillors implied that the funding available for the wellbeing scheme was limited. The budget allocation was not apparently discussed or agreed with officers. It is also clear that officers had not expected the cost of the overall scheme to be so high.

- 42 Except for the receipt of progress and project completion reports, no formal assessment has been made of whether the grant funding was used for its intended purposes and/or the projects achieved the expected public health outcomes. The results of the scheme have not been reported to the Health and Wellbeing Board or other Council committee.
- 43 There is some evidence of other funding being secured by grant recipients but there is also evidence of possible duplication of funding (for example free swimming sessions funded through Barnoldswick Town Council, Brierfield Town Council, Nelson Town Council and directly with Pendle Leisure Trust).
- 44 As noted above, no complete record has been kept of the suggestions made by County Councillors or the projects which were not put forward for approval. Many of the applications from community groups and organisations were also initially received by Councillor Ali before being forwarded to [REDACTED]. It is therefore not possible to determine how many of the projects were initiated by Councillor Ali himself. However, it is also noted that approximately £268k of the grants were awarded to projects in whole or part benefitting Nelson and the surrounding area.
- 45 County Councillor Nikki Hennessey was photographed outside the Age UK Wellbeing Centre in Ormskirk holding a cheque for £1,000. The cheque gave the impression that the funding was being provided by the Labour party rather than the County Council. This was clearly misleading. It is understood that other Labour councillors were photographed with similar cheques.

## Conclusions

- 46 The idea of providing funding to community groups and organisations as a way of building resilience and improving health outcomes at a local level is in line with national policy and the County Council's Health and Wellbeing strategy. The approach has also been replicated by other councils.
- 47 The involvement of other councillors in the process of identifying possible projects also has benefits. Councillors have a good understanding of their local communities, the different groups and organisations who are operating, and the needs and priorities of their residents.
- 48 The process followed to assess and select projects was however inadequate. The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing allowed himself to become directly involved in the selection process even though he was also promoting and overseeing the scheme, and approving which projects would receive funding.
- 49 There was no objective assessment of the proposed projects to determine whether they would deliver public health outcomes in line with the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. There was also no assessment of whether the projects offered value for money. It is also not clear whether the wellbeing grant scheme was a priority compared to other possible public health activities or initiatives.
- 50 The approval of the projects was undertaken in accordance with the County Council's decision making processes and was therefore lawful. However, the

Cabinet Member should have limited his involvement to setting the overall scheme objectives and principles. Officers should have been asked to administer all other aspects of the scheme, including determining which projects were recommended for funding (using pre-determined criteria).

- 51 There was inadequate planning before the scheme was launched. Whilst there was an anticipated underspend against the 2016/17 public health budget, there does not appear to have been any discussion or clear agreement about the level of funding which would be made available to support the scheme. Officers appeared to have little prior knowledge of the actual number of projects which might be included or how the scheme would operate in practice. No process had been established to assess the suitability of the proposed projects or to administer the payment of grants. There also seemed to be an expectation that a scheme involving over 100 grants could be set up and delivered within less than three months. This was unrealistic, particularly given the limited resources available within the Public Health and Wellbeing service and the absence of any existing systems or processes for administering a scheme of this nature.
- 52 The Director of Public Health and Wellbeing expected the scheme would involve a small number of projects. The risks to the County Council were limited and he thought a light touch approach was therefore appropriate. There were also perceived benefits in running a small scale scheme as this presented a learning opportunity which could help inform the development of larger scale projects in the future.
- 53 Officers quickly realised that the actual number of projects being proposed was far greater than they expected. At this point, officers should have advised the Cabinet Member to delay the roll-out of the scheme so as to enable more robust systems and processes to be established. However, officers felt under pressure to deliver the scheme because it was regarded as a priority by the Cabinet Member and had the backing of the Leader. Officers instead chose to introduce a series of additional control measures to help protect the County Council and the public funds which were being made available.
- 54 Officers were satisfied that the grants were intended to support activities which would benefit public health and wellbeing. The expenditure therefore met the conditions of the Public Health grant. This funding was not otherwise available to support other council budget pressures.
- 55 Adequate audit trails do not exist to show which projects were not taken forward or the reasons for their exclusion. It is also not possible to identify the projects suggested by each County Councillor. As a result there was a lack of transparency about the process followed. This has made it difficult for the County Council to respond to questions or challenges. There was also a lack of adequate segregation in decision making. The Cabinet Member was effectively selecting and approving projects for funding, including projects within his own ward.
- 56 The conditions included in the grant acceptance letters sent to community groups and organisations (for those grants under £15,000) were appropriate. However,

the letters were sent after the majority of the grant payments had been made. This has undermined the County Council's ability to take action against those community groups and organisations who did not sign and return them (and who subsequently may have failed to comply with the grant conditions).

- 57 The actual vetting of the groups and organisations to determine their authenticity prior to the award of the grants was limited.
- 58 Since the award of the grants there has been only limited monitoring of the projects with progress reports and project completion forms being returned in only 56% of cases. The information and evidence provided by the grant recipients has also been variable. No formal assessment has been made to determine whether the overall scheme was successful in delivering the required public health outcomes and/or the grant funding was used for its intended purposes in each case.
- 59 It was not appropriate for County Councillors to give the impression that the funding was being provided by anyone other than the County Council.



## Cabinet Member decision report – 1 December 2016

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>£</b>
Veterans Association UK	Veterans Association UK - supporting veterans (Burnley)	5,000
South West Lancashire Independent Community Advice Network	South West Lancashire Independent Community Advice Network (Skelmersdale)	4,000
Calico Enterprise Limited	Calico Enterprise Limited - Unity Hall - Community Café (Nelson)	35,000
Sahara in Preston	Sahara in Preston Luncheon Club	4,000
Southfield Community Action Forum (SCAF)	Southfield Community Action Forum - tackling social isolation (Nelson)	9,400
Migrants Wellbeing Association Lancashire	Migrants Wellbeing Association Lancashire (Nelson)	7,500
Crawshawbooth Community Association	Crawshawbooth Community Association - local community activities (Rossendale)	5,000
WOW (Women Organisation for Walverden)	WOW - Women Organisation for Walverden (Nelson)	4,950
<b>Total grants approved</b>		<b>74,850</b>

## Cabinet Member decision report – 9 February 2017

Recipient	Project	£
Chorley & South Ribble Shop Mobility	Chorley & South Ribble Shop Mobility (Chorley Shop Mobility)	2,000
Access Alpha Ltd	Access Alpha Ltd (Mental Health Support for Women in Burnley & Pendle)	6,895
West Lancashire ARC CIC	West Lancashire ARC CIC - Women in Our Community	4,800
Dance Syndrome	Dance Syndrome (Chorley and South Ribble)	2,110
Bradley Community Association	Bradley Community Association - Women 2 Women events (Nelson and Brierfield)	5,800
PEEF Peoples Enterprise & Empowerment Forum	PEEF Peoples Enterprise & Empowerment Forum - BME Elderly (Pendle)	7,000
Preston Muslim Forum	Preston Muslim Forum Luncheon Club	3,500
The Leyland Project	The Leyland Project – diversionary activities (South Ribble)	1,000
Stacksteads Countryside Park Group	Stacksteads Countryside Park Group Rossendale Lantern Parade	1,000
Ali School of Mixed Martial Arts	Ali School of Mixed Martial Arts (Nelson)	4,992
ITHAAD Community Development Trust	ITHAAD Community Development Trust (Pendle)	8,200
Alf's Blackbelt academy in Stacksteads	Alf's Blackbelt academy in Stacksteads (Rossendale)	1,000
Rising Bridge Community Association	Rising Bridge Community Association	1,000
Divine Days Creative Arts CIC	Divine Days Creative Arts CIC (West Lancashire)	1,000
Scaitcliffe Community Centre	Scaitcliffe Community Centre – over 50's programme (Hyndburn)	5,800
Barnoldswick Town Council	Barnoldswick Town Council - free child holiday swim initiative - West Craven	7,050

Recipient	Project	£
	Sports Centre, Pendle Wavelengths and Pendle Leisure Centre	
Brierfield Town Council	Brierfield Town Council - swimming (Nelson)	5,500
Nelson Town Council	Nelson Town Council - free swimming – Pendle Wavelegths	10,496
INTACT Centre Ingol	INTACT Centre Ingol - Fit and Fat Free (Preston)	5,000
Fable Arts - Shrimptown	Fable Arts – Shrimptown (Fylde)	5,000
Burnley Wood Community Centre	Burnley Wood Community Centre (Burnley)	9,801
Evanfest 17	Evanfest 17 (Preston)	600
Pendle Support Care Services Enable U	Pendle Support Care Services Enable U / Dance Class CIC	3,020
Colne Open Door	Colne Open Door - community celler creative hub	10,000
Cottage Lane Misson	Cottage Lane Misson - Messy Church & luncheon club (Ormskirk - West Lancashire)	1,000
The Civic Ormskirk	The Civic Ormskirk (Ormskirk - West Lancashire)	1,000
Age UK Lancashire	Age UK Lancashire - 50+ reminiscence event (Ormskirk and Skelmersdale)	1,000
Calico Enterprise Limited	Calico Enterprise Limited - Luncheon Club provision (Burnley)	10,500
Building Bridges Burnley	Building Bridges - 'Feel Good Factor' (Burnley)	2,000
Calico Enterprise Limited	Calico Enterprise Limited - heart programme tackling obesity and diabetes (Burnley)	4,500
Calico Enterprise Limited	Calico Enterprise Limited - Mediterranean food classes (Burnley)	9,500

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>£</b>
Sahara in Preston	Support to BME women with moderate mental health problems (Preston)	2,000
Fishwick Rangers	Fishwick Rangers - Street Sport & Disabled Group (Preston)	2,450
Leyland Sports Association	Leyland Sports Association - Crown Green Bowling Club (South Ribble)	4,000
Pendle District Cricket League	Pendle District Cricket League (Pendle, Burnley, Hyndburn and Rossendale)	4,200
Together Lancashire	Together Lancashire - fun, friends and food (East Lancashire)	2,000
Eagle & Child bowling club	Eagle & Child bowling club - seating & shelters (South Ribble)	2,000
Creative Futures Burnley	Creative Futures Burnley	8,800
Bacup Pride	Bacup Pride - new planters / bulbs / derelict land (Rossendale)	500
Whitworth Sports Council	Whitworth Sports Council - annual sports festival (Rossendale)	500
Community Leisure Association of Whitworth (CLAW)	The Riverside - Community Leisure Association of Whitworth (CLAW) (Rossendale)	500
Whitworth Valley Football Club	Whitworth Valley Football Club (Rossendale)	500
Mid Pennine Arts	Mid Pennine Arts - Spodden Valley Revealed - family outdoor activities (Rossendale)	500
Jinnah Development Trust Limited	Jinnah Development Trust – digital buddies (Burnley)	3,780
Lancashire Council of Mosques	Lancashire Council of Mosques - health & wellbeing projects (East Lancashire)	5,000
Haslingden St. James' CE Primary School	Haslingden St. James' CE Primary School - sensory room (Rossendale)	2,845



<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>£</b>
Christine Stringfellow (Fylde Arts – Lytham)	Fylde Arts – tea party (Lytham)	1,500
Lytham Community Choir	Lytham Community Choir (Fylde)	5,000
Skelmersdale Men Aces	Skelmersdale Men Aces – adventure and training (West Lancashire)	5,000
Friends of the Estuary Coastal Care Group	Friends of the Estuary Coastal Care Group (Fylde)	900
Park View 4 U	Park View 4 U – gardening club (Fylde)	5,000
Kingsfold Primary School	Kingsfold Primary School – nurture group (South Ribble)	200
Homestart Holiday Hunger Project	Homestart Holiday Hunger Project (South Ribble)	3,500
Face to Face Group	Face to Face Group – children with special needs (Heysham)	1,000
Colne Open Door	Colne Open Door – high visibility jackets (Pendle)	200
Whitewell Bottom Community Association	Whitewell Bottom Community Association – health and wellbeing projects (Rossendale)	5,000
<b>Total grants approved</b>		<b>208,939</b>

## Cabinet Member decision report – 15 March 2017

Recipient	Project	£
The West Lancashire Pensioners Forum	The West Lancashire Pensioners Forum (West Lancashire)	1,000
Fylde Coast YMCA	Fylde Coast YMCA - free swim passes (Wyre)	2,500
Westview Community Association	Westview Community Association – Duke of Edinburgh's awards (Wyre)	4,294
AAWAZ Access Point	AAWAZ Access Point – support for vulnerable women (Hyndburn)	7,600
Extreme Fitness	Extreme Fitness – health and exercise programme (Nelson)	8,100
Pendle Borough Council	Pendle Borough Council - contribution to environmental improvement scheme (Nelson)	15,000
Lazy Days	Lazy Days luncheon club (South Ribble)	1,500
Skerton Community Association	Skerton Community Association – The Autumn Club (Lancaster)	4,500
Birchwood Junk Food Café	Birchwood Junk Food Café and Move On – West Lancashire Crisis and Information Centre	3,500
Hapton Parish Council	Hapton Parish Council - Hapton Luncheon Club (Hyndburn)	2,040
Friends of Euston Park	Friends of Euston Park – play equipment (Preston)	500
Acorn Recovery Funding	Acorn Recovery Projects – healthy eating (East Lancashire)	18,000
(Fulledge) Belmont Community Association	(Fulledge) Belmont Community Association – health and wellbeing activities (Burnley)	4,000
Migrants Wellbeing Association Lancashire	Migrants Wellbeing Association Lancashire – reducing social isolation (Pendle)	8,400
Ultimate Strength & Fitness	Ultimate Strength & Fitness – independent wellbeing centre (Pendle)	13,200

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>£</b>
South West Lancashire Independent Community Advice Network	SWLICAN South West Lancashire Independent Community Advice Network – conferences (West Lancashire)	5,000
PULSE	Peoples Umbrella for Learning, Socialising and Empowerment – events and activities to combat loneliness and isolation (West Lancashire)	5,000
Community Rooms CIC (E Rooms)	Community Rooms CIC (E Rooms) – free music workshops (Skelmersdale)	1,000
Garstang Memory café	Garstang Memory café (Wyre)	7,000
Burnley FC	Burnley FC in the Community – support to people with poor mental health through the ‘Active Clarets’ programme (Nelson)	15,000
Hyndburn & Ribble Valley BME	Hyndburn & Ribble Valley – support to BME community	7,200
In-Situ-In-Place	In-Situ-In-Place art programme with the Vernon Street Community Centre (Pendle)	9,400
Arooj organisation	Arooj organisation - family support service BAME (East Lancashire)	15,000
Ethnic Minority Association	Ethnic Minority Association – arts programme (East Lancashire)	10,500
Cue Foundation	Cue Foundation – community hub (Pendle)	8,300
Parish of Nelson Little Marsden	Parish of Nelson Little Marsden - music therapy project (Pendle)	4,200
Life-line care 4 U	Life-line care 4 U – luncheon clubs (Burnley and Pendle)	7,200
Lancashire amateur sport club	Lancashire amateur sport club – active youths programme (Pendle)	7,200
West Lancashire Debt Advice	West Lancashire Debt Advice – advice to people with poor mental health	1,000
Nelson Football Club	Nelson Football Club – programme to improve sports participation	7,200

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>£</b>
Cottam Community Association	Cottam Community Association – install defibrillator and replace furniture (Preston)	1,656
Pendle Leisure Trust	Pendle Leisure Trust – free swimming lessons	21,510
Brierfield Volleyball Club	Brierfield Volleyball Club – national tournament (Pendle)	2,300
Leyland Methodist Church	Leyland Methodist Church – coffee bar and community centre (South Ribble)	5,000
<b>Total grants approved</b>		<b>234,800</b>



**Cabinet Member decision report – 5 April 2017**

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>£</b>
Marsh Community Centre	Marsh Community Centre - health living support to young people (Lancaster)	1,000
Lancaster Green Spaces - Forest Friends	Lancaster Green Spaces - Forest Friends – volunteering activities	500
Friends of Coronation Field & Freeman's Wood	Friends of Coronation Field & Freeman's Wood – outdoor gym equipment (Lancaster)	1,000
The Friendship Centre	The Friendship Centre - reducing social isolation (Lancaster)	1,000
Breast Buddies Barnoldswick	Bumps and Babies' group	3,000
<b>Total grants approved</b>		<b>6,500</b>

**Grants not paid or repaid by recipient**

The following grants were repaid or payments were not processed:

<b>Project</b>	<b>£</b>	
Southfield Community Action Forum (Nelson)	9,400	Project not completed and funding therefore returned
Lazy Days luncheon club (South Ribble)	1,500	Address and bank details not supplied
Community Rooms CIC (Skelmersdale)	1,000	Bank details not supplied