

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/16 REPORT NO. 31

MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

Cabinet -22nd July 2015

REPORT OF:

Chief Executive

Contact officer and telephone number:

Alison Trew tel: 020 8379 3186

alison.trew@enfield.gov.uk

Agenda - Part: 1

Item: 13

Subject:

Enfield Residents' Priority Fund

Wards:

All

**Cabinet Members consulted: Councillors
Brett, Oykenner and Georgiou**

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Enfield Residents' Priority Fund (ERPF) has been in operation since 2011 and has been a great success. Over the four years, more than 750 projects worth £6.1m have been devised by residents working with ward councillors.

Increasing pressures on the Council's budgets led to the decision not to continue with the ERPF in 2015/16.

£63,115 of the 2014/15 ERPF resource was not allocated to projects. The ERPF Cabinet Sub-Committee agreed that they wish to ensure that residents benefit from the funding and having considered a number of options, are making a recommendation to Cabinet.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet approve

2.1 The closure of the ERPF and that the £63,115 unallocated funding from the 2014/15 ERPF be returned to the General Fund.

2.2 Following 2.1 above, that £63,115 be redirected to Environment and Regeneration to fund additional environmental improvements to be delivered in the wards (as directed by the ward councillors) for the unallocated ward funding as set out in Appendix 1 of the report. An earmarked reserve will be set up and managed by the Director of Regeneration and Environment.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Enfield Residents' Priority Fund (ERPF) has been in operation since 2011 and has been a great success. Over the four years, more than 750 projects worth £6.1m have been devised by residents working with ward councillors. The projects have varied in size and covered a wide range of activities and age-groups, and brought real benefit to communities and neighbourhoods across the Borough.
- 3.2 Increasing pressures on the Council's budgets led to the decision not to continue with the ERPF in 2015/16.
- 3.3 Following the final meeting of the ERPF Cabinet Sub Committee, £63,115 of available funding across a number of wards remained uncommitted. (List of wards and amounts - Appendix 1). Given the small amount of funding available, and reduction in officer capacity to quality assure applications and support the delivery of projects, it was felt that it would not be feasible or cost-effective to continue with the ERPF. The money would therefore be returned to the Council's General Fund.
- 3.4 However, members of the ERPF Cabinet Sub Committee felt that this funding should still be available to enable ward councillors, in consultation with local residents, to initiate activities to improve their local areas. It is proposed, therefore, that the funding be allocated from the General Fund to Environment and Regeneration to enable public realm activities such as additional street cleansing and the removal of fly-tips to be delivered.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

To continue with the ERPF until the funding has been allocated. It was felt that, given the small amount of money and the amount of officer and Member time to effectively deliver the programme, this was not feasible

5. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

To provide clear direction.

6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

6.1 Financial Implications

There is £63,115 of unallocated funding remaining from the 2014-15 allocation which is available to redistribute as set out in the body of the report. The £63,115 of unallocated funding will be transferred to an earmarked reserve for use on specific Regeneration and Environment projects in agreement with the Director of Regeneration and Environment.

6.2 Legal Implications

The recommendations outlined in this report are in accordance with the Constitution and with Part 4.8 the Financial Regulations.

7. KEY RISKS

7.1 Given the reduction in support and quality assurance capacity, continuing to allocate the remaining ERPF funding using the existing ERPF process could result in issues of probity and governance.

7.2 There would be the possibility of reputational risk to the Council if the remaining ERPF funding was not used for its intended purpose of providing direct benefit to local residents.

8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

Fairness for All Growth and Sustainability, Strong Communities

Implementing the recommendations will ensure that the funding is spent on activities where there is evidence of genuine need and that contribute to the creation and maintenance of strong communities.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

Environment and Regeneration will ensure that allocation of the funding follows the Council's policy and procedures. Applications to The Enfield Community Support Fund must demonstrate how they support the Council's key aims of achieving Fairness for All, Growth and Sustainability and Strong Communities, and how they build community resilience and address inequality.

9. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Distribution of the funding will be effectively monitored.

Background Papers

None

Appendix 1 –Enfield Residents’ Priority Fund 2014/15 - unallocated funding

WARD	Unallocated ERPF
Edmonton Green	£5,471.00
Haselbury	£4,730.00
Enfield Highway	£2,982.00
Enfield Lock	£6,505.00
Jubilee	£3,818.00
Lower Edmonton	£11,650.00
Southgate	£1,364.00
Southgate Green	£11,100.00
Southbury	£3,405.00
Town	£4,568.00
Turkey Street	£6,700.00
Upper Edmonton	£822.00
TOTAL	£63,115.00