

By: Mike Hill, Cabinet Member for Customer & Communities
Amanda Honey, Corporate Director, Customer & Communities

To: Communities Cabinet Committee

Date: 14 November 2012

Subject: **Social Fund Localisation**

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: The Department for Work and Pensions currently runs a national scheme of Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans which are part of the Discretionary Social Fund. From April 2013 this scheme will cease and part of the funding will be transferred to local authorities (county councils in two-tier authorities) with the intention that they design their own local replacement schemes.

This paper provides recommendations for a one year Kent-wide pilot scheme which will test out the demands on a local scheme and the various mechanisms proposed for meeting need. The recommendations for the pilot are that the front end (claim management and decision making) should take place in a specialist team within the KCC Contact Centre. With regard to the help provided to individuals it is proposed that KCC develop mechanisms, if feasible, to meet needs in ways that do not involve giving money to an individual unless this is absolutely necessary. Instead of money, goods and services should be provided and other help given to deal with the presenting problem and, if possible, any underlying issues affecting the individual and their family.

During the pilot period key information will be collected on the nature of the demands on the scheme, claim and decision making systems will be tested and the various schemes for delivering the goods, services and cash (where necessary) will be evaluated. In addition, further public consultation will take place and the Equality Impact Assessment will be updated in light of experience during the pilot.

Recommendation: Members of the Cabinet Committee are asked to consider and either endorse or make recommendations on the Cabinet Member decision to agree that the Customer & Communities Directorate be responsible with

effect from 1 April 2013 for a one-year Kent-wide pilot scheme to test the demands of a local discretionary social fund and the various mechanisms needed to deliver it so a Kent scheme can be developed to meet the needs of the area.

1. Current scheme run by the Department for Work & Pensions

- 1.1 Currently, there is a system of discretionary payments administered by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) known as the Discretionary Social Fund. The payments (grants and loans) are designed to help vulnerable individuals remain or establish themselves in the community, or ease exceptional pressures they or their family are facing. Provision is only by means of cash and no proof is required that the money awarded is spent on what it was claimed for. See Appendix 1 for further details of the current scheme.

2. What will change from April 2013

- 2.1 The Welfare Reform Act 2012 contains measures which will abolish the Discretionary Social Fund (Community Care Grants, Crisis Loans and Budgeting Loans) from April 2013 and replace this with the following:

○ locally-based provision (provided by local authorities) to replace:

- Community Care Grants
- Crisis Loans for general living expenses AND

○ a new nationally administered (by the DWP) advance of benefit facility:

- Short Term Advances for someone awaiting their first benefit payment
- Budgeting Advances for people with certain one-off expenses

- 2.2 Funding for the locally based provision will be devolved to local authorities (county councils in two-tier authorities) in England and to the devolved administrations in Scotland and Wales. There will be no new statutory duty requiring local authorities to deliver the service and the funding will not be ring-fenced. There is no expectation that the local service will mirror the current social fund scheme and the Government has indicated that, in line with the localism agenda, local authorities should think radically and creatively about the design of their new service, developing a local system that is better targeted and will better reflect the needs of the local community. In particular, there is no expectation that the new local schemes will simply provide cash to people in need and no expectation that loans

will be provided (although in both cases these could be provided if councils so wished).

2.3 The sort of needs the local scheme will have to address can be roughly divided into two groups:

- Emergency help with food, fuel, travel expenses etc.
- Help with household items (furniture, white goods, etc) and clothing.

Proposals for dealing with such requests during the pilot period will be outlined below in section 7.

3. Funding available for the scheme

3.1 The settlement letter detailing the funding Kent can expect to receive was only sent out on 6 August 2012. The indicative funding is as follows:

2012-13	
Set-up funding	£28,638

2013-14	
Programme funding	£2,863,798
Administrative funding	£605,142

2014-15	
Programme funding	£2,863,798
Administrative funding	£554,678

3.2 The programme funding is based on previous spend in Kent between April 2011 and September 2011. This was the most up-to-date information available to the DWP at the time and the full 2011-12 year data has only recently become available (see Appendix 4). The DWP are attempting to drive down the spend on Crisis Loans to 2005-06 levels and they have said they are on target to do this. The letter states that final Programme funding will be based on spend for the 2012-13 year. If this is nearer to 2005-06 levels the Programme funding may be closer to £2.25 million for each of the two years. The funding will be provided via a Section 30 grant. Funding after the current Spending Review period is not known at this point.

3.3 Information recently communicated verbally by DWP officials is that a final settlement letter will be sent out in November 2012 and that they are not anticipating much change to the figures already given. They also stated that a discussion is taking place between the DWP and DCLG about where funding responsibility should lie after 2014-15. There has been a ministerial commitment that there will be a review of

the local schemes during 2014-15 and this will inform the next round of funding.

- 3.4 It is of particular concern that the funding transferred will not be sufficient to meet demand, particularly in view of the current uncertain economic situation and the wider welfare reforms. The funding is a fixed budget and there is a danger that it may not last for the required period. It will be vital that mechanisms are put in place to ensure the funding lasts throughout the year as there will be no additional funding from central government in the event it is used up before the end of the financial year. Finance has started work to develop a Profile Budget using Oracle that will be able to monitor monthly expenditure and ensure it stays within acceptable parameters. It is hoped that by restricting support to goods and services the money is more likely to last for the required period. The DWP has provided information on the times of the year when expenditure has historically always been significantly higher. These are the winter months, the Christmas period and the period running up to the beginning of the school year.
- 3.5 It is being recommended that the funding for the scheme be ring-fenced within Customer & Communities Directorate for the initial two-year period.

4. Policy Context

- 4.1 The reform of the Social Fund is in line with the broader localism agenda of the Coalition Government. Another example of this trend is the localisation of support for Council Tax, also from April 2013. However, not all reforms operate in this direction. The introduction of Universal Credit will see the delivery of Housing Benefit taken away from local councils (the rules have always been nationally laid down) although indications are that the Government is considering a role for them in the delivery of Universal Credit.
- 4.2 The reform is also part of the wider drive to make savings to the welfare benefit budget (see 3.2 above) alongside a desired parallel growth in non-statutory provision ("Big Society" provision).
- 4.3 In terms of Kent's agenda, the reform fits with Ambition 2 "To Tackle Disadvantage" and gives Kent an opportunity to try to deal with the need in a more effective way. The preferred option also sits well with the Customer Services Strategy as the intention is to make better use of the Contact Centre, Gateways and other customer facing outlets and with the prevention and early intervention strategy of KCC. There may be links to the "Troubled Families" agenda but this is mainly in terms of the prevention agenda, helping families before they reach the stage when more serious intervention is necessary. However, some families in the "Troubled Families"

cohort will either be current claimants from the Social Fund and/or likely to require assistance from the local scheme.

- 4.4 Developing an effective local replacement scheme would seem to be particularly essential in view of the wider context of welfare reform and economic recession. One of the keys to the success of the Government's welfare reform programme will arguably be the availability of discretionary support to vulnerable individuals at a time when they most need it. However, for these same reasons, which mean that demand may well be very high, the reform poses significant challenges.

5. Nature of the likely demand pressures on a local scheme

- 5.1 Community Care Grants (CCGs) are currently mainly claimed for essential household items needed to help vulnerable individuals remain or establish themselves in the community or to set up a new home as a result of circumstances such as domestic violence. The extract from the DWP's 'Local authority fieldwork summary report' (Annex J) reproduced at the end of this report shows a breakdown of the most common items money is awarded for. Appendix 2 gives some real case studies of successful claims. An average award is approximately £400.

- 5.2 By client group the current breakdown of claimants is as follows:

- Disabled or long term health condition – 31.2%
- Lone Parents – 29.6%
- Unemployed – 21.4%
- Pensioners – 7%
- Others – 10.8%

- 5.3 Figures are not available on the proportion of recipients that are also clients of local authority 'Families and Social Care' services. However, it is believed (including by Citizens Advice) that a high proportion of those who access CCGs (including large numbers of disabled people and lone parents) do not have high enough needs to qualify for help from social services.² Indeed the granting of a CCG often acts as a preventative measure reducing the need for social services intervention.

- 5.4 Crisis Loans for Living Expenses are awarded for immediate needs in crisis situations, usually when people do not have enough money for basic needs like food and fuel. An average award is about £60. The spend on Crisis Loans has increased dramatically since the service was centralised in 2005 and accessed mainly via a call centre. The DWP are currently engaged in an exercise to drive

¹ DWP Annual Report by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions on the Social Fund 2011/2012, July 2012.

² Communities and Local Government Select Committee report into Localisation issues in welfare reform, 13 October 2011.

down the spend on Crisis Loans as mentioned above but this may not reflect real demand.

5.5 By client group the current breakdown of claimants of Crisis Loans is as follows:

- Disabled or long term health condition – 15.9%
- Lone Parents – 12.8%
- Unemployed – 61.7%
- Pensioners – 0.5%
- Others – 9.1%

3

The vast majority of Crisis Loans are awarded to young single people under 35 who are in receipt of Jobseekers Allowance and within this group about 37% of awards are made to people between 18 and 24. Appendix 3 shows some case studies of successful claims provided by the DWP.

Appendices 4 and 5 show the spend on Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for Living Expenses in each district of Kent over a number of years and the number of claims and awards.

5.6 Although data is available on the uptake of the current scheme, it is difficult to predict the demand on the new local replacement scheme as this will be very different in nature. A fundamental difference will be that cash will not be provided except when absolutely necessary. This may reduce demand on the scheme. On the other hand, some of the other welfare reforms may lead to an increase in demand from people who do not usually apply to the current scheme. There is particular concern about the default position under Universal Credit of paying claimants in one monthly payment.

6. Reasons for recommending a one year Kent-wide pilot scheme

6.1 As stated above, the demands on the local scheme are unclear at this point. The need to develop a better picture of demand (in terms of numbers and claimant breakdown) is one of the main reasons for recommending a pilot scheme for the first year. The data collected during the pilot will assist with the full procurement process in the future.

6.2 The indicative funding for the local scheme was only released in August 2012. In order to be sure that a local replacement can be in place by 1 April 2013, plans have to be finalised by the end of December 2012 so that enough time is available to prepare for implementation. In view of the many uncertainties it was decided to propose an interim pilot scheme during which the planning for the

³ DWP Annual Report by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions on the Social Fund 2011/2012, July 2012.

final scheme can be continued. The data collected during the pilot will inform the final plans. In addition information about future funding may be clearer by the end of the pilot.

- 6.3 During the pilot period the claim and decision making systems can be tested and the various schemes for delivering the goods, services and cash (where necessary) will be evaluated. In addition, further public consultation will take place and the Equality Impact Assessment will be updated in light of experience during the pilot.
- 6.4 Postponing the decision on the final scheme gives the local councils more time to consider whether they might want to work with KCC in the delivery of the local support. As proposals for the local scheme have been developed over the last few months there have been extensive discussions with representatives of the local councils. There are clearly some advantages to locating a local scheme within existing district provision including the fact that the claimant group is more aligned with district clients than KCC clients. However it has become clear that local councils are not unanimous in wanting to deliver a local scheme at this stage and it would be unlikely that we would be able to achieve a consensus in time to get this up and running by April 2013. Local councils are facing significant other pressures in relation to Welfare Reform (e.g. the introduction of the local Council Tax support schemes in April 2013 and the fact that from October 2013 they will have to deal with the impact of Universal Credit) and this, undoubtedly will affect their ability to take on any local social fund requirements. This may change in the future. Having a pilot for the first year gives more time for this to be considered and for more clarity on the role of the districts in the delivery of Universal Credit, which may affect any decision.
- 6.4 Postponing the decision on the final scheme also gives other interested organisations more time to consider their capacity to deliver elements of the scheme on a more long-term basis. Information collected during the pilot (e.g. on the likely demand for the scheme) will assist such organisations with this.

7. Proposed key features of a local scheme during the pilot period

- 7.1 **Claim management and decision making:** It is recommended this should take place in a specialist team within KCC. The preferred option at this stage is for the team to be located, and work closely, with the existing Citizens Advice Consumer Advice team in the Contact Centre. This will involve recruiting either new or seconded staff and using part of the administration funding to do so.
- 7.2 **Budget and project management:** This will sit with Commissioned Services within the Customer & Communities Directorate. It is recommended the budget be ring-fenced for the replacement scheme.

- 7.3 **Eligibility criteria:** It is proposed that, at least initially, this should be similar to the current criteria. For example, to qualify for help with household goods a person should be on certain means-tested benefits and, in addition, have savings less than a certain amount (currently £500 or £1,000 for pensioners). Criteria for emergency provision should obviously be even stricter including that the person has no other funds available. In addition to passing this first hurdle, assistance should only be given, as now, to people who can demonstrate that they fit into certain categories of need (for example to prevent them going into institutional care or to ease exceptional pressures they or their family are facing).
- 7.4 **Emergency help with food, fuel, travel expenses etc:** It is proposed emergency help should, if feasible, be provided in ways that avoids the provision of money. Options for this are currently being considered. These include purchase of food and other essentials over the internet from supermarkets wishing to participate, arrangements with utility companies, use of travel warrants and possibly arrangements with the 'not for profit' sector. With regard to providing cash, should this become necessary, alternatives are being considered including an arrangement with the Post Office which would be able to provide a cost effective solution and would include a verification service (i.e. for checking identity, addresses, etc).
- 7.5 **Help with household items, furniture, white goods etc:** It is proposed this support would be mainly provided by linking up with the 'not for profit' furniture re-use sector in Kent. They offer a range of services including access to second-hand furniture, PAT tested electrical goods, new 'end of line' goods and 'starter packs' for people setting up homes. In addition to providing a more cost effective solution than new goods, they also assist the drive towards recycling.
- 7.6 It is considered prudent during the pilot period to have a fall back mechanism for procuring new household goods and clothes if this becomes necessary. Options are currently being considered.
- 7.7 **Market engagement:** This is being carried out via the SE portal to give organisations and companies within Kent the opportunity to take part in the pilot scheme.
- 7.8 **Enhanced information and advice:** This should include information about other sources of help including the remaining DWP Budgeting Advance schemes, Kent Savers, debt and other advice, sources of employment help, etc. The Citizens Advice service in Kent is keen to explore an arrangement whereby fast-track referral for a guaranteed number of hours of specialist advice

could be arranged in exchange for a set fee (similar to the arrangement with the KCC Help Fund). This is being considered.

- 7.9 **Out of hours provision:** Currently claims can only be made during normal office hours. Jobcentre Plus has out of hours teams that can visit (and if necessary make payments to) people outside these times but this can only be accessed via referral from the Police, Social Services, etc. According to the DWP, in 2010-11 only 11,374 referrals were made to the out of hours service in Great Britain as a whole which led to 4,667 payments at a total cost of £154,484.
- 7.10 The out of hours service referred to above will cease in April 2013. It is not intended that KCC provides a more enhanced out of hours service than that which exists currently.
- 7.11 **Data sharing:** The DWP has stated that regulations and processes will be in place by April 2013 to allow KCC to obtain relevant data on an individual's benefit status. This information is vital to determine eligibility for help from the local scheme.

Primary legislation has already been enacted (Welfare Reform Act 2012) which allows for this without the need for client consent, although good practice suggests this is preferred where possible. The most likely route the DWP will take to enable this is to give county councils access to the CIS system currently used by district councils in their benefit departments. The necessary ICT infrastructure is already in place in KCC and discussions have begun with ICT to facilitate developments. In case the necessary processes are not in place in time, contingencies are being considered.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 Organisations and key individuals in the statutory and voluntary sector have already been consulted on the best way to deliver the new responsibility. In terms of public consultation advice from KCC's Consultation team and Legal Services is that the following should be undertaken:
- After the decision is made on the general approach for the pilot scheme, some time should be spent engaging with stakeholders and advocacy groups to help finalise the details of the scheme before it is implemented in April 2013 (but not as a formal consultation exercise).
 - KCC could create a working group (with advocacy groups and other relevant parties) to review the scheme at quarterly intervals throughout the pilot year.

- Towards the end of the pilot, KCC should formally consult on a final version of the scheme that could be introduced from April 2014.

9. Equality Impact Assessment

9.1 An initial Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been carried out to identify the potential impact on individuals based on the various protected characteristics. These are: age, disability, gender, gender identity, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, pregnancy/maternity and marriage/civil partnerships. The initial screening is available on request.

9.2 It is considered that equality issues will be particularly important with regard to:

- The ability of all groups to access the local scheme taking into account the fact that certain groups may have more need of assistance under the scheme than others.
- Whether certain groups will be less able to cope with their application being declined due to the availability of other support and how this can be factored into the design of the scheme.

9.3 It is planned that during the pilot period information will be routinely collected on the protected characteristics and this data, together with the further consultation referred to above, will enable the EIA to be developed and used to inform the design of the final scheme from April 2014.

10. Key Decision recommendations

10.1 It is being recommended that the Cabinet Member for Customer & Communities takes the following decision with regard to the pilot scheme – that:

- KCC agrees to use the devolved funding for the first year to set up a pilot scheme to test how a long-term scheme might work best and the demand for a local scheme.
- the funding for the scheme be ring-fenced for the local scheme
- the criteria and terms of the scheme are....(as outlined in this report)
- the claim management and decision making take place in-house, within the Customer and Communities Directorate.
- the goods and services awarded by the scheme are provided by 'not for profit' organisations where possible or where appropriate commercial businesses commissioned to do so.
- authority be delegated to the Director of Customer and Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Customer & Communities to agree the details of the implementation including determining and appointing those companies and organisations commissioned to provide goods and services as part of the scheme.

11. Recommendations

- 11.1 Members of the Cabinet Committee are asked to consider and either endorse or make recommendations on the Cabinet member decision to agree that Customer & Communities Directorate will be responsible with effect from April 2013 for a one-year Kent – wide pilot scheme to test the demands of a local discretionary social fund and the various mechanisms needed to deliver it so a Kent scheme can be developed to meet the needs of the area.

Lead Officer: Christine Grosskopf
Tel No: 7000 6611 (01622 696611)
e-mail: chris.grosskopf@kent.gov.uk

Background documents

1. National Audit Office report on The Community Care Grant, 22 July 2010.
2. Public Accounts Committee 11th Report on The Community Care Grant, 16 Dec 2010.
3. Communities and Local Government Select Committee report into Localisation issues in welfare reform, 13 October 2011.
4. DWP Annual Report by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions on the Social Fund 2010/2011, July 2011.
5. DWP Annual Report by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions on the Social Fund 2011/2012, July 2012.
6. Local support to replace Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for living expenses – Government response to call for evidence, June 2011.
7. The Social Fund Commissioner's Annual Report 2010/2011, Independent Review Service.
8. Local authority fieldwork summary report, DWP, December 2011.
9. Social Fund use amongst older people – DWP Research Report no. 172.
10. Social Fund Community Care Grants – DWP Customer Insight Research Report 2, 2011.
11. Experiences and consequences of being refused a Community Care Grant – DWP Research Report, no. 210.
12. Settlement letter received from DWP, dated 6 August 2012.
13. CPAG report: Delivering the Social Fund at London-level: opportunities and risks, June 2012.
14. KCC Equality Impact Assessment (Initial Screening) on the Localisation of the Discretionary Social Fund, October 2012.

Appendix 1 Details of the current scheme

Current situation with the Discretionary Social Fund

Currently there is a system of discretionary payments administered by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) known as the **Discretionary Social Fund**. This is made up of three separate funds:

Community Care Grants – non repayable. These are available to people getting certain means-tested benefits like Income Support and Pension Credit or who are likely to start getting one of these benefits within the next six weeks because they are moving out of care. They are payable mainly to help people remain living in the community, to help them re-establish themselves in the community or to ease exceptional pressures on a person and their family.

Crisis Loans – repayable. These are interest free loans available to meet a person's immediate short term needs in an emergency or as the result of a disaster. There must be a risk of serious damage or risk to the person's (or their family's) health or safety. There is no requirement for the person to be in receipt of certain benefits.

Budgeting Loans – repayable. These are interest free loans for people who have been on certain means-tested benefits for at least 26 weeks. They are intended to help spread the cost of certain one-off expenses like furniture, rent in advance and removal expenses over a longer period.

In addition to the above there are various payments available under the **Regulated Social Fund** (Funeral Payments, Sure Start Maternity Grants, Cold Weather Payments and Winter Fuel Payments). These will not be affected by the proposed reforms and will continue to be administered nationally by the DWP.

Appendix 2 Community Care Grants Case Studies (provided by DWP)

The following examples all resulted in awards.

Case Study 1

Ms T made an application for a Community Care Grant to purchase a cooker, curtains, washing machine and fridge freezer. Her application was made as a consequence of her involvement in a court action which resulted in violence and threats. The police provided her with a panic alarm for her old home. However she still wished to move to new accommodation as her health was suffering because of the stress. Ms T's support worker confirmed the details were accurate.

Case Study 2

Mr G made a Community Care Grant application for a single bed. The bed was intended for the customer's son who suffers from Attention and Hyper Mobility condition. The symptoms of this condition include poor danger-awareness, falling and sleep problems. The son's health condition resulted in him jumping on the bed with such frequency that the base of his bed had broken and he was now sleeping only on the bed mattress which was further adversely affecting his condition.

Case Study 3

Mrs B applied for a Community Care Grant for a dishwasher including delivery and fitting costs, and for an orthopaedic bed. Mrs B was 76, and received Attendance Allowance, along with her Pension Credit. She had rheumatoid arthritis and took medication to help combat long-standing clinical depression.

Mrs B's bed frame and mattress was old and no longer gave proper support. She lived in a housing association flat. Mrs B's needs had recently been assessed by social services and they provided support for her application.

Case Study 4

Ms L applied for a Community Care Grant for a mattress and quilt. She received Income Support and Disability Living Allowance, and suffered from depression. She also wet the bed due to stress incontinence and had asthma. Ms L had coughing fits every night, suffered with arthritis and has a long-standing history of psychosis and manic depression. She was bed wetting at least once a night. All of this and in particular the lack of sleep was affecting her mental health.

Appendix 3 Crisis Loans Case Studies (provided by DWP)

The following examples all resulted in awards.

Case Study 1

Mr G is a 43-year old married Jobseeker and he has an 18 month old son. He applied for a crisis loan of £50 to help him buy food and pay for fuel for 4 days. He had received his usual fortnightly Jobseeker's Allowance but 4 days before his next payment of benefit was due his son had become unwell suddenly and had to go into hospital. Mr G lives in a semi-rural area with no car and as there was no public transport, and the hospital was unwilling to provide hospital transport, Mr G had to pay for a taxi to and from the hospital. This spent the final £50 of his benefit, which the family would normally expect to have lasted them for food until the next benefit payday

Case Study 2

Miss H is the lone parent of one son aged 18 months. She receives Income Support each Monday.

Miss H applied for a crisis loan of £90. She had lost her purse while out doing her main weekly shop. The purse had been on top of the hood of her baby's pushchair. She bought a couple of small things from a freezer shop, and she had her purse at that stage; she discovered it was missing when she arrived at the large supermarket when she went to look for a £1 coin to get a trolley. She had walked from her home to both shops and retraced her steps, as well as asking the staff in the freezer shop if a purse had been found, without success. Miss H said she also gets child benefit and child tax credits, but these are paid 4-weekly, with her next payment not being due for 10 days. All of this meant she needed money for food and for her electricity meter from Tuesday to Sunday inclusive, after which her next Income Support would be due.

Appendix 4 Breakdown of Expenditure on Crisis Loans for Living Expenses and Community Care Grants by District in Kent

District	CLLE 2005-2006	CLLE 2010-11	CLLE 2011-12	CCGS 2005-06	CCGS 2010-11	CCGS 2011-12
Ashford	14,000	93,700	74,100	132,800	141,600	136,400
Canterbury	35,000	90,800	82,400	176,800	166, 400	159,600
Dartford	12,000	71,700	60,900	74,800	91,200	114,400
Dover	35,000	114,400	93,800	142,600	142,200	167,800
Gravesham	12,800	87,700	85,400	87,100	136,200	152,000
Maidstone	9,700	81,000	75,400	120,310	137,800	179,000
Sevenoaks	5,900	29,900	27,100	81,700	70,900	65,100
Shepway	25,600	119,700	100,700	163,900	171,200	169,000
Swale	19,300	128,300	108,400	201,700	233.900	280,000
Thanet	34,800	246,600	200,700	362,700	351,700	349,500
Tonbridge & Malling	7,400	44,000	40,000	73,900	91,600	80,800
Tunbridge Wells	12,300	58,100	40,600	89,600	75,400	64,600
TOTAL FOR KENT	223,800	1,165,900	989,500	1,707,910	1,810,100	1,918,200

Appendix 5 Breakdown of Claims and Awards for Crisis Loans for Living Expenses and Community Care Grants by District in Kent

District	CLLE 2005-2006	CLLE 2010-11	CLLE 2011-12	CCGS 2005-06	CCGS 2010-11	CCGS 2011-12
Ashford	310 (260)	2010 (1620)	1,750 (1,390)	520 (320)	700 (350)	610 (290)
Canterbury	590 (520)	2000 (1590)	1,880 (1,490)	770 (450)	770 (420)	730 (350)
Dartford	200 (180)	1600 (1290)	1,390 (1,120)	300 (180)	460 (220)	470 (220)
Dover	430 (330)	2470 (1980)	2,220 (1,770)	750 (410)	790 (380)	810 (380)
Gravesham	250 (240)	2060 (1580)	1,980 (1,560)	370 (220)	770 (350)	700 (320)
Maidstone	210 (150)	1920 (1490)	1,820 (1,450)	480 (280)	750 (370)	800 (400)
Sevenoaks	100 (90)	650 (540)	670 (520)	280 (190)	330 (170)	290 (140)
Shepway	330 (270)	2610 (2130)	2,380 (1,930)	760 (450)	890 (450)	830 (410)
Swale	360 (340)	2990 (2370)	2,620 (2,050)	940 (520)	1260 (620)	1,220 (610)
Thanet	660 (540)	5410 (4330)	4,730 (3,810)	1730 (940)	1960 (950)	1,820 (830)
Tonbridge & Malling	110 (100)	980 (770)	920 (740)	240 (160)	430 (220)	370 (170)
Tunbridge Wells	240 (210)	1260 (1050)	940 (790)	320 (200)	430 (200)	360 (140)
TOTAL FOR KENT	3,790 (3,230)	25,960 (20,740)	23,300 (18,620)	7,460 (4,320)	9,540 (4,700)	9,010 (4,260)

NB: Claims stated first and awards in brackets

Annex J – Most common items awarded as part of a Community Care Grant

