

By: The Leader of the Council  
Chief Executive

To: County Council – 19 June 2008

Subject: **LOCALISM – A STRATEGY FOR SUCCESS**

---

## **Summary**

(1) The Council's approach to localism is at an exciting stage in its development. The neighbourhood forum model in Dover continues to be a success and the Audit Commission has commended the model. The Leader believes this is the direction of travel for other parts of the County, subject to the views of local members, other relevant authorities and community leaders. He is proposing that those Cabinet Members who are Members of Local Strategic Partnerships should work together with existing Local Board Chairmen and their Members, along with District, Borough, Town and Parish Council colleagues to agree an innovative and flexible way forward for localism in their areas. These discussions should be supported by the Community Liaison Team in Legal and Democratic Services and carried out on a phased basis over the next 6 to 9 months. The Leader remains of the view that "one size does not fit all" and it will be up to local areas to agree the way forward. The Leader is also anxious to see the localism arrangements used much more extensively by all County Directorates for "bottom-up" service and policy formulation, user consultation and involvement, supported by strong corporate leadership to ensure that this happens across the whole organisation. A two-way dialogue with District and Borough Councils, via the local arrangements, is also vital. We must encourage the communities of Kent to seize the opportunities that localism provides to secure ownership of activities in the areas in which they live and communicate with elected Members from all 3 tiers of local government to perform their roles as frontline Councillors. The County Council's strategy for localism, properly resourced and expertly delivered, will achieve this aim.

## **Introduction**

(2) At the County Council meeting on 3 April, the Leader undertook to report to the Council on how it is proposed to take the Localism agenda forward for Kent.

(3) This report reflects primarily on the conclusions of the Informal Member Group: Going Local, which reported to the County Council in September 2007 and provides an update on where we are on the key recommendations from the IMG. The report also mentions the main aspects of feedback from the recent Corporate Assessment, which commented that outcomes from the Local Board structure were mixed but that the neighbourhood forum model in the Dover District was worthy of further exploration for other parts of Kent.

(4) In the Leader's ongoing discussions with District and Borough Council leaders in Kent, they have explored how working together can enhance the value of our respective strategies for community engagement but equally, there is a wide spectrum of views about the County Council's existing Localism work held by District and Borough leaders, ranging from successful and fully integrated to disconnected and irrelevant.

(5) The Leader has agreed with the Kent leaders that Localism arrangements should, in future, be tailor-made to the specific requirements of the relevant area, with more flexibility on design and governance. There should be no "one size fits all" approach and there are a number of variables in terms of structure, financial arrangements, membership, chairmanship, format of meetings, powers, etc that the Leader is keen to see deployed locally in an innovative and imaginative way for the benefit of the people of Kent. This is vital to reaffirm and strengthen the Kent Commitment and enhanced two and three tier working.

## **Background**

(6) The County Council agreed a Local Board structure in July 2003, with one Local Board for each Borough/District Council area. This has been successful in building capacity in Localism in terms of networks, awareness, trust and capability to work at a local level with tangible outcomes. However, success has been varied and it is considered that the model going forward must have more local flexibility to reflect the widely varying characteristics and needs within Kent.

(7) Between March 2006 and September 2007, the Informal Member Group: Going Local was commissioned to make recommendations to the full Council on:

- (a) functions that could be undertaken by a local democratic structure; and
- (b) the impact of the Government's agenda for Localism for current democratic structures

(8) The key outcome of the Informal Member Group was that the Council should build on the positive outcomes of its Localism work, particularly the Dover model and the joint Local Board operating in the Tonbridge and Malling area. At its meeting on 6 September 2007, the County Council welcomed the report of the IMG and agreed that the proposals be submitted to Cabinet so that a series of options be developed for taking Localism forward in Kent with other local authority partners. At its meeting on 17 September 2007, the Cabinet welcomed and noted the report as a sound basis for taking forward Localism in Kent.

(9) The various recommendations from the IMG are set out below in a table, with an appropriate commentary alongside each one detailing the progress made and proposed future action:

**Progress Report on the key recommendations from the Informal Member Group: Going Local**

<p>(a) The principle of setting up Joint Local Boards/Forums with District/Borough and Town/Parish Councils be accepted;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported.</p>
<p>(b) Localism should be more outcome-focused with regular reports to Cabinet, Cabinet Members and others; there should be prompt feedback to the public on specific issues raised at local meetings and that all forms of media including electronic media should be utilised;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported. Strong corporate buy-in will be important to ensure that feedback to the local forums is timely, comprehensive, objective and acted upon appropriately.</p>
<p>(c) Two key objectives in the way forward should be to meet the “place shaping” agenda envisaged by Lyons and to encourage all political representatives to become champions and leaders for their communities;</p>	<p>Working in partnership with the remaining two tiers of local government in local areas will help to achieve the place-shaping agenda, as well as supporting frontline Councillors and Community Calls for Action.</p>
<p>(d) There should be clear links to Local Strategic Partnerships (LSP), Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP) and other structures set up in response to new initiatives, for example, Children’s Trusts, with Member roles and accountabilities defined to meet objectives of the Kent Commitment and individual Council needs;</p>	<p>This is a worthy guiding principle and we must be careful to ensure that there is synergy between all of the local engagement activity across Kent. Relationships between various participative forums must be effective and avoid duplication or over-consultation. We believe that further work will be needed as neighbourhood forums evolve.</p>
<p>(e) Local Board outcomes need wider publicity at local level, not just in the press, but through structured local networks including the development and use of modern systems including the web and Kent TV;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported</p>
<p>(f) Chief Officers and Cabinet should identify which services can be delegated to local level and influenced by local Member views based where possible on community needs and preference;</p>	<p>It will be an important part of the role of local arrangements that Local Board/Neighbourhood Forums are able to influence, commission and prioritise services for their communities.</p>

<p>(g) Budget options and priorities for local service provision should have major Member influence locally so that prioritisation of spend at local level is a bottom up process within an overall financial settlement;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported.</p>
<p>(h) KCC should explore further with District Councils and other local partners what they believe would improve community engagement at all levels within their district, within the objectives of the Kent Commitment;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported and the strategy outlined in this paper will achieve this aim.</p>
<p>(i) KCC should adapt Local Boards and extend Joint Local Boards and Neighbourhood Forums to other Districts according to local wishes;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported and is exactly what this paper is seeking to do.</p>
<p>(j) Member Development (including the need for training of Chairs of Local Boards and Forums) should be structured to achieve the objectives set out above and to embrace KCC's "ways to success" strategy so that the public's views and needs can be responded to in an appropriate way;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported and will feature as a specific development area within the overall Member Development Policy, which is due to be submitted to the full Council for approval at the next meeting.</p>
<p>(k) There should be an improvement in informal consultation processes for local services (e.g. based on similar lines to those operating within Kent Highways Services) and resources should be made available for the new strategy;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported.</p>
<p>(l) The roll-out of the Gateway facilities should be used for the co-location of Member and local services surgeries;</p>	<p>This principle is fully supported.</p>
<p>(m) There should be a mechanism to assess the effectiveness of the overall structures emerging from the Kent Commitment and associated new partnerships;</p>	<p>It is proposed that this important principle should be monitored by means of an annual report to the Corporate Policy Overview Committee.</p>

<p>(n) In light of the emerging policies on Localism, resources should be made available to enable the new strategy to be delivered; the role and number of Community Liaison Managers will need to be re-defined together with the need for support staff;</p>	<p>The Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership will assess resource requirements as the Council's strategy for localism develops and the Leader is committed to ensuring that appropriate resources are made available in the current year and future years.</p>
<p>(o) Selected KCC grants and those of other public, private and voluntary bodies should from 2008/09 be aligned with the objectives of KCC and DC Community Strategies and be used as an incentive for levering in additional money and pooling of resources;</p>	<p>This is an important principle, which will feature in the discussions involving all of the key authorities and organisations going forward.</p>
<p>(p) Where there is agreement, there should be an option for Joint Transport Boards or Youth Advisory Groups to be merged with the new Joint Boards;</p>	<p>If there is consensus locally, there is no reason why this recommendation should not be pursued and will feature in the local discussions going forward as indeed will streamlining appropriate District based Member briefings.</p>
<p>(q) Consideration should be given for the new Joint Boards to play a role in Community Call for Action through local scrutiny; alternatively, District Council Scrutiny Committees could be augmented through co-option of KCC Members;</p>	<p>This is a worthy principle and further work will be required to achieve it fully. It is worth noting that the CFE Policy Overview Committee has agreed to set up a sub group to scrutinise the activity of the locality based Children's Trust.</p>
<p>(r) Chairmanship of Joint Local Boards or Fora should be determined at a local level and be open to Members from County, District, Town and Parish, on a rotational basis and according to local circumstances. There should also be a mechanism for planning and agreeing agenda topics through the year;</p>	<p>Achieving buy-in at a local level will be important if the localism strategy is to be achieved. The issue of chairmanship is part of achieving buy-in and will feature in the local discussions going forward. With regard to the transitional phase, it is suggested that all of the existing Local Boards should remain, even if they only meet once in the next 12 months, whilst other structures are developed and embedded.</p>

(s) Given its objectives for Localism, KCC needs to consider what its response would be in the event of a District Council not wishing to be a partner in such an enhancement to Local Boards	The County Council would do all it could to ensure this did not happen, but in the eventuality it did, the situation would be accepted, with regret.
---	--

### Local policy context

(10) The Dover model continues to be a real success of the Council's Localism strategy (see appended case study of the neighbourhood forum model in Dover District), but in order to move forward in other parts of Kent, it is appropriate to remember that KCC is not the only public authority attempting to engage in Localism. These include:

- **Kent County Council** – as well as Local Boards and Neighbourhood Fora, service directorates have already adopted delivery structures to engage and consult at a local level both in relation to communities of interest and communities of place, e.g. school clusters, highways community operations, adult social services, rural regeneration etc;
- **District Council Arrangements** – District and Borough Councils have already developed/are developing their own Localism arrangements through a variety of mechanisms in response to the same Government agenda;
- **District Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs)** – District LSPs are providing a local mechanism for driving local community priorities across the public sector partners at the District level. This includes the recent integrated East Kent LSP;
- **Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs)** – The Police and Justice Act 2007 introduced new national standards that places a legal duty on CDRPs to undertake their own community engagement. The Act also requires the establishment of a Countywide CDRP. It is worth noting that Dartford and Gravesham agreed in 2007 to integrate their CDRPs’;
- **Town and Parish Councils** – represent the embodiment of local representation at the sub- District level. One of the successes of the Neighbourhood Fora model operating across Dover is the involvement of the Parish Councils;
- **Partners and Communities Together Panels (PACT)** – A countywide initiative established by Kent Police alongside the roll out of its Neighbourhood Policing Programme, which established local panels to agree priorities and work with local authorities to solve this problems.

(11) It is a vital aspect of moving forward with Localism in Kent that the unique characteristics of existing, successful partnerships are maintained and enhanced and that duplication of effort, consultation fatigue, confusion and poor communication are avoided at all costs.

(12) It is also relevant to bear in mind the known and likely future shape of the Government's expectations for local government in relation to democratic engagement and local service improvement work. Of particular significance is the place shaping role defined in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, i.e. denoting a set of activities and behaviours that characterise the pivotal role of local government in a particular area. The 2007 Act also empowers citizens through "Community Call for Action", which should result in a greater role for the scrutiny of services locally and a greater role for scrutiny generally in relation to the performance of other public services providers.

(13) The Sustainable Communities Act 2007 is intended to give local people more control over improving their community by establishing community panels, which can suggest ways in which local spending can be better used to improve local services and the quality of local life, including suggesting the transfer of functions between different public agencies. The Empowering Communities White Paper – promised for later on this summer is likely to resurrect many ideas put forward by David Milliband in 2005/06 about 'double devolution' with communities having input in local budgets and influencing their own service delivery standards.

### **Key Challenges**

(14) Localism is vital to the County Council in relation to the terms of the 'Kent Commitment'; it is what Members, our partners and the public expect. It is clear going forward that flexibility in piloting Localism models is key to a successful strategy. Kent has widely varying characteristics and needs. It is essential that working with our partners we continue to be innovative to our approach to the Localism agenda providing the flexibility to achieve the best outcomes for the public and our partners.

(15) The Leader is committed to see the County Council take the next steps forward in its Localism Strategy and that we explore through one or more pilot areas giving greater empowerment to elected Members, e.g. maybe by allowing Members to commission and prioritise through Kent Highways Services an agreed level of work to enable certain decisions to be made at a local level. Of more significance, however, is the need to ensure that there is the flexibility at a local level and appropriate levels of local Member grants.

(16) Accordingly, there are a number of key issues that the Leader would wish to promote for local debate in terms of the future for Localism in Kent.

## *Governance*

(17) The Governance arrangements must be clearly defined and agreed to by each of the partner bodies, yet remain simple and flexible. This will include clear terms of reference, clarity on the role and purpose of the body, procedural rules both for meetings and the decision making process, the allocation of grants and funding streams. Ensuring the appropriate checks and balances in decision-making is important, but local arrangements need to be fleet-footed and not too bureaucratic. They need to be developed individually to meet local circumstances and need.

(18) The governance arrangements and procedure rules for the Dover Neighbourhood forum model appear to offer an appropriate balance between “due process” and flexibility, but the Leader is keen to explore other governance methods that will achieve our aims.

(19) Discussions and work is advancing positively with colleagues from Gravesham Borough Council in starting three Neighbourhood Forums in the Gravesham Borough Council area two urban Fora (in an un-parished area) and a rural Forum where the Borough is parished. Furthermore, agreement has been reached in principle with the Leaders of both Canterbury City Council and Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council to pursue neighbourhood forums in conjunction with County and Parish Councils. These pilots should be implemented in the first phase of the implementation of this next stage of the localism strategy and will also provide an excellent opportunity to explore greater involvement of the third sector in the arrangements.

(20) The existing Dover model is a combination of single Member and joint Member neighbourhood forums (5 in total) and it would be a matter for Members to decide whether to coalesce along these lines, dependent on geography and a willingness/appropriateness to do so. For instance, the Leader is minded to explore joining with Mrs Stockell and Lord Bruce-Lockhart in a neighbourhood forum covering their 3 electoral divisions. In an ideal world, the Leader does not imagine more than 3 or 4 neighbourhood forums in a District/Borough area, unless the resources to support localism were increased substantially.

(21) The Leader would like to see an annual meeting within each individual Borough and District area whereby all three tiers of Local Government come together possibly to discuss the past year’s achievements and set out delivery plans for the following 12 months. The Leader has no wish to be too prescriptive about these annual meetings but they could also include a public debate on a single issue of particular relevance to local residents. Again, this could easily be designed into the new governance arrangements for our Localism strategy.

(22) The Leader believes, however, that there will be a need to retain the overarching local board structure to oversee the District/Borough based neighbourhood forums and collectively decide upon Small Community Capital Grant allocations. These do not necessarily need to be public meetings.



(23) The Leader also wants to re-assess the effectiveness of Directorate briefings, which in some cases are very poorly attended by elected Members yet they are provided for the benefit of Members. The Leader believes that there is scope for briefings involving more than one Directorate and sharing these with our Borough/District colleagues; a two-way conversation more along the lines of a “place briefing”. The Leader also wants to explore whether there are more effective ways of keeping local Members more effectively informed, which builds capacity for Members and the officers who support Members. The Leader is looking forward to the outcomes of the Informal Member Group Member Information being chaired by Mrs Dean which is seeking to address some of these issues.

### *Finance*

(24) The Leader is keen to ensure that the amount of money for individual Members to spend in their local areas is sufficient to really make a difference to service delivery and the Leader is looking at ways to increase the overall amount by reviewing the current funding streams.

(25) As Members will be aware, there are currently three different funding streams (see attached appendix 2 for the 2008/09 figures), as follows:-

- **Members Community Grant** – each Member has £10,000 a year to be spent in the financial year on schemes and projects that provide benefits to the community and where the Member is of the view that it is a good idea and worthy of support;
- **Small Community Capital Grants** –these are grants up to £20,000 per scheme for capital expenditure (a total of £500,000 is available across the County each year). The amount available is allocated according to the population for each Local Board area;
- **Local Schemes Grants** – allocated to Local Boards pro rata to the Council Tax on second homes in each Borough/District. One of the principal aims of Local Schemes grant has been to support initiatives compatible with KCC’s “Towards 2010” Strategy. A total sum of £400,000 is available across the County each year.

(26) The Leader has asked the Cabinet Member for Finance to review the amount of money available to elected Members to spend in their local areas on local priorities.

### *Resources*

(27) The Dover model is successful but requires a greater investment of resources, particularly in relation to the frequency of meetings in the District and the work involved in servicing the highly effective workshop-style meetings. If the neighbourhood forum model is extended to other parts of the County, the Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership will need to ensure that the number of Community Liaison Managers is appropriate in order to support the new arrangements as they are introduced over the

coming months, together with any relevant additional support staff that might be required. Any increases in resources for grant giving will also require a greater input from the Finance and Community Liaison teams in terms of managing the grants process from initial enquiry to post grant-giving audit requirements. In addition, marketing and publicity for Local Boards and forums was highlighted as an important issue in the Going Local IMG report and the impact on Corporate Communications would need to be properly assessed and funded if the Localism strategy going forward is to be a success.

(28) Members are reminded that £345K was set aside in the current financial year for taking forward the Localism Strategy. As we are now part way through the current financial year, not all of this money will be spent and some of this funding has already been utilised to strengthen the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Function, as this was a key outcome of the corporate assessment. As we move forward with the Localism Strategy as outlined in this paper, it may well be that additional funding is required and the Leader is fully committed to supporting this as part of the budget setting process.

#### *Member Development*

(29) The Council is currently reviewing its approach to Member Development and we intend to achieve the South East Charter for Member Development by the end of this municipal year. An important part of the Member Development strategy and programme will be how frontline Councillors are supported in terms of their community liaison and development role. Appropriate resources will be allocated for this purpose.

(30) It is also relevant to say that localism is more than just having a coordinated structure of meetings with other authorities and partner organisations working in a particular geographical area. The real challenge in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is for elected Members in all tiers of government to be engaging dynamically through a variety of channels, including via electronic media. Face-to-face engagement will always be important but, as an excellent and innovative authority, KCC must embrace both existing and emerging technologies to improve the active participation of all of the communities we serve. Accordingly, the Council must explore best practice nationally as a matter of urgency to ensure that elected Members are fully supported and afforded opportunities for development in these important roles.

#### **Next Steps**

(31) In the Leader's discussions with colleagues and the Leaders and Chief Executives of Borough and District Councils, he would like to see the County Council's Localism strategy reviewed and refreshed as indicated in this paper and phased in across the County by the end of 2008/09 at the latest, subject to adequate resources being available.

(32) Accordingly, it is proposed to the County Council that each Cabinet Member who serves on one of the Local Strategic Partnership Boards should formally liaise and consult with the existing Local Board Chairmen and Members, District/Borough and Town/Parish Council colleagues, supported by the Community Liaison team, to negotiate the preferred way forward for Localism in their areas. This will involve the retention of some form of local board and a neighbourhood forum model, which will hopefully include representation from all tiers. Once there is agreement, work will commence to introduce the preferred model to that part of the County with appropriate governance arrangements. It is appropriate that the Council should evaluate all models after a period of one year.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**That the Council:**

**(1) Notes the contents of this report; and**

**(2) Approves the proposals contained in paragraph 32.**

Report author: Peter Sass/Paul Wickenden

Tel No: (01622) 694002

e-mail: [peter.sass@kent.gov.uk](mailto:peter.sass@kent.gov.uk) or [paul.wickenden@kent.gov.uk](mailto:paul.wickenden@kent.gov.uk)

Background information:

## Appendix 1

### The Neighbourhood Forum model in Dover District – a case study

During the course of 2006, the principles of the 5 Dover Neighbourhood Fora were agreed with Dover District Council, the Kent Association of Parish Councils and local Town and Parish Councils within Dover District. The first two rounds of meetings took place in November 2006 and June 2007. In October 2007, agreement was reached between KCC and Dover District Council to continue with the Neighbourhood fora in Dover until 31 March 2009.

The Dover Neighbourhood fora are recognised as being a successful model of Localism with the following positive attributes:-

- Involves all 3 tiers of local government in the Dover area.
- Fully involves the public in workshop-style, problem-solving, discussion and debate, rather than a more traditional public meeting with a top table of Councillors, the public facing the top table seated in rows and limited, controlled opportunities for public participation.
- A number of statutory and other partners have attended forum meetings to assist and guide discussion on specific topics, e.g. Primary Care Trusts, the Government Office for the South East (GOSE), health authorities, the police and Dover Harbour Board.
- As far as is possible, all Members agree to keep party politics out of the forum meetings.
- Responsive – requests for information and agreed tasks are taken away and actioned. Progress reports are made to the next meeting.
- The Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of the forums are elected locally by and from each of the three tiers of local government, which helps to ensure local commitment and ownership. Whilst all Chairmen were KCC Members and Vice Chairmen were all Town or Parish Council Members in year one, this is now changing in year two.
- The average attendance by members of the public has been 40 at each local forum, which compares favourably to the figures for Local Boards
- Nearly all of the Town and Parish Councils have attended and some have provided clerks for the meetings.
- Within the same overarching Terms of Reference, each forum is slightly different in its construction, format and style, depending on the characteristics of the local area.
- Discussions have been lively and interactive, with a relaxed and informal chairing style, which has helped to realise many interesting suggestions for service improvement and priorities locally.
- Relationship building between local members representing the 3 tiers has been positive.

- It is hoped that by agenda setting for the medium term (say, up to a year ahead) will help to sustain interest and commitment from the community.
- The Small Community Capital Grants have attracted match funding from Dover District Council.

A great deal of effort goes into planning the agendas for local forum meetings, depending on the topic(s) under discussion, the venue, the number of known speakers and the organisations they represent and the desired outcomes from the meeting, be they problem-solving, prioritisation of actions, service improvement ideas, etc. Support from District, Town and Parish Council Members and Officers is seen as vital, both during the pilot stage and going forward. The round-table workshop style is both productive and rewarding but can be resource-intensive and assistance is required to “scribe” and feedback from mini-group discussions. Levels of participation from this type of model are much higher than a typical public meeting, where only a small percentage of attendees will want to stand up and speak in a formal setting.

There is a growing appetite for the devolution of certain functions to the forums. These include deciding which pot-holes should be filled, aspects of grounds and parks maintenance, library opening hours etc. Making differences locally, such as re-siting a bus stop, preventing continued fly-tipping in a particular area or improving signage generally, both empower and sustain communities.

To date the two biggest achievements that the Dover Neighbourhood forums have brokered are:

“Teen Fusion”: a meeting with young people in November 2007 showed how desperate they were for something to do in the Deal area. Following the meeting, the partners to the forum have started “Teen Fusion”, which is an under-18’s monthly disco. These have proved so popular that some 850 people turned up to a recent one and it has now been decided that these will take place twice a month. This is a true partnership, with Parish Councils agreeing to provide funds to lay on buses to and from the venues for young people; Police Community Support Officers agreeing to escort the travellers for safety and security reasons; and the PCT now also wishing to get involved by taking the opportunity to talk to young people about health issues, including healthy eating, exercise, smoking, alcohol and teenage pregnancy.

“Deal with it”: a local environmental group has been created through the Neighbourhood Forum to take action locally in response to climate change. Their first major task is to persuade local retailers in Deal to not use plastic carrier bags. Other local environmental initiatives will follow.

### Current Local Board Grant Schemes

(position for 2008/9 as known at 9/5/08)

Local Board	No. of Members	Member Community Grant (see note1)	Local Schemes Grant (see note 2)	Small Community Capital Projects Fund (see note 3)	Local Board Total	Mid 2008 District population estimate	Notional Local Board Grant total per head of District population
		£	£	£	£		£
<b>Dartford</b>	6	60,000	9,600	31,900	101,500	89,653	1.13
<b>Gravesham</b>	5	50,000	5,200	34,500	89,700	96,891	0.92
<b>Maidstone</b>	9	90,000	12,800	51,500	154,300	144,814	1.06
<b>Tonbridge/Malling</b>	7	70,000	14,300	40,800	125,100	114,586	1.09
<b>Tunbridge Wells</b>	6	60,000	29,800	37,400	127,200	105,112	1.21
<b>Sevenoaks</b>	7	70,000	12,000	40,100	122,100	122,647	0.99
<b>Thanet</b>	8	80,000	72,500	46,700	199,200	131,327	1.51
<b>Dover</b>	7	70,000	65,300	39,000	174,300	109,543	1.59
<b>Shepway</b>	6	60,000	55,600	36,600	152,200	102,760	1.48
<b>Ashford</b>	7	70,000	21,600	40,700	132,300	114,449	1.15
<b>Canterbury</b>	9	90,000	56,600	53,800	200,400	151,224	1.32
<b>Swale</b>	7	70,000	44,700	47,000	161,700	132,231	1.22
	<b>84</b>	<b>840,000</b>	<b>400,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>1,740,000</b>	<b>1,405,237</b>	<b>1.23</b>

Notes:

**Note 1** – Member Community Grant is based on a fixed allocation of £10,000 per Member.

**Note 2** – Local Schemes Grant is divided between Local Boards pro rata to the income accruing to that District from Second Homes Council Tax.

Several Local Boards then choose to subdivide the total so that individual Board Members can make recommendations relating to their electoral area.

**Note 3** – The Small Community Capital Projects Fund comes from KCC's Capital Budget. Its allocation between Local Boards is made pro rata to District population. A small minority of Local Boards then subdivide the Board total to individual Member areas. Originally, KCC had intended the Small Community Capital Projects Fund to rise to £750,000 for Kent from 2007/8 but this did not happen.