# [2011]

# Berkhamsted Ideas Delivered



Claire Lynch DBC

Contents	Page Number
Background	2
Planning Meeting	3
Publicity	4
Management of Bidders	5
Voting Event	6
Results & Next Steps	7
Evaluation	8-13
Cost of BID project	14
Appendices	1-20

## Background

#### Consultation

Berkhamsted Youth Town Council was involved in 'Have Your Say' consultation in December 2010. From that consultation it was established that too many opportunities were organised and offered to them and not enough opportunities were given for them to organise themselves. BYTC identified that they were keen to take on a new, innovative and challenging project which involved a 'hands on' approach which would make them feel like they had an influence.

#### Stags Lane Development - 106 money

In July 2008, Dacorum Borough Council received £40,000 as a Sport Facilities contribution from the Stag Lane development in Berkhamsted for use towards the "improvement of sports facilities in the vicinity of the development or facilities serving the Development". The s106 did not specify a particular project but specified that the funding must be spent by 5.8.13 and that this could be allocated to a third party.

A proposal was made to the Corporate Strategy Steering Group to use the participatory budgeting process as a way of determining how best this funding should be used to meet the needs of the local community. The proposal was for BYTC to lead the project, supported by the Neighbourhood Action Team.

#### The Process

Participatory Budgeting is a long process which involves the steering group making all the decisions about the project.

#### Introductory meeting

- The chair and key members of the group were briefed about the project and asked if they wanted to take on the role of the steering group.
- Kevin Ambrose from the PB unit explained the participatory budgeting process and the group watched a DVD about previous projects.



#### **Planning Meetings**

- Key members of the group presented the ideas to the full youth council to seek agreement to take the project forward.
- All the key decisions that needed to be made were outlined by Kevin Ambrose from the PB unit.
- Date for voting event was decided.
- The time plan was put together based on the date of the event and the key decisions that had to be made.
- Monthly Youth Council meetings were used to make the main decisions. Subgroup meetings were planned when needed based on the schedule.

Appendix 1 – PB Schedule



#### **Criteria and Ground Rules**

It was essential that only projects which are eligible for funding under the terms of the s106 were taken forward to the consultation stage. A structured decision making process was essential to prevent any conflict of interest. Examples of what would and would not constitute an eligible bid were incorporated into the criteria and ground rules for the day.

Appendix 2 – Criteria and Ground Rules

# Publicity

The Berkhamsted Youth Town Council was keen to get involved in every aspect of the process, including designing the publicity. 3 members of the steering group met with the designers to discuss their ideas. An additional meeting was held with one of the group to review draft ideas. The final draft was created by the designer and Gemma Dalton, Youth Town Councillor. Gemma created all the BID lettering and passed this on to the designer for use in the final publications.



Appendix 3 - Full size Leaflets

#### **Leaflet Distribution**

Each home in Berkhamsted was leaflet dropped twice. The first leaflet explained the project and invited people to bid for the money. The second leaflet invited people to the bidding event.

#### **Gazette Articles**

Clare Muir, Clarke for the Youth Town Council led on liaising with the Gazette. 3 Articles were written; the first explained the project and invited people to put bids forward. The second focused on Gemma Dalton, Youth Town Councillor who led the Youth Council in the Project. This was an interview style article and also publicised the voting event. The final article reviewed the voting event and results.



#### **Management of Bidders**

Gemma Dalton, Youth Town Councillor and Clare Muir, Clarke for the Youth Town Council managed all enquires regarding the bidding process and sent applications to interested parties.

Every person that enquired received the following documents by post;

- Letter
- Copy of Criteria & Ground Rules
- Application Form

Berkhamsted Youth Town Council has	Application Form
been allocated £50,956 by Dacorum	First Name
Borough Council for Sporting Facilities	Sumame
in the HP4 area, its up to YOU the people	
living in HP4 to decide how this is spent.	Address
For local people, charities and community groups, it is up to YOU to	Postcode
come up with ideas for sporting equipment. We welcome bids from £1-£50,956.	Telephone No.
The outcome will be decided by YOU at a voting event on Sunday	Email
30 October in Berkhamsted Civic Centre, YOU will have the	
opportunity to hear presentations from all the bidders and YOU will	Are you representing a group? Yes No
decide how the money is spent.	If you have ticked yes please state the name of the group
A	What is your project? (please use additional sheet if needed)
Y V OF O	How does your project benefit the HP4 area?
the second se	

Appendix 4 & 5 – Full sized Application & Letter to interested parties

#### **Reviewing the applications**

27 completed bids were received and reviewed by the BID steering group against the criteria. 22 of these met the criteria outlined by the steering group. Bidders were sent a letter telling them if they were/ were not successful.

Appendix 6 - Letters to Candidates



2 groups pulled out of the process 1 week before the event. Voting forms had already been printed at this stage; this meant that 2 of the bidders listed would not be presenting on the day.





# Voting Event

Appendix 11 – Results

Letter

The voting event was the most successful first event that has ever take place in the country.

- 245 people attended the event •
- 35 of these were under the age of 10 •
- 187 people were eligible to vote •
- Doors were shut at 3pm as specified in all publicity, 5 sets of people were • turned away after this time as they were late and so not eligible to vote.
- 19 of the 20 bidders presented at the event •
- 11 of the 19 groups received the funding requested •
- 3 of the bids listed on the voting form were not there on the day -2 pulled out • after printing and 1 did not show up. This caused problems with 4 residents who voted for a project that were not there.





## **Results and Next Steps**

The results from the votes were counted on stage and shared with the audience. Kevin Ambrose and Gemma Dalton were the returning officers and had the final say if a vote was eligible. Results could be viewed after the event from;

- Berkhamsted Town Council Newsletter and Website
- Berkhamsted Living
- Dacorum Borough Council Website
- Dacorum Digest
- Local Newspaper
- Notice Boards in the area

#### **Briefing Meeting**

All successful applicants met with the steering group to agree the terms of their funding. A legal agreement was signed by parties involved and paperwork was provided for the groups to keep their accounts.

Appendix 13 – Legal Agreement

Appendix 14 – Statement of Accounts

#### **Progress Report**

A progress report will be presented by all successful bidders at the Berkhamsted Town Council AGM in April 2012.

# Evaluation

115 evaluation forms were returned from the 245 attendees. The vast majority of these (74%) first heard about the event by word of mouth (44%) or from another meeting or group (30%). Only 18% of people indicated that they first heard about the event via the leaflet through the door. 96% of respondents were there to vote (71%) or vote and bid for funds (25%).







87.50% of people either agreed (50.90%) or strongly agreed (36.60%) to the statement 'I was given the opportunity to be involved with this project'. 2.70% or 3 people disagreed (0.90%) or strongly disagreed (1.80%). The remainder were unsure (2.70%) or neither agreed nor disagreed (7.10%).

82.30% of respondents either agreed (49.60%) or strongly agreed (32.70%) with the statement 'the event has given me the opportunity to influence decisions'. 4.40% or 5 people disagreed (3.50%) or strongly disagreed (0.90%). 11.50% or 13 people neither agreed nor disagreed.

81.60% either agreed (50%) or strongly agreed (31.60%) with the statement 'I would like to be involved in similar projects in the future'. 5.30% or 6 people disagreed (4.40%) or strongly disagreed (0.90%). 9.60% or 11 people neither agreed nor disagreed.

78.10% of people agreed (55.30%) or strongly agreed (22.80%) with the statement 'I enjoyed the event'. 7% or 8 people disagreed (3.50%) or strongly disagreed (3.50%). 12.30% or 14 people neither agreed nor disagreed.



#### 5. What would you improve about the event?

60 people responded to this literal question, some of the respondents wrote more than one way to improve the event. 72 different ways were noted and categorised, displayed in the bar graph on the opposite page. The length of the day was the most common response – 8 people identified that it was too long. The temperature of the room was also common with 6 respondents pointing this out.

6 people proposed that the voting should rank all the projects or at least 5 instead of 3 to make it fairer. 6 people also stated that they felt that the size of the organisation you attend and the number of supporters you brought along had a direct impact on the result.

5 people thought that all of the money should have been divided so that all the groups got some. 5 people also thought that there should have been a maximum amount for people to bid for and better advertising. 5 people identified that the voting forms needed to be amended. This was due to the fact that 2 groups pulled out the week before and 1 did not show up on the day.

3 people thought that the voting process was flawed/ not democratic and 4 people would have liked their voting forms before all the presentations. (Please see the bar graph opposite for the remainder of the proposals)

The main factors that will be presented to the steering group if this event is to take place in future;

- 1. Use electronic voting to shorten the length of the day.
- 2. Ensure that the venue has adequate ventilation for the numbers attending.
- 3. Allow voters to rank projects based on how many have entered i.e 1-5 or 1-10.
- 4. Do not print the voting forms until the day before the event in case people pull out.
- 5. Give every member of the audience their own list of presenters before the presentations.
- 6. Clearer information before the event on how votes will be counted.











# Cost of the BID project

The total cost of the project came to £3,790.77. The costs were incurred through the design of the leaflets, printing and delivering two set of 11,000 leaflets to every home in the HP4 area. Designing and printing the application and voting forms, refreshments and hall hire.

#### Breakdown of costs

200 A3 posters	103.00
11,000 A5 posters	495.00
100 A4 folded leaflets	094.00
11,000 A5 leaflets	495.00
350 A4 Leaflet	143.30
Design and Artwork	400.00
Delivery of leaflets 01/08	850.00
Delivery of leaflets 17/10	850.00
Hall Hire	145.75
Refreshments	139.72
Admin Costs	075.00

Total £3790.77