



**REPORT ON THE  
CONSULTATION ON  
INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT  
FOR THE VCS**

**IN**

**NEWCASTLE**

**SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2007**

Charity No. 226263

## INTRODUCTION

This consultation consisted of 3 main pieces of work:

- A** A questionnaire to the NCVS membership
- B** A Focus Group programme
- C** Discussion with funders, and an analysis of the current funding scene.

These are reported in 3 sections.

## A - SUPPORT SERVICES SURVEY

### Introduction

This questionnaire was sent to all NCVS members to establish what their support needs had been in the recent past; whether they had received the help they needed, and what agencies had been used.

The questionnaire was sent to 428 organisations, 361 in electronic form, and 67 in paper form. 68 (15%) responded.

### A caution

Some caution is needed in interpreting the results. The major point to note is that it goes to one person in the organisation; that person may be new, and not know what help has been sought; they may not know which other members of the organisation have sought help; they may or may not consult others to try and get a complete picture before completing the questionnaire. The combined effect of all these factors is that the results will almost certainly underestimate both the demand for and supply of such services.

Some estimate of the degree of difference can be suggested by the fact that 21 organisations report using NCVS for advice on constitutions, while the NCVS monitoring shows that in the last year 213 organisations have received such advice. This is not to suggest that the survey is not helpful; but that it is not useful for suggesting **absolute size** of demand, but only for the **relative importance** of various areas of need.

### What services were needed

Respondents were asked if they had needed help in 20 key areas, and also given space to mention any other areas where they needed help. Table A shows the results. Not surprisingly, advice about funding topped the list, with 60% of the sample having needed help in this area. The second most frequent need was advice on constitutions, with 40% of respondents having needed help. These two findings will come as no surprise to anyone working in the field.

No heading was completely unused, but the two least mentioned were Social Enterprise and Quality Systems, with 7% and 6% respectively.

The rest of the areas were needed by between 10% and 29% of the sample.

Respondents were also asked if there were other areas where they had needed help. 7 organisations responded, but many of these suggestions were more specific examples of work that would actually fall under one of the given headings, especially funding advice and financial advice. Only 3 suggestions were seriously different, mentioned once each, and they were:

- help with child protection
- waste management
- ancient monuments

This data indicates quite clearly that the areas on which the sector needs support are well understood by the relevant agencies.

### **Obtaining Help**

In the same question, respondents were asked if they had managed to obtain help. Table A also shows this, with the percentage of those needing help in each area who found it. The range goes from 40% to 100%, and it is notable that in a quarter of the areas listed, 100% of those needing it had obtained it. In a further 7 areas over 80% had obtained the help they needed. The least satisfactorily met area was Social Enterprise, but very few had needed it in the first place, so the numbers are very small, and therefore not reliable. Averaging all areas, 82% got the help they needed.

In addition, some follow up phone calls and visits were made to explore why people felt they hadn't got help when needed. Though the numbers were small, the results were interesting.

- 1 had completed the question wrongly, and actually had received all the help required.
- 2 had received help, but it had not solved their problem.
- 2 had very specialised needs that did not fit easily under standard headings.
- 2 had found difficulty knowing where to go when they were not yet constituted groups.

### **Where the help came from**

Tables B1 – B20 show where those who got help got it from. In all areas except Employment Law and ICT the most used source of help was NCVS. In most cases the other agencies used are a broad spread, with each agency being used only once or twice. The exception is Employment Law, where solicitors and ACAS are used by several organisation, and ICT, where CITA and consultants are also cited by several organisations.

The only sensible interpretation of the data is that there is a wide range of agencies that can be used for advice on these areas, and people may choose to use them for all kinds of reasons, such as personal contact, chance, or a specialist connection, but that it is clear that the major advice agency in Newcastle is NCVS, with use of other specialist agencies in some areas – ACAS, the HSE, lawyers and consultants.

Some answers are unhelpful about locating sources – “the internet”, “newsletters”, “training” and so forth, but since these are single mentions, they do not greatly affect the overall pattern.

### **How often groups need support**

We also analysed the data to see how many areas of help each organisation had needed. The results are shown in Table C. 15% of the sample said they had needed no support services at all, and 7% had needed it only once, but the remaining 77% had needed support on multiple areas, with the maximum number of areas being 11. The mode – ie the most frequently occurring number - was 5.

This would support intuitive knowledge of the field – some organisations seek no help, either because they do not need it, or they are not organised enough to seek it; but most organisations who are plugged into the network need support in several areas.

Because we have tried to keep the questionnaire very short, we have made no attempt to distinguish different kinds of need. There is an obvious difference between seeking help on one occasion to meet a specific need – help with a constitution, for example, or funding advice; and ongoing supplies of information, such as newsletters and forums. It may well be that organisations that value and use the latter have not interpreted it as “needing advice and support”, because it is part of their ongoing work experience.

### **Organisations used for help**

This question tackled the issue in a different way, presenting a list of agencies, and asking if respondents had used them for advice or support. They were not asked what kind of support, or how often they had used them.

The results are shown in Table D. They are interesting in that they show again the predominance of NCVS, but perhaps surprisingly, the second most used agency is the City Council. There is also considerable difficulty in reconciling this data with the data in Table B1 – 20. When asked where they got support as an open ended question, a large number of agencies that Table D says have been used, were never cited. They are:

- NCVO
- VONNE
- Other CVSs
- Community Empowerment Network
- Pentagon
- Change Up Hubs

On the face of it, this makes no sense whatsoever. The only logical explanation should be that respondents received advice and support from the above agencies on a range of topics not mentioned on the “help needed” question, but this really is unlikely to be the case, as it makes no intuitive sense. The only conclusion seems to

be that asking the question in these different ways provokes different memories or interpretations in respondents, which then produces this conflicting data. Further interviews would probably discover what is happening here, but the only safe conclusion at this point seems to be that the data from this question is probably correct in its own right, but that it cannot be easily matched with the data from the preceding question.

Respondents were also asked to list other agencies used for advice and support. Table E shows the results, which cite a very diverse list of agencies, 36 in all; of which only 2 – New Deal and Newcastle University - are cited more than once. This supports the idea previously advanced, that organisations may look for advice across a wide spectrum of agencies for a number of reasons – specialist requirements; personal contacts, chance, and so forth. This is a normal and reasonable process that one would expect in a lively and pluralist society, but it has little to say about how to build a dedicated support structure for the VCS.

### **Usefulness of NCVS Services**

Given that NCVS is the main support agency, it is interesting to see whether their services are seen as useful. Respondents were given a list of NCVS major services, and asked if they had used them, and if so, whether they found them useful. Results are shown in Table F. The usage rates are rather low, compared with NCVS' own monitoring figures of organisations using these services, but this may reflect the point made on the cautionary note on page 3, that the single person answering the questionnaire will often have an incomplete knowledge of the organisation's contacts. The percentages finding the services useful are extremely high – in 16 out of the 25 it was 100%, and the lowest figure was 76%.

### **Conclusions**

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this data:

1. The areas of need for support for VCS are well understood, as no serious areas of need were revealed that were not on the questionnaire list.
2. As was predicted, the two major areas of need are funding advice and constitutional advice.
3. The predominant delivery agency is NCVS, by a very wide margin.
4. There is some use of specialists on a paying basis – accountants, lawyers and consultants, but not a great deal.
5. A very wide spread of agencies are cited as having been used, but many of them are reported only a few times, or even just once.
6. There is no evidence of any serious unmet need, though of course there are some organisations who did not find what they wanted.

Given these conclusions, a further one becomes clear – if all these NCVS services were secure, one would have to conclude that basic advice services for the VCS were in place. However since **all** the major ones are under threat from April 2008, our priority must be to try and secure the continuation of these services.

**TABLE A**  
**SERVICES NEEDED, AND OBTAINED**

	% of sample that needed help	% of those needing that got help
Funding Advice	60	88
Constitutions	40	100
Advice on Trustees	29	85
Volunteers/Volunteering	28	74
Liaison with other voluntary organisations	28	79
Financial Advice	22	100
Employment Law	19	69
Finance Services	19	92
ICT	19	92
Government Policy – Social Care	16	64
Government Policy - Health	16	82
Health and Safety	15	80
Business Planning	13	89
Government Policy - Regeneration	12	62
Equal Opportunities	12	100
Advice in a crisis	10	71
Government Policy - Other	10	71
The Compact	10	100
Social Enterprise	7	40
Quality Systems	6	100

**TABLE B – SOURCES OF HELP**

<b>B1 - FUNDING ADVICE</b>	
NCVS	22
City Council	3
Community Foundation	3
“Newsletter”	3
FINE	2
Various	2
Directory of Social Change	2
West City Project	1
Gateshead Economic Development Department	1
Community Development Worker	1
BECON	1
Guidelines from Trusts	1
National Housing Federation	1
Newcastle Diocese	1
“Workshops”	1
SAGE	1
West End Community Development Consortium	1
Joicey Trust	1
“Internally”	1
Consultant	1
Internet	1
Associate Members	1
FHL	1

<b>B2 - CONSTITUTIONS</b>	
NCVS	23
West City Project	2
Lawyer	2
Project North East	1
Gateshead Economic Development Department	1
Charity Commission	1
Interchange	1
Government Works	1
Trustees	1
FHL	1

<b>B3 - FINANCIAL ADVICE</b>	
NCVS	6
Accountants	2
Trustees	1
Auditor	1
Investment Advisors	1
Project North East	1
Government Works	1
City Council	1
Ret. Accountant	1
MBA	1
Internally	1
SAGE	1
Associate Staff	1
FHL	1

<b>B4 - FINANCE SERVICES</b>	
NCVS	9
Accountant	1
Business Link	1
MBA	1
SAGE	1
Associated Staff	1

<b>B5 - EMPLOYMENT LAW</b>	
Solicitors	6
ACAS	5
NCVS	3
Telephone Helplines	1
Internet	1
CIFD	1
H R Net	1
Consultants	1
BECON	1
Internally	1
Trustees	1
Associate Staff	1
FHL	1

<b>B6 - HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>	
NCVS	5
HSE	3
Consultant	2
Union	1
Newsletters	1
Referendum for the North East	1
Internet	1
Project North East	1
Sure Start	1
Workplace Direct	1
Internally	1
Associate Staff	1
FHL	1

<b>B7 - VOLUNTEERS AND VOLUNTEERING</b>	
NCVS *	5
CSV *	3
Volunteer Centre *	3
Project North East	1
BECON	1
Service Cadet Forces	1

\* The Volunteer Centre is jointly run by NCVS and CSV

<b>B8 - QUALITY SYSTEMS</b>	
NCVS	2
Charity Evaluation	1
BECON	1
Internally	1
Personnel Officer	1

<b>B9 - TRUSTEES</b>	
NCVS	9
Charity Commission	5
Internet	2
Companies House	1
Var. briefings	1
Governance Hub	1
Lawyer	1
BCVO Course	1
Project North East	1
Governance Works	1
Charities Aid Foundation	1
MBA	1
OSCR	1
FHL	1

<b>B10 - LIAISING WITH OTHERS</b>	
NCVS	8
Mailouts	2
CSV	1
NHS Confed.	1
Gateshead Economic Development Department	1
SITRA	1
NHF	1
Reg. Ref. Forum	1
Forums eg NYWYO	1
Networking	1
Regional Youth Work Unit	1

<b>B11 - GOVERNMENT POLICY – SOCIAL CARE</b>	
NCVS	3
Newsletter	2
Mailouts	2
NHS Confed.	1
Carers Centre	1
SITRA	1
GONE	1
Conferences	1
Reading	1

<b>B12 - GOVERNMENT POLICY - HEALTH</b>	
NCVS	2
Newsletter	2
NHS Confed.	1
Carers Centre	1
Public Health Alliance	1
National Health Cities Network	1
Internet	1
GONE	1
Mailouts	1
Conferences	1
Reading	1

<b>B13 - GOVERNMENT POLICY - REGENERATION</b>	
NCVS	5
City Council	2
Urban Forum	1
NHF	1
GONE	1
Mailouts	1

<b>B14 - GOVERNMENT POLICY - OTHER</b>	
NCVS	2
Internet	2
Mailouts	2
Ref. Forum North East	1
GONE	1
Bulletins	1
Ministry of Defence	1

<b>B 15 - THE COMPACT</b>	
NCVS	3
GONE	1
Regional Youth Work Unit	1
Training	1

<b>B16 - BUSINESS PLANNING</b>	
NCVS	2
DWP	1
Internet	1
Banks	1
Business Advice Centres	1
Governance Works	1
One North East	1
Business Link	1
MBA	1
Internally	1
Consultants	1
Trustees	1

<b>B17 - ICT</b>	
CITA Community IT	4
Consultant	3
NCVS	3
C-PAC	1
Web Design Company	1
ICT Hub	1
VONNE	1
New Deal	1
IT 4 Communities	1
Volunteer	1

<b>B18 - SOCIAL ENTERPRISE</b>	
NCVS	2
Gateshead Economic Development Department	1
Project North East	1

<b>B19 - ADVICE IN CRISIS</b>	
NCVS	3
Solicitor	1
BECON	1
Trustees	1
Ministry of Defence	1
FHL	1

<b>B20 - EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES</b>	
NCVS	2
West City Project	1
Equal Opportunities Organisation	1
NERS	1
BECON	1
Ministry of Defence	1
FHL	1

**TABLE C**  
**NUMBER OF SUPPORT SERVICES NEEDED**

<b>Number of Services</b>	<b>Number of Organisations</b>	<b>%</b>
0	10	15
1	5	7
2	8	12
3	9	13
4	9	13
5	11	16
6	4	6
7	3	4
8	3	4
9	2	3
10	3	4
11	1	2

**TABLE D**  
**ORGANISATIONS USED FOR ADVICE,  
 INFORMATION OR OTHER SUPPORT**

	<b>% of sample who have used</b>
NCVS	85%
Newcastle City Council	62%
NCVO	29%
Project North East	29%
ACAS	24%
VONNE	22%
Other CVSs	18%
Business Link	16%
Community Empowerment Network	12%
Community IT Academy	12%
Government Office North East	12%
Governance Works	4%
BECON	4%
Pentagon	3%
Change Up Hubs	3%

**TABLE E**  
**OTHER ORGANISATIONS**  
**USED FOR ADVICE AND SUPPORT**

	<b>Number of organisations using</b>
New Deal	3
Newcastle University	2
Healthworks East End Alliance	1
NHS Confederation	1
National Institute for Mental Health England	1
Mental Health Providers Forum	1
Huntington's Disease Website	1
Shelter	1
Angelou Centre	1
West End Girls Group	1
Arts Council	1
Charity Commission	1
Mentor in a larger charity	1
Management Training through Northern Rock	1
Church Community Workers Association	1
Envirowise	1
Regional Refugee Forum North East	1
North East Refugee Service	1
West End Refugee Service	1
Children's Society North East	1
Newcastle PCT	1
Health Action	1
Northumbria University	1
Durham University	1
Federation of City Farms and Community Gardens	1
Family Planning Association	1
Iranian Centre North East	1
Jet Job Shops	1
Social Enterprise Europe	1
AIDA	1
Regional Youth Work Unit	1
WECDC	1
Volunteering England	1
Woodcraft Folk Head Office	1
English Heritage	1
IT 4 Communities	1

**TABLE F**  
**USE OF AND SATISFACTION**  
**WITH NCVS SERVICES**

	<b>Used %</b>	<b>Found Useful %</b>
Funding Bulletin Newsletter	72	100
On the Hoof Newsletter	50	85
Inform Newsletter	47	100
Telephone Advice	35	100
Regen Newsletter	35	83
Funding Advice Session	34	100
Mailing Service Information	34	96
Constitution Work	31	100
CHYPIN Newsletter	25	76
Sending in Mailing Service	25	100
Advice Session (other than Funding and Information)	19	92
Member Regen Forum	19	77
Advice Session with IOs	18	100
Advice on Charity Law	16	100
Website	16	91
Volunteer Centre	15	90
Payroll Service	12	100
Member Voluntary Sector Youth Service Forum	10	100
Member Health & Community Care Forum	9	100
Advice in a Crisis	9	100
Advice on Employment Law	7	100
Accountancy Service	6	100
Financial Advice	4	100
Training Courses	32	90
Information Sheets	28	100
Used No Services	15	

## **B - FOCUS GROUP WORK**

### **Introduction**

One of the interesting points about this was that there was a very low level of interest in attending. This supports the view that while organisations value the service available from the infrastructure bodies, they don't actually want to spend their own time on the issue - they want the infrastructure to save them time, not cost it.

Two focus group sessions were offered, but only one was run due to lack of interest. Seven organisations were represented, covering a good range from a totally voluntary group to a housing association with a £5 million turnover. The group included a tenants association and a regional infrastructure organisation, so a wide range of potential support needs were represented.

The focus group worked to obtain views in 3 broad areas:

- What are the support needs;
- What level are they best delivered at;
- Are there preferred methods of delivery.

### **What are the support needs**

This exercise and discussion confirmed yet again that the list of needs that was in the questionnaire is indeed the correct list of needs in the sector, and there is no surprising area of need that is not understood by the delivery agencies. They do know what the customers want and need.

The most forceful points to come out of the general discussion was that it was clear that those present saw NCVS as the natural supplier of the majority of infrastructure support, and that they put a surprisingly high value on the role NCVS plays as an interface with statutory authorities, particularly the Council. It was described by one participant as a useful buffer between the Council and the VCS.

### **Level of Delivery**

The group was asked to consider if there were services that were best delivered at different levels – local, sub regional, regional and national.

There was an extremely strong preference for local delivery, so much so that it was quite hard to get the group to consider the other levels. There seem to be 2 main drivers for this – ease of personal access, and wanting agencies with good knowledge of the local situation.

Most of them used some national resources, usually NCVO and/or the national organisation in their area of work. They all felt it was useful that this information level was available.

On the regional level, most accepted the idea of policy and liaison work done with regional agencies, such as GONE and ONE, but they did not come up with the idea on their own initiative, and weren't terribly enthusiastic about it.

On sub regional delivery they were extremely clear that they could think of nothing that could be appropriately delivered at that level. They would not even accept a policy and liaison role as they did with regional work, because they could see no important sub regional agencies where liaison was needed.

### **Methods and Delivery**

The group started by using a checklist of possible delivery methods. They were clear and unanimous in their view that all delivery methods are useful at different times and for different people. However they were also unanimous in their view that sometimes advice must be delivered personally, because of the need for discussion, explanation and reassurance. The internet, written material and toolkits will never remove the need for personal interaction.

However they do all use the internet more, and do find it useful; and they find paper information such as newsletters and information sheets especially useful as they can be physically passed around, both within their own organisation and to other organisations.

### **Conclusions**

The work with the focus group supported some of the major conclusions of the questionnaire work, but obviously produced some new ones because of the more personal nature of the input, and the different agenda.

The 3 conclusions that are the same are:

1. The areas of need for support for the VCS are well understood, and there were no new areas of need revealed.
2. The predominant delivery agency in the city is NCVS.
3. There is no serious evidence of a lot of unmet need.

In addition some new conclusions can be added:

4. There is very strong support for continued local delivery.
5. There is little support for regional delivery, and virtually none for sub regional delivery.
6. A total mix of delivery methods is perceived as useful, and there is a unanimous view that personal contact will always be needed.

## C – FUNDING CONDITIONS

### Background

In 2005 the multi-agency campaign group **Invest 2006** warned of the impending dramatic loss of funds for the VCS, arising largely from the end of the Single Regeneration Budget; changes to European funds, and possible changes in the way Lottery funds were going to be disbursed to the VCS. Most of what the group predicted has come to pass, and there is indeed a severe shortage of funding in the sector.

Such a shortage of funds tends to affect infrastructure bodies particularly severely, as they are often perceived by funders as somehow less important than front line organisations. The dearth of funds is likely to be exacerbated by the squeeze on Local Authority budgets, as they tend to be an important, if not the main, funder of infrastructure bodies.

### The City Council

In Newcastle, the City Council and the Newcastle Strategic Partnership (NSP) currently have two main funding strands for supporting the voluntary sector infrastructure:

- A historic core grant to NCVS to provide basic infrastructure support.
- Grants from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) to support the voluntary sector and a wider community function in which 4 organisations, NCVS, Healthy City, East End Partnership and West End Community Development Consortium co-operate to provide these varying kinds of support. The Community Empowerment Network is included in this.

With the ending of the current NRF programme, most of the latter function is under threat, as it is not known what will be possible under the new NRF programme. General opinion, confirmed in discussions with the Acting Chief Executive of the NSP, is that it will be difficult to continue the funding at the size it is at present. If so, the community and voluntary sector support at present supplied will be badly affected.

There will also be a threat to NCVS provision of core services support. The ending of NRF, and of a grant from Northern Rock Foundation, plus uncertainty over the future Change Up programme, means that in April 2008 NCVS is in danger of losing:

- 50% of its volunteer bureau capacity
- 50% of its information advice capacity
- 75% of its policy and liaison capacity

These losses, if they occur, will severely affect the availability of infrastructure support to the sector.

We consulted with Newcastle City Council, as they are clearly the main funder of the infrastructure in the city. They were clear that:

- they see infrastructure support as best delivered locally, and would be unlikely to fund measures outside their own area;
- they do not see the existence of 3 and 7 year plans as an encouragement to additional investment;
- they are unlikely to make additional investment, especially given the financial pressures arising from the Comprehensive Spending Review.

The letter stating their position is Appendix A.

There are currently no signs of any new streams of funding that might assist in this situation. Assessing some of the main contenders, we see:

**Northern Rock Foundation** – They have finished their infrastructure support programme, and also are, as everyone knows, in difficulties arising from the situation of their sponsor bank.

**Primary Care Trust** – The PCT in this area has always been very happy to use the services of NCVS, but has consistently declined over at least 2 decades to fund such core support, with the exception of a brief period when they were able to use Health Action Zone money to do so. There is no sign of them changing their stance on this.

**Big Lottery BASIS** – This is a stream of money for infrastructure support, and those lucky enough to win funds under Round 1 have indeed been helped. However it is well known that there was huge over-bidding for the fund, showing that it is nowhere near enough to meet the infrastructure's needs. Their suggested proposals for Round 2 attempt to deal with this problem by putting the money into regional and sub regional schemes, and ignoring local structures. Given that this consultation shows a clear preference for local delivery, this seems less than helpful. In addition, they do not propose to give any funds till 2009, by which time much damage could be done to the sector.

**Change Up** - It is not yet known what programmes Change Up will mount from April 2008. At present they seem to favour regional and sub regional streams, so they may be of little assistance to local delivery agencies. They also seem to be adopting the position that they do not need to fund services, and that their role is to help lever funds from other sources. In our view, this strategy is deeply misconceived.

## Conclusions

The funding situation in Newcastle means that the main aim of any infrastructure strategy must be to try and prevent impending losses to the current range of

infrastructure support services. There is a clear danger to the existing highly valued range of local services, and anything that can be done to protect them, should be.

## **APPENDIX A – LOCAL AUTHORITY POSITION**

### **Capacity Builders Consultation**

Thank you for contacting me about Capacity Builders and the Tyne and Wear Change Up Consortium.

I am pleased to acknowledge the council's role as the main funder of voluntary sector infrastructure in Newcastle. I understand that Capacity Builders are obliging NCVS to carry out a consultation and to produce both an operational plan for the next three years and a strategic plan for the next seven years on how this infrastructure can be further developed.

You highlight two themes for comment:

1. That the best way forward is to look at sub-regional delivery of service.
2. That the existence of these plans will encourage other funders, especially local authorities, to put more funds into supporting the voluntary sector infrastructure.

Our experience at Newcastle City Council is that voluntary sector infrastructure is usually best considered and indeed engaged with, at a citywide level. Whilst I am sure there are some exceptions to this the scale that allows neighbourhood projects to benefit from being part of a wider network. At the same time it allows organisations to be heard, and support given, in a timely and appropriate way.

Of course the way to develop any infrastructure is through careful planning. I do not, however, see how the preparation of operational and strategic plans will in itself offer significant encouragement to local authorities or others to invest additional funds in voluntary sector infrastructure. Indeed, the conclusion drawn from such plans could just as easily be that the sector is sufficiently provided for. Furthermore, local authorities understandably look to invest in their own geographical area and, all things being equal, would be unlikely to fund measures, particularly when resources are tight, outside their own part of the sub-region.

Newcastle City Council already makes a major investment in voluntary sector infrastructure. In my view, it is difficult to see how a sub-regional approach or the production of these plans could lead to an even greater level of funding. And this is before considering the financial pressures which may be placed on local authorities by the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007.

I hope these views will be helpful to you and am happy for you to incorporate them into your consultation.

**George Kelly**

**Head of Policy & Programme Integration, Newcastle City Council**