

Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee		
Report title	Main grants programme 2015-18	
Ward	All	Item 6
Contributor	Head of Cultural and Community Development	
Class	Part 1	20 April 2015

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to outline recommendations for the allocation of the Main Grant Programme 2015 – 18 . The report details the recommendations that Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) will be asked to agree at their meeting on 13 May 2015 as well as the appeals process for organisations unhappy with officer recommendations.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that Members of the Safer Stronger Select Committee note:

- 2.1 the proposed approach for agreeing the grant allocations.
- 2.2 the proposals to fund voluntary and community sector groups, as set out in Appendix 1, for the financial years 2015/16 – 2017/18 unless otherwise stated.

3. Policy Context

- 3.1 Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2020, ‘Shaping our Future’, sets out the borough’s ambitions to encourage development, enable citizens to live healthy lives and to empower Lewisham’s communities to prosper. It has six strategic priorities, including a commitment to creating a borough that is “*Empowered and Responsible*: where people are actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities”.
- 3.2 The *empowered and responsible* strand of the strategy highlights the importance of the community and voluntary sector in all areas of public life. It recognises that the sector plays a significant part in Lewisham’s ongoing success.
- 3.3 This is reflected in Lewisham’s corporate priorities: “Community leadership and empowerment: developing opportunities for the active participation and engagement of people in the life of the community”.
- 3.4 Lewisham has a strong history of working with the voluntary and community sector and empowering residents and communities. Lewisham is fortunate to have a strong and thriving sector which ranges from very small organisations with no paid staff through to local branches of national charities. The sector includes charities, not for profit companies limited by guarantee, faith

organisations, civic amenity societies as well as social enterprises. There are estimated to be around 800 community and voluntary sector organisations in the borough.

- 3.5 What all these organisations have in common is their ability to bring significant additional value to the work that they do through voluntary support and raising funds from sources not available to other sectors such as charitable trusts. In addition they often provide services that the Council cannot easily provide; create links between communities and people; and give people a voice.
- 3.6 As well as being directly involved in delivering services to citizens in the borough, third sector organisations also provide the essential infrastructure to allow the sector as a whole to develop and support individual citizens to be able to play an active role within their local communities.
- 3.7 Lewisham was the first London Borough to develop a compact with the third sector in 2001. The compact seeks to support a positive relationship between the sector and key statutory partners. It includes expectations around the management of grant aid as well as broader partnership working principles. The compact was further developed in 2010 with the addition of guidelines for commissioning with the third sector in recognition of the important contribution that the third sector should play in identifying needs as well as potentially delivering service solutions.
- 3.8 Although the third sector's role within the commissioning of local public services continues to grow (over £30m worth of services were commissioned from the third sector in 2013/14), the council recognises that there continues to be a need for grant aid investment for the following reasons:
 - a recognition of the importance of maintaining an independent sector that can act as a critical friend to challenge public sector policy and delivery.
 - a recognition of the key role that the sector plays in building civic participation, providing a voice for seldom heard residents and providing community intelligence.
 - a recognition of the great diversity of the sector and the need to engage with small and emerging groups as well as large established organisations.
 - a recognition of the sector's potential to take risks and innovate which does not always sit easily within commissioning frameworks.
 - a recognition that third sector organisations have been key delivery partners for a wide range of targeted short term initiatives. Grant aid provides a level of security for organisations ensuring that there is a strong sector ready to work in partnership with us.

4. Current Grants Programme and changes to budget

- 4.1 The current main grants programme was agreed by Mayor and Cabinet Contracts in July 2011. Funding was provided over four themes; Children and Young People, Building Social Capital, Gateway Services and Communities

that Care. Funding was awarded to 73 organisations in October 2011 and, following two subsequent extensions, is due to expire at the end June 2015.

- 4.2 As such it has been necessary to review the current grant criteria to ensure that they are fit for purpose and reflected changes in the political and policy landscape since 2011.
- 4.3 In addition, as part of the overall reduction in Council's budget, the funding available for the grants programme has been reduced from around £5,889,000 in 2014/15 to £4,389,000 – a reduction of £1,500,000 or around 25%.
- 4.4 An element of the remaining funding has been ring-fenced for the London-wide London Councils Grants scheme and the Small and Faith Grants in Lewisham leaving an annual budget of £3,880,248 for the Main Grants programme.
- 4.5 In order to ensure that as many organisation as possible were able to receive funding the Council has earmarked reserve funding to cover projects that will only be grant funded for 2015/16, and transferred approximately £70,000 additional grant funding into the main programme. Lewisham CCG has also agreed that it will contribute £100,000 per year to the programme to support projects which support vulnerable older people.
- 4.6 This means that there is an available budget of £2,936,411 for July 2015 – March 2016 which is recommended for allocation as detailed in Appendix 1. Funding for 2016/17 and 2018/19 will be increased to a pro rata annual figure unless otherwise indicated.

5. Agreeing the Grants criteria for 2015 – 2018

- 5.1 Given the length of time since the last programme and the scale of reduction in funding the Mayor and Cabinet agreed for a full public consultation on the revised framework for the Main Grants programme. In line with the Council's Compact with the voluntary and community sector, a three month consultation period was agreed.
- 5.2 The consultation was open to all and written submissions on the proposed criteria were sought from across the borough. To support the call for written responses two formal meetings with voluntary and community sector organisations took place in July and September 2014 led by the Cabinet Member for the Third Sector and the Executive Director for Community Services. 120 individuals attended the two meetings in total, consisting of voluntary sector organisation senior officers and trustees.
- 5.3 In addition to the two general meetings, specific themes within the Main Grants programme were discussed with organisations in the following areas:
 - the advice sector
 - Communities that Care organisations (e.g. community centres)
 - transport

- organisations undertaking investment funded projects, focusing on the integration of community-based social care support
- organisations expressing an interest in undertaking community development work
- sports organisations
- arts organisations

- 5.4 In total there were 173 attendees at consultation meetings organised by the Council and a further 60 individuals were involved in the consultation at meetings organised by the VCS and attended by council officers. Officers also met with a number of organisations individually during the consultation. In addition to these discussions, two articles on the consultation were included within Voluntary Action Lewisham's magazine, Grapevine. The consultation was also available on the Council's online consultation portal.
- 5.5 Feedback from the 233 attendees at the consultation meetings and 21 individual written responses led to a number of changes in the proposed criteria including:
- recognition of the need for a coordination function for equalities work across different protected characteristics.
 - more emphasis on quality and the track record of currently funded organisations
 - a recognition of the need for support from borough wide infrastructure
 - organisations around new ways of using and sharing premises.
- 5.6 It was confirmed as part of this process that a number of areas previously funded through the grants programme would no longer be included in the criteria. These included employment and skills and youth activity and work which could be funded through schools. Employment and skills provision was to be provided through locally held Job Centre Plus budgets and related regional commissioning activity. The focus for youth activity within the main grants programme was confirmed as cultural provision as the Youth Service through both its direct and commissioned services provides for generic youth work. The importance of very grass roots responses to youth activity was recognised through the inclusion of youth activity within the Neighbourhood Community Development Strand.
- 5.7 Another key element of the consultation response was the overwhelming feedback that if a 25% reduction had to be achieved it would be more effective to fund fewer organisations better than try to apply a cut across the board and fund the same number of organisations. Only one respondent suggested reducing equally across the board.
- 5.8 The consultation response was reported to Safer Stronger Select Committee on 3 November 2014. The committee expressed concern about the lack of grass roots LGBT activity in Lewisham and requested that the criteria be amended to encourage better engagement with Lewisham residents by strategic equalities organisations.

- 5.9 The criteria were amended to reflect this and the final version were agreed by Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) on 12 November 2014.
- 5.10 In summary the criteria invited applications relating to one or more of 4 broad themes:
- **Strong and Cohesive Communities** – this theme seeks to develop and maintain strong communities and build a more inclusive and cohesive borough. It is divided into two strands, one to support Borough-wide provision and the other to fund a network of neighbourhood community development projects. With the reduction in statutory resources, residents and communities are being asked to do more for themselves. This theme seeks to ensure that there is an infrastructure across the borough that can encourage and capitalise on active citizenship, supporting grass roots activity. The theme will also fund services that provide equalities support to ensure equal access to services.
 - **Communities that Care** – the overall intention of this theme is to fund a range of organisations that together provide support to vulnerable adults to assist them in accessing services, prevent their needs from escalating, reduce the burden on statutory services and provide links between statutory services, VCS and communities in relation to working together to support vulnerable adults. The activities funded through this theme form an important part of the borough's preventative strategy.
 - **Access to Advice Services** – the advice sector provides an essential service to some of the borough's most vulnerable residents. Advice organisations provide independent, high quality advice to individuals to ensure that they receive the benefits they are entitled to, are supported to manage debts, address financial exclusion and deal with housing issues. Statutory services work closely with the advice sector as addressing these issues are of mutual benefit.
 - **Widening Access to Arts and Sports** – this theme seeks to ensure that the rich and diverse contribution that the borough's Arts and Sports organisations make to the quality of life of residents is maintained. The Arts and Sports sectors are adept at attracting resources from external funding, earned income and volunteers. However, the sectors still require a level of core funding to enable them to continue to attract these resources that would otherwise be lost to the borough. The focus of our support will be on increasing participation particularly by those who are less able to participate due to disability, economic disadvantage and age.
- 5.11 In addition to the main criteria it was recognised that in the areas of adventure playgrounds and counselling and psychological therapy services to adults with mental health needs the Council will be reviewing its provision during 2015/16. For this reason it was agreed by Mayor and Cabinet that funding for Somerville Adventure Playground and The Cassel Centre would be recommended, at an appropriate rate, despite not meeting the grants criteria

with provision reviewed in line with the overall service area during 2015/16. During the course of the evaluation it became apparent that the Lewisham Bereavement Counselling service also fell within the scope of the counselling and psychological therapy review so short term funding is also recommended for that service outside of the agreed criteria.

6. Application process for the 2015-2018 round

- 6.1 In November 2014 LB Lewisham issued the application process for its main grants programme with the priorities to be assessed across the four themes outlined in paragraph 5.10 above.
- 6.2 117 applications were received requesting annual funds of £8,940,0896 against an available budget of £3,880,248. This represents a subscription rate of 230% - for every £1 available there were requests for £2.30.
- 6.3 The requests for funding were not evenly distributed across the themes with Communities that Care receiving applications for funds totalling 2.5 times the amount requested under the Access to Advice theme.
- 6.4 In order to ensure an equitable distribution across the themes based on identified need and corporate priorities rather than simply organisational funding demand a broad theme allocation was determined as set out in the table below.
- 6.5 When the applications were allocated against these allocations it again showed the Communities that Care theme as the most over subscribed but with the Widening Access to Arts and Sports theme also having a significant level of oversubscription.

Theme Area	Total requested - annual	Total available - annual	Subscription
SCC	2,008,727	963,104	209%
CtC	3,726,882	1,250,000	298%
AtA	1,485,394	1,003,862	148%
WatAS	1,719,083	663,282	259%
Total	8,940,086	3,880,248	230%

- 6.6 A three stage assessment process was used to assess each application. The first was an assessment of how well an application met the partner profile. This assessed the organisation's readiness to work with the Council as active partners and what they can bring to such a partnership against the following categories:
- Local Intelligence - the level of understanding of local need.
 - Transformation - the ability to transform the ways of working to better meet needs.
 - Collaboration - track record of working in partnership.

- Resources - track record of attracting resources both financial and volunteer time. This section allows organisations to demonstrate their financial sustainability.
- Shared Values - commitment to London Living Wage, Equality, Environmental Sustainability
- Quality and effectiveness – how well an organisation has performed in the past and how it measures its success

6.6 These assessments were then quality assured by a manager leading on each of the four themes. The manager then assessed the proposed activity and considered how well it met the published criteria and proposed to meet the need in the borough. The assessment of the proposed activity to be funded by the grant was the key element in the assessment and it was therefore possible that an organisation who had scored highly on the partner profile might not be recommended for funding if their proposal for specific deliverables was weak or failed to meet the stated criteria.

6.7 Having considered all the applications across the theme the manager prepared recommendations ensuring a spread of provision across the different aspects of the area. These recommendations were then considered by a senior officer panel which provided a challenge function and again checked for consistency and quality of assessment before agreeing the draft recommendations.

6.8 Given the level of oversubscription a number of ‘working principles’ were adopted in the allocation of funding to ensure value for money and to avoid destabilising current provision:

- Currently funded organisations would receive growth on their current allocation only in exceptional circumstances
- Organisations would not simply be funded because they have received funding in the past, however where bids of equal value were received in similar areas those already in receipt of funding were prioritised to ensure continuity of provision and organisational stability
- Where alternative sources of council, or other, funding were available grants would not be agreed unless the provision was distinctly different to areas funded through other means
- Where the council had taken a corporate decision to decommission an existing service grant funding would not be used to replace that funding like for like

6.9 Based on the objective assessment of all the applications and guided by the above principles 62 applications are recommended for funding with 55 not recommended.

Recommended	Not recommended
62	55

6.10 This reflected the overwhelming view during the consultation that the council should fund fewer organisations at a higher level rather than try and maintain the current number of organisations at a lower funding level. The recommended number of 62 organisations represents a 17% reduction on the currently funded level of 75.

6.11 Of the 62 organisations recommended for funding 48 are currently in receipt of grant funding. Of the 48 organisations recommended for on-going funding 35 (73%) are receiving at least 80% of their current funding and 27 (56%) are receiving at least 90%. 19 organisations are recommended to receive funding at or above their current level:

Currently Funded	New Organisations
48	14

6.12 Of the 55 not recommended for funding 24 were currently funded organisations while 31 were applying for new funding:

Currently funded – not recommended for funding	Not currently funded – not recommended for funding
24	31

6.13 Overall these figures indicate that the grants programme was available for access to new entrants but that organisations with a track record of effective delivery who still met the revised criteria were slightly more likely to be recommended for funding.

6.14 The details of the allocations under each individual theme are explored in more detail below. To avoid confusion these have, as far as possible, been grouped under the primary theme despite the fact that many organisations applied under multiple themes.

6.15 This report intends to give an overview of the rationale for the decisions taken and the organisations recommended for funding but does not detail each and every recommendation – a full breakdown of the proposed allocations is contained in appendix 1 and the full assessment documents are available at appendix 2.

7. Theme 1 – Strong and Cohesive Communities. Strand 1a - Borough wide

7.1 Theme 1a was designed to support borough wide infrastructure for the voluntary sector. The criteria for the theme stated that the Council would fund a group of organisations that would adopt strong and collaborative approaches in sharing resources and minimising duplication.

7.2 Ten strands were identified to this work which grouped into three main areas:

- General organisational infrastructure support, eg networking, policy development, facilitating collaboration

- Equalities, aimed at increasing inclusivity, reducing marginalisation and identifying over-representation of particular communities requiring support
 - Promoting volunteering and brokerage services and working with community organisations to access volunteers and provide advice on volunteer recruitment, supervision and management
- 7.3 A wide range of bids was received from organisations already funded by the Council as well as those not currently funded. In some cases proposed services overlapped.
- 7.4 In the case of **infrastructure support**, there was a degree of misunderstanding as a number of organisations simply indicated that they would operate direct delivery services on a borough-wide basis rather than offering the infrastructure support described in the grant application guidance. Voluntary Action Lewisham (VAL) was the only organisation whose application fully addressed the application criteria.
- 7.5 In the case of **Equalities**, a number of organisations applied to deliver programmes or services which officers considered under the umbrella of the Council's Comprehensive Equalities Scheme (CES).
- 7.6 The CES requires all organisations to give regard to 9 protected characteristics. It was never intended that this focus should be of equal emphasis across all characteristics and the recommendations for funding reflects this.
- 7.7 The CES has 5 key objectives which themselves reflect the national legislative framework:
1. Tackling victimisation and discrimination
 2. Improving access to services
 3. Closing the gap in outcomes for different citizens
 4. Increasing mutual respect and understanding in communities
 5. Increasing participation and engagement
- 7.8 The Council is looking to a number of public sector partners as well as itself to deliver against these objectives and is co-ordinating the use of a number of funding streams to assist this process.
- 7.9 Voluntary sector grant aid is just one of these resources and the recommendations reflect where it is considered important that the voluntary sector take a leading role in representing the views of those with a particular protected characteristic.
- 7.10 Two applications – a VAL-led consortium and The Metro Centre – sought to establish a borough-wide Equalities partnership which was welcomed but neither fully captured the breadth required in delivering this approach and it is

therefore proposed to provide this co-ordination through the Stronger Communities Partnership Board led by VAL and the Council.

- 7.11 The role of this partnership would be to coordinate the work of those leading on the specific areas of the CES. Appendix 3 details how the council will work with the Voluntary Sector to deliver against the specific objective of the CES. In preparing the recommendations for funding under this theme officers have made certain assumptions:
- Culturally specific services will not be funded unless there is a clearly defined reason why these services cannot be accessed elsewhere
 - All organisations are required to have an equalities plan that looks at how due regard will be paid to the protected characteristics
 - There is a need to offer training and support to organisations to develop and deliver effective comprehensive quality plans
 - It is essential to ensure that individual residents have access to information and advice to help them challenge victimisation and discrimination
 - That neighbourhood community development will also focus on delivering equality outcomes.
- 7.12 In order to ensure that all of Protected Characteristics are covered within this theme, further analysis of equalities impact assessments is being undertaken and will be reported to Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) with the full recommendations.
- 7.13 An application was received from Equaliteam which aimed to establish a “critical friend” and equalities awards programme.
- 7.14 Equaliteam was established in 2012 as “a single focused race equality body, with due regard to all equality areas. This would be achieved by having a coordinated approach through a consortium with all other voluntary organisations and especially those providing equality and advocacy support services for other disadvantaged groups of people on grounds of sex, disability, age, sexuality, religion and belief”
- 7.15 The organisation appointed its first staff members in the summer of 2013. However, it has experienced a number of difficulties which have delayed its development. At its annual monitoring visit in May 2014, the organisation was advised that delays in developing its service delivery offer were concerning and the organisation was asked to prioritise this work. However, although the organisation has undertaken a number of stakeholder events, it is yet to start any direct service delivery. As a result of the lack of service delivery, the organisation has accrued a significant grants underspend of £184,634.
- 7.16 It should be noted that, although the organisation was initially established to provide “a single focused race equality body”, in 2014 it reviewed its priorities and decided that work with African and Caribbean communities would be its priority for the immediate future. In light of this decision, Equaliteam’s

Main Grants application in 2015 was particularly focused on the African and Caribbean communities rather than an overarching equalities offer. Given the level of underspend, the Council will discuss the possibility of Equaliteam delivering part of their proposed programme using the previously underspent grant to develop its offer. No further funding is recommended under the current Main Grants application round.

- 7.17 An application was received from Lewisham Ethnic Minority Partnership (LEMP). The service proposed in this application is not being recommended for funding because the programme proposed did not provide detail of a service at a sufficiently strategic level to address the theme requirements and to have an impact in this important service delivery area.
- 7.18 Applications to provide **Volunteering** infrastructure were relatively limited. Volunteer Centre Lewisham's application focused on volunteer training, development and capacity building and also offered a borough-wide volunteer brokerage service. A VCL consortium also submitted a proposal to work with Local Assemblies to recruit volunteers to organise activities specifically around the Big Lunch.
- 7.19 In total, 33 bids were received for funding under Theme 1a. Of these 15 were ruled out because it was clear that Theme 1a had been indicated in error – these were sports organisations and organisations representing specific minority communities offering direct delivery of very specific services. The panel also agreed that sub-sector second tier organisations would not be funded and, as a result, the Pre-School Learning Alliance's application was not recommended for funding. Of the remainder, 6 have been recommended for a funding award, with 11 failing to meet the application process requirements. All but one recommended organisation is already funded by the Council, with the Stephen Lawrence Centre being the new entrant.
- 7.20 The quality of bids received varied widely. Most organisations addressed the partnerships section of the application well, explaining current services and working arrangements clearly and with commitment. However, when it came to detail of the programmes that they intended to deliver, organisations tended to be less specific.
- 7.20 VAL will be asked to provide a leading role in supporting voluntary and community sector organisations. In addition to VAL, a proposal from Bellingham Community Project to develop work with voluntary and community sector organisations in the south of the borough is being recommended. The other organisations being recommended for funding under the Equalities strand are:
- Metro Centre
 - Stephen Lawrence Centre
 - LRMN
 - Lewisham Pensioners' Forum

7.21 Volunteer Centre Lewisham's main application will be funded, but the Big Lunch consortium did not meet application criteria. Volunteer Centre Lewisham's offer will also represent a reduction in their existing grant. It is recognised that the proposed reduction, along with loss of other grants funding may have a significant impact on the organisation and further discussion will take place with them regarding premises support and possible collaboration with other organisations.

7.22 The following organisations are not recommended for funding under this theme:

- Action Family Centre
- AFC Lewisham
- Dynamo Youth FC
- EqualiTeam Lewisham
- Indo-China Refugee Group
- Inspiring Your Imagination
- LEMP
- Lewisham Polish Centre
- Lewisham Volunteering Consortium
- Pre-School Learning Alliance
- Tamil Academy of Language and Arts
- Young Lewisham Project
- Contact a Family
- C of E Parish Church of St. Mary the Virgin Lewisham
- Forest Hill Football Club
- Hub Arts Map
- Teachsports 2010 CIC

7.23 A number of organisations that support a specific community are not recommended for funding under this theme. Similar organisations are also not recommended for funding under other themes. In order to facilitate the use of mainstream services all advice agencies are required to make their services accessible to all and the Lewisham Multilingual Advice Service is recommended to receive the full amount they applied for – a 65% increase on their current allocation.

8. Theme 1 – Strong and Cohesive Communities, strand 1b – Neighbourhoods

8.1 Within the Neighbourhood strand of the Strong and Cohesive Communities theme officers were hoping to fund (indicative £24k/ward/year) a network of organisations that will work in designated ward(s) alongside the Local Assembly to deliver Community Development. This would include:

- Practical support to build strong and cohesive communities
- Strengthening local area partnerships by bringing organisations in an area together to work collectively for and with residents in that neighbourhood, a local level infrastructure provider

- Harnessing skills and volunteer time to develop strong and resilient communities
- Facilitating involvement of residents in the issues which affect their lives; and supporting collective action to deliver change
- Identifying gaps in youth and community provision in the ward
- Delivering activities to meet gaps where possible and raise additional resources through volunteers and fundraising to extend provision

8.2 Under this new strand a total of 19 applications were received. Even if funding was agreed for all 19 this would not achieve full coverage across all the Lewisham Wards and even within the 19 the quality of the bids varied significantly.

8.3 As such officers have taken the pragmatic approach and only recommended funding for bids that were considered to have a strong chance of delivering the objectives outlined in paragraph 8.1. This means that 9 organisations are recommended for funding, covering 8 individual Ward areas, plus Teatro Vivo as a Borough Wide engagement resource available to the Local Assemblies.

8.4 The 9 applications recommended for funding are:

- Ackroyd Community Association – Crofton Park
- Bellingham Community Project – Bellingham
- Corbett Estate Neighbourhood Forum – Catford South
- Goldsmiths Community Association – Whitefoot
- Grove Park Community Group – Grove Park
- IRIE! – New Cross
- Lee Green Lives – Lee Green
- Somerville Youth & Play Provision – Telegraph Hill
- Teatro Vivo – Engagement support, all wards.

8.5 These 8 ward focused organisations, plus Teatro Vivo, give a reasonable geographical spread across the Borough, with only the South West of the Borough particularly under resourced.

8.6 The remaining funding will be used to maintain the Community Connections work, whilst officers monitor and review this new strand to see what works well, and what doesn't.

8.7 The intention is for officers to assess how this piece of work ties in with the Community Health Improvement Networks as they come on stream, alongside the need for the Community Development work through Community Connections, to ensure that all these elements are integrated and are not duplicate resources. The aim is to achieve an equitable spread of Community Development across all 18 Wards.

8.8 As this piece of work moves forwards, the Council will ensure that all 9 funded organisations, plus Community Connections work together as a Community Engagement Network.

8.9 Organisations not recommended for funding under this theme are:

- The Albany
- Creekside Education Trust
- Downham (Wesley Halls) Community Association
- The Grove Centre
- Honor Oak Community Centre Association
- Hub Arts Map (South London Art Map)
- Inspiring Your Imagination
- Lewisham Irish Community Centre
- Rushey Green Time Bank
- Young Lewisham Project

9. Theme 2: Communities that Care

9.1 The overall intention of the Communities that Care theme is to fund a range of organisations that together provide support to vulnerable adults to assist them in accessing services, prevent their needs from escalating, reduce the burden on statutory services and provide links between statutory services, the VCS and communities to work together to support vulnerable adults. The theme is split into 5 strands:

- connecting and supporting
- transport
- advocacy
- provision for vulnerable adults
- support for families with disabled children and young carers

9.2 This was a very popular area with 53 organisations applying directly under this theme and a further 5 making reference to it in their application. The theme was nearly 3 times oversubscribed with £2.98 requested for every available £1.

9.3 The organisation often applied under more than one of the 5 strands and more often than not the Connecting and Supporting strand merged with the Provision for Vulnerable Adults and these were assessed together considering both overarching and individual client group approaches.

9.4 The criteria for the **Connecting and Supporting/Provision for vulnerable adults** strands included the delivery of a volunteer befriending service for vulnerable adults who are experiencing social isolation and a network of timebanks across the four integrated health and social care neighbourhoods.

9.5 These categories also split between bids that provided for services across all vulnerable people and those providing for individual client groups (covered

individually in paragraphs 9.7 – 9.16). The below organisations are recommended for funding to deliver a range of activity including community development, coordinating timebanks across the borough, running an online system to enable people to secure personal assistants and a range of other provision:

- Albany (also see Older Adults)
- Age UK – Community Connections
- Rushey Green Timebank
- Greenwich Carers Centre
- Parent Support Group
- Noah's Ark
- Voluntary Service Lewisham

9.6 A number of organisations were not recommended for funding under this strand for a range of reasons including not meeting the criteria as set out, alternative funding streams being available, poor application forms or poor value for money. These were:

- Volunteer Centre Lewisham – the Volunteer Centre is being funded through the SCC theme
- Lee Fair Share
- Lewisham Access on Mediation Project
- Refuge
- Nar
- Marsha Phoenix
- Federation of Refugees from Vietnam in Lewisham (FORVIL)

9.7 The criteria for the **Older Adults** strand was to combat isolation, increase independence, reduce or delay the need for statutory services and offer an alternative to day centres. Services for older adults should consider how they are able to accommodate adults with dementia and identify what steps they would need to take in order to achieve this.

9.8 This was a very popular strand and funding is recommended for a range of provision on the proviso that the organisations work together to provide a network of service co-ordinated by Age UK and Eco Communities. The network would be made up of:

- Ackroyd Community Association
- Age Exchange
- Age UK Lewisham & Southwark
- Ageing Well in Lewisham
- Deptford Methodist Mission – Disabled People's Contact
- Eco Communities
- Entelechy Arts/Albany
- The Grove Centre
- Lewisham Elders Resource Centre (Seniors)
- Sydenham Garden (see also Mental Health)

- 9.9 Applications not recommended for funding generally offered similar services to those above but were less well developed, provided less clarity on their outcomes or were extremely close to a more positive bid. These are:
- 2000 Community Action Centre
 - 60 Up CIC
 - Bexley Crossroads Care
 - Deptford Action Group for the Elderly (DAGE)
 - Greenwich Association of Disabled People
- 9.10 The criteria for the **Adults with learning disabilities** strand was to extend the range of available day activities, provide access to social activities in a safe environment.
- 9.11 This strand had 5 applicants listing it as their primary focus with HeartnSoul, Mencap, Lewisham Speaking Up (also see Advocacy) and Wheels for Wellbeing all recommended for funding and only Providence Linc United Services not recommended for funding as their application was to directly replace funding previously provided through commissioning channels.
- 9.12 The criteria for **Mental Health service users** was to offer cost effective activity programmes that support mental health service users and reduce their dependence on statutory services.
- 9.13 Again there were relatively few bids aimed exclusively at Mental Health issues and both of these, Sydenham Garden and Bromley and Lewisham MIND, are recommended for funding. A application from Family Action for a floating support service is not recommended for funding as a similar service was recently decommissioned by the council through another process.
- 9.14 The criteria for the **Adults with complex social needs** required organisations to demonstrate that they would deliver positive activities for adults with complex social needs that support them to build their self-esteem and be actively engaged with their local community.
- 9.15 Both the 999 Club and Deptford Reach were able to do this effectively and are recommended for funding under this theme although Deptford Reach are not recommended for funding under the Advice theme which they also applied as it was felt it was more appropriate that this be delivered by specialist organisations with the infrastructure required to deliver this service at scale.
- 9.16 The opposite is true of the 170 Community Project who are recommended for funding under the Access to Advice theme (see section 10 below) but are not recommended for extra funding under this theme to make their service accessible for vulnerable groups as it is expected that this is part of their core offer. A further bid for the 170 Project leading a consortium of employment and training providers is also not recommended for funding as employment support

has been removed from the criteria for this round of the Grants programme (see paragraph 5.6). The final bid in this section was from CRI and offered to develop a social enterprise business for vulnerable adults. The bid had some interesting elements but represented very poor value for money.

- 9.17 The **Transport** strand was seeking an organisation or consortium of organisations that will deliver an integrated community transport service that complements existing provision such as taxi card, dial a ride etc and incorporating group transport, individual journeys and support to access other mainstream transport in order to reduce social isolation and increase access to services for vulnerable adults.
- 9.17 Complementary applications were received from Lewisham Community Transport Scheme and Voluntary Services Lewisham to continue to deliver and develop their Access Lewisham and related services. These met the criteria well and are recommended for funding.
- 9.18 The third application in this area from the Shopmobility service providing scooters and wheelchairs for hire out of Lewisham Shopping Centre is not recommended for funding as it is felt that commercial sponsorship could be sought to replace the current grant.
- 9.19 Only one application was received under the **Advocacy** strand and it is recommended to fund Lewisham Speaking Up who submitted a very positive application and have a strong track record of providing advocacy services in people with learning disabilities in Lewisham.
- 9.20 The final strand under this theme was **Support for families with disabled children and young carers** which looked for organisations which reduced social isolation and improved access to services and decision making forums.
- 9.21 Under this strand funding is recommended for Noah's Ark who provide a getaway service for a range of vulnerable people and groups in Lewisham that include young people's services and Contact a Family who support families with disabled children.
- 9.22 Under this theme funding is not recommended for Carers Lewisham as while the application meets the criteria services providing Young Carers support will be provided through the London Borough of Lewisham's Carer's funding. This funding allocation is currently being reviewed to ensure that it meets the statutory requirements within the Care Act 2014 and the Children and Families Act 2014. For similar reasons a secondary bid from Family Action is also not recommended for funding.
- 9.23 Funding is also not recommended for Lewisham Opportunity Pre-School as some years ago the Council made a decision that it would no longer be a provider of subsidised child care. Following this decision the council took steps to close/transfer the Council providers at Amersham, Ladywell, Rushey

Green and Honor Oak. The latter two are now successful social enterprise organisations operating in the market without Council subsidy which is the model recommended for other provision.

9.24 Finally a number of organisations that highlighted Communities that Care as a second or third theme were considered under their main application theme and are referenced elsewhere in this report. These are:

- Grove Park Community Group
- Indo-China Refugee Group
- Lewisham Irish Community Centre
- Lewisham Disability Coalition
- Tamil Academy of Language and Arts and Donderry Primary School After School Club

9.24 Overall, while some very difficult decisions had to be made given the funding constraints, it is felt that the recommendations under the Communities that Care theme represent positive coverage across the borough in all of the required areas.

10. Theme 3 - Access to Advice Services

10.1 Theme 3 required applicant organisations to be Lewisham-based voluntary sector advice organisations, delivering social welfare advice and information services, particularly to vulnerable residents such as older people, disabled people and people from newly arrived communities.

10.2 Applicants were asked to identify consortium and partnership working to support a value for money approach and to offer innovations in terms of digital technology to support local people in addressing their own advice needs. Key areas of social welfare advice to be covered were: welfare, debt and money advice, housing, immigration, employment. The theme was broken into three key advice type areas as follows:

- Generalist
- Client specific
- Specialist

10.3 There was an additional specific application area focusing on partnership building and support, aimed at coordinating and developing the work of all funded advice providers.

10.4 A relatively low number of bids were received from organisations not currently funded. Of these, many failed to address the specification, stating that they offered advice but not demonstrating that they could provide services to the standards required. Of the eight currently funded organisations, six of the bids were deemed to be of good or excellent quality, with the remaining two being satisfactory but failing to address some of the key requirements.

- 10.5 In making the funding recommendations officers emphasised that further discussions would be required with all successful organisations to ensure that services offered were not being duplicated elsewhere and that organisations established effective mutual referral arrangements. This was to ensure that individuals were offered a coherent programme of support which retained a single point of contact throughout.
- 10.6 In arriving at the allocation for CAB, officers took account of the organisation's loss of £148,000 Public Health grant to provide services within GP practices. A condition of the award to the CAB would be that they re-design the GP service to work with Community Connections and organise the service on a community hub basis.
- 10.7 Other awards have taken account of the geographical spread of provision. With regard to specialist providers, it was agreed that further discussion would take place to ensure that their services were not delivered in isolation and that there was close collaboration with other providers to maximise the level of service being received by individuals. For this reason all allocations for Advice provision are for 2015/16 while work is undertaken to improve this coordination as some reallocation of resources may be necessary to meet specific needs and organisational circumstances.
- 10.8 Organisations recommended for funding:
- 170 Community Project
 - Lewisham Citizens' Advice Bureau (including Advice Lewisham)
 - Age UK
 - Evelyn 190
 - Lewisham Disability Coalition
 - Lewisham Multilingual Advice Service
 - Lewisham Refugee and Migrant Network
- 10.9 Organisations not recommended for funding:
- Contact a Family
 - Indo-China Refugee Group
 - Deptford Reach
 - Teachsports
 - Greenwich Association of Disabled People
 - Nar (funding request under this theme not specified)
 - Lewisham Mencap (funding request under this theme not specified)
 - Tamil Academy of Language and Arts (funding request under this theme not specified)

11. Theme 4: Widening Access to Arts and Sports

- 11.1 The intention of this theme is to fund organisations or consortiums of organisations that will take a strategic approach to increasing the number of people who participate in the arts and sport in Lewisham. This will particularly involve addressing barriers and providing opportunities for those who are less able to engage. Applications were expected to demonstrate how they will:
- a. Increase participation, particularly including people who are less able to participate due to disability, economic disadvantage and age (young people and older people).
 - b. Nurture talent and provide progression pathways, including developing outreach links into other settings such as schools.

- 11.2 The theme is split into two strands:

A. *Widening Access to Arts*

Through this theme the expectation is to fund a network of organisations that will deliver activities that:

- Provide opportunities for people of all ages to engage with the arts as active participants and members of an audience
- Provide opportunities for people of all ages to explore and develop their creativity and acquire new skills
- Increase awareness and enhance the reputation of Lewisham as a place to spend leisure time
- Capitalise on funding and other support opportunities from regional and national bodies.

B. *Widening Access to Sports*

Officers recommend that the Council works with a range of voluntary sports clubs and organisations to develop a more coordinated and partnership driven approach to sports provision in the borough in order to make the best possible sporting offer available to the residents of Lewisham. In this context we expect to fund partnerships or single organisations that will take a lead in facilitating partnerships to develop & deliver borough wide, development plans for specific sports. Applications will be expected to show how they will meet the general criteria for this fund (a and b above) and also respond to the following questions:

- Can you demonstrate high levels of demand or growing demand for your sport within Lewisham?
- How will you make the best use of the borough's current and emerging facilities?
- How will you capitalise on funding and/or other support opportunities from regional and national bodies?
- How will you provide activities that encourage people to participate in recreational sport and physical activity?

- 11.3 Within the **Arts** strand 35 applications were received, with a large number of good submissions that strongly addressed the criteria. In addition a large

number of bids from community organisations (particularly youth organisations) that use art as part of their methodology but were not primarily arts organisations and did not fully address the criteria.

- 11.4 A number of applications were for relatively large sums of money but with little track record of delivery and the remainder were made up of small grant type applications with good ideas around increasing participation but which only partially addressed the criteria.
- 11.5 Generally bids were weak in terms of real collaboration and instead tended to broadly address the partnership requirements.
- 11.6 The recommendations are based on a strict application of the funding criteria. Given the volume of bids, only those that fully meet the criteria have been recommended. This means that where generic youth organisations or community organisations have applied to deliver art based activities or one off art courses, they have not been recommended because there is no evidence of their track record in nurturing talent or providing development pathways. However, a large proportion of applications that are recommended for funding are from youth arts organisations and so will naturally deliver services targeting young people.
- 11.7 There is a reasonably good geographical spread of organisations and activities, although the north of the borough is over represented.
- 11.8 Organisations recommended for funding under the Widening Access to Arts theme:
- The Albany
 - Deptford X
 - Greenwich & Lewisham Young People's Theatre
 - Heart n Soul
 - IRIE!
 - Lewisham Education Arts Network
 - Lewisham Youth Theatre
 - The Midi Music Company
 - Montage Theatre Arts
 - Second Wave Centre for Youth Arts
 - Sydenham Arts Ltd
 - Teatro Vivo
 - Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance
- 11.9 Organisations not recommended for funding under the Widening Access to Arts theme:
- Bellingham Community Project Ltd
 - Blackheath Conservatoire of Music and the Arts Ltd
 - C of E Parish Church of St.Mary the Virgin Lewisham
 - Community Youth London Frameless Arts CIC

- Grove Park Community Group (GPCG)
- Harts Lane Studios
- Honor Oak Community Centre Association
- Hub Arts Map (South London Art Map)
- Inspiring Your Imagination
- Lewisham Young Womens Resource Project
- MakeBelieve Arts
- Mobile Media Interactive
- Olympus Playgroup
- Platform1/Forest Hill Youth Project
- Prince's Trust (The)
- Tea Dance for Little People/Creative Homes
- Young Lewisham Project
- Youth, AID Lewisham

11.10 Across the **Sports** strand 14 applications were received including 3 strong collaborative bids involving a number of clubs alongside the national or regional governing body. In contrast weaker bids tended to seek funding for the running costs of individual clubs.

11.11 Given the limited budget it has only been possible to recommend support for five sports. Three of these are the collaborative bids mentioned above.

11.12 Organisations recommended for funding under to Widening access to Sports theme:

- London Amateur Boxing Association
- London FA on behalf of Lewisham Football Network
- London Thunder
- Saxon Crown Swimming Club
- South East London Tennis (Lewisham Tennis Consortium)

11.13 Organisations not recommended for funding under to Widening access to Sports theme: :

- AFC Lewisham CIC
- Catford Wanderers Cricket Club
- Double Jab A.B.C.
- Dynamo Youth FC
- Forest Hill Park Football Club
- Royal London Society for Blind People (RLSB)
- S Factor Athletics Club
- Teachsport 2010 CIC
- Wheels for Wellbeing

11.14 All recommended applications include both recreational/physical activity opportunities as well as opportunities for competitive sport and are assessed as being able to deliver borough wide development plans for their sports

12. Next steps and appeals

- 12.1 All organisations were written to on Monday 30 March to inform them of the draft recommendation of their funding level. This letter also acted as three months notification of a change of funding for all current grant recipients. The letters inform the organisations that unless otherwise stated the recommended award is for 2.75 years until 31 March 2018. The letter also highlights that all council expenditure is subject to annual review in light of central government cuts to LB Lewisham but any changes to grant funding will be subject to formal consultation.
- 12.2 As part of the main grants process organisations are given the opportunity to appeal against officers' recommendations. The organisations were given until 15th April to write to the council disputing their funding recommendation with officers to respond by the end of April. Both the appeal and the response letter will then be considered at a special meeting of Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) on Monday 11th May where organisations also have the opportunity to present their case in person.
- 12.3 The outcome of this meeting will then be fed into the subsequent meeting of Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) on Wednesday 13 May where the final allocation decisions will be taken.

13. Rent grants

- 13.1 There is a varied pattern of occupation and management agreements for a number of council owned premises occupied and run by community groups. The council provides support to organisations in a number of different ways, including providing repairs & maintenance, rent grants, main grant funding, peppercorn lease arrangements and so on.
- 13.2 Outside of the main grants programme there are currently four organisations receiving rent grants: Ackroyd Community Association, Lewisham Young Women's Resource Centre (LYWRC), The Midi Music Company and Downham Community Association (Wesley Halls). These grants are to cover the cost of rent charged by the Council and are not linked to specific outcomes.
- 13.3 Two of these organisations Ackroyd Community Association and The Midi Music Company are recommended for continued Main Grants funding while the other two, Lewisham Young Women's Resource Centre (LYWRC), and Downham Community Association (Wesley Halls) are not recommended for ongoing funding.
- 13.4 The consultation on the Council's Community Assets Strategy has only recently closed and, as such, it is recommended that the current rent grants are extended for 9 months until the end of March 2016 to allow for the conclusion of this work.

14. Financial implications

14.1 This report recommends award of grants totalling £3,173,239.25 in 2015/16, £4,091,952 in 2016/17 and £4,091,952 in 2017/18 as set out in appendix 1.

14.2 The available main programme budgets are shown in the following table ::

2015-16 Budget.

2014-15 Revised Budget	6,121,500
<u>Less</u>	
Savings - COM5 15-16	-1,125,000
Reserves - once of funding from earmarked reserves for Investment Fund	-232,100
2015-16 Budget	4,764,400
<u>Budget Allocation</u>	
London Councils - London Boroughs Grants Scheme	303,800
Small and Faith Grants	100,000
April-June 15 - Extension Funding - Delegated Authority Exec Director for Community Services 4.2.15	
Main Grants	1,179,473
Investment Fund	173,181
Grant Funding - July 15 - March 16 - available for allocation part year	2,936,141
Somerville Youth and Play Provision	71,805
2015-16 Budget	4,764,400

2016-17 Budget.

2014-15 Revised Budget	6,121,500
<u>less</u>	
Savings - COM5 15-16	-1,125,000
Savings - COM5 16-17	-375,000
Reserves - once of funding from earmarked reserves for Investment Fund	-232,100
2015-16 Budget	4,389,400
<u>Budget Allocation</u>	
London Councils - London Boroughs Grants Scheme	303,800
Small and Faith Grants	100,000
Grant Funding - April 16 - March 17 - available for allocation full year	3,889,860
Somerville Youth and Play Provision	95,740
2015-16 Budget	4,389,400

14.3 In addition to these main budgets the following sums available :

2015/16

CCG funding for community developments	£75,000
Cassel centre – underspend	£85,000
Lewisham Bereavement Centre – underspend	£19,000
Allocation of other Cultural Development funding	<u>£62,500</u>
	<u>£241,500</u>

2016/17

CCG funding for community developments	£100,000
Allocation of other Cultural Development funding	<u>£ 83,300</u>
	<u>£183,300</u>

This increases the funding available to £3,177,651 in 2015/16 and £4,073,160 in 2016/17.

14.4 The proposed allocations in appendix 1 therefore represent a small under-allocation (£4,402) in 2015/16 and a small over-allocation (£18,792) in 2016/17. This 2016/17 risk will be addressed through allocation from the directorate's non-pay inflation allocation.

15. Legal implications

15.1 Under S1 of the Localism Act 2011 the Council has a general power of competence to do anything which an individual may do unless it is expressly prohibited.

15.2 The giving of grants to voluntary organisations is a discretionary power which must be exercised reasonably taking into account all relevant considerations and ignoring irrelevant considerations.

15.3 In relation to any consultation exercise sufficient reasons must be given for any proposal, adequate time must be given for consideration and response and the outcome of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account by the decision maker.

15.4 The Equality Act 2012 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected

characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

15.5 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

15.6 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

15.7 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at:

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>

15.8 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
- Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
- Engagement and the equality duty
- Equality objectives and the equality duty
- Equality information and the equality duty

15.9 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at:

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

16. Crime & disorder implications

- 16.1 There are no direct crime and disorder implications arising from this report. Some of the recommended main grant organisations deliver services and projects which help to reduce the fear of crime.

17. Equalities implications

- 17.1 A mini Equalities Analysis Assessment (EEA) was undertaken on each of the recommendations within this report highlighting mitigating actions where required – these are detailed in the individual assessment forms attached as appendix 2.
- 17.2 An overall EEA across the programme will be completed for consideration by the meetings of Mayor and Cabinet (contracts) on both 11 and 13 May.

18. Environmental implications

- 18.1 There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

19. Conclusion

- 19.1 The Council recognises the important part the voluntary and community sector play in the lives of our residents and the main grants programmes seeks to support this provision. The continued awarding of main grant funding to 62 organisations in 2015-18 will enable these organisations to continue to deliver much needed services across the borough.

For further information on this report please contact James Lee, Head of Cultural and Community Development, james.lee@lewisham.gov.uk, 020 8314 6548

Appendix 1 – List of recommended allocations for main grant funding

Appendix 2 – Full assessment forms for all applicants to the main grants programme (available online at <http://tinyurl.com/macq6ld> and by request)

Appendix 3 – Voluntary Sector role in delivering CES 5 Key Objectives

Appendix 3 – Voluntary Sector role in delivering CES 5 Key Objectives

1. Tackling victimisation and discrimination
2. Improving access to services
3. Closing the gap in outcomes for different citizens
4. Increasing mutual respect and understanding in communities
5. Increasing participation and engagement

Objective 1: Tackling victimisation and discrimination	Funding	Provider / delivery programmes
<p>1a: For the individual resident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to information, advice, advocacy and representation 	<p>Grant aid to the advice sector with some specialist advice e.g. immigration/legal advice</p>	<p>Across the advice sector but work required on coordination of activity to ensure specialisms such as immigration, language support and translation are open and available to all.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy access to report victimisation and discrimination 	<p>As above plus VCS grant aid to ensure mechanisms are in place and working, i.e Hate Crime, Stop and Search Group</p>	<p>VCS representation on Hate Crime forum, Stop and Search Group. Outcomes to be agreed with these forums.</p>
<p>1b: Ensuring that patterns of discrimination and victimisation are fed from the grassroots (groups and residents) into the appropriate forums and then into the partnership board</p>	<p>Grant Aid and mainstream Funding</p>	<p>Disability Forum Disability Coalition Stephen Lawrence and LRMN Pensioners Forum and Ageing Well Council* Metro – model for capturing views from grassroots to be developed Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG) Forum Refuge*</p>

Objective 2: Improving access to services	Funding	Provider / delivery programmes
Ensuring that grassroots organisations can access training and support to develop deliverable equality plans	Organisations with development programmes focused on individual organisations	Stephen Lawrence Centre Disability Coalition Metro VAL Equaliteam (using unspent grant from previous years) Pensioners Forum
Objective 3: Closing the gap	Funding	Provider / delivery programme
Ensuring that forums have an infrastructure to work in partnership with public sector providers	Tackling health inequalities – Healthwatch LA contract	Bromley and Lewisham Healthwatch*
	Other public sector providers to resource relevant partnership boards	Membership of Stronger Communities Partnership board to be reviewed.
Objective 4: Increasing mutual respect	Funding	Provider / delivery programme
Helping organisations to work together at neighbourhood level.	Prevent funding	Programme 2015/16 to be finalised
	Faith funding	To be allocated 2015/16

	Neighbourhood development funding	Ackroyd Community Association Bellingham Community Project Corbett Estate Neighbourhood Forum Goldsmiths Community Association Grove Park Community Group IRIE! Lee Green Lives Somerville Youth & Play Provision Teatro Vivo Age UK Southwark and Lewisham
Objective 5: Increasing participation and engagement	Funding	Provider / delivery programme
Influencing all organisations	Mainstream grant aid Neighbourhood community development money	All

* - Mainstream rather than grant funded