

## Main Grants 2017-18 report

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Lee Green Lives</b>
<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>7<sup>th</sup> September 2016</b>
<b>Names and positions of attendees</b>	<b>Jim Mallory (Chair) Julia Gemie (Secretary) Caroline Mayow (Vice Chair) Ade Joseph (Development Officer- LBL) Petra Marshall (Community Resources Manager – LBL)</b>

<b>Group Name:</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>
Total funding received 2015-16	<b>£18,000</b>	N/A	£6,000	£6,000	£6,000
Total funding to be received 2016-17	<b>£24,000</b>	£6,000	£6,000	£6,000	

<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Support</b>
	1. Local residents able to address health, social or educational needs – exercise, disability, youth, computer, leisure (knitting, sewing), and gardening – but also help to overcome loneliness and disadvantage by easily accessible and local inexpensive means. Lead to better community cohesion and improved individual well-being.
	2. Thriving volunteer network. Volunteer with a wide mix of skills and experience can support or lead activities with monitoring and back-up from coordinator, improving their life skills and employment prospect.
	3. Greater awareness of the Centre as a resource and its future use through outreach and publicity on local estates and other neighbourhoods.
	4. Generic advice resource with Council and / or voluntary sector to meet the needs of ‘drop-in’ visitors in need of advice and support.

	5. Referrals resources with centre as possible base, using activities for older, disabled and young people as attractions.									
	6. Established forum / consortium of local partners – groups and organisations to shape future community development of Lee Green area.									
	7. Improved communication links, ensuring steady exchange of information and promotion of other groups' activities and events.									
	8. Feasibility study of alternative structure (e.g. Community Interest Company) to increase sustainability of LGL and Centre.									
<b>Outputs: 2015 - 16</b>	2015-16 Target	2015-16 Q2	2015-16 Q3	2015-16 Q4	2015-16 Total	% Achieved	2016-17 Target	2016-17 Q1		% Achieved TD
1. Increase number of users by 20%. Both within existing activities and with additional activities organised with partners. Explore possible other activities either at the centre or elsewhere (e.g. parks, schools) through work with other local groups, organisations, enabling those organisations to flourish.	Users numbers increase by 20%	15 - 20	15 new users	Maintaining existing numbers, increase in some groups, some new	<b>35 new users</b>	<b>Baseline, target and performance data submitted are not clear so difficult to ascertain if output has been met.</b>				
2. Increase volunteer numbers, in particular,	Increase volunteer numbers	3 new Volunteers	3 new volunteer and	18 all of whom qualify for	<b>18 volunteers</b>	<b>Baseline, target and performance</b>				

through work with other groups and organisations e.g. Lee Fair Share time bank members, Trinity pupils, and reward them through expenses and / or Community Contributor Card (C3), currently being developed by Rushey Green Time Bank.			request from local organisation for volunteer from us	C3 card and 3 new volunteer this quarter		<b>data submitted are not clear so difficult to ascertain if output has been met.</b>				
3. More people able to take up and suggest new opportunities. More and possible new groups using centre.		2 new groups	2 new activities	3 new groups	<b>7 new groups / activities</b>	<b>Target across all three quarters was unclear, however 7 new recorded</b>				
4. Work with Council and others to develop proposal for generic advice and referrals.	Proposal developed	Advice session still tbc	None – Lewisham Advice still to deliver	Ongoing work in progress	<b>Not delivered</b>	<b>Not delivered</b>				
5. Work with Community Connections, Lee Fair Share and Youth Club	Effective system of referrals created	In process	Community Connection worker left post	Ongoing work in progress	<b>Some work undertaken but system</b>	<b>Partially delivered</b>				

to create effective system of referrals.					<b>not fully delivered</b>					
6. Work through Lee Green Assembly, using its Local Plan with other group and organisations to make sure development supports overall priority framework set down by Assembly.	Attend and play an active part in co-group and assembly	Active part and developing training for local groups	Yes play an active part and support the assembly framework	Continue to play an active part	<b>Delivered</b>	<b>Delivered</b>				
7. Create well-used website linked to other local groups and encourage more use of social media by all groups, organisations and individual users.	Website Developed	Assembly website, some use of Facebook	Regular and comprehensive use of website	Regular updates and use of local website	LGL website not delivered but use of local assembly website instead	<b>Partially delivered</b>				
8. Work with Affinity Sutton, Eco Communities, Soul Refresh Café / or other interested parties on developing new	New governance arrangement in place	Yes, with Affinity Sutton and Soul Refresh	Draft constitution for CIO by LGL and Soul Refresh	In progress	Partially delivered	<b>Partially delivered</b>				

governance arrangements.										
<b>Outputs 16/17</b>										
1. Sustain and increase number of users by 25% from a target of 1025, both within existing activities, through additional activities organised with partners, including community groups, meetings and our drop-in visitors.							<b>1300 attendance by end of year</b>	1085 total attendances despite summer break for many groups		<b>106%</b>
2. Increase volunteer numbers by 4, in particular, through work with other groups and organisations, e.g. Lee Fair Share time bank members, Trinity pupils and reward them through expenses and / or Community Contributor Card (C3), currently being developed by Rushey Green Time Bank							<b>20 volunteers by end of year</b>	14 volunteer at end of June 2016- some volunteers have moved on. Recruitment drive planned		<b>78%</b>

3. Seek to establish 4 new activities both at the Centre and elsewhere through work with other local groups and organisations to flourish and more people to take up local opportunities and activities.								<b>4 new activities</b>	1 new activity - Advice and advocacy		<b>100%</b>
4. Work with Lewisham Advice and others to develop proposal for generic advice and referrals. Develop alternative through advice and advocacy pilot. Total target 175 referrals								<b>Advice and advocacy pilot set up with 175 referrals across year</b>	28 referrals		<b>112%</b>
5. Work with Community Connection, Lee fair Share and Youth Clubs to create effective system of referrals								<b>Effective system of referrals set up and used</b>	Referral system set up. Record system being developed		<b>100%</b>
6. Work through Lee Green Assembly, using								<b>Support developm</b>	Successfu l		<b>100%</b>

its Local Plan with other groups and organisations to make sure development supports overall priority framework set down by Assembly							<b>ent in ward through assembly and Local Plan</b>	showcase held on June 18 with 12 groups plus LGL		
7. Dovetail work with LeeGreen.London (Assembly website). Contribute monthly activity update plus one article per quarter							<b>12 x monthly activity update &amp; 4 articles (1 per quarter)</b>	One monthly update and one article - Leegate		<b>Partially delivered</b>
8. Work with Affinity Sutton, Eco Communities, Soul Refresh Café and / or other interested parties on developing new governance arrangements.							<b>New governance arrangements in place</b>	Constitution agreed at AGM on June 28		<b>100%</b>

## 1. Remove funding from under-performing groups/those performing least well

Have you achieved at least 90% of the agreed reporting outputs and outcomes in all quarters since the start of the programme?

Lee Green Lives (LGL) has delivered some good work since July 2015 and met and exceeded some of its targets. However their quarterly reporting during 2015/16 has lacked clarity with a lack of baseline data for some targets to be able to establish whether they are delivered against target. For example, output 1 sought to increase user attendance and output 2 sought to increase volunteers at the centre and working with other groups; without understanding what the baseline figure was it is difficult to conclude whether the target has been met.

Officers have met with representatives from the organisation to discuss concerns found in the quality of their reporting and offered support and advice on what is expected from them to ensure measurable targets are set for 2016-17. These targets have been agreed with LGL and it is noted that monitoring returns have much improved. As such, officers can confidently report that LGL have met or exceeded their targets in 2016/17 in 6 out of 8 outputs and are on track to deliver across the full year.

Officers acknowledge and have seen first hand the good work that takes place in the centre and the key role it plays in the wider community / ward.

Have you achieved all of the wider outcomes outlined in the initial grant application?

Lee Green Lives was founded as charity in 2010 by local residents, with the support of the Assembly to bring life back into the rundown Leegate Shopping Centre. From inception, the group developed a wider community development remit, responding to the varied needs and aspirations of local people. This resulted in the creation of the Lee Green Community Centre where a wide range of activities was developed in response to local request to address loneliness and isolation, learning disability, mental health, older people's health, generic advice and referrals, youth provision and many more. The centre now has a growing and thriving list of activities, most of which are delivered and run by volunteers, supported by members of the management committee and the centre paid coordinator and a support whose awareness of local issues contributes to the invaluable resources at the centre. All of these activities and many more has contributed immensely and helps to build a stronger and more cohesive community through bringing together diverse sections of the local community who would not have otherwise met. Additionally, the Centre provides a venue for many local groups' meeting including the Lee Green Assembly Coordinating group.

LGL has achieved most of the wider outcomes listed in their initial application, with the exception of a few areas due to external factors. The organisation provides a valuable service, positively changing the lives of the vulnerable disadvantaged groups and individuals in the community. LGL continues to sustain and increases its activities all of which helps to overcome loneliness and disadvantage. A user survey conducted last year recorded an impressive 81% of users feel the centre has made a difference to their lives through the activities they attend, providing a solution to loneliness, mental well-being and the desire to learn something new.

LGL has maintained a steady thriving number of volunteer network with a wide mix of skills and experience for most part of last year, strengthening their skills and job prospects



through training and experience offered at the centre. Unfortunately this great work has not been captured well in their reporting. The organisation works well with local voluntary groups to develop and expand their volunteer network using Rushey Green Time Bank Community Contributor Card (C3) as an incentive. Although there was a small drop in the numbers of volunteers last year resulting from the closure of the youth club and some volunteers moving on or into paid employment, the organisation reacted positively to this change by embarking on a recruitment drive to increase its volunteers. Other local groups approach the organisation to supply them with volunteers to assist with their project.

The organisation offers practical support to build strong cohesive community exploring other possible activities both at the centre and elsewhere through collaboration work with other local groups and organisation. This enables the organisation to flourish and allows more people to take up local opportunities and activities. For example, the promotion of the centre has led to a new well used advice and advocacy and CAB sessions with big numbers of drop-ins and appointment-based residents attending. Recently, a local food bank has begun operating from the centre, more outreach is taking place in neighbouring estate assisting and encouraging unrepresented residents to develop better links with their landlord. The intervention by LGL has resulted in Affinity Sutton providing funding for events and activities to the centre to target their residents.

A recent addition to activities at the centre is their popular drop-in and appointment based Advice and Advocacy and CAB services. The organisation is in negotiation with Community Connections to develop a referral system with them and other agencies to support people with more complex needs.

LGL have actively engaged to widen their presence in Lee Green and beyond. They have recently produced a film promoting their work. They have led in strengthening local partnerships and in processes to developing a consortium of community groups in the Lee Green area, building on the successful Assembly Community Showcase, creating a platform where local groups can promote their work, improve working amongst themselves and together plan for services and funding challenges of the future.

The organisation also feeds into and supports the Assembly website with regular updates and articles as an alternative to developing their own website due to a lack of volunteer expertise.

A new governance arrangements is in process with the organisation upgrading its status to a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) and they are receiving free support from Affinity Sutton to develop a business plan to further this objective.

If no to either of the above:

- What are the mitigating factors?
- What plans are in place for improving performance?
- What progress has been made against actions agreed with your Development Officer?

2015/16

In 2015/16 outputs 1 and 2 have been classed as amber, being partially met due to the unclear baseline from which to measure performance, as described above. With regards to action planning, there were initial issues identified in establishing agreed measurable

targets with LGL from the outset at both ends. Feedback and support has since been offered to assist the organisation to set achievable indicative targets for each of their strand. Support and advice has been offered on how they can present acceptable system of reporting. We have since noticed some improvements in their reporting in Q1 of 2016-17.

Output 4 was around working with Advice Lewisham to develop a proposal for generic advice and referrals. This output was dependant on delivery by Advice Lewisham which was unfortunately unable to provide this service as their bid for funding was unsuccessful. LGL responded well to this obstacle by recruiting alternative services (pro-bono legal advice) to ensure some form of advice service was in place to address local needs. The issue has been resolved and a new well subscribed advice and advocacy and CAB services is now being offered at the centre in 2016/17; along with a consolidated and improved referral system in place.

Output 5 was around setting up an effective system of referrals. This has only been partially met in part due to the Community Connections workers leaving post, with a 3 month gap in provision.

LGL state that building a new relationship with the new worker and establishing a workable system of referral for more complex cases would take time, however the organisation took the initiative to seek other agencies who could begin to address this gap in the meantime.

Output 7 required LGL to develop its own website however on reflection it was agreed that it would be better engaging with and using the recently set up local assembly website so as to not dilute the offer already in place. LGL have been contributing articles and information to this website and the target for 2016/17 has been tightened to make this a measurable output.

Another external contributory factor that has impacted on the organisation inability to fully meet its targets was the sudden loss of the weekly generic Youth Club at the centre. The youth provision supported by Triple X experienced low attendance with numbers dwindling on a weekly basis. This resulted in the project taking the decision to limit provision to half-term and school holidays only which in retrospect affected the numbers of youth referrals expected.

LGL has had some staffing changes and their first paid support worker left shortly after taking up position as she was unable to meet her commitments. A replacement support worker has been secured to provide more effective administrative support for the coordinator in order to free up their time to do more outreach work. However, these staffing issues have had an effect on LGL ability to deliver some of its targets in 2015/16; including increasing the number of volunteers.

Work has begun with the Assembly to establish an effective consortium of local groups and organisation to reduce duplication and enable a more joint up working towards achieving a common purpose

The new CIO, once established, will increase organisation financial flexibility in attracting additional funding.

What local support/evidence of need can you identify for the work you are undertaking?

LGL's role as a community organisation is largely based on responding to the needs of local people and facilitating their involvement in issues affecting their lives. Although the organisation has conducted a basic user survey, they do not have the capacity to conduct an evidence based survey. The organisation manages the only community centre in the ward. They conduct regular outreach in the community engaging the hard to reach group encouraging and supporting them to access the varied activities and supportive services on offer at the centre and elsewhere in the ward. Some of these activities (Notably the Advice and Advocacy and CAB services) has become so popular that it has placed the centre at full capacity. There is evidently a great demand for these services in the area.

## 2. Negotiate reductions and seek alternative funding streams

Are there any proposals that you can put forward that will deliver significant saving against current expenditure? This can include capital investment to change your delivery/business model.

There are no obvious or immediate significant savings that could be found for LGL.

What alternative funding streams are you already pursuing?

Discussions held with LGL showed there is a reliance upon main grant funding for the continuation and survival of their provisions. Apart from main grant fund, other sources of funding comes from private donations and small charges secured from hire of space to local groups to hold their meetings. Attempting to minimise current expenditure will result in cutting back on the delivery of some of its vital activities. However, this might change in the near future as work has already began to change the status of the organisation to CIO. It is envisaged that this will offer the organisation more flexibility in yielding more diverse ways of spreading cost and seeking funding from other sources.

For now LGL is fully reliant upon main grant funding and there are no bids currently in process. However, they are currently looking into the possibility of funding opportunities from People's Postcode, London Community and Affinity Sutton Community Fund. LGL has encouraged delivery partners (Advice Lewisham and CAB) to look for alternative funding as a condition of its continued use of the centre.

LGL has also cited the impact the loss of funding previously provided by Lewisham Public Health for the well-attended weekly older people exercise and the Get Together Club (an activity supporting people with learning disability). LGL did not spend its full main grant funding in 2015/16 and is using the underspend in 2016/17 to enable the continuation and the survival of both services in the short term. No funding has been identified to continue both activities. LGL has been advised that it would probably need to charge participants or seek alternative funding to continue both activities as these are not formally part of the main grant funding. It has stated that it is unlikely they will impose the first as the beneficiaries of these activities cannot afford to pay.

Are there any other funding streams that you can identify that the council can support you to access?

The organisation has sought support and advice from the Council in identifying suitable funding which will enable them to continue the work they deliver to meet local needs.

Currently they do not have the resources and expertise to progress this action. Officers have suggested that the organisation consider crowd funding to assist them to secure funding for the continuation of some of its activities in the interim.

### 3. Work with groups to consider mergers or asset sharing

Are there any organisations doing similar work to you in the borough who you may consider sharing resources or merging with? Who have you considered/approached?

LGL is unique in its formation. It is the only organisation developed from an Assembly priority and set up as a charity to bring back life into to the run down shopping centre. The group has since evolved and adjusted their remit to meet the needs and aspirations of local people across the ward. The Community Centre created and managed by the organisation offers a range of activities in response to local request. The group has mentioned that they are unaware of similar organisation in Lewisham operating in the same way but they are nevertheless are open to suggestions. LGL work in partnership with numerous organisations on project based activity; e.g. Bromley and Lewisham MIND, Trussell Food bank, and Sydenham garden.

Are there other groups in the local area that you could share resources with even if they are delivering a different type of service? Again, who have you considered/approached?

LGL is lacking in local agencies or groups with whom they might share resources. They are limited to existing smaller community groups run by volunteers which themselves are operating on very little or no resources. Partnership with other local groups is usually one-way as many look upon LGL for support with the one resource they have i.e. the community centre to deliver some of their activities paying a nominal fee. It is envisaged that a positive development would emerge when the consortium is established, where the discussion could take place around sharing resources. Contribution could be either through provision of volunteers, expertise in social media, finance or legal advice.

Affinity Sutton have agreed in principle to partner with LGL in a new community centre arising out of the Leegate redevelopment; and in the meantime provide free support in governance and financial planning.

What support might you need to move these suggestions forward?

LGL are keen to seek assistance on what training and funding opportunities might be suitable to progress the work of their organisation. They have already sought support from VAL to get their finance record in order. Further help have been sought from Council's Finance section as part of their "community experience scheme" but this has not progressed much as yet.

Currently, the organisation feeds into the assembly website to promote its work. They have expressed a wish to sought technical training for some of their volunteers which would enable them to develop an active website of their own.

#### 4. Pro-rata reductions across all groups

What would a 25% cut in your grants look like in service delivery terms? What are the wider impacts?

Discussion with LGL took place around reducing their funding by more than a pro-rata cut. This is due to:

- the unclear and under performance in 2015/16
- underspend of their grant 2015/16
- main grant funding is subsidising an activity previously funded by Public Health.

Officers believe that despite this LGL have been delivering some good work, addressing needs in the ward, and delivering against their wider outcomes and the general ethos of the grant theme; and are confident that the revised and strengthened outputs for 2016/17 will put LGL on a better footing.

As such, an agreement was made to reduce LGL's funding by 35%.

LGL believe that this will not have an adverse impact on their ability to continue to deliver their outputs in the short term due to the carry-over of £12,578 from 2015/16. LGL would be able to maintain reserves; but would be required to put together successful project bids in the medium term to continue all activities.

Have you modelled this cut and developed an action plan for its implementation?

Following discussion with officers LGL have modelled what a 35% cut would look like and will follow this up with more detailed analysis of their income and expenditure forecasting.

#### Conclusion

**Any other comments / areas discussed**

#### Conclusion and recommendation

Lee Green Lives provides practical support to build a strong and cohesive community in Lee Green ward. A key principle underpinning the work of this organisation is evident in its approach at facilitating activities aimed at addressing disadvantaged residents in the area, supporting people in overcoming loneliness and isolation, learning disability, mental health, older people's health, provision for young people and leisure activities. All of these activities and many more takes place in a disused retail unit developed into a community resource centre within the run down Leegate shopping.

They have made every effort to maintain a steady numbers of volunteers who assist the organisation in delivering of some of its activities. Outreach in neighbouring housing estates has led to a new well subscribed Advice and Advocacy and CAB services.

However, due to under and unclear performance against targets in 2015/16 and an underspend of main grant funding; officers are **recommending a 35% cut to Lee Green Lives main grant.**

Equalities groups disproportionately impacted by recommendations

Ethnicity:	√	Pregnancy / Maternity:	
Gender:	√	Marriage & Civil Partnerships:	
Age:	√	Sexual orientation:	
Disability:	√	Gender reassignment:	
Religion / Belief:			

Commentary and potential mitigations:

The grant funding provided to Lee Green Lives (LGL) is for the benefit of the wider community. In addition LGL facilitates and provides activities to vulnerable people including two activities - The Get Together Club (activity for people with learning disability) and sitting exercise for older people – which may be disproportionately impacted by the recommended 35% cut. Officers will work with LGL to mitigate or reduce this impact when agreeing new outputs and outcomes for 2017/18.

It is important to note that attendance to the Get Together Club attracts participants borough-wide and is not restricted to Lee Green residents only.