Main Grants 2017-18 report

| Name of organisation | Corbett Estate Neighbourhood Forum |
|----------------------|--|
| Date of meeting | Wednesday 19 th September 2016 |
| Names and positions | Barbara Grey – Catford South Community Neighbourhood Developer |
| of attendees | Lucy Formolli – Lead Officer Cultural Development, LBL |
| | James Lee – Head of Culture and Community Development, LBL |

| Group Name: | Total | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |] |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| Total funding received 2015-16 | | N/A | | | | |
| Total funding to be received 2016-17 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Outcomes | Support | | | | | |
| | 1. A more | robust and | l cohesive a | approach d | eveloped t | o collective action in Catford South – original outcomes |
| | 2. Practica | l support t | o build stro | ng and coh | esive com | munities, finding and addressing gaps – original outcomes |
| | 3. Strength | en local a | rea partner | ships by br | inging orga | anisations in area together |
| | 4. Work co | llectively f | or and with | residents i | n the neigh | bourhood |
| | 5. Infrastru | cture deve | elopment | | | |
| | 0.000000000 | in of loop | | م منابع ال | | lana |

| | 5. Infrastru | cture dev | elopment | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---|----------|-------|---------|---------|-----------------|-------|-------|-----------|
| | 6. Ownersh | 6. Ownership of local issues and delivering local solutions | | | | | | | | |
| | 7. Developi | 7. Development of resilient collective action to deliver change through a strategic whole ward approach | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | % | | 2016- | | % |
| | 2015-16 | 2015- | 2015-16 | 2015- | 2015-16 | Achieve | | 17 | 2016- | Achieve |
| Outputs: | Target | 16 Q2 | Q3 | 16 Q4 | Total | d | 2016-17 Target | Q1 | 17 Q2 | d TD |
| | | | | | | | Framework for | Stage | | |
| Frameworks for joint strategic | | | | | Stage 1 | 100% | joint strategic | 2 | | 100% - |
| planning and working in Catford | | Ongo | | | complet | stage | planning and | Comp | | target |
| South identified | Stage 1 | ing | Ongoing | 1 | е | one | working in | lete | N/A | completed |

| | | | | | | | Catford South – | | | |
|--|--------------|---|---------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------|-------------------|
| | | | | | | | stage 2 complete | | | |
| | | | 22 | | | | | | | |
| | | | achived | | 38 / | | | | | |
| Links established with key | | | through dementia | | groups and key | | | | | 100% |
| community organisations in Catford | | | awarene | | individua | | SWOT Analysis | | | achieve |
| South and Neighbouring Wards | 20 groups | 6 | ss event | 10 | ls | 190% | Report x 1 | 1 | N/A | d |
| | | | | 1 RA | | | ' | | | |
| Identify issue based opportunities to | | 1 - | | Develop | | | | | | |
| take ownership and support groups | | BEM | 1 | ment / | | | | | | 100% |
| to strengthen local partnerships and | | healt | Dementi | collabor | 0 | 4000/ | PEST Analysis | | N1/A | achieve |
| joint working Opportunities for involvement | 3 4 Older | h | а | ation | 3 | 100% | Report x1 | 1 | N/A | d |
| publicised effectively with residents | people 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| matched to them and feeling | younger | | | | | | Stakeholder | | | |
| supported – including ensuring | People | | | | | | Analysis, | | | 100% |
| assembly funding applications | opportuniti | | | | | | potential roles & | | | achieve |
| around YP and OP projects | es created | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 100% | opportunities x1 | 1 | N/A | d |
| | | | | | | | Faith Group | | | |
| | | | 2 (mak | | | | collaborative | | | |
| | | | 3 (web, assembl | 1 | | | options report drafted and | | | N/A |
| Communicating local issues and | | | y, twitter | assemb | | | shared with local | | | Delivery |
| successes across Catford South | 4 | | account) | ly | 4 | 100% | faith leaders x1 | 0 | N/A | in Q2/3 |
| | | | 5 (all | | | | | | | |
| | | | faith | | | | Catford South | | | |
| Develop relationship with local faith | | | groups | | | | Stakeholder | | | |
| groups and children's centre with | E 6-10 | | attended | | | | Meeting to review | | | N/A |
| view to extending use of their facilities | 5 faith | 2 | dementia | 3 | 11 | 183 | and comment on above x1 | 0 | N/A | Delivery in Q3 |
| | Commun | 3 Dication in | event) mprovemen | | | | | 0 | IN/A | in Q3 |
| | | | | | | 100% - upturn in | Catford South | | | N/A |
| Improve communications across the | | face communication with local businesses, and community organisations. to enhance love Catford | | | | | strategy 1st draft | | | Delivery |
| ward | website a | nd twitter | r but adverti | sing the be | enefits to | assembly attendees | x1 | 0 | N/A | in Q3 |

| | local people. communicating the purpose of local assemblies to people who may not otherwise think ti is for them and disseminate the assembly leaflet across the ward | | | | | at assembly | | | | |
|--|--|------|--------------|--------|---------|----------------|---|--------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| Review Assembly Action Plan and | | | | | | | Catford South | | | N/A |
| present gaps and options to Assembly and other local groups | 1 annual | 1 | | | | 100% | strategy 2nd draft | 0 | N/A | Delivery in Q4 |
| Targeted groups identified for | As | • | | | | 10070 | Strategy agreed | 0 | 1 1/7 1 | N/A |
| development of provision to meet | discovere | | | | | | by local | | | Delivery |
| gaps | d | 3 | | | | ongoing | stakeholders x1 | 0 | N/A | in Q4 |
| | | | | | | | Dementia Friends Awareness Week Programme 2 local DF | 2 sessio ns 3 x local | | 100% Sessions delivered 50% |
| Public acknowledgement of | | | | | | | sessions / 6 x | cham | | champio ns |
| volunteers | ongoing | 0 | 1 | 20 | 21 | | champions | pions | N/A | trained |
| | | | | | | | Website | | | 50% |
| | | | | | | | volunteers | | | achieve |
| Deliver activities that meet gaps | 12 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 141% | recruited x 6 | 3 | N/A | d |
| | Quantina | Ongo | 0 | Ongoin | | 4000/ | Scouts youth | Ongoi | N1/A | |
| Minimum of 4 Crowd Funding | Ongoing | ing | Ongoing | g | Ongoing | 100% | involvement Crowd funded | ng | N/A | Ongoing 100% |
| Projects Supported over course of 3 year funding stream | | | | | | | projects supported x 4 | 4 | N/A | Achieve d |
| Ongoing Community Engagement/Development and Resourcing Activities including arranging local sessions and working to bring activity into the ward | | D | etailed abov | /e | | N/A | Ongoing Community Engagement/Dev elopment and Resourcing Activities – this output will be split into more specific targets going forward | Ongoi ng – | N/A | Ongoing |

| Personal Development Activities x 2 in Y1. 12 additional | 2 | Loc | – ality erence | 1 – VAL Training | | 100% | Personal Development Activities x 12 | | B N/A | 25% Achieve d |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|--|---|-------|---------------------|
| Succession Plan developed x 1 | | continuation ve on. Involvi | | | | | Succession Plan | | | N/A Delivery |
| before end Y2 | | | ČE | NF | | _ | developed x 1 Funding Toolkit | (| N/A | in Q4 |
| Online Toolkits required by the community identified in year one, | Using the a | above outputs | s to ide | entify need | ls of the co | ommunity | for organisations created – draft | | | N/A Delivery |
| completed in Y2 and Y3 | once Neig | hbourhood de | evelop | ment stra | nd comes t | o an end | version x 1 | (|) | in Q4 |

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?

CENF have submitted detailed narrative reports of their actions regarding outputs and outcomes for 15-16 and into 16-17. Year one was focused around mapping the ward and the resources already in place as well as finding the gaps, introducing local organisations to the neighbourhood development stand of main grant and increasing the reach of the Assembly. It was also around beginning to build community resilience and infrastructure and bringing groups within the ward together.

Direct impact has been difficult to assess in year one as this is built into outcomes later in the project however there has been an upturn in attendees at Assembly meetings. There has also been evidence of community groups working together in partnership – this has not been the case in the past. CENF has facilitated existing Resident Associations to work together, is developing a new residents association to cover an under developed area within the ward.

After extensive mapping CENF discovered a lack in provision for BME community in the ward with poor health outcomes and started the Healthy Habits group that is a forum for the BME community to come together and speak about health issues and get practical advice. They also identified a need for provision for older and younger residents in the ward and helped groups develop strong bids for the assembly around these themes.

CENF facilitated 4 Crowd Funded projects, hosting 2 information sessions for groups interested in applying and supporting their application process and helping them spread the word across the community.

CENF have been reporting to the Assembly coordinating group and to the boards of the Archibald Corbett Society (their fund holders) and other boards in the local community. They have been working very closely with the Assembly coordinator/Lead Officer to ensure that all work stays on track and in line with the requirements of the funding stream

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

The quarterly targets were adjusted at the beginning of the process and were strengthened to include more target driven analysis and delivery. This was agreed with CENF, Lead officer and agreed by the full Assembly co group as realistic and achievable. These quarterly outputs will be altered to improve delivery throughout the process and continue to be pragmatic to address changing community need to ensure maximum delivery of outcomes

CENF has gone beyond the original application by reacting to needs in the community as they have arisen. For example, they were a driving force in setting up the community infrastructure project <u>www.lovecatford.co.uk</u> the community website. They also reacted quickly and decisively when it was decided that Catford South would aim to become the first accredited Dementia Friendly community in Lewisham. CENF have done much of the work facilitating this including a large event for the whole community that was attended by 28 local groups.

CENF continue to react well to any changes but remain on track with the original goals detailed in their application.

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?

What are the mitigating factors

There are no mitigating factors to report on outputs and outcomes so far delivered. Detailed quarterly narrative reporting underpins the quality of the work being delivered

What plans are in place for improving performance?

It has been identified that although CENF are now a constituted organisation, it still reports to a number of organisations and has no real governance or management. In order to overcome this management issue the CENF is reporting directly to Lead Officer as a form of direct line management and to the assembly co group as 'management committee'

As essentially a lone worker, CENF has been asked to develop a complete succession plan. It has been agreed that it is important that the CENF has a plan in place should the sole neighbourhood development officer leave the position. This has been asked for by the end of this financial year (2016-17).

CENF has also been tasked with creating a solid fundraising toolkit and platform to enable groups to become more sustainable. CENF has been told that fundraising for the area should be a priority going forward for themselves, existing groups and new organisations that are starting up to fill gaps identified.

What progress has been made against actions agreed with your Development Officer?

Lead officer has specifically tasked CENF with ensuring that Year 3 is less strategy driven and more focused on delivering sustainability tools for the ward, develop the volunteering pool and work to the creation of an RA to cover the part of the ward not already supported with a constituted groups such as the Corbett RA and the Culverley Green RA. These actions are moving forward.

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

Catford South is an area where people from diverse communities feel they can live in an area lower than borough average rates of crime, with local facilities and amenities that provide for the large number of families with young children and older residents who chose to stay in the area once their children have grown and left home.

A higher proportion of residents are in same sex couples which is a very positive reflection of the area being a place where people can live as themselves and feel part of an area with a strong community feel.

- CENF has supported LGBT Issues in the local area and has promoted the launch of the new Lewisham LBGT forum through LoveCatford.co.uk

Local need will be for provision for an intergenerational community with particular provision for children aged 8 to 17 and older residents.

CENF supported assembly funding and Crowd funded projects specifically to reach these areas of need. They are currently assessing full provision available through the Lewisham Youth Service as part of the overall Catford strategy and are working closely with the scouts and soon the brownies about developing the role of young people in the community. CENF has also supported apprenticeships for young people in the ward. They are leading much of the front facing community work on the successful accreditation for Catford South to be a Dementia Friendly Community

CENF Officer identified that fewer than average residents are accessing the services they might need through statutory provision. This is recognised by the growth of local residents groups who are taking more responsibility for meeting gaps in the area.

- The population of Catford South has 5,712 households with 15,214 people. The unique features of the area are:
 - 464 households (7.9%) of have 1 person household with residents aged
 65+ in Catford South
 - 257 households (4.5%) with all residents aged 65+ compared to 2.7% for Lewisham
 - 863 households (15.1%) with dependent children compared to 12.2% for Lewisham
 - 15.1% same sex partnerships with dependent children compared to 12.2% for Lewisham
 - 6% same sex partnerships without dependent children compared to 3.3% for Lewisham
- Ethnicity: Shows Catford South is a very diverse are with White English/Irish/Scottish residents representing 33.5% of Catford South population. The largest non white group are African Caribbean who make up 20.5% of residents compared to a borough average of 11.42%. Asian Indian and Pakistani residents represent 2.7%, Chinese residents 1.2% and Asian other make up 5.7%.

CENF has developed a programme specifically targeted to the local BME community around health outcomes for that community known as Healthy Habits

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.

Is not relevant for this Organisation as the neighbourhood strand is going directly to pay the development worker.

However it would improve the ability for the lone worker to work with volunteers, apprentices and so on if an office became available.

A reason for this includes their inability to work with an apprentice provided by Locality, as CENF were unable to provide Locality with a location base for the apprentice that satisfied their Health and Safety requirements. By having an office space they could increase their delivery and provide training opportunities for young local people.

What alternative funding streams are you already pursuing?

CENF have not been actively pursuing funding themselves but have been working with VAL and Locality and have been helping other organisations access some funding through the assembly and Space Hive. However it is felt that this has not been enough of a focus, which is reasonable as they first year of the project was to map, identify gaps and strategize.

However as above CENF has been task to ensure that a focus of community resilience must have a toolkit to access funding local groups.

There is also potential for CENF to apply directly for funding via health providers to continue to deliver some of the healthy habits work for the BME community, or older people's sessions directly.

A recent attempt to crowd fund for events for older people was unsuccessful – due to issues of the digital divide in using this platform. CENF did however support 3 other local organisations to successful crowd funded projects with the potential to do the same in year 2/3

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

The Neighbourhood grant remains the only known source of funding for this type of community development work presently. However it is possible that LBL could work with the CENF on accessing more national funding pots around volunteering and space improvements.

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?

The CENF has a close relationship with the key players in the majority of the local organisations and although there is potential for the CENF to come under one of their umbrellas, as this post is funded through the main grant, no organisation would be able to cover this cost.

With the advent if the new library there is potential to broker a deal to use some of their space as an office, however again, they are likely to want to maximise their own income.

There is potential to combine some of the surrounding wards into a wider community development area, as some outreach is already happening outside of the boundaries of the ward as stated in the original application. CENF specifically mentioned work happening at the Green Man in Downham and within the Bellingham ward

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?

CENF has not approached anyone to share resources with. This question is not applicable for the CENF as the constituted organisation is volunteer run so have no outlay and the funding goes directly to the Archibald Corbett Society to pay the CENF worker.

What support might you need to move these suggestions forward? As above, this question is not applicable for the CENF This funding stream in this instance goes to directly paying the lone worker, and as the majority of the role is out in the community there are few opportunities to suggest an alternative way of working

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?

The cut would not directly affect service delivery in any real terms, the CENF lone worker does 3 full days and the rest of the time is spent in a voluntary capacity.

There is an issue around the lone worker being able to support themselves on less funding, however it was discussed and felt that stepping back from the direct involvement in organisations – such as not attending all additional board meetings of other organisations could help free up more development time.

The lone worker felt able to manage in the short term and as mentioned earlier in this report but there could be a time where additional work would be needed, to cover the loss of income

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

One of the strengths of the CENF is strategizing for the local area and had already created an exit strategy, should funding but cut more significantly that 25%.

The worker would refocus the outputs and outcomes with the lead officer to ensure prioritisation of increasing the community resilience and ability to develop at a local level through developing community toolkits

Conclusion

Any other comments / areas discussed

It was also clarified that the lone worker was not getting involved in the development of the new community library to the detriment of the wider work in the ward. It was confirmed that although they had an involvement in helping them create a partnership between the Corbett RA and The Archibald Corbett Society to put them in a position to apply for the

tender, they were not actively involved in the delivery of the library service and additional activities.

Although it was noted that as a significant community hub, the CENF would of course need to have involvement with the delivery group and services in general

It was agreed that the CENF delivery of community development in Catford South was an excellent example of how the neighbourhood strand of the main grant was functioning extremely well and that the lone worker should keep up the good work!

Conclusion and recommendation

The original outputs and outcomes that LBL asked CENF to report on did not best reflect the scope and depth demonstrated in the original application, therefore these were increased and strengthened to better reflect it. This led to the CENF reporting on significantly more outcomes and outputs than originally agreed. This was done at the very start of the process and all were happy and confident to proceed

The CENF have achieved all targets and outputs for year one 2015-16, they are also currently achieving targets for Year 2. However the outputs are mostly different, due to the nature of the development work.

CENF is a constituted organisation but does seem to have confused governance, it was suggested that although the lone worker is essentially line managed by the Lead Officer and reports in to the local assembly co-group as a de-facto management committee, the governance structure needs more clarification going forward to ensure a sustainable plan for the future should the lone worker leave. A succession plan has been requested

Due to the nature of the development work, there are no real options to change business delivery model or merge that would be meaningful in any cost saving ways. so mergers and asset sharing have not be pursued

The modelled cut would lead to less time spent in the community at board meetings and with other organisations, however CENF feel that would be workable at this stage in the 3 year process as the links have been made.

As target outputs and outcomes have been achieved and wider development work is successfully being delivered - It is recommended that the Corbett Estate Neighbourhood Forum receive a pro-rata cut.

| 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: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Equalities groups disproportionately impacted by recommendations

Given the nature of the provision it is not felt that any one groups will be disproportionately affected with the impacts spread across the Catford South demographics:

Residents = 15,214, Second most populous ward in Lewisham

- Aged 0-19 = 4,179, 2.1% higher than the Lewisham average Aged 20-34 = 3,077 7.6% lower than Lewisham average
- Aged 35-49 = 3,685 0.1% Higher than Lewisham average
- Aged 50-64 = 2,547 3.3 % higher than Lewisham average
 Aged 65+ = 1,726 1.8% higher than the Lewisham average

The population of Catford South has 5,712 households with 15,214 people. The unique features of the area are:

- 464 households (7.9%) of have 1 person household with residents aged 65+ in Catford South
- 257 households (4.5%) with all residents aged 65+ compared to 2.7% for Lewisham
- 863 households (15.1%) with dependent children compared to 12.2% for Lewisham
- 15.1% same sex partnerships with dependent children compared to 12.2% for Lewisham
- 6% same sex partnerships without dependent children compared to 3.3% for Lewisham

Ethnicity : Ethnic Group Catford South Lewisham

| | Ca | tford South | Lewisham |
|------------------------|-------|-------------|----------|
| White | 43.8% | 53.5% | |
| Black or Black British | 35.3% | 27.2% | |
| Mixed | 8.1% | 7.4% | |
| Asian or Asian British | 10.1% | 9.3% | |
| Other Ethnic Group | 2.7% | 2.6% | |

SE6 has the highest Dementia diagnosis rate in Lewisham Catford South has a higher median income rate than the Lewisham average Catford South is around average for people with disabilities (7%. Lew average7.1%) and residents born in the UK 67.8%. Lew Average 68.3%)