

Mayor & Cabinet (Contracts)			
Report Title	Main Grants Programme 2017-18 and 2018/19 – funding recommendations		
Key Decision	Yes	Item No.	
Ward	All		
Contributors	Executive Director for Community Services, Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration, Head of Law		
Class	Part 1	Date:	7 December 2016

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement for the allocation of the Main Grant Programme 2017 –19. The report details the recommendations that Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) are asked to agree with a further paper to be tabled detailing the outcome of the appeals process for organisations who wish to challenge officer recommendations.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) agree:

- 2.1 the proposals to fund voluntary and community sector groups, as set out in Appendix 1, for the financial years 2017/18 and 2018/19
- 2.2 that £210,000 be ring-fenced for the development of the new ‘infrastructure’ offer (this represents a 25% reduction on the current funding to Voluntary Action Lewisham and the Volunteer Centre Lewisham)
- 2.3 that officers undertake a review of grants awarded to organisations that provide similar activities around youth theatre and performing arts to report back to Mayor and Cabinet in June 2017
- 2.4 the ring-fencing of £15,000 to support boxing in the borough in light of the recommendation to defund London Amateur Boxing Association
- 2.5 that officers review the allocations to Eco Communities during 2017/18 and report back to Mayor and Cabinet during 2017 with a recommended allocation for 2018/19
- 2.6 that rent grants cease from 1 April 2017 in order to regularise the support given to organisations in council buildings. The impact and agreed next steps for each of the four organisations affected are set out in section 11 of this report
- 2.7 that officers undertake a review of the grant making process to inform future allocation rounds.

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 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. Main Grants background

4.1 The current main grants programme was agreed by Mayor and Cabinet Contracts on 13 May 2015. Funding was provided over four themes:

- strong and cohesive communities
- communities that care
- access to advice services
- widening access to arts and sports

4.2 In addition to the themes outlined above there is a commitment to fund:

- Organisations that are committed to working with each other and us to ensure the best possible outcomes for Lewisham's residents with our shared resources.
- Active partners who are as passionate about Lewisham as we are and have the drive and capacity to make a difference to people's lives.
- Organisations that understand the level and profile of local need and have the ability to transform the way they work to meet that need.
- Organisations with a track record of adding value to council funding through attracting resources both financial and volunteer time.
- Organisations that share values with the council as well as commitment to the London Living Wage, equalities and environmental sustainability.

4.3 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) agreed 2016-17 funding to 60 organisations on 17 February 2016. Funding was awarded for 2 years and 9 months, from July 2015 to March 2018.

5. Savings requirement

5.1 Due to the overall financial position of the Council Mayor and Cabinet have agreed to reduce the funding to the grants programme by £1m from 1 April 2017. This equates to around 25% of the overall main grants budget.

5.2 As such the Council was required to develop an approach to realising this saving and undertook a 6 week consultation on the proposed approach between 19 May 2016 and 30 June 2016.

5.3 In July 2016 the Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) agreed that a full re-letting of the current programme was not appropriate and that officers should seek to realise the saving from the existing funding allocations through the activity outlined below in order of precedence:

1. Remove funding from under-performing groups/those performing least well
2. Negotiate reductions and seek alternative funding streams
3. Work with groups to consider mergers or asset sharing
4. Pro-rata reductions across all groups

5.4 It was agreed that this would be undertaken in a uniform way with all groups following a detailed set of follow up questions also agreed by Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) on 13 July 2016. These question are attached as Appendix 2 and full details of the consultation and the agreed approach can be found at <http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?Id=2921>.

5.5 In recognition of the fact that groups with funding agreements for three years faced reductions during that period it was agreed that the revised settlement would be extended for a further year through to 31 March 2019.

6. Implementation

6.1 Following the approval of the approach at Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) officers undertook the following activity in developing funding recommendations for each group while ensuring they were kept fully informed of the process and given ample opportunity to engage with the process and plan for any potential funding reduction:

- Head of Cultural and Community Development wrote to all funded groups (29/07/16) to outline the agreed approach and the list of questions (Appendix 2) that would be followed at meetings and suggested modelling for a 25% reduction including discussions with Trustees and frontline staff and volunteers
- Officers responded to initial requests for information or ad hoc meetings to discuss particular issues during the late summer
- Formal meetings were held with every group during July, August and September (see Appendix 3 for full meeting dates and attendees) to go through the agreed questions and formulate potential savings options
- Officers held internal 'Dragon's Den' style sessions during October where managers challenged colleagues on their analysis, assumptions and recommendations
- Draft recommendations presented to Executive Director for Community Services (20/10/16)
- Draft recommendation reports sent to all groups (02/11/16) with a two week deadline for formal appeals
- Draft recommendations considered by Safer Stronger Select Committee (28/11/16)
- Appeals against officers recommendations made to Mayor and Cabinet (30/11/16)

6.2 The recommendation report for each group set out the performance data considered, a record of the meeting and the rationale behind the proposed level of funding. These reports are attached as appendices 6 – 65. A summary of the key findings and recommendations are presented in sections 7 – 10 below, under the headings of the steps taken with the groups.

6.3 Overall these meetings were extremely positive with officers meeting with 77 Members of staff from funded organisations as well as 36 trustees with board level representation at 65% of the meetings.

6.4 5 organisations appealed their recommended allocation and a report detailing the outcome of the special meeting of Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) on Thursday 30 November 2016 has been tabled at the meeting.

6.5 The final recommended allocations are attached as appendix1.

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

- 7.1 The vast majority of funded groups are meeting their agreed outputs and outcomes well with some groups significantly overachieving against targets.
- 7.2 There were a small number of organisations who have underperformed against one or two of their outputs but had strong rationale for changing the focus of their work e.g. Age Exchange reallocated a small amount of their resource from advice to activity at the request of their service users.
- 7.3 Other groups had strong mitigating factors to be taken into account and were able to demonstrate that they had done everything they could to refocus their efforts or address the specific issue during the period e.g. Disabled Persons Contact underperformed against the number of trips that had been undertaken due to a bus crash but they refocused their resource on more local activity while they fundraised for a replacement bus.
- 7.4 However there were a small number of groups whose underperformance was not considered to be sufficiently mitigated and officers are recommending a full or partial defunding.
- 7.5 While **Grove Park Community Group** (GPCG) provide a successful community resource at the Ringway Centre it became apparent through the monitoring process that the organisation had failed to grasp the community development side of the grant with little work taking place until quarter one of 2016-17. This has been despite meetings with the monitoring officer and an agreed set of actions put in place. There was very little progress demonstrated against some of the key deliverables set out in the grant application and it is recommended that no main grant funding is awarded beyond March 2017.
- 7.6 It is worth noting GPCG did perform well on some of the agreed outputs but that these were being delivered prior to the grant and it is officers' assessment that they will continue to be delivered if the grant were to be removed.
- 7.7 **IRIE!** receives funding under both the Widening access to Arts and Sports (WATAS) and Strong and Cohesive Communities (Neighbourhood) funding streams. Whilst the organisation has failed to meet the stated output targets in either area, officers believe there are sufficient mitigating factors within the WATAS work (not least the distraction of the Strong and Cohesive Communities work) to recommend a pro-rata cut for this element of provision.
- 7.8 However the lack of delivery against the outputs in relation to a wider community development approach is more difficult to justify. This is particularly in relation to the development and implementation of outreach strategies which would underpin a genuinely outward facing community development presence in the area. One of the strategies has now been completed and approved in the 2016/17 period but overall the organisation has not been able to demonstrate real progress in this area of work. As such it is recommended that IRIE! do not receive funding under the Strong and Cohesive Communities (Neighbourhood) theme beyond March 2017.
- 7.9 **Volunteer Centre Lewisham** have underperformed on a number of their outputs and it is therefore recommended that funding does not continue beyond March 2017.
- 7.10 However, the strategic importance of volunteering continues to be recognised and so it is recommended that funding is ring-fenced to be part of the budget allocated to the

new organisation that will deliver a redesigned voluntary sector infrastructure support offer – see section 9.

- 7.11 The situation with **Mencap** is a slightly unusual one. The recommendation report for funding for this round of Main Grant (2015-18), agreed by Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts) in May 2015, stated that Mencap's grant award would be for the provision of social clubs and related activity and that this should be the priority for the organisation. It further recommended that advocacy, and information and advice be delivered by other organisations where needed.
- 7.12 However, Mencap have continued to use the Main Grant for the provision of advocacy and information and advice, and provide monitoring data for this. The council has also continued to accept this monitoring data and has not dealt with this error until now.
- 7.13 As such it appears that a substantial proportion of the grant is used to provide this advocacy, information and advice and Mencap are therefore using the grant erroneously. The social groups which the council does fund are predominantly run by volunteers with a small amount of administrative support and sessional worker cost.
- 7.14 Therefore, it is recommended that Mencap receive a 50% cut. This is to safeguard the social activities which they are funded for and in recognition that the advocacy, information and advice work is not funded by the council.
- 7.15 **Eco Communities** underperformed against two of their targets but officers are prepared to accept mitigating factors regarding the closure of a building and library manager sickness and that these figures are improving in quarter one of 16-17. However, it also became clear that the delivery of the outputs agreed under the grant are closely linked with the management of the community library buildings and it is unclear which takes priority in resource allocation. As such it is recommended that this funding be initially only for 2017/18 while officers work with Eco Communities to review the use of the grant and the future of the current library buildings that Eco manage.
- 7.16 In addition to the above groups recommended for full or partial defunding it should be noted that **Greenwich Carers Centre** had their funding removed in July 2016 due to changes in market conditions leading to underperformance. This reduction in funding is formally recognised as on-going as part of this process.
- 7.17 Overall the process of reviewing the performance of all groups during a focused and intensive period has been a very positive one and led to a significant amount of dialogue regarding the purpose of the individual grants and a refocusing of outputs to best achieve the outcomes desired by both the council and the funded organisations.
- 7.18 However, it is important to note that during the course of the process it has become apparent that the nature of grant making meant that comparing groups and making an objective assessment of relative performance was very difficult.
- 7.19 It is also the case that services have traditionally been assessed primarily in relation to their initial application rather than other similar projects and that there is a lack of parity in levels of funding provided to different organisations who are delivering similar services.
- 7.20 Furthermore it is clear that there is not a single, agreed approach on the way in which organisations provide output data as part of the performance monitoring process. Some groups only list services directly funded by the grant, some list all outputs

supported by the grant, while some see the funding as a contribution towards their overall delivery and include activities funded from other sources

7.21 In order to provide greater clarity to future monitoring and funding rounds it is recommended that officers undertake two specific pieces of work:

- a review of grants awarded to organisations that provide similar activities around youth theatre and performing arts, including Lewisham Youth Theatre, Trinity Laban and Greenwich and Lewisham Young Person's Theatre to report back to Mayor and Cabinet in June 2017
- that officers undertake a root and branch review of the grant making process to inform the process for any future allocation rounds.

8. Negotiate reductions and seek alternative funding streams

8.1 During the course of discussions with groups in excess of 50 different funding streams were considered ranging from large trusts and foundations, through alternative statutory funding to small scales giving and fees and charges.

8.2 However, with the exception of small charitable giving most funding streams are focused on particular activity and outcomes and fund specific posts or activity rather than being able to directly replace funding provided through the grants programme.

8.3 However officers have been successful in securing £250,000 from the Better Care Fund (BCF) to support the work of the **Community Connections Consortium** for the remainder of the programme.

8.4 The BCF is a unique funding stream that straddles health and local government and is designed to place individuals at the centre of their care and support providing them with 'wraparound' fully integrated health and social care, resulting in an improved experience and better quality of life.

8.5 BCF resources have been made available to Community Connections in recognition of the vital work it plays, and will play, in the integration of the voluntary sector into the Neighbourhood Care Network. This funding means that the Main Grant to Community Connections can be reduced to £86,000 while protecting the overall investment at the current level of £336,000 per annum.

8.6 In addition to this officers continue to work with a number of groups to secure increased level of funding through their engagement with the local authority and/or the CCG including **Sydenham Garden**, in relation to their dementia work, and Voluntary Services Lewisham's **Access Lewisham** scheme.

8.7 Officers were also able to negotiate funding reductions with a number of groups due to a variety of reasons:

8.8 Despite positive performance data it has become apparent that **London Amateur Boxing Alliance (ABA)** who are currently funded through the Main Grants programme has broken away from the only recognised National Governing Body (NGB) 'England Boxing.' The London region of England Boxing is now called London Boxing.

8.9 London Boxing has highlighted that clubs working with the Alliance would not be able to access Sport England funding or any other major funding that is linked to involvement with the NGB.

- 8.10 Officers have spoken to representatives of the ABA who recognise that this makes their council funding untenable and have agreed that this will mean they can no longer be funded although they will continue to promote boxing in the borough. It is recommended that the London ABA are defunded but funding (£15,000) is ring fenced for boxing support in the borough. This would include developing provision in the south of the borough, following the closure of Palmers and support to Double Jab in the north of the borough. Officers will work with London Boxing and England Boxing (the NGB) to develop this support for implementation from 1 April 2017 although this is recommended to be a one year allocation initially to allow for a full evaluation of the new approach.
- 8.11 Officers have negotiated a 35% reduction in funding for **Lee Green Lives** based on under and unclear performance against targets in 2015/16.
- 8.12 This is not a reflection on the quality of work delivered by Lee Green Lives but rather the nature of the provision and the lack of common understanding regarding the agreed outputs. The reduced level of funding also represents the current level of unspent funding and the expectation that this resource be used to bolster activity over the remaining funding period.
- 8.13 A 50% cut has been negotiated in the funding for **Saxon Crown** swimming club. Again, this is not a reflection of the quality of delivery but a recognition of where the organisation's strengths lie and a need to focus on core swimming offers e.g. for those with disabilities rather than a wider sports development role. This reduction takes account of the re-profiling of underspend on current funding across the remaining years which would reduce the impact of the reduction.
- 8.14 Officers have undertaken detailed negotiations with **Somerville Youth and Play Provision (Somerville)** who are currently funded outside of the main grants themes in recognition of the uncertainty relating to the overall youth provision in the borough at the time of the letting of the programme.
- 8.15 There is now greater clarity regarding this provision with the creation of Youth First mutual and it is important that Somerville moves towards a sustainable future alongside the wider provision in the borough.
- 8.16 However, Youth First is still its infancy and it is important that Somerville are not destabilised in the short term. As such officers have negotiated a 25% reduction in the allocation for 2017/18 and a further reduction in 2018/19. It was originally proposed that the target for 2018/19 was £0 but Somerville made the case that this would severely undermine the organisation as they use the Lewisham Grant for match funding for other funding. Officers accepted this consideration and agreed to make a provisional recommendation of £40,000 for 2018/19 (to cover the level of match funding already stated) but to work with Somerville during 2017/18 to see if this could be reduced.
- 8.17 Officers will work with Somerville, Youth First and other services for young people in the borough on future provision as previously agreed by Mayor and Cabinet.
- 8.18 Finally, there has been a reduction in the level of contribution to the London Borough Grants Scheme from 2017 and an element of this reduction has been reflected as part of the overall saving. The overall reduction has yet to be confirmed but is likely to be around £10,000 higher than the figure taken as saving in order to create a small contingency within the 2017/18 grants budget.

9. Work with groups to consider mergers or asset sharing

- 9.1 The potential to mitigate the impact of any revenues reductions and to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of provision through asset sharing and/or mergers was discussed with every group.
- 9.2 A number of groups expressed interest in exploring this further and officers will be facilitating discussions and workshops for a number of individual groups as well as sectors (e.g. groups providing services for Older People) but at the time of writing only one set of formal negotiations has begun.
- 9.3 This is regarding the provision of a new 'infrastructure' offer to the voluntary and community sector in the borough. These negotiations are in part due to the recommended defunding of the Volunteer Centre Lewisham (see paragraphs 7.9 – 7.10) but also in response to a wider set of circumstances including the removal of infrastructure funding through the London Councils grants programme, the production of 'The Way Ahead' report by the London Funders and the investigation into the needs of the sector by Lewisham's Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committee.
- 9.4 These factors have all contributed to officers holding discussions with Voluntary Action Lewisham (VAL), the Volunteer Centre Lewisham (VCL) and the Rushey Green Timebank (RGT) about what the future offer may look like. RGT have been included in these discussions due to their role coordinating timebanking across the borough and the delivery of specific sector leading projects such as the Lewisham Community Contributor Card.
- 9.5 A number of meetings have taken place to discuss a merged organisation or joint venture and there is broad agreement around the vision and purpose of the offer based on nine principles put forward by VAL:
- involve – getting communities involved in co-producing an understanding of need and what must happen to make Lewisham better, stronger and more sustainable;
 - introduce – understanding and connecting people, groups and formal organisations – bringing people together to achieve change;
 - initiate – identifying needs and encouraging others to act – sparking collaborations and starting discussions to get solutions;
 - incubate – providing seedbed space (physical and intellectual) for emerging groups to tackle new and changing needs;
 - inspire – showcasing excellence, developing new ideas, sharing learning from within and outside Lewisham;
 - invest – equipping civil society with the skills, knowledge and resources to make a difference;
 - inform – sharing data on needs and policy developments with Lewisham groups, and out to local decision makers and the London Hub;
 - influence – championing the role of the sector, the needs and strengths of local communities, and helping strategic people make better decisions; and
 - innovate – be a centre of excellence for civil society support, piloting new ways of working to achieve positive change.
- 9.6 These principles echo the use of the term 'civil society' in the Way Ahead report to reflect a wider role than just supporting the voluntary sector and also make reference to the London Hub which is likely to be created to replace pan-London support funded by London Councils.

9.7 These broad principles will be developed, incorporating recommendations from the Safer, Stronger Communities Select Committee, into a formal service offer from 1 April 2017. However at the time of writing it is unclear whether RGT would formally be part of any new offer and as such the recommendation within this report is that £210,000 be ringfenced for the development of the new offer (this represents a 25% reduction on the current funding to VAL and VCL) with RGT receiving a pro-rata cut. Officers hope that the outcome of the negotiations will be positive with the new offer delivered using the combined resource.

10. Pro-rata reductions across all groups

10.1 The activity outlined in sections 7-9 above mean that the pro-rata cut applied to all remaining groups who are performing well is 14.9%.

10.2 This is well below the 25% reduction that officers have modelled with organisations and the expectation is the impact will be significantly reduced as groups have been planning for a larger cut for several months.

11. Rent Grants

11.1 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 and peppercorn lease arrangements.

11.2 During 2015 the Council developed and consulted on a voluntary sector accommodation plan which was agreed by Mayor and Cabinet in July 2015 and November 2015. Part of this plan was to regularise the support offered to voluntary organisations in council owned buildings, and to ensure a transparent and fair approach across the board.

11.3 Historically the council has provided rent grants to some organisations to cover the cost of rent charged by the council. The rent grants are not linked to specific outcomes. Four organisations who currently receive rent grants are as follows:

- Ackroyd Community Association
- Lewisham Young Women's Resource Centre (LYWRC)
- The Midi Music Company
- Downham Community Association (Wesley Halls)

11.4 Two of these organisations (Ackroyd and Midi Music) were successful in receiving main Grant funding in 2015-18 whilst the other two were not recommended for Main Grant funding.

11.5 Whilst the voluntary sector accommodation plan was being implemented it was agreed that the four organisations receiving rent grants continued to receive their funding in 2015/16 and 2016/17 to allow for the conclusion of this work.

11.6 It is proposed that since this work is coming to a conclusion, that rent grants cease from 1 April 2017 in order to regularise the support given to organisations in council buildings. The impact and agreed next steps for each of the four organisations affected are as follows:

11.7 Lewisham Young Women's Resource Project (LYWRP) – This organisation was identified in the voluntary sector implementation plan as either moving to shared premises (e.g. one of the new community hubs) or a full lease to be implemented by

March 2017. LYWRP are currently on a lease and feel they are in a position to remain in the building and on removal of the rent grant from 1 April 2017 will pay the rent going forward.

- 11.8 Wesley Halls – This community centre was identified as core provision within the borough and in order to bring them in line with other core community centres on leases it has been agreed with them to change their lease to peppercorn from 1 April 2017 by either deed of variation or side letter. They will be responsible for repairs and maintenance as required by the lease.
- 11.9 Ackroyd Community Centre – This community centre was identified as core provision within the borough and is Main Grant funded. In order to bring them in line with other core community centres on leases it has been agreed with them to change their lease to peppercorn from 1 April 2017 by either deed of variation or side letter. They will continue be responsible for repairs and maintenance.
- 11.10 Midi Music – This building is identified as a specialist facility in the plan. It is proposed that a lease is negotiated with them which will be at less than market rate, whilst these negotiations are underway it has been agreed that their current Tenancy at Will is stopped and a new one issued at peppercorn rate from 1 April 2017.
- 11.11 For the last three buildings (Wesley, Ackroyd and Midi) there is a net zero income position for the council in removing the rent grant and introducing peppercorn arrangements from 1 April 2017. In the case of LYWRP the rent paid from 1 April 2017 will go to Regeneration and Asset Management service.

12. Financial Implications

- 12.1 This report proposes allocations of the main grants programme budget, supplemented by £250k from the Better Care Fund, for 2017/18 and 2018/19 (Appendix 1). In 2017/18 the proposals achieve the £1m saving (L5) considered by Mayor & Cabinet on 30 September 2015 and 10 February 2016. In 2018/19 the available resource will reduce by a further £100k and proposals must be developed in the course of 2017/18 to address this gap.

13. Legal Implications

- 13.1 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.
- 13.2 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.
- 13.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution the decisions required in this report are reserved to Members.
- 13.4 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.
- 13.5 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.
- 13.6 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.
- 13.7 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/>
- 13.8 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
- 13.9 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/>

14. Crime and Disorder Implications

- 14.1 A number of the groups funded through the Main Grants programme work with people who may be involved with the criminal justice system. These groups are all recommended for a pro-rate cut and officers will work with them to mitigate any impact on their service delivery.
- 14.2 Officers will also liaise with colleagues from the Crime Reduction and Supporting People service to monitor any issues arising as a result of grant reductions in order to agree actions to address the impact.

15. Equalities Implications

- 15.1 A full equalities impact assessment was undertaken on the Main Grants Allocations for 2015 - 18 – attached as appendix 5. As Mayor and Cabinet agreed that this overall allocation process was respected as part of the savings process the main findings of that assessment have been reassessed and are considered to be sound. As such an assessment has been undertaken on the potential impact of the funding reductions contained within this report. By focusing on reducing funding to groups performing least well and by securing BCF resources for the Community Connections service officers have sought to minimise the direct impact on current service delivery.
- 15.2 However, individual assessment of the protected characteristics most affected by each funding recommendations show that the highest impact will be against age (primarily older people) with 37 of the 63 recommendations assessed as having an impact, disability (23) and ethnicity (13) – see appendix 6.
- 15.3 Officers have worked with every individual groups to mitigate the specific impact of the funding reductions on their particular service and have sought to mitigate the impact on older people through the protection of funding to Community Connections who work primarily with older people. This work will be enhanced by bringing together the other groups that serve this community to consider asset sharing and mergers to protect frontline delivery.
- 15.4 The impact on disabilities is, in the majority of cases, also linked to age specific services and officers will work with the relevant Council colleagues and other services to highlight the potential reduction in frontline service and identify alternative activities where required.
- 15.5 Further work will be undertaken to secure alternative funding sources for groups and to promote ways of working that reduce the impact on front line services but it has to be acknowledged that some impact will be felt through a funding reduction of this size. Officers will monitor the individual impacts on a project by project basis and take all necessary steps to ensure that no groups are disproportionately affected.

16. Environmental Implications

- 16.1 There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report.

17. Conclusion

- 17.1 The Council is seeking to realise £1m savings from 1 April 2017 from the Main Grants budget. Currently 60 organisations (63 individual projects) are funded from the programme. Consultation took place between 19 May and 30 June 2016 around the proposed approach to realising the savings with a general acceptance of the approach proposed.
- 17.2 Officers have taken a robust approach to the delivery of this approach and have managed to reduce pro-rata element of the reductions from the planned 25% to 14.9%.
- 17.3 The process of meeting with all funded groups has been beneficial for all concerned and the recommendations contained within the report ensure that the remaining programme will deliver significant outputs and outcomes during 2017/18 and 2018/19.

If there are any queries on this report please contact James Lee, Head of Service for Culture and Community Development on 020 8314 6548.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Recommended Allocation 2017-18 and 2018-19
- Appendix 2 – Questions explored with all groups during savings process
- Appendix 3 – Meeting dates and attendees
- Appendix 4 – Equalities Impact Assessment of the Main Grants Programme 2015-18
- Appendix 5 – Equalities impacts - grants amendments 17-18 and 18-19

Recommendation Reports

- Appendix 6 – 170 Community Project
- Appendix 7 – 999 Club
- Appendix 8 – Access Lewisham (VSL)
- Appendix 9 – Ackroyd Community Association
- Appendix 10 – Advice Lewisham bid - Lewisham CAB
- Appendix 11 – Age Exchange
- Appendix 12 – Age UK
- Appendix 13 – Ageing Well in Lewisham-LCC
- Appendix 14 – Bellingham Community Project Ltd
- Appendix 15 – Bromley & Lewisham Mind
- Appendix 16 – CAB (Lewisham Citizens Advice Bureau)
- Appendix 17 – Community Connections Partnership (Age UK Lewisham and Southwark)
- Appendix 18 – Contact a Family
- Appendix 19 – Corbett Estate Neighbourhood Forum
- Appendix 20 – Deptford Mission – Disabled People’s Contact
- Appendix 21 – Deptford Reach
- Appendix 22 – Deptford X
- Appendix 23 – Eco Communities
- Appendix 24 – Entelechy Arts
- Appendix 25 – Evelyn 190 Centre
- Appendix 26 – Goldsmiths Community Association
- Appendix 27 – Greenwich & Lewisham Young People’s Theatre
- Appendix 28 – Grove Centre, The
- Appendix 29 – Grove Park Community Group
- Appendix 30 – Heart ‘n’ Soul
- Appendix 31 – IRIE!
- Appendix 32 – LEAN (Lewisham Education Arts Network)
- Appendix 33 – Lee Green Lives
- Appendix 34 – Lewisham Community Transport Scheme
- Appendix 35 – Lewisham Disability Coalition
- Appendix 36 – Lewisham Pensioners Forum
- Appendix 37 – Lewisham Speaking Up
- Appendix 38 – Lewisham Youth Theatre
- Appendix 39 – LMLAS (Lewisham Multilingual Advice Service)
- Appendix 40 – London ABA (Amateur Boxing Association)
- Appendix 41 – London FA (on behalf of Lewisham Football Network)
- Appendix 42 – LRMN (Lewisham Refugee and Migrant Network)
- Appendix 43 – Mencap
- Appendix 44 – METRO (The Metro Centre Ltd)
- Appendix 45 – Midi Music Company, The
- Appendix 46 – Montage Theatre Arts

Appendix 47 – Noah's Ark Children's Venture
Appendix 48 – Parent Support Group (PSG)
Appendix 49 – Rushey Green Time Bank
Appendix 50 – Saxon Crown
Appendix 51 – Second Wave Centre for Youth Arts
Appendix 52 – Seniors EPRC (Lewisham Elders Resource Centre)
Appendix 53 – Somerville Youth & Play Provision
Appendix 54 – Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust
Appendix 55 – Sydenham Arts Ltd
Appendix 56 – Sydenham Garden
Appendix 57 – Teatro Vivo
Appendix 58 – Tennis Lewisham (South East London Tennis)
Appendix 59 – The Albany
Appendix 60 – Thunder Basketball (London Thunder)
Appendix 61 – Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance
Appendix 62 – VAL (Voluntary Action Lewisham)
Appendix 63 – VCL (Volunteer Centre Lewisham)
Appendix 64 – VSL (Voluntary Services Lewisham)
Appendix 65 – Wheels for Wellbeing