

Grants Committee

2022-2026 Pan-London Grants Programme - Implementation update

Item: 14

Report by Feria Henry/Joanne Watson **Job title** Grants Managers

Date 13 July 2022

Contact Officer Feria Henry/Joanne Watson

Telephone 020 7934 9529 **Email:** feria.henry@londoncouncils.gov.uk
020 7934 9815 joanne.watson@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary At the November 2021 meeting, Grants Committee agreed recommendations for grant funding for Priority 1, Combatting Homelessness, and Priority 2, Tackling Domestic and Sexual Violence for the 2022-2026 Pan-London Grants Programme.

This reports updates members on the implementation of the new programme.

Recommendations Grants Committee is asked to:

- note the activity to-date (section 1) and continuing activity (section 3) to implement the 2022-2026 pan-London Grants Programme
- note the final awarded grant values to partners who are delivering the programme from April 2022 (table 1)
- discuss and suggest aspects of involvement with the programme over the coming year (section 4).

2022-2026 Grants Programme – Implementation update

1 Background

- 1.1 At the November 2021 meeting, Grants Committee agreed recommendations for grant funding for Priority 1, Combatting Homelessness, and Priority 2, Tackling Domestic and Sexual Violence for the 2022-2026 Pan-London Grants Programme.
- 1.2 The total funding available through the prospectus for the life of the programme was £21,100,000; £9,800,000 for combatting homelessness and £11,300,000 for tackling domestic and sexual abuse. Funding was split across nine services areas:

1.2.1 *Priority 1 – Combatting homelessness*

- 1.1 Prevention and targeted intervention - £4million
- 1.2 Prevention and targeted intervention for rough sleepers - £1million
- 1.3 Prevention and targeted intervention for young people - £4million
- 1.4 Improving the response to homelessness in London (working with housing and homelessness organisations and professionals) - £800,000

1.2.2 *Priority 2 – Tackling domestic and sexual abuse*

- 2.1 Prevention (children and young people) - £1million
- 2.2 Specialist advice, counselling and support (for medium risk survivors (including post-IDVA/ISVA) and target groups not accessing general provision) - £7million
- 2.3 Helpline services (advice and support, access to refuge provision) - £1.2million
- 2.5 Improving the response to domestic and sexual abuse in London (working with domestic and sexual abuse organisations and professionals) - £800,000
- 2.6 Services for people affected by harmful practices - £1.3million

- 1.3 The [prospectus and service specifications](#) are available on the London Councils website.

2 Activity with recommended applicants

- 2.1 Twelve organisations were recommended for 13 grants to deliver the services outlined in the prospectus (see Table 1).

- 2.2 Since the November Committee meeting the grants team has undertaken the following activities:

- 2.2.1 Pre-agreement meetings – to cover a range of pre-award matters including:

- roles and responsibilities (grant agreement)
- review of activity, outcomes, and budget profiles
- monitoring and reporting (including borough level)

- 2.2.2 Programme assessment

- assessment of outcomes against prospectus
- review of all profiles and budgets to assess pan-London delivery and value

- 2.3 Co-design of reporting arrangements (working with Superhighways) using a collaborative approach to review current system and scope the future system with the aim of:

- reducing time grants officers spend on collating and analysing information
- reducing time, and funding, grantees spend on reporting to London Councils
- sharing collated reporting outcomes with grantees on a more consistent basis.

- 2.4 A key issue the team and new partners have been managing is adjusting projects to match available resources. Following initial negotiations, grants have been reduced proportionally to the funding for programme priority, to avoid reducing smaller grants to the point of non-viability (see Table 1).

Table 1: Applicants and Agreed Awarded amount

Service Area	Organisation	Original requested amount	Agreed awarded amount
1.1	Shelter, The National Campaign for Homeless People Ltd	£3,993,720	£3,706,718
1.1	St Mungo Community Housing Association	£1,455,633	£1,315,749
1.2	St Mungo Community Housing Association	£445,109	£413,021
1.3	New Horizon Youth Centre	£3,999,795	£3,756,866
1.4	Homeless Link	£767,910	£693,509
Priority 1: Combatting Homelessness		£10,662,167	£9,885,863
2.1	Against Violence and Abuse	£998,375	£944,987
2.2	Galop	£643,749	£642,295 ¹
2.2	Women and Girls Network	£5,820,952	£5,533,157
2.2	SignHealth	£1,171,769	£1,047,148
2.3	Refuge	£1,200,000	£1,139,673
2.5	Women's Resource Centre	£799,996	£758,088
2.6	Asian Women's Resource Centre	£1,300,000	£1,234,646
Priority 2: Tackling Domestic and Sexual Violence		£11,934,841	£11,299,994

¹ This is the recommended figure, final budget is still being negotiated, project has started at own risk

3 Activity

3.1 Activity for the team since the last report in March has included:

- 3.1.1 finalising actions from pre-agreement meetings
- 3.1.2 extending the agreement for the current Grant for specialist refuge services - led by Ashiana Network - to April 2023. This extension is to give time to develop longer term arrangements with the boroughs and the GLA following the introduction of the Domestic Abuse Act.
- 3.1.3 Finalising the agreement for refuge data services - In July 2021, Grants Committee agreed to an award of grant (£100,000 total) for the period 2022 to 2026 to the Women's Aid Federation for continuation of data services related to refuge domestic abuse services and refuge provision.
- 3.1.4 Agreeing new reporting arrangements – work has continued with Superhighways to introduce a new reporting portal to streamline the way partners report on their outcomes to London Councils. Several workshops have been delivered with a to deploying the reporting tool in readiness for the first quarter's return later this month; first quarter performance will be reported to the next Grants Committee meeting in November 2022.
- 3.1.5 Most funding agreements have been issued with the remainder to be issued shortly.
- 3.1.6 Projects that have met all provisional requirements have received a first payment.
- 3.1.7 Since November, the team has worked with Superhighways to develop a more efficient reporting tool for the programme. This work will continue during the remainder of the year.
- 3.1.8 Work to scope out and commission an evaluator for the 2022-2026 programme will begin over the summer.

4 Year one activity for Grants Committee

- 4.1 Grants Committee members were involved in bringing the new programme to life from developing the prospectus, contributing to workshops through to scoring of applications and engagement with a programme panel.
- 4.2 There will be opportunities for Grants Committee members to find out more about and further develop the programme in year one (2022-2023). For example:
 - 4.2.1 induction sessions for new members
 - 4.2.2 partners presenting to Grants Committee
 - 4.2.3 scoping and commissioning of the 2022-2026 programme evaluation
 - 4.2.4 arranging visits for members throughout year and informing members of opportunities to visit funded projects
 - 4.2.5 continuing to use the evaluation findings from 2017-2022 programme to discuss and agree any programme management changes
 - 4.2.6 reviewing new programme reporting arrangements
 - 4.2.7 scoping and agreeing changes during the life of the programme
 - 4.2.8 agreeing champions for specific aspects of work.
- 4.3 Grants Committee members are invited to discuss the above and suggest any further aspects of involvement with the programme over the coming year.

5 Recommendations

- 5.1 Grants Committee is asked to:
 - 5.1.1 note the activity to-date (section 1) and continuing activity (section 3) to implement the 2022-2026 pan-London Grants Programme
 - 5.1.2 note the final awarded grant values to partners who are delivering the programme from April 2022 (table 1)
 - 5.1.3 discuss and suggest aspects of involvement with the programme over the coming year (section 4).

Financial Implications for London Councils

The budget for 2022-23 was agreed by Leaders' Committee in December 2021.

Legal Implications for London Councils

London Councils manages the London Councils Grants Programme on behalf of all the boroughs and the City of London. The Programme makes grants to voluntary organisations to deliver improved outcomes for Londoners.

The Programme operates within a scheme made under Section 48 of the Local Government Act 1985. It is a collective scheme i.e. all the boroughs fund the Programme, through a levy contribution based on the boroughs proportion of the capital's population. Boroughs must exercise their functions in respect of the scheme 'with due regard to the needs of the whole of Greater London'.

Leaders' Committee determines the principles and priorities of the Programme and the overall budget of the Programme. The Grants Committee commissions services, makes awards of funding, manages projects' performance and may advise Leaders' Committee on the Programme.

The legal requirements of good decision-making by public authorities, in summary, require the following:

1. **Declaration of interests:** The principle being, a decision maker should not be a "judge in his own cause". Where a decision-maker has an interest in the subject of a decision he is making it is likely to preclude his participation in the decision where – the decision will affect a friend or relation, the decision-maker has a financial interest in its outcome, the decision-maker is a director of an organisation affected by the outcome of the decision, the decision-maker is a member of group campaigning for one outcome or another, the decision maker's spouse, civil partner or other close family member has an interest in the outcome. Although a close connection with the subject of the decision will automatically disqualify a person from making a decision, declaration of a less direct interest before a decision is made may permit them to take part. In the latter circumstances the person concerned and any colleagues participating in the decision-making process must decide whether the connection would lead a fair-minded and informed observer to conclude that there was a real possibility that the decision-maker would be biased

if they took part. London Councils has policies and procedures to assist in managing these matters, with Members being required to comply with their own authority's Code of Conduct.

2. **Following correct procedure:** A decision-maker will often be required to follow a set procedure for making its decisions, whether set out in statute or set by the decision-maker itself. Any such procedures are usually drafted with the purposes of both ensuring the decision-maker takes into account all relevant considerations as well as ensuring procedural fairness for those affected by the decision. In taking decisions which engage consideration of specific duties, such as the equalities duties, any process must ensure that those duties are also met. In your case, this will ensure that you turn your mind to, and can evidence that you have had due regard to the public sector equality duty in taking the decision. As you know this does not necessarily require a formal public consultation or EIA (but see below). Examples of prescribed procedures for decision-makers include express duties to: consult, give reasons for decisions, be informed of a right to appeal (if there is one), etc. NB: Whilst it is necessary for a public body making decisions to follow a set procedure that will not of itself render the procedure fair, and in certain circumstances it may also be appropriate/fair to depart from the published procedure.
3. **Consultation:** Public bodies are required by law to consult before making decisions, particularly in the context of making policies or issuing guidance. In some cases, there is an express duty to consult and a statutory process which must be followed. There is no express statutory requirement to consult under the Grants Scheme, although in having due regard to the needs of the whole of Greater London in making the scheme and exercising the relevant functions under section 48 of the Local Government Act 1985, and specifically in meeting the duty under subs 48(10) to keep the needs of the whole of Greater London under review, one must have regard to the general public law principles and requirements relating to consultation. There is published government guidance (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/consultation-principles-guidance>) and London Councils should have regard to this guidance

In summary: a public authority has a wide discretion in choosing the options upon which to consult; consultation may be an iterative process; consultation must be

lawful (and therefore fair), and such consultation must also be adequate; consultation should be proportionate to the potential impact of the proposal or decision being taken; it should be undertaken at a formative stage in developing the proposals; the timeframe for any consultation should be proportionate and realistic to allow stakeholders an adequate time to consider and respond; the information provided as part of the consultation should be useful and accessible, the objectives of the consultation clear, and the public authority must give sufficient reasons for any proposals being consulted upon to allow for intelligent consideration and response; those consulted should be aware of the criteria that will be applied by the public authority when considering proposals and which factors will be considered decisive or of substantial importance at the end of the process of consultation, such as in evaluating the consultation responses or in taking the decisions informed by the consultation; consultation need not be formal and in writing, and there are a number of ways of engaging with stakeholders which may be appropriate e.g. by email or web-based forums, public meetings, working groups, focus groups and surveys; etc.

If a public authority has promised it will engage in consultation before making a decision it would normally be unfair not to do so. Public bodies should be mindful of any public statements/guidance that may have issued promising consultation e.g. where decisions engage equalities issues. Past practice may imply a promise to consult again on the same type of decision - fairness generally requiring that the practice of consultation is continued. Even if there is no promise or past practice of consultation, the nature and impact of the decision may mean that fairness requires it.

Measures of the severity of a decision's impact include - the extent to which it unexpectedly alters the existing position or legitimate expectations of the affected individuals/groups; or the severity of consequences of the decision on the affected individuals/groups; etc . The product of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising proposals.

4. **Rational and evidence-based:** A public body must take rational decisions. An irrational or unreasonable decision is one that was not objectively rational and reasonably open to the decision-maker. Evidence-based decisions help to ensure that decisions are objectively reasonable.

5. **All relevant considerations:** A decision maker must ensure that it takes into account all relevant considerations in reaching a rational and evidence-based decision. The subject matter of the decision will inform what is relevant. EG: the proposal, response to consultation, guidance on parameters for decision, costs of decision, effects of the decision on others (including, for example, having due regard to the decision-makers' public sector equality duty), advice from officers, etc.
6. **Proper purpose:** A public body must act for a proper purpose and in taking their decisions decision-makers must apply their minds to the correct statutory objective. A public body must act in good faith.
7. **Proportionate:** Public decision-makers should act in a way that is proportionate. Proportionate decisions are also likely to be rational, evidence-based and reasonable.
8. **Properly reasoned:** Procedural requirements on public decision-makers require that reasons must be given for their decisions. Reasons do not need to be excessively detailed but do need to be adequate. Adequate decisions – deal with all the substantial points that have been raised; are sufficient for the parties to know whether the decision-maker has made an error of law; set out and explain key aspects of the decision-maker's reasoning in coming to its conclusion; include all aspects of reasoning that were material to the decision; but do not need to set out in detail all the evidence and arguments referred to by the decision-maker. The reasons for decisions should be recorded at the time the decisions are made.
9. With reference to the above, the standard grounds for judicial review are on the basis that a decision: was unlawful/ultra vires; was irrational; or was procedurally unfair - in that the decision-maker has not properly observed the relevant procedures (whether set by statute or by itself) e.g. it has failed to consult or give reasons for its decision, or there has been a failure to observe the principles of natural justice in the decision-making process e.g. evidence of bias.

Further, a public authority should also be careful not to raise a further ground of challenge if, through their own conduct or statements, they have established a legitimate expectation as to how the public body will act. A legitimate expectation may arise exceptionally in three cases – where the decision-maker has made a clear and unambiguous representation that it will adopt a particular form of procedure above and

beyond that which it would otherwise been required to adopt; where the claimant has an interest in some ultimate benefit that it hopes to attain or retain fairness may require the claimant to be given an opportunity to make representations; and where the decision-maker has a substantive right on which it was reasonable for the claimant to rely. Public bodies may change their policies or depart from them (and so not fetter their discretion), and so a legitimate expectation will only arise if departure from the existing policies was an abuse of power.

Equalities Implications for London Councils

In reaching decisions for the implementation of any future grants programme, the Committee is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equalities Act 2010, particularly the Public Sector Equalities Duty.

London Councils' funded services provide support to people within all the protected characteristics (Equality Act 2010), and targets groups highlighted as particularly hard to reach or more affected by the issues being tackled. Funded organisations are also required to submit equalities monitoring data, which can be collated across the grants scheme to provide data on the take up of services and gaps in provision to be addressed. The grants team reviews this data annually.

Background Documents

Grants Committee (AGM), 11 November 2020, Item 13, Extension to the current Grants Programme; Item 14 New grants programme 2022-2026: Planning and implementation

Grants Committee, 17 March 2021, Item 6, Grants Programme 2022-26: Planning and implementation

Grants Committee, 14 July 2021, Item 14, Grants Programme 2022-26: New programme prospectus

Grants Committee, 24 November 2021, Item 8, 2022-2026 Pan-London Grants Programme: Recommendations for award of grant

Grant Committee 16 March 2021, item 12, 2022-2026 Pan-London Grants Programme: Implementation Update