

<b>Committee/Meeting</b> Corporate Grants Programme Board	<b>Date:</b> 13 <sup>th</sup> January 2014	<b>Classification:</b> Unrestricted	<b>Report No:</b>
<b>Report of:</b>  <b>Robert McCulloch-Graham, Corporate Director</b> Education, Social Care and Wellbeing  <b>Originating officer(s)</b> Barbara Disney, Service Manager, Strategic Commissioning		<b>Title:</b>  <b>Update on the provision of Older People's Lunchclub services</b>   <b>Wards Affected: All</b>	

<b>Lead Member</b>	Cllr Abdul Asad
<b>Community Plan Theme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A safe and supportive Community</li> <li>▪ A Healthy Community</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Priority</b>	Housing and Overcrowding

## 1. INTRODUCTION/SUMMARY

- 1.1 Social isolation and loneliness are often considered to be particularly problems of older age. Reduced social contact, loneliness, isolation and being alone are thought to affect older people's quality of life and their health.
- 1.2 This report provides an update on the performance of Older People's Lunch Club services funded by the Council through Mainstream Grants (MSG) and the Lunch Club Development Fund (LCDF).
- 1.3 The report looks to the future funding of the LCDF lunchclubs, in the context of the JSNA that is currently being written on the impact of loneliness, and proposes that the LCDF lunchclubs be extended to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014 to align them with the MSG funded lunchclubs and to enable them further opportunity to seek alternative income.
- 1.4 In the short term, this report proposes that any underspend against the LCDF lunchclub budget is offset against the projected overspend in the MSG lunchclub budget.

## 2. DECISIONS REQUIRED

- 2.1 The Corporate Grants Board is recommended to:
  - Note the contents of this report
  - Agree the proposal to extend the LCDF lunchclubs and the 0.6wte officer to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014

- Agree that any underspend against the LCDF budget can be offset against the MSG lunchclub overspend.

### **3. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS**

- 3.1 To ensure that the use of LCDF lunchclub budget is maximise and that there is a consistent approach to the delivery of lunchclubs across the borough, that meet local need.

### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 4.1 Members could make the decision not to support these proposals and reduce or cease funding of lunchclubs from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014.

### **5. BACKGROUND**

- 5.1 The Council has long established arrangements for funding local third sector organisations through its 'mainstream grants programme process@'. Lunchclub provision for older people are an integral part of these arrangements as they support older people in the community and deliver a range of health and social activities to support independence and address social isolation.

### **6. BODY OF THE REPORT**

#### **Current situation**

- 6.1 There are currently 37 lunch clubs in receipt of LBTH funding. This includes 32 funded by MSG and five by LCDF. The primary purpose of Lunch Clubs is to enhance the lives of older people (50+) who may be at risk of social isolation or gradually losing their independence, through the provision of a range of practical and social activities. In addition, Lunch Clubs play a vital part in supporting people on low incomes to have a healthy cooked meal at minimal cost.
- 6.2. Grant Agreements with the 32 MSG-funded lunch clubs are in place until 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 and represent a funding commitment of £374,747 per annum against a budget of £324,380 – a shortfall of £50,367 per annum. Funded for a 27 month period from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2013, the lunchclubs target a wide range of older residents across the borough, including BME communities and users with dementia and their carers.
- 6.3 A 33<sup>rd</sup> MSG-funded Lunch Club – Fern Street Settlement – ceased operating at the end of September 2013 due to declining attendance figures.
- 6.4. There is a total allocated budget of £150,000 for the LCDF, which aims to set-up lunch clubs in wards where 20% or higher of residents aged 65+ are living in multigenerational households<sup>1</sup>. The proposal to allocate this funding was supported as part of the 2013-14 budget process through the £954k funding for accelerated delivery workstreams. This budget includes salary costs for the Lunch Club Development Officer up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014. Currently, there are five lunch clubs operating under this funding stream. Although there are different start dates for

---

<sup>1</sup> Mayhew Harper population study of March 2011.

these projects, each of the grant agreements runs for a six-month period with funding that includes running costs and a contribution towards set-up costs. The commitment for these five lunchclubs to the end of December 2013 stands at £27,748.

6.5 Negotiations are well progressed with a further five organisations with a view to setting up LCDF-funded lunch clubs. They are:

- **Ensign Youth Club** – outputs have been agreed and the project will open during the first week in January 2014.
- **Locksley Estate TRA (Dora Hall)** – officers are expecting their proposal during the first week of January 2014, with a view to opening during the second or third week in January.
- **Limehouse Bangladeshi Cultural Centre and Mosque** – initial meeting held but the organisation is experiencing some internal problems and awaiting the election of a new Management Committee.
- **Shadwell Women's Group** – currently based in a private home so looking for premises. A number of options have been followed up with officer support but none have met expectations.
- **Vision for Globe Town** – officers are expecting their proposal during the first week of January 2014, with a view to opening during the second or third week in January.

If the recommendations in section 2 are accepted, this will mean that these lunchclubs will initially be given agreements for funding for periods shorter than six months up to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014 (ie. From the date of opening to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014)

#### **Performance Update**

6.6. The attached *Appendix One* provides information related to each lunch club and awards a RAG rating based on actual attendance during Q2 2013/14. The rating has been awarded as follows:

- Green – attendance is 100% or more against the agreed target
- Amber – attendance is between 70 and 99.9% of the agreed target
- Red – attendance falls below 70% of the agreed target

6.7. Of the 37 lunch clubs in operation, 31 monitoring returns have been received for the second quarter.

Two MSG-funded lunch clubs have not provided their returns:

- **Kingsley Hall** commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 and the Monitoring Officer has unsuccessfully made efforts to obtain their monitoring information. Payments have not been made for Q1 or Q2 of 2013/14 as these can only be released upon receipt of satisfactory monitoring returns for the previous quarter.
- **Children Education Group** have not submitted their returns and has been subject to an internal Audit. Payment for Q1 2013/14 has recently been authorised and released. Payments for subsequent periods are suspended. The Audit has identified that this organisation represents poor value for money as it falls short of achieving targets. Additionally, Audit noted that a core group of individuals are receiving heavily subsidised daily meals through the organisation, without contribution to the cost. Strategic Commissioning Officers and Contract Management

Officers will be meeting with the provider shortly to re-negotiate the outputs and outcomes.

Only one of the five LCDF funded lunch clubs was able to provide information for Q2 2013/14, as this project commenced their service earlier than others on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2013. The remaining four lunch clubs are included in the appendix for completion but are not due to provide monitoring returns until the next period (Q3 2013/14).

6.8. The majority of lunch clubs are performing very well with 25 achieving over 80% of their attendance. 19 of these are meeting or beating their agreed attendance targets.

6.9 Three organisations rated as 'red' is as follows:

- **Newlon Fusion:** The organisation has reported that attendance has reduced in this quarter due to eight members being unable to attend for various reasons (including long-term sickness; clash with physio appointments, long-term holiday). The organisation is attempting to increase attendance through publicity.
- **St Peter's Community Advice Centre:** The organisation has reported that attendance has fallen off due to the discontinuation of activities as a result of a reduction in grant funding. The organisation is looking into ways to attract users, including introducing – or reinstating - new activities that are provided to the organisation free of charge.
- **Ocean Somali Community Association:** Attendance has dropped from 55.7% in Q1 to 43.9% in Q2 despite the organisation's expectation to report increased figures. The project commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013.

6.10. In the previous Performance Report, three organisations were rated as 'red'. They were:

- **Poplar Bangladeshi Community Project:** This organisation has reported an increase in attendance from 69.5% against target in Q1 to 76% in Q2. It is now rated as 'amber'.
- **Ocean Somali Community Association:** Attendance has continued to decrease as noted above, and at the moment this may lead to a reduction in funding.
- **Fern Street Settlement:** This service closed at the end of September 2013. Officers are reviewing possible alternative lunch clubs that can be established in LAP6 in order to ensure there is a form of continuation of provision in the area.

6.11. All MSG payments for those organisations that have submitted satisfactory monitoring returns are up to date. This excludes Kingsley Hall and Children Education Group as noted above. Initial payments (covering Q3 2013/14) for those LCDF-funded lunch clubs commencing during Q2 have been made.

## **Key Issues**

- 6.12 For a number of reasons, the LCDF lunchclubs have taken longer to set up than initially envisaged. Reasons include the difficulty in identifying appropriate premises. This means that most organisations would not have had the opportunity to offer a service for a six month period without permission to roll over the available funding and would limit their opportunities to seek alternative sources of funding for when the Council's funding ends.
- 6.13 Lunchclubs are required to levy a proper charge to those seeking a meal within a lunchclub. This cost is equitable with that levied to people who are housebound or unable to cook their own meal and seek a meal through the Community Meals service. Not all lunchclubs seek this income and it is proposed, in line with recommendations of the Audit investigation into the Harkness Luncheon Club (Children's Educational Group), to more closely monitor this across both the MSG and LCDF lunchclubs to ensure equity for all older residents.
- 6.14 The MSG lunchclub funding stream comes to an end on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2015, and although a timetable has yet to be confirmed for the advertising and application process, it is proposed that Officers, in partnership with Tower Hamlets CVS, run a workshop to support lunchclub providers to apply for funding elsewhere and seek other avenues to maximise income.
- 6.15 The current financial situation for the LCDF lunchclubs as outlined in *Appendix Two*, indicates a potential underspend of at least £23,786, although this may be notably more, dependent on the start date of the four lunchclubs currently in development, and, indeed, whether they all enter into an agreement with the Council to offer a service.
- 6.16 As there is a significant projected overspend on the MSG lunchclubs of £50,367 per annum, in the financial years 2013-14 and again in 2014-15, totalling £100,734 officers propose that any underspend identified in the LCDF funding stream is reallocated to the MSG during 2014-15.
- 6.17 The reason for the overspend in the MSG lunchclub programme is because the ADP lunchclubs were continued without commensurate increase in MSG funding.

## **7 COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER**

- 7.1 Recurrent funding of £0.324m in the base budget for Older People Commissioning and one-off funding of £0.152m agreed as a decision of the Executive Mayor in June 2013 for Lunch Club Development is available for 2013/14 and 2014/15 to meet the recommendations of the report.

## **8 CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)**

- 8.1  
8.2

## **9. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS**

- 9.1 The service specification supports two of the four themes of the Community Plan:

- **A healthy community**

Lunch clubs contribute to the healthy community theme by offering a nutritious meal, supporting the prevention agenda and offering additional opportunities for advice around healthy living and exercise activities and health promotion.

- **A safe and supportive community**

Lunch club provision contributes to the safe and supportive community theme by promoting peer support and volunteering and ensuring that services are safe to use for service users

9.2 The earlier round of MSG worked to ensure that lunch club provision enabled the needs of a wide range of clients including those with learning disabilities, physical disabilities and long term conditions to be catered for. Special focus was given to providing services to the diverse faith and ethnic communities in Tower Hamlets. The proposal in this paper focuses on older adults living in overcrowded conditions, usually in multi-generational families, which is a characteristic of certain parts of the Borough.

9.3 However, due regard continues to be given to encourage people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low through volunteering, and engagement in shaping services and decision that affect their own lives, such as involvement in user groups.

## **10. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT**

10.1 There are no immediate sustainability or environmental issues to consider. The prospective service providers, as organisations within the borough, would be required to comply with all national and local legislation regarding energy conservation, recycling etc. As services will be provided locally, most of their staff would be local too, thereby reducing commuting.

## **11. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 Detailed service specifications and targets will be negotiated and appropriate monitoring arrangements maintained to minimise risk of underperformance of these services. The service agreements will contain appropriate dispute, claw-back, liability and termination clauses.

## **12. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 There are no immediate Crime and Disorder reduction implications.

## **13. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT**

13.1 There are no cashable savings to be made by these proposals but the transfer of the LCDF underspend to offset the MSG overspend minimises the overall impact on the budgets.

**14. APPENDICES**

- Appendix One – Performance Data
  - Appendix Two – Lunchclub Development Fund – Impact of extending projects to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2014.
-

