

Committee/Meeting Corporate Grants Programme Board	Date: 17 July 2014	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No:
Report of: Deborah Cohen Education, Social Care and Wellbeing Originating officer(s) Barbara Disney, Service Manager, Strategic Commissioning		Title: New Lunch club Development Wards Affected: All	

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

1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Social isolation and loneliness are often considered to be particular 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. However, little attention is given to the needs of older people living in multigenerational households, particularly those in overcrowded households which is an acute problem of this Borough.
- 1.2 The recent round of Mainstream Grants (MSG) awarded funding (from 1st January 2013 to 31st March 2015) to 33 lunch clubs across the borough targeting a wide range of older residents, including BME communities and users with dementia.
- 1.3 Members asked that focus was given to the areas of highest prevalence of multigenerational families in the development of new lunch clubs to provide some respite to affected families. The detailed Equalities Impact Assessment supporting the process did not address issues of overcrowding but additional data has been gathered which identifies wards where multigenerational households are prevalent.
- 1.4 The proposal for additional lunch clubs was supported as part of 2013-14 budget process through the £954k funding for accelerated delivery workstreams to the sum of £152k. This is referred to as the Lunch Club Development Fund (LCDF).

2. DECISIONS REQUIRED

The Mayor is recommended to:-

- 2.1 Agree funding of £63,624 to provide further support for the nine LCDF lunch clubs, both directly and through the continued support of the Lunchclub Development Officer as set out in paragraph 6.1.6 below.

3. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

- 3.1 To ensure that the newly set up lunch club provisions in areas where overcrowding is prevalent, are able to consolidate their provisions and secure external funding to continue their services beyond the end of their funding.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 Members could make the decision not to support this proposal and to allocate the money elsewhere.

5. BACKGROUND

- 5.1 The Council has long established arrangements for funding local third sector organisations through its 'mainstream grants programme' process. Lunch clubs 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.

6. BODY OF REPORT

6.1 Mainstream Grant 2012-15 Older People Lunch Club Services

- 6.1.1 The latest round of Mainstream Grants (MSG) awarded funding (from 1st January 2013 – 31st March 2015) to 33 lunch clubs across the borough targeting a wide range of residents, including BME communities and users with dementia.
- 6.1.2 The detailed Equalities Impact Assessment supporting the process did not address issues of overcrowding and additional data has been gathered which identifies wards where multigenerational households are prevalent. The nine lunch clubs developed under the LCDF targeted these wards based on the evidence of the Mayhew Harper population data sourced from Council Tax, the Electoral Register, GP Register, LLPG (Property register), School Census and NHS Register. It is based on family name, and for our Bangladeshi communities, can be seen as an accurate assumption. For the general communities' data, it is less accurate and specific community data cannot be extrapolated. The Mayhew Harper population data can be found in the table below.

Mayhew Harper population study of March 2011.	All residents aged 65+ of all household types	Persons aged 65 and over living in multigenerational households		Percentage of persons age 65+ in multigen households
		LAP/Ward*	Persons	
LAP 1	2,871	442	277	15%
Bethnal Green North	961	183	114	19%
Mile End and Globe Town	980	123	74	13%
Weavers	930	136	89	15%
LAP 2	1,338	369	250	28%
Bethnal Green South	774	196	130	25%
Spitalfields and Banglatown	564	173	120	31%
LAP 3	2,064	481	332	23%
St Dunstons and Stepney Green	1,247	244	153	20%
Whitechapel	817	237	179	29%
LAP 4	1,637	257	167	16%
Shadwell	931	182	125	20%
St Katharine's and Wapping	706	75	43	11%
LAP 5	2,116	190	78	9%
Bow East	1,106	83	36	8%
Bow West	1,010	107	42	11%
LAP 6	1,601	349	212	22%
Bromley By Bow	845	194	120	23%
Mile End East	756	155	91	21%
LAP 7	2,099	299	174	14%
East India and Lansbury	1,062	153	85	14%
Limehouse	1,037	146	89	14%
LAP 8	1,736	275	129	16%
Blackwall and Cubitt Town	935	128	57	14%
Millwall	801	147	72	18%
Borough Total	15,462	2,662	1,618	17%

* Wards in this document are based on the geography of the old wards before the electoral

6.1.3 Between June 2013 and April 2014 nine lunch clubs were set up:

Name of Lunch Club	Date set up	Ward
--------------------	-------------	------

Westferry Lunch Club	11.06.13	Millwall
BBC Elderly Lunch Club	11.09.13	Spitalfields & Banglatown
Al Huda Lunch Club	04.10.13	Bethnal Green South
Redcoat Elders Club	23.09.13	St Dunstons & Stepney Green
Ford Square Lunch Project	10.10.13	Whitechapel
Ensign	03.01.14	St Katherine & Wapping
Globe Town Lunch Club	15.01.14	Mile End & Globe Town
Dora Hall Lunch Club	24.01.14	Limehouse
Shadwell Women Lunch Club	03.04.14	Shadwell

6.1.4 The services of the nine lunch clubs reach a small number of people (up to 15 for each lunch club) in small local neighbourhoods. Seven out of the nine lunch clubs are attended by Bangladeshi men, one by Bangladeshi women and one is aimed at Somali men. All have received funding towards setting up their lunch clubs with amounts ranging from £1,500 to £2,000, in one case it was £2,995. Their grant agreements make it a condition to seek external funding.

6.1.5 The lunch clubs were contracted to deliver services initially until the end of March 2014. They were then extended to the end of June 2014 through the £954k Accelerated Delivery work stream. These lunch clubs are currently being funded at risk to the sum of £10,604 including £2,354 salary costs for the Lunch Club Development Officer by the directorate under a director's action to the end of July 2014, pending decision by the Mayor on further funding.

6.1.6 The financial implications of an extension from 30th July to 31st December 2104 would be an additional £63,624. This can be broken down into salary costs for the Lunch Club Development Officer of £14,125 and the running costs of the lunch clubs of £49,499 with the majority of lunch clubs receiving £5,000, one £7,500 and one £6,999. The budget and expenditure until June 2014 and from 1st July to December 2014 are summarised in the table below:

	LCDF	LCDF Officer post	Spend (£)	Budget (£)	Difference (£)
--	------	----------------------	--------------	---------------	-------------------

2013/14	53,678	28,250	81,929	120,000	-38,071
April to June 2014	26,683	7,063	33,746	30,000	3,746
July to December 2014	49,499	14,125	63,624		

6.1.7 While the table above shows an underspend of £34,325 for the period April 2013 to June 2014, it was agreed by Members (Corporate Grants Programme Board on 20th January 2014 and ratified by the Mayor through the Individual Mayoral Decision making process) to use this to alleviate the overspend for the MSG funded lunch clubs for the period 1st April 2012 to 31st March 2015.

6.1.8 The following table shows the performance of the new lunch clubs with regards to meeting their agreed attendance targets as far as monitoring information is available:

Project	Attendance %age against target based on all available monitoring data
Westferry Lunch Club	101%
BBC Elderly Lunch Club	110%
Al Huda Lunch Club	100% (to be verified)
Redcoat Elders Club	158%
Ford Square Lunch Project	115%
Ensign Lunch Club	93%
Globe Town Lunch Club	101%
Dora Hall Lunch Club	65%
Shadwell Women Lunch Club	N/A ¹

6.1.9 All lunch clubs are required by contract to charge a service user contribution of £2.40 to ensure equity with those housebound residents that are provided with Meals on Wheels. However, all nine lunch clubs agreed to a charge of only £1.00; yet seven out of nine do not charge at all, one lunch club charges £1.00 and one £1.35 per service user. The issue of charging is to be

¹ The Shadwell Women's Lunch Club started delivering services only from April 2014 and has not yet submitted a monitoring report.

addressed across all lunch clubs – MSG funded and LCDF funded ones - in the forthcoming review.

6.1.10 In addition, all nine lunch clubs were also required to seek external funding to improve their financial sustainability by submitting at least four applications. So far they have been reluctant to do so and only one of them has secured some additional funding from a Registered Social Landlord. Again this will be addressed in the forthcoming review.

6.1.11 A map indicating the service location of currently funded lunch clubs is included in Appendix A.

7. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

7.1 This report is seeking to apply for £63,624 from the Corporate Grants Programme Board to facilitate the extension of the lunch clubs scheme to the end of December 2014. The total available budget for Lunch clubs and a related project concerning Prevention, Health and Wellbeing is £601k.

7.2 The application of the additional grant would help to alleviate some pressure on this budget. Should the application not be awarded the funding required will need to be met from existing ESCW resources, this is likely to add to the base budget pressure overall for the directorate in 2014/15.

8. LEGAL COMMENTS

8.1 The Council has power under section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948 to make arrangements for promoting the welfare of vulnerable adults of various kinds, including the provision of recreational facilities for those people outside of their homes. This power would be sufficient for the Council to support lunch clubs for older people.

8.2 The Council has power under section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 to do anything that individuals generally may do, subject to specified restrictions and limitations imposed by other statutes. As an individual may provide support to a community organisation, this is something that the Council also may do provided there is a good reason for doing so. There would be a good reason for doing so if the funded project supported the Council's strategic objectives, for example as set out in the Community Plan. There is information in the One Tower Hamlets section of the report identifying relevance to the Community Plan objectives.

8.3 A decision may relevantly be a key decision for either or both of the following reasons: (1) it involves significant expenditure having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function in question (**the financial test**); or (b) it will have a significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the borough (**the community impact test**). Article 13 of the Council's Constitution provides that in determining whether a decision is a key decision, regard must be had to the following matters –

- Whether the decision may incur a significant social, economic or environmental risk
- The likely extent of the impact of the decision both within and outside of the borough
- Whether the decision is likely to be a matter of political controversy
- The extent to which the decision is likely to result in substantial public interest.

8.4 This is clearly stated to be a non-exclusive list of considerations.

8.5 It would be open in this case to conclude that the financial test of significance has not been met. The proposed decision involves expenditure of £63,624 against the budget identified by the chief finance officer. The Council has not identified a financial threshold above which decisions must be considered significant, either in absolute terms or as a percentage of the identified budget. Accordingly, in each case judgment must be exercised on a reasonable basis having regard to the budget and the considerations outlined in paragraph 8.3 above.

8.6 It would be open in this case to conclude that the community impact test has not been met. The report discloses that the nine lunch clubs together service up to about 135 people. These groups are spread across more than one ward, but do not represent a significant number of people in the borough. The lunch clubs in question no doubt have an important effect on the lives of the individuals concerned, but the overall effect on communities may not be considered relevantly significant.

8.7 When considering whether or not to set up the emergency fund, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who don't. There is information in the report relevant to these considerations.

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.
- 9.3 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. It is clear, as set out in paragraph 6.1.4 of the report that the nine lunch clubs benefit groups of people who share protected characteristics within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010, as identified. This is the result of targeting the additional lunch clubs towards those parts of the borough where the overcrowding issues persist. Any indirectly discriminatory effect is considered to be a proportionate means of meeting this identified need. Overall, the Council funds 42 different lunch clubs which provide support for an appropriate mix of people.
- 9.4 Due regard continues to be given to encouraging 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 have been negotiated and appropriate monitoring arrangements maintained to minimise risk of underperformance of these services. The service agreements 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 will be non-cashable savings by enabling more people to use the services by setting more ambitious targets.

14. **APPENDICES**

- Appendix A – Map of Tower Hamlets showing all lunch clubs and highlighting those set up under LCDF.

Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Brief description of “background papers” Name and telephone number of holder and address where open to inspection.

None

N/A