

**KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA PARTNERSHIP**  
**NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND**  
**REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR YEAR 5 PROGRAMME ADDITIONAL**  
**ALLOCATIONS**

**18 May 2005**

This paper:

Sets out options for allocating the money remaining within the Year 5 NRF Programme, and clarifies some of the background.

This paper proposes four options to the KCP:

- Option 1: Pre-allocate funding to the Race Equality Partnership (REP) and the Environmental Improvements Programme at the level originally envisaged when a higher level of underspend was predicted, and then follow the scoring system;
- Option 2: Accord the REP and Environmental Improvements Programme a high degree of priority, but fund at a slightly lower figure to allow more projects to be funded at realistic levels;
- Option 3: Allocate all of the available budget strictly in line with the numerical scoring system;
- Option 4: Agree the recommendations contained in the 26 April report: allocate only part of the budget and hold some back to commission specific projects to forward recent priorities identified by the Partnership.

**FOR DECISION**

1. Background

- 1.1 On 28 January 2004, the KCP agreed a programme for NRF in Years 4 and 5 (2004/05 and 2005/06).

In addition to this, at the KCP meeting of 26th January 2005, the KCP then agreed to the principle of 5% over-programming for Year 5 and invited suggestions from members as to how this funding might be allocated.

- 1.2 At that meeting, it was also agreed that the REP and the Environmental Improvements Programme would be allocated any **potential** carry-forward, arising from underspend in the programme as a whole in 2004/05. The report on NRF prepared for the March meeting predicted underspend on the programme as a whole as £55,650, and the report recommended that the REP should be allocated £30,650 and Environmental Improvements £25,000. The report clearly stated that **"both allocations are dependent on this particular amount of underspend being available."** (Even if individual projects underspend their particular allocation within the relevant financial year, this does not mean that the money is necessarily available for carry-forward, since the NRF programme as a whole is over-programmed, to take account of any slippage, or projects dropping out of the programme.)
- 1.3 Because of the time-lag between reports being prepared, and the actual meeting taking place, the financial picture had changed again by 16 March. Officers reported verbally that it now appeared that there would be little or no underspend on the programme as a whole for the 2004/05 financial year. The minutes state that "it was agreed that the above two projects (ie. REP and Environmental Improvements Programme) would join the four other projects that had been put forward to take up the agreed 5% over-programming in Year 5." It was on this basis that the small panel comprising voluntary and statutory representatives (with no direct interest in any particular application) then looked at all the applications.
- 1.4 At the meeting on 26 April, it transpired that this had not been made sufficiently clear to the KCP, and the small panel was asked to look again at its recommendations. Additionally, the financial picture had become further complicated by the Tabernacle going into voluntary liquidation, and the amount of money available for redistribution had therefore changed again.
- 1.5 The panel met again on 10<sup>th</sup> May, and looked again at its recommendations. In the light of the confusion over the two candidate projects for carry-forward, and some member views that the panel should stick rigidly to the numerical scoring system, the panel agreed to present a range of options to the KCP for decision at its meeting on 18 May.
2. Amount Available for Allocation
- 2.1 The table overleaf shows the total amount still available to allocate for the Year 5 NRF Programme and what this figure comprises:

Source of Funds	Amount	Notes
Grant	£1,080,670	Grant
Over-programming	£54,033	5% of £1,080,670
<b>105% Allocation</b>	<b>£1,134,703</b>	<b>Grant plus 5%</b>
<b>Total allocated so far</b>	<b>£1,090,000</b>	<b>Includes NOVA £20k</b>
Balance to Allocate	£44,703	£1,134,703 minus £1,090,000
Tabernacle to reallocate	£45,900	
Carry Forward	£9,938	Confirmed 10/05/05
Tabernacle Reimbursement	£5,300	
<b>Total Balance to allocate</b>	<b>£105,841</b>	

### 3. Options

#### 3.1. **Option 1**

This option suggests that the KCP agrees that the Race Equality Partnership and the Environmental Improvements Programme should be given a particular priority because they had already been agreed as the favoured candidates if underspend was available. The amounts that had been agreed **in principle only** (subject to underspend being available) were as follows:

REP:	£30,650
Environmental Improvements:	£25,000
	<b>£55,650</b>

If these amounts were agreed, that would leave £50,191 for the other projects submitted. Based purely on the scoring system, this would suggest the following:

Dalgarno Neighbourhood Trust:	£39,500
MRCF:	£10,691 (requested £20,000)
	<b>£50,191</b>

#### 3.2 **Option 2**

This option again suggests that some priority should be accorded to the two candidate projects for underspend, but suggests that they should both be funded at a slightly lower level. (Both projects actually submitted lower bids as part of the assessment process, recognising that they would be in competition with others.) The panel recognises that funding at the lower amounts outlined in the bids could impact on the effective delivery of the projects, and is therefore suggesting a compromise. This would see them awarded most of the money they were hoping for had there been sufficient underspend, but would allow the KCP to fund its third-ranked project at a realistic level too. Figures would be as follows:

REP:	£26,000
Environmental improvements:	£20,341
Dalgarno Neighbourhood Trust	£39,500
MRCF:	£20,000
<hr/>	
	£105,841

### 3.3 Option 3

This option suggests that the KCP strictly follow the results of the scoring process, which would produce the following result:

Dalgarno Neighbourhood Trust	£39,500	
REP	£20,500	(based on bid)
MRCF	£20,000	
ADKC	£23,420	
Business seminars	£ 2,421	(requested £5000- adjusted to balance)
<hr/>		
	£105,841	

This option would see no funding for the Environmental Improvements programme.

### 3.4: Option 4

The panel suggests that that the KCP also may wish to reconsider the original proposal, which proposed the following allocations:

Dalgarno Neighbourhood Trust	£39,500	
REP	£20,500	(based on bid)
ADKC	£15,000	
KCP commissioned work	£30,841	(reduced from £35,000)
<hr/>		
	£105,841	

## 4. Conditions

4.1 All of the grants made through the NRF programme are subject to a range of standard conditions, and also have detailed funding agreements prepared. However, officers would propose project -specific conditions for each of the grants proposed in the various options above (subject to funding decisions):

- For the Dalgarno Neighbourhood Trust, there needs to be a clear plan for long-term sustainability;
- For the REP, the panel would like to see clear detail provided through monitoring and reporting about how the REP has, and will continue to, progress and develop the work of the Racial Harassment Forum (from which the partnership has evolved), and details of how it will involve its wider membership in its activities;
- For MRCF, there needs to be a clear plan for long -term sustainability;
- For Environmental Improvements, the NRF grant should help to lever in matched funding, and should also assist in building relationships which

will deliver improvements to the appearance of all the Borough's bridges, and other environmental improvements locally;

- ADKC would need to be clear how the specific outcomes of the project will feed through into future partnership work;
- For the Chamber of Commerce – business seminars, the proposed programme of activities aimed at increasing the participation of BME businesses, voluntary/charitable enterprises and people with disabilities should demonstrate how this work will be built into the Chamber's mainstream activities in the future.

5. For Decision

The KCP is requested to decide which of the four options it wishes to approve:

- Option 1: Fund the Race Equality Partnership (REP) and the Environmental Improvements Programme at the level originally envisaged when a higher level of underspend was predicted, and then follow the scoring system;
- Option 2: Accord the REP and Environmental Improvements Programme a high degree of priority, but fund at a slightly lower figure to allow more projects to be funded at realistic levels;
- Option 3: Allocate all of the available budget strictly in line with the numerical scoring system;
- Option 4: Agree the recommendations contained in the 26 April report: - allocate only part of the budget and hold some back to commission specific projects to forward recent priorities identified by the Partnership.

**FOR DECISION**

Christine Lawrence  
Head of Regeneration and Partnerships  
20-7361-3336 E-mail: [christine.lawrence@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:christine.lawrence@rbkc.gov.uk)

**Background papers used in the preparation of this report:**

NRF report to KCP – 26 January 2005 and minutes of meeting  
NRF report to KCP - 26 April 2005 and minutes of meeting