ADDENDUM – amendment to the text of Item 21 of the minutes of the
CIAP meeting of 7 November 2012

The text below contains some amendments to the details of the text in respect
of individual applications but please note that there has been no amendment
to the resolution for this item.

Minutes of the meeting of the Community Investment Advisory Panel held on
7 November 2012 – amendment to one item

Item 21 – Innovation Grants Round 3

See the report by the Community Development and Grants Officer – Agenda
Item 3

Kate Tomkinson presented the report which contained details of the
applications to the Innovation Grants Fund.

The Chair advised that, in terms of the Innovation Grants Applications, he was
happy to approve funding for most of the applications and he advised that his
funding recommendations were listed in the table on pages 10 and 11 of the
report. However, he felt that there were seven applications that required
further discussion by the panel before the funding amount was agreed.

Councillor Jabbal queried the location of some of the organisations that had
been approved for funding by the Chair. He felt it was important to find out
where the organisations were based as they would be receiving grants from
the London Borough of Hounslow. Kate Tomkinson confirmed that the
organisations were located within Hounslow and also that they had to submit
a working history as evidence of the service providing benefit to Hounslow
Residents when they applied for funding. In terms of the process for allocating
Innovation Grants, Kate Tomkinson advised that a panel of four officers
checked each application thoroughly and checked the terms of reference,
policies, procedures, and constitution for each organisation. Officers also
carried out monitoring visits so that they were satisfied with the services being
provided over the life of the project. In addition, Ms Tomkinson advised that
for organisations offering services with a particular slant, such as training or
education, officers would check with the education department to ensure there
was no duplication of the service provision.

The Chair moved the discussion on to the applications that required further
discussion.

Integrated Neurological Services

Kate Tomkinson advised that the organisation had worked in Hounslow for
approximately five years. She advised that she had spoken with the Health &
Social Care Department at the Council and they were extremely supportive of
the project. She advised that officers at the Council felt it would be necessary
to commission a similar service next year as they recognised that there was a gap in this type of service provision. However, this year there would be no similar service provided by the Council.

In response to questions from Members, Ms Tomkinson advised that they were awarded funding by the panel last year, but it was £30k for a different project, specifically for motor-neurone disease.

Councillor Jabbal expressed concern about repeatedly awarding funding to the same organisations. He felt it was important that organisations were working towards long-term sustainability. He stated that he would agree to fund the application on the basis that the organisation match funded the grant amount with £20K from their own funds.

Resolved:
That the panel agreed to fund the project with £20,000.

**Hounslow Multicultural Centre**

Ms Tomkinson advised that the project aimed to recruit volunteers to provide a daily meals service to residents in their homes, meeting their cultural preferences and personal needs. The service would operate from the Multicultural Centre and Wellington Day Centre.

Kate Tomkinson stated that there was a need for a service that provided hot/healthy meals for residents coming out of hospital but the costs of the project were unclear so value for money was hard to judge. The Health and Wellbeing Department at the Council had felt that a more valuable and sustainable project long-term would be to show people how to cook healthy meals within their own homes. Ms Tomkinson stated that the application lacked detail about how it would transition into a social enterprise. She advised that there were concerns about the level of costs for Project Management and administration but lack of costs (or detail) included for the delivery aspect of the service.

The Chair noted that the service users would be requested to pay for the service and their meals.

Councillor Jabbal noted that the organisation had requested £38,500, however the service would be run by neighbourhood volunteers and they would be charging for the meals. He questioned what the funds would be used for. Ms Tomkinson advised that the administration costs for the organisation appeared disproportionally high.

Councillor Jabbal commented that the Multicultural centre was very well used by elderly people. He noted that a lot of elderly people used the free taxi service to go to the centre for a break from their homes. He felt that the Multicultural centre provided a good service to elderly residents.
Councillor Chatt stated that he was happy about the idea behind the application but expressed concern about the lack of details provided in the application. He felt that the Council had a duty of care to make sure that the project worked.

Members agreed to fund the application with a maximum of £20k to help the organisation start the project up.

Resolved:
That the panel agreed to fund the project with £20,000 and the CPU team will work with the organisation to develop a more robust project offering value for money to residents. CPU will link the organisation with the social enterprise support project in the borough for free advice on development.

Action Acton

Kate Tomkinson advised that the organisation had requested funds to provide ESOL and citizenship training, information, advice and guidance for third country national women in the Borough.

In response to questions, Ms Tomkinson advised that the organisation had received funding previously for a different project. She advised that the organisation was prepared to match fund any funding they received. She advised that she had spoken with LBH Adult & Community Education who had confirmed that there was a gap in service provision for this user group.

Resolved:
That the panel agreed to fund the project with £29,925.

TW4 Community Development Trust

Kate Tomkinson presented the application, and advised that it was an interesting project that aimed to bring together different communities affected and or displaced by war, to build mutual understanding and to collaborate on a joint artistic project. She advised that the only concerns were that the project would be dealing with very emotive issues and that these would need to be tackled sensitively and appropriately.

The Chair commented that the project seemed to be very innovative and unique.

Councillor Chatt stated that he knew the organisation very well and could confirm that they were very good at the work they carried out. He felt it was a commendable project and felt that the funding amount requested seemed so small compared to such a large problem that the project would be addressing. He felt that the organisation was more than capable of tackling the issues and delivering the project well.
Resolved:
That the panel agreed to fund the project with £25,025.

Butts Farm Working Together Group

Kate Tomkinson advised that the money requested was for The Athena Project which was a volunteers development programme which would offer training and support to work on local mini-projects. Ms Tomkinson advised that CPU would like to work with the organisation to help them improve their outputs as these were felt to be low, however the Unit recognised the need in the area.

Councillor Chatt felt there was a huge need for local community integration in the area and supported funding the mini projects.

Resolved:
That the panel agreed to fund the project with £15,000.

The Asian Women’s Network

Kate Tomkinson advised that the project focussed on providing mentoring and support for Black and Ethnic Minority Women to increase their participation in citizenship, leadership and civic roles in Hounslow. While the project tackled interesting issues she advised that the organisation had unfortunately provided very little evidence of need/demand from residents, and had not provided evidence of their interaction with women in Hounslow.

Councillor Jabbal felt that there were a lot of Asian women’s groups and he expressed concern that the project would be a duplication of projects/provisions already in existence.

Resolved:
That the CIAP advised that the application be rejected.

Together We Create

Kate Tomkinson advised that the project had requested funds to hold three celebration events and deliver a website to hold advice and information. The project aimed to encourage residents to consider Hounslow’s past, present and future by working with 50 different groups to produce postcards illustrating their memories, current opinions and hopes for the Borough. Ms Tomkinson advised that the project had applied under the integration stream, however, none of the groups would appear to be brought together, they would work separately which was a shame. She raised inaccuracies in the budget, and also a lack of evidence to demonstrate a need/demand for the project.

Resolved:
That the CIAP advised that the application be rejected.
Resolved:

- That the Community Investment Advisory Panel considered the applications for Hounslow Innovation Grant Round 3 and the assessment undertaken by officers.

- That the Lead Member, in consultation with the Community Investment Advisory Panel, approved the allocation of the Hounslow Innovation Grants Round 3 funding to the organisations set out in 4.1 of the report.

It was AGREED that the Advisory Panel recommend the following allocation of the Hounslow Innovation Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Total score (from 80)</th>
<th>Amount requested (£)</th>
<th>Chair’s recommendation (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Home Start Hounslow</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10,074</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>London Sustainability Exchange</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27,098</td>
<td>27,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Princes Trust</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>15,622</td>
<td>15,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feltham Arts Association</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>31,978</td>
<td>31,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thameside Enterprise Ltd</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrated Neurological Services</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disability Network Hounslow</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>29,936</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hounslow Multi-Cultural Centre</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Action Acton</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>29,925</td>
<td>29,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sparrow Farm Tenants and Residents Association</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>13,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BridgeLink Centre</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TW4 Community Development Trust</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>25,025</td>
<td>25,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Butts Farm Working Together Group</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38,148</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Asian Women’s Network</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26,587</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Together We Create</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26,840</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Innovation & Development: £212,308
Chair’s recommendation: £146,698
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>Total score (from 65)</th>
<th>Amount requested (£)</th>
<th>Chair's recommendation (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Mulberry Centre</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>3,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Friends of the River Crane</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Victim Support</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Innovation &amp; Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£13,265</strong></td>
<td><strong>£11,265</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Riana Development Foundation Network</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>4,990</td>
<td>4,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Inclusion &amp; Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£4,990</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4,990</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL SMALL GRANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£18,255</strong></td>
<td><strong>£16,255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2     | Friends of Beaversfield Park       | 49                    | 14,525               | 5,000                     |
|       | **Total Inclusion & Participation** |                       | **£196,950**         | **£110,850**              |
|       | **TOTAL LARGE GRANTS**             |                       | **£409,258**         | **£257,548**              |