

Grenfell Support

Scrutiny update: Y2 Q1 2026/27

Community Support programme

August 2026



If you would like a translated copy of this document please contact futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

আপনি যদি এই নথির একটি অনুবাদিত অনুলিপি চান তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন।

የተተረጎመውን የዚህ መረጃ ይዘት ከፈለጉ እባክዎ በ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

إذا كنت ترغب في الحصول على نسخة مترجمة من هذه المعلومات، فيرجى الاتصال بـ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk

«اگر یک نسخه‌ی ترجمه شده از این اطلاعات را می‌خواهید، لطفاً با ایمیل futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk

Se desejar uma versão traduzida desta informação, por favor entre em contato com futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

Haddii aad rabto nuqul dukumeenti ah oo la turjumay fadlan la xidhiidh futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

Si desea una versión traducida de esta información, póngase en contacto con futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

ናይዚ ሓበሬታ ፍሉይ ወይ ዝተተርጎመ ስሪት ምስ እትደልዩ፡ በጃኹም ብ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk ርኽቡና።

Purpose

This document is the fifth Independent Scrutiny Function update on scrutiny of the Community Support programme. It provides a assessment on delivery of the programme from April – June 2026.

Previous scrutiny reports can be accessed [here](#).

Overview

What is the Independent Scrutiny Function?

The Grenfell Support programme is being delivered by the Grenfell Partnerships Team (GPT) and overseen by an Independent Scrutiny Function (ISF). The job of the ISF is to help ensure the Grenfell Support is delivered transparently and effectively in the interests of bereaved and survivors and the immediate local community near Grenfell Tower. Further information about the ISF and its appointment can be found [here](#).

What is the purpose of this document?

This document provides a summary of our scrutiny assessment on the delivery and monitoring of the Grenfell Community Support programme from April – June 2026.

What are the contents of this document?

This document presents our scrutiny assessment according to our scrutiny framework (which you can see on slide 6). This quarter, we have drawn on insights from a review of the GPT's Y2 Q1 Monitoring Report, the Grenfell Community Public Dashboard refreshed on 30th June 2026, supporting evidence provided by the GPT, and insights shared by residents during the ISF's community sensemaking and reflection session.

Contents

1. Scrutiny framework – slide 6
2. Summary scrutiny assessment – slides 7-15
3. Sharing your views and staying in touch – slides 16-17

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment (slides 18-34)

Scrutiny framework

To make our scrutiny assessment, we reviewed the GPT's monitoring data against the following questions:

Delivery, reach and impact	Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? Who is accessing the programme and who is it not reaching? Is the programme having an impact and being adapted as required to improve impact?
Complaints	Are there any trends or patterns in complaints? What learning/actions have been taken as a result?
Expenditure	Is expenditure for the programme as intended? Have significant changes in expenditure been recorded and justified?
Reporting and transparency	Is reporting/planned reporting providing people with clear, honest, and timely information about the programme and decisions?
Restorative practice	Is the GPT ensuring that the process of delivery and monitoring centres the perspectives and experiences of people accessing the programme? Is the delivery and monitoring of the programme informed by restorative practice?
Monitoring	Is the monitoring providing the necessary insight for the GPT to deliver and improve the programme?

Y2 Q1 2026/27 summary scrutiny assessment

Scrutiny assessment overview (1)

Based on the evidence reviewed, the ISF is satisfied that the GPT continued to deliver the Community Support programme effectively during Y2 Q1. The quarter saw substantial progress with year 2 wellbeing grant payments, continued delivery of Grenfell Community Advocacy Team (GCAT) and the Leisure Centre offer, and further development of the community activities programme.

There is stronger evidence this quarter of monitoring and resident feedback informing programme decisions. In particular, the work with the Operational Steering Group (OSG) demonstrates residents having substantial influence over aspects of the community activities programme, while monitoring of participation and resident feedback is being used to adapt the wider wellbeing offer.

The programme is also entering a stage where questions about how support can add most value are becoming increasingly important. For GCAT, the changing complexity of some casework creates an opportunity to understand where more intensive, coordinated support is most effective and what this can tell us about how the wider system responds to residents.

Summary of overall progress:

- Year 2 delivery progressed: the GPT made 2,520 Year 2 wellbeing grant payments during the quarter, alongside continued delivery of GCAT and the Leisure Centre offer.
- Community activities programme developed: Learning from the pilot and work with the OSG has informed the longer-term programme, including commissioning arrangements and evaluation criteria. There is evidence of resident challenge directly changing aspects of the proposed approach.
- Monitoring is increasingly informing delivery: Participation data and resident feedback are being used to identify barriers and adapt programme design, including consideration of residents less likely to use the Leisure Centre and access for working adults and families.

Scrutiny assessment overview (2)

- GCAT review underway: the GPT is reviewing the overall effectiveness of GCAT as the nature of demand changes. This includes understanding what kinds of support add most value, how increasingly complex casework is best managed, and what can be learnt from cases where a single team or professional holds and coordinates support across different services.
- Resident feedback mechanisms strengthened: A new survey has been introduced for residents whose GCAT cases have closed, while the annual resident survey will provide further evidence about experiences of the wider programme.
- Public reporting continues to develop: the GPT has continued to improve the Community Dashboard and is preparing to test it with residents before wider publication.

Strengths:

- The development of the community activities programme provides particularly strong evidence of resident influence. OSG members have contributed to decisions about commissioning and evaluation, including successfully challenging a proposed requirement within the commissioning approach.
- There is stronger evidence of monitoring being used as a tool for programme improvement. Information about participation, service use and resident experience is increasingly being connected to decisions about delivery rather than reported in isolation.
- The GPT continues to demonstrate flexibility in how residents can access support, including applications by phone, email and in community venues and home visits through GCAT where appropriate.
- The Q1 evidence provides more practical examples of restorative practice shaping live decisions, including the reset of the OSG and the approach being taken to understand residents' experiences before making longer-term decisions about the Leisure Centre offer.

Scrutiny assessment overview (3)

Key risks/issues:

- Financial sustainability of the Leisure Centre offer: the GPT is forecasting an overspend of close to £100,000 for the Leisure Centre offer in 2026/27 and is considering options including drawing down future years' funding, wellbeing grant underspend and interest accrued on reserves. The immediate commitment to residents remains in place, but decisions about the longer-term funding model could create trade-offs elsewhere in the programme. The GPT plans to use the annual resident survey, alongside further engagement with residents, to understand experiences of the offer and inform consideration of future options.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Delivery, reach and impact

The GPT continued to deliver the Community Support programme effectively during Q1, including progressing Year 2 wellbeing grant payments, maintaining GCAT and Leisure Centre support and developing the longer-term community activities programme.

Overall programme reach remained broadly stable following the significant increase at the end of year 1. The GPT explains that increasing reach was not a priority during Q1 while year 1 and year 2 payments were being completed, with targeted outreach to households that have not yet applied planned for Q2/Q3.

The evidence continues to demonstrate the value of GCAT advocacy and multi-agency support. Increasingly complex and longer-term cases are also providing important learning about where intensive, coordinated support adds most value. This is being considered through the GPT's review of the effectiveness of the GCAT model.

There is also positive evidence that learning about participation is influencing programme design, including greater consideration of groups less likely to use the Leisure Centre and provision outside usual working hours.

Feedback from the community sensemaking session was positive about the support available and the value of responsive routes into the programme, as well as the flexible and relational approach of the GPT. Residents also highlighted ongoing challenges around understanding what support is available and clarity on eligibility.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Complaints	The GPT received two stage 1 complaints in Q1, both relating to wellbeing grant eligibility. Both were responded to within the required timeframe and neither was upheld. The number of complaints remains low and the evidence reviewed does not currently indicate a wider issue with the eligibility process.
Expenditure	The most significant financial pressure is the Leisure Centre offer, where the GPT is forecasting an overspend of close to £100,000 for 2026/27. The GPT intends to maintain its commitment to fund memberships until March 2027 and is considering several options for managing the pressure, including drawing down future years' Leisure Centre funding, wellbeing grant underspend and potentially interest accrued on programme reserves. The previously agreed reallocation of Communications and Engagement funding to the Leisure Centre offer has also been implemented. Longer-term funding decisions have not yet been made and the ISF considers it important that residents have meaningful opportunities to understand and inform decisions where these could affect the future offer or create trade-offs elsewhere in the programme.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (3)

Reporting and transparency	The Community Dashboard continues to strengthen the GPT's reporting and provides increasingly detailed information about programme delivery and reach. The GPT is preparing to make the dashboard publicly accessible and has developed additional support, including a short video to help residents use it. Resident accessibility testing had not yet taken place at the time of scrutiny. The GPT intends to test the dashboard with a small group of OSG members before wider publication. The ISF welcomes this progress and will look for evidence of how resident feedback has influenced the final version.
Restorative practice	The Q1 evidence provides stronger practical examples of restorative practice informing programme delivery and decision-making. The reset of the OSG has provided greater clarity about what residents can influence, while enabling substantive resident involvement in the design of the community activities programme. There is also evidence of restorative principles informing the approach to the Leisure Centre offer. The GPT intends to understand residents' reasons for non-use and explain the financial pressures associated with the offer before making longer-term decisions. The ISF welcomes this progression from earlier quarters, with clearer evidence of restorative principles being applied to live programme decisions.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (4)

Monitoring	Monitoring continues to strengthen and there is increasing evidence that it is being used to inform programme improvement. Participation data and resident feedback are influencing the community activities programme, while changes in the nature of GCAT casework are being identified and explored through further review, including what can be learnt from more complex cases. The community activities pilot will provide an important additional source of learning. The GPT is combining provider monitoring with consistent participant feedback and plans to hold learning conversations with providers. As providers are using different evaluation approaches, it will be important to bring these sources together to identify common learning that can inform the wider programme.
-------------------	---

Scrutiny assessment: further information required in the future

Information we want to see immediately from the GPT (i.e., before the next round of scrutiny)

- Confirmation of the outcome of the planned resident accessibility/usability testing of the Community Dashboard, including any changes made in response to feedback, and confirmation of its wider publication.

Information we want to see in the next round of scrutiny

- Findings from the GCAT review, particularly what it concludes about what kinds of support add most value, how the changing nature of casework should shape the model, and what learning from complex cases can inform wider Council and system practice.
- Learning from the community activities pilot, including how evidence from different providers and participant feedback has been brought together and used to inform the main programme.
- Progress on the financial position and longer-term sustainability of the Leisure Centre offer, including how residents have been involved in considering future options.
- Evidence from the annual resident survey, including what it shows about barriers to participation, residents' experiences and programme impact, and how the GPT intends to respond to the findings.
- Continued evidence of how monitoring and restorative practice are influencing programme decisions and adaptations.
- An update on plans for resident forums in North Kensington, including next steps following the Grenfell Assembly and how residents will have meaningful opportunities to engage with the Council and feel listened to.

**Sharing your views and staying in
touch**

Sharing your views and staying in touch

The monitoring and scrutiny arrangements aim to help ensure the Grenfell Support programme is delivered transparently and effectively in the interests of bereaved and survivors and community members.

The ISF's monitoring and scrutiny updates will be shared with you via the GPT every quarter, but your voice is also crucial. To share your views on the programme's delivery and get involved in its scrutiny, you can:

- Provide direct feedback to the GPT by contacting FutureGrenfellSupport@rbkc.gov.uk.
- Provide direct feedback to the ISF by emailing isf@involve.org.uk or calling 020 3745 4334.
- Participate in the collective scrutiny & reflection sessions. These are a dedicated sessions with the GPT to help understand programme delivery so far, and identify changes needed for the programme (and beyond). There will be two community sensemaking & reflection sessions a year on the Community Support programme, facilitated by the ISF. The ISF will be in touch prior to this with details about how to take part.

You can be involved as much or as little as you would like, and your involvement can vary at different points in the programme depending on your interest and capacity. There is **no** obligation to get involved in these scrutiny processes and your choice to participate or not will not affect your ability to access support.

Appendix: Y2 Q1 2026/27 Detailed scrutiny assessment

If you'd like more detail than provided in the above summary, please see the following slides for a more detailed assessment against each part of the scrutiny framework

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: delivery

Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? What have been key areas of success and challenge?

Based on the information reviewed, the ISF is satisfied that the Community Programme continued to be delivered in line with its overall purpose during Y2 Q1. The quarter saw year 2 wellbeing grant payments progress, further development of the community activities programme and continued delivery of GCAT and leisure centre support.

A particular strength is the progress made with the Operational Steering Group (OSG) to develop the longer-term community activities programme. Learning from the pilot has informed decisions about the commissioning process, and the evidence reviewed shows OSG members having substantial influence over aspects of programme design. Alongside this, the GPT is using wider resident feedback and plans to draw on the annual resident survey to inform future programme decisions. This included challenging a proposed requirement that organisations applying to deliver community activities should receive no more than 40% of their income from RBKC. Following resident challenge, this was changed from a requirement to a recommendation.

The programme has also continued to provide flexible routes into support. Applications can be made by phone, email and in community venues, and GCAT has continued to undertake home visits where appropriate.

At a community sensemaking session the ISF hosted in July, residents spoke positively about elements of the support available, programme communications, and the GPT's flexible, open and relational approach, while also identifying a need for greater clarity in some areas, including eligibility and how different parts of the offer can be accessed.

A key area to monitor is the changing nature of demand on GCAT. The GPT reports a growing number of residents presenting with multiple and complex needs requiring more intensive advocacy, longer interventions and multi-agency coordination, alongside a reduction in some more transactional work. **The ISF welcomes the review currently underway and considers it an important opportunity to understand what kinds of GCAT support add most value and what learning can be drawn from complex cases, particularly where they demonstrate the value of a single team or professional coordinating support across services.**

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: delivery

Have challenges been addressed? How?

The GPT has identified a number of delivery challenges and is taking steps to understand and respond to them.

The changing nature of GCAT casework is an important area of learning. The GPT reports an increase in residents presenting with multiple housing, health, welfare, legal and wellbeing needs requiring more intensive and longer-term support, alongside a decrease in some more transactional work. The GCAT review is considering the overall effectiveness of the model, including how different kinds of support add value and how complex work is managed and coordinated.

The ISF welcomes this review and would particularly like to understand what it shows about where GCAT can add most value, and how learning from complex cases can inform practice across the wider system.

In Year 2, the GPT was unable to use Council Tax records to confirm current addresses for residents who had applied previously. Current Council records were available for 1,214 residents living in Council housing, but not for 866 residents living in housing association or private rented properties. The GPT therefore had a choice between asking those residents to provide new proof of address, which would have delayed automatic payments, or proceeding with payment and relying on residents to report address changes. The GPT consciously chose the latter approach to avoid placing an additional burden on residents.

Current address does not determine eligibility for the grant. The additional check is intended to reduce the risk of duplicate household payments. Seven new applications were identified where somebody had previously been paid against the same time-of-fire address. Six presented no issue; one payment should not have been made and will be deducted from the Year 3 grant. The GPT is now checking all new applications against previous applications for the same time-of-fire address.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: delivery

Are there any factors from beyond the programme's remit that are impacting delivery, positively or negatively? If so, what are they? How are these being recorded? How are these being addressed?

Wider housing-system constraints continue to affect GCAT's ability to resolve some residents' cases. During Q1, GCAT reported challenges maintaining consistent engagement with housing providers because of staff turnover, organisational changes and the use of generic contact routes, which can create delays.

GCAT has begun rebuilding relationships with senior representatives from housing associations to strengthen collaborative working arrangements. During the scrutiny check-in, the team explained that access to named contacts can make a significant difference to how quickly cases can be progressed and that the effectiveness of these relationships will also be considered through the GCAT review.

The ISF welcomes the steps being taken to strengthen these relationships. Previous scrutiny identified wider housing-system constraints as limiting what GCAT can achieve for residents. The Q1 evidence provides greater insight into some of the mechanisms creating these difficulties. **We would welcome continued monitoring of whether strengthened relationships with housing providers lead to improvements in residents' experience and outcomes, and whether recurring systemic barriers can inform wider Council learning.**

The ISF is also working with GCAT and housing colleagues to identify how the two teams can work and learn together to improve outcomes for residents. We have held an initial workshop with GCAT and are currently interviewing housing team members. **We will report on progress and emerging findings in Q2.**

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: reach

What percentage of eligible people have accessed the programme? How does access vary by programme strand?

Overall programme reach remained broadly stable during Q1, following the significant increase seen at the end of year 1. The GPT reports that reach among households living in the area of support has remained roughly unchanged since Q4.

The GPT explains that increasing reach was not a priority during Q1 while the team focused on completing year 1 payments and making year 2 wellbeing grant payments. Targeted work is planned for Q2 and Q3 to identify eligible households that have not yet applied, including through individual letters and door knocking.

There are also differences between approval and take-up of the leisure centre offer. The GPT reports that 5,070 people had been approved for leisure centre memberships by the end of June, while 3,697 had gone on to create a membership. During the scrutiny check-in, the GPT clarified that residents can request membership for other members of their household and that some people may choose not to activate an approved membership immediately. Importantly, the GPT confirmed that unactivated memberships do not result in expenditure.

The ISF considers the planned targeted outreach in Q2/Q3 an important next step and will continue to monitor whether this increases reach among households that have not yet accessed the programme.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: reach

Are there specific groups of people the programme isn't reaching? What work is being done to understand this?

The Q1 evidence continues to show some differences in participation across the programme. Analysis of leisure centre use shows that women continue to participate more than men, with 56% of women visiting the leisure centre compared with 42% of men. The GPT has included questions in its annual review survey to better understand why some residents are not using the leisure centre.

There is also evidence that learning about who is less likely to participate is beginning to influence the design of the community activities programme. The application process now asks providers to consider provision for groups less likely to use the leisure centre, including older residents, disabled residents and people with long-term health conditions, as well as whether activities will be available outside usual working hours.

This responds positively to feedback from residents, including concerns that activities taking place during the working day can exclude working adults and families. **The ISF welcomes this use of monitoring and resident feedback to inform the design of the wider wellbeing offer.**

What measures have been taken to improve reach? Why were these measures chosen? What has been the impact of these measures on reach?

Alongside the targeted outreach planned for Q2/Q3, the programme continues to offer different routes into support, including community drop-ins. However, attendance at drop-ins reduced during Q1 as year 2 wellbeing grant payments were completed.

Previous scrutiny identified that drop-ins can provide an important route into wider support, with residents sometimes raising additional needs when attending about their grant. The reduction in attendance may therefore reduce opportunities for early identification and intervention. **The ISF would welcome continued monitoring of this change and whether other routes are maintaining opportunities for residents to access GCAT support.**

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: impact

What difference is the support making? What benefits has it enabled?

The Q1 evidence continues to provide examples of the difference GCAT support can make for residents. The monitoring report includes case studies demonstrating the value of advocacy and multi-agency working, including support to resolve a longstanding housing issue for a resident who experienced difficulties communicating their needs.

These examples also illustrate the increasingly complex nature of some GCAT casework. Support can require intensive multi-agency coordination and longer-term involvement where residents might otherwise fall between gaps in services. These cases demonstrate the value GCAT can provide and reinforce the importance of using the current review to understand what forms of support add most value, as well as what complex cases can teach the wider system about effective coordination.

The GPT has also strengthened its approach to gathering direct feedback about GCAT. At the end of June, a survey was launched with residents whose support request had been closed during the previous three months. The GPT intends to use this to generate regular feedback about residents' experiences of support, with findings feeding into the GCAT review and reported in Q2.

The ISF welcomes this development. Combining resident feedback with case studies and service data should provide a stronger basis for understanding both the outcomes achieved through GCAT and where residents' experiences could be improved.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: impact

Does the programme's impact need to increase? If yes, what actions are being taken to increase impact?

There are areas where the programme's impact is still being understood. The GPT plans to use its annual resident survey to strengthen programme-wide evidence about residents' experiences and the difference the support is making, with findings expected to be reported later in the year.

Leisure centre data continues to show a gap between people approved for the offer and those who go on to activate and use a membership. The GPT plans to use the annual survey to understand barriers to use before making decisions about the future of the offer. **The ISF welcomes this approach, particularly given the financial pressures associated with the leisure centre offer, as decisions about future provision should be informed by residents' experiences as well as usage and expenditure data.**

The community activities pilot also provides an important opportunity to understand the impact of a broader wellbeing offer. Providers are gathering participant and outcome information through different approaches, and the GPT is collecting participant contact details so that it can independently ask a consistent set of questions about their experience. The GPT also plans to meet with providers to understand their experience of delivery and use the learning to inform the main community activities programme.

The ISF welcomes these different sources of evidence. As the pilot is evaluated, it will be important for the GPT to bring the information together in a way that allows common learning across projects to be identified and used to strengthen the longer-term programme.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: impact

Are there any factors from beyond the programme's remit that are influencing its impact, positively or negatively? If so, what are they? How are these being recorded? What is being done to address these?

Wider housing-system constraints continue to influence the impact GCAT can achieve for some residents. The GPT reports that staff turnover, organisational changes and the use of generic contact routes within housing providers can delay communication and make it harder to progress cases efficiently.

During the scrutiny check-in, the GPT explained that it is working to rebuild relationships with housing providers and strengthen access to named contacts, as this can help cases move more quickly. The impact of these relationships will also be considered through the wider GCAT review.

The ISF welcomes these efforts. As housing-related barriers remain outside the programme's direct control, it will be important to continue recording where these system constraints affect residents' outcomes and to use this learning to support escalation and wider Council learning where appropriate.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: complaints

How many complaints have been received? What proportion have been resolved, in what timeframe? What proportion have been escalated?

The GPT received two stage 1 complaints in Q1, both relating to eligibility for the wellbeing grant. Both complaints were responded to within the required timeframe and neither was upheld.

Are there any trends or patterns in complaints? What actions have been taken as a result?

The number of complaints remains low. Both Q1 complaints related to wellbeing grant eligibility, with the GPT explaining that some residents living outside the eligible area have raised concerns about being excluded from the programme.

While both complaints related to the same broad issue, neither was upheld and the evidence reviewed does not currently indicate a wider problem with the eligibility process. **The ISF will continue to monitor complaints over future quarters to identify whether any recurring themes or learning emerge.**

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: expenditure

The Grenfell Support Programme is subject to usual council expenditure and budget monitoring and oversight, and an annual external audit. The role of the ISF is to decide whether, overall, expenditure for the programme is as intended, and whether significant changes in expenditure have been recorded and justified.

Is expenditure and predicted spend for the programme as intended? What variances are there, outside of 5%? What are the reasons for these? How have any variances been managed?

Overall programme expenditure remains broadly in line with budget. The main significant budget pressure identified in Y2 Q1 relates to the Leisure Centre offer.

The Leisure Centre offer has a revised 2026/27 budget of £330,000, which includes £200,000 previously reallocated from Communications and Engagement and an additional £30,000 from Public Health. Based on current usage, expenditure is forecast at £423,240, leaving a further forecast pressure of approximately £93,000.

The GPT intends to honour its commitment to fund memberships until March 2027 and is considering a number of options for managing the financial pressure. These include drawing down some Leisure Centre funding allocated to future years, using underspend from the wellbeing grant, and potentially using interest accrued on programme reserves.

The ISF recognises that the GPT is actively considering how to manage the immediate pressure while maintaining the offer to residents.

However, using funding allocated to future years could have implications for the longer-term sustainability of the offer. The GPT has confirmed that its intention remains to provide the Leisure Centre offer throughout the programme, and discussions with Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) about the future cost and value of the offer are planned ahead of the current agreement ending in March 2027.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: expenditure

Have you made any decisions to reallocate budget across programme strands or across years? If so, what reallocations have been made and why? How were these decisions reached?

The GPT has implemented the previously agreed reallocation of unspent Communications and Engagement funding to the Leisure Centre offer. The £200,000 reallocation has therefore already been incorporated into the current Leisure Centre budget. Despite this additional funding, a further deficit of approximately £93,000 is forecast for 2026/27.

This reallocation follows the previous programme review and reflects a decision informed by resident feedback. Longer-term decisions about funding the Leisure Centre offer have not yet been made. The GPT intends to use feedback from the annual resident survey alongside further opportunities for residents to consider the available options before agreeing its longer-term approach.

Given the scale of the forecast pressure and the potential trade-offs between different programme budgets, the ISF considers it important that future decisions are clearly communicated and that residents have meaningful opportunities to understand and inform any changes to the offer.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: reporting & transparency

What reporting and wider communications have you shared with the wider community in the last quarter?

The Community Dashboard has continued to develop as an important part of the GPT's approach to public reporting. The dashboard now brings together more comprehensive programme data and enables more detailed analysis of delivery and reach.

The GPT plans to make the dashboard publicly available and has undertaken further work to improve its accessibility. This includes developing a SharePoint version of the dashboard and producing a short video to help residents understand how to use it.

The ISF welcomes the continued development of the dashboard. This represents clear progress against earlier scrutiny feedback about making programme information more accessible and providing residents with greater visibility of delivery and monitoring information.

Have you had any feedback on things you have shared? What might you need to change or improve?

The GPT plans to test the dashboard with a small group of OSG members before wider publication. At the time of the scrutiny check-in, this had not yet taken place as the GPT wanted to ensure that the dashboard, including financial information, was complete before sharing it for feedback.

The GPT intends to seek feedback on how understandable and accessible the dashboard is and make further improvements where needed. **The ISF welcomes this approach and would like to see what residents identify through the testing and how their feedback influences the final version.**

The next important step is therefore to complete the planned resident testing and establish the dashboard as an accessible and regularly updated public reporting tool.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: restorative practice

If and how are power dynamics being managed to support open, honest and two-way conversations between people eligible to access the programme and those delivering it?

The Q1 evidence provides stronger examples of restorative practice informing how the GPT works with residents. In particular, the GPT has reset its approach to the OSG, including being clearer with members about what is already fixed and what remains open to influence.

There is evidence that this has supported more substantive resident involvement in decisions. OSG members have contributed to the design of the community activities programme, including the commissioning timetable, evaluation criteria and how criteria should be weighted. Residents also challenged a proposed requirement that organisations should receive no more than 40% of their income from RBKC, resulting in this being changed from a requirement to a recommendation.

During the scrutiny check-in, the GPT reflected that the reset of the OSG, including a change of Chair and clearer focus, appears to have been helpful. Some members have provided positive feedback about the progress being made and the GPT is considering how membership of the group should be refreshed in future.

The ISF welcomes this progress. The evidence suggests that greater clarity about the boundaries of residents' influence has supported meaningful participation within those boundaries, with resident challenge resulting in changes to programme design.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: restorative practice

How has restorative practice informed delivery, including reporting and complaints, and monitoring approach?

The Q1 evidence provides practical examples of restorative principles influencing delivery and decision-making.

The GPT is taking a restorative approach to considering the future of the Leisure Centre offer. Rather than interpreting non-use of memberships in isolation or making immediate changes to the offer, the GPT plans to ask residents about the reasons they are not using their memberships and explain the financial pressures associated with the offer before longer-term decisions are made.

There is also evidence of resident feedback influencing the design of the community activities programme. Concerns about access for working residents have informed the application process, which now asks providers about delivering activities outside usual working hours. Monitoring of groups less likely to use the Leisure Centre has also informed questions about how proposed activities will reach these residents.

The ISF welcomes these examples because they demonstrate restorative practice being applied to live programme decisions rather than considered only as a separate area of reflection.

What have you learnt and how will this inform your practice in the future? Are there implications for the wider Council?

The experience of resetting the OSG suggests that being explicit about what residents can and cannot influence can support more constructive participation and clearer decision-making. The community activities work also demonstrates the value of combining monitoring evidence with resident experience when adapting programme delivery.

As these approaches develop, the ISF would welcome continued reflection on what the GPT is learning about applying restorative practice in practice, including whether learning from the programme has relevance for how the wider Council engages with and responds to residents.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: monitoring

Is the monitoring information and process giving the necessary insight to deliver and improve the programme?

The ISF considers that the GPT's monitoring continues to provide increasingly useful insight into programme delivery, reach and emerging challenges. The Community Dashboard enables more detailed analysis across the programme and the GPT is supplementing this with surveys, qualitative case studies and feedback from residents.

There is also stronger evidence in Q1 of monitoring being used to adapt delivery. Analysis of Leisure Centre participation has informed the design of the community activities programme, including greater consideration of groups less likely to use the Leisure Centre. Resident feedback about the accessibility of activities for working adults and families has similarly informed questions included in the commissioning process.

The monitoring report also identifies changes in the nature of GCAT casework rather than reporting activity alone. In particular, the increase in more complex cases is being explored through the GCAT review to understand what forms of support add most value and what learning this can generate for the wider system.

The ISF welcomes this continued development, particularly the stronger connection between monitoring information, resident feedback and changes to programme delivery.

Q1 Y2 2026/27 scrutiny: monitoring

Is there any additional monitoring information, insight or learning that has not already been included in this report that you would like to share?

The evaluation of the community activities pilot will provide an important source of further learning. Providers are gathering information about participation, expenditure and outcomes using a range of approaches. The GPT is also collecting participant contact details and using a consistent set of questions to gather independent feedback about participants' experiences.

The GPT plans to meet with providers once monitoring information has been received to understand their experience of delivering the pilot and working with the team. This learning will be used to inform the main community activities programme, with the GPT intending to hold these conversations more regularly in future.

The ISF welcomes the combination of provider monitoring and consistent participant feedback. As different providers are using different evaluation approaches, it will be important for the GPT to bring these sources together in a way that identifies common learning across projects and provides a clear basis for adapting the wider programme.