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Executive Summary

The following evidence is submitted jointly by the National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO), the Lloyds Bank Foundation, Charity Finance Group (CFG) and the National Association for Voluntary Community Action (NAVCA). The focus of this submission is on the impact that reductions to local government finance has had on local communities, and on the local infrastructure and voluntary organisations that support them. All the findings from previous research undertaken on this issue demonstrate that a new approach to funding local government is needed.

Key findings

Since 2011, local authorities have experienced unprecedented reductions in funding. The National Audit Office estimates that 1 in 10 councils are now using their financial reserves at a rate which is not sustainable for more than three years.

Last year the Lloyds Bank Foundation published *A Quiet Crisis*; this research showed that while local authorities have taken steps to try and reduce the impacts of cuts on their services for people facing disadvantage, almost the entire burden has fallen on the most deprived communities, where demand for services is typically higher.

The research also highlighted that, in the face of rising demand and shrinking resources, councils have been forced to shift spending away from preventative services in order to meet crisis need.

Where statutory services have been restricted or withdrawn, local infrastructure organisations and the wider voluntary sector have faced increasing pressure to provide support to communities. Life enhancing, non-statutory services are also being shifted on to the voluntary sector.

Over the past decade, councils have significantly reduced (and in some cases completely withdrawn) the core funding from grants that many local infrastructure organisations have relied upon to provide practical support to the wider local voluntary sector and local communities.

All of this means that voluntary organisations face increased need and demand for their services, but fewer resources and less support with which to deliver. Local infrastructure organisations have consequently faced a double pinch point: increasing need for support from those local organisations facing reduced resources and increased demand, while at the same time handling their own reduction in resourcing and capacity.

Losing voluntary sector infrastructure from a locality brings with it a destabilising and devastating effect on communities, voluntary organisations and local economies though the loss of services designed to support the most vulnerable people, the lack of appropriate risk management and governance support within the voluntary sector, and the loss of jobs and volunteering opportunities within the sector.
With local authorities facing significant funding challenges, and each local authority having their own policy on discretionary business rate relief, an emerging trend is that of local authorities creating distinctions between different kinds of charity or to withdraw discretionary relief altogether. This has created a postcode lottery for charities receiving the discretionary relief for business rates, which is one of the most significant tax relief provided to charities.

Reductions in local authority funding and the move towards increased competitive tendering for the delivery of local services have meant that co-commissioning is extremely price driven. This has moved voluntary organisations into a difficult space where they are forced to compete with the private sector (and sometimes each other) and in effect, become subcontractors to the public sector.

**Recommendations**

Local councils, working with local infrastructure and local charities, have a vital role to play in government achieving its aims to tackle burning injustices and build strong, resilient communities. If the government wants to bridge economic and geographical divides and support areas that have previously been left behind, it must fund local authorities based on need – taking into account the higher levels of disadvantage and therefore the higher demand for services in more deprived areas, and recognising that these areas are also less able to raise their own funds.

Given their embeddedness within and deep knowledge of local communities, local infrastructure and other voluntary organisations need to be involved and to play a meaningful role in strategic discussions and decision making on local authority budgets.

The regime of business rates for charities should be reviewed: a system that would ensure fairness, simplicity and consistency would be to raise the mandatory business rate relief for charities to 100%, replacing the existing provision for 20% discretionary rate relief.

As councils continue to face funding pressures, there are steps that can be taken to allow the voluntary sector to deliver better, more efficient and responsive public services. In order to do so, government and the voluntary sector need to work in partnership to remove the barriers that prevent organisations from playing their full part. But it is also important to recognise that, while the voluntary sector has often stepped in to deliver and fill the gaps, its role is to complement local government, not to replace it.

Dormant assets (money in dormant savings accounts, untouched charity trusts and forgotten gift cards) should be used to create a new ‘community wealth fund’: a long-term source of investment to create community infrastructure, particularly in the areas that need it most.
The voluntary sector: a financial overview

The economic contribution of the voluntary sector

Voluntary organisations play a vital role in improving our society and make a huge contribution to the UK economy. Charities employ over 880,000 people and support nearly 12 million people to volunteer at least once a month. The voluntary sector contributed £15.3bn to the UK economy in 2015/16, representing around 0.8% of total GDP, roughly equivalent to the GDP of Estonia.

Income from government

In 2015/16 the sector received £15.3bn from government bodies. The majority of the sector’s income from government comes from relationships with local government, with £7.5bn incoming from this source. Central government and the NHS accounted for £6.7bn, while the remaining £1bn came from the EU, international governments and international agencies like the UN.

Up to 2009/10, income from government grew (with occasional fluctuations) to a peak of £15.6bn and was a key factor in the growth of the sector over that period. After 2009/10, income from government decreased, following the pattern of the general reduction in government spending. The decrease occurred particularly between 2010/11 and 2011/12 (the first full year after the government’s spending review), with income from government falling to £14.6bn in 2011/12 and £14.5bn in 2012/13. The 2015/16 level remains £600m below the peak of 2009/10 in real terms.

For the first time since 2010, local government funding, both in terms of amount and the proportion of overall government income for the voluntary sector, increased in 2015/16. This is despite local government seeing a reduction of £16bn to core funding from government between 2010 and 2020\(^1\). The vast majority of this increase occurred among charities with income above £10m and to a far lesser extent, amongst large organisations (£1m-£10m), with smaller charities seeing a drop in local funding. This again perhaps reflects the ability of larger charities to engage in a commissioning environment that increasingly favours organisations with both the resources and capacity to bid and deliver large scale public service contracts.

---

1 https://data.ncvo.org.uk/a/almanac18/income-from-government-2015-16/#_ftn1
Charitable income from central and local government, 2004/05 to 2015/16 (£m, 2015/16 prices)

Local government funding for charities with turnover below £1m, 2012/13 to 2016/17 (£m, 2016/17 prices)
How changes to local government funding have affected communities

Since 2011, local authorities have experienced unprecedented reductions in funding. The National Audit Office estimates that 1 in 10 councils are now using their financial reserves at a rate which is not sustainable for more than three years\(^2\). While all areas are under pressure, there are particular threats to specific geographies and services which have been exacerbated by changes to local government funding structures.

Last year the Lloyds Bank Foundation published research, *A Quiet Crisis*, by New Policy Institute, which showed that while local authorities have taken steps to try and reduce the impacts of cuts on their services for people facing disadvantage, almost the entire burden has fallen on the most deprived communities, where demand for services is typically higher. Local authorities have also been forced to shift spending away from prevention in order to meet crisis demand, which will likely lead to significant rises in human and financial costs further down the line. The findings of the research demonstrate that a new approach to funding local government is needed, recognising the severe pressures they are facing, particularly in more deprived areas, and the impacts this has on communities and people facing disadvantage.

The most disadvantaged communities have been hardest hit by cuts to local government funding

*A Quiet Crisis* shows that councils have managed, to some extent, to mitigate the impact of cuts on services for people facing disadvantage (with an average 2% cut as opposed to an average 8% cut to services overall). However, this is at a time of rising demand for services, and there are concerns that this is unsustainable under the current funding arrangements. Three quarters of charities surveyed for the Foundation reported rising demand, with more than half seeing waiting lists grow over the previous year\(^3\).

97% of cuts to local authority spend on services for people facing disadvantage have fallen on the most deprived fifth of local authorities, where demand for these services is highest. By contrast, the least deprived local authorities have been able to increase spending on disadvantage. This pattern follows the shift in local authority funding away from the revenue support grant based on need, towards requiring local authorities to raise a greater share of resources themselves. Areas with greater levels of deprivation are least able to raise revenue from business rates or council tax, and are also seeing the highest levels of demand for services. As a result, they are likely to fall even further behind under the current funding arrangements.

Local councils, working with local charities, have a vital role to play in government achieving its aims to tackle burning injustices and build strong, resilient communities. If the government wants to bridge economic and geographical divides and support areas that have previously been left behind, it must fund local authorities based on need – taking into account the higher levels of disadvantage


\(^3\) nfp synergy grantee survey – not published
and therefore the higher demand for services in more deprived areas, and recognising that these areas are also less able to raise their own funds.

**Councills have been forced to shift from prevention to crisis spending**

The research also highlighted that, in the face of rising demand and shrinking resources, councils have been forced to shift spending away from preventative services in order to meet crisis need. For example, spending on disadvantage in housing has fallen 13% over five years and, within this, spending on preventative services (enabling people to stay in their homes) have been cut by 46%, while crisis spending (primarily on temporary accommodation) has increased by 58% over the same period. The human costs of pushing people into crisis are wide-ranging, such the impact of homelessness on physical and mental health.

This shift will exacerbate problems further down the line – if people do not receive the support they need at an earlier point, their problems can escalate and become more difficult and costly to resolve in the long run. As the preventative provision which helps people maintain a job or their tenancy are cut back, this will increase strain on wider public services such as welfare, health or housing, pushing up costs.

These long-term costs are already starting to hit some local authorities. The research highlights that spending on disadvantage in children’s services actually increased overall, reflecting the growth in the number of children being looked after in local authority care in recent years. Some local authorities attribute this growth to reductions in spending on early intervention and prevention, as well as the impact of long-term spending cuts on already deprived communities. Support for looked-after children was the second largest category of all spending on disadvantage, making up 26% of the total.

Local authorities already have made efficiency savings, are using their financial reserves at an unsustainable rate and have been forced to do a lot more with a lot less for some time. They are reaching the limit of what is possible in the current context, as has already been seen in areas such as East Sussex or Northamptonshire. A longer-term approach is needed to the funding of local authorities, to ensure that they can continue to provide the services their communities need rather than pushing problems down the road.

**Vital services have been reduced and are at risk of disappearing altogether**

The range of services that local authorities provide is being negatively affected by the funding crisis. Services which are now discretionary, such as Local Welfare Assistance, have been cut back and are at risk of disappearing altogether. While there is no longer a statutory responsibility on local authorities to provide these services, the need for this provision still exists. Local Welfare Assistance provides emergency support such as help with food or fuel bills, or support for someone establishing a tenancy after a period of homelessness or after fleeing abuse. This support is critical in preventing people from falling into crisis. Yet spending on Local Welfare Assistance fell by 26% between 2013/14 and 2016/17, and in 2016/17, 26 authorities had ceased provision altogether. This leaves a gaping hole in the safety net, at a time of rising need. Funding for local authorities

---

should reflect the full range of services they need to provide, ring-fenced to ensure vital services continue.

How changes to local government funding have affected local voluntary organisations

Where statutory services have been restricted or withdrawn, local infrastructure organisations and the wider voluntary sector have faced increasing pressure to provide support to communities. Life enhancing, non-statutory services are also being shifted into the voluntary sector (e.g. Anti-Social Behaviour, litter picking, engagement with disadvantaged neighbourhoods etc). Many local authorities are recognising that communities benefit significantly from the support of voluntary anchor organisations which can respond quickly and be flexible to their needs, and local infrastructure organisations are continuing to co-design and deliver key services, and to bring about more locally responsive decision-making for the communities they are based in.

However, as councils have been forced to reassess spending and implement cost savings, the cuts to local budgets have frequently resulted in funding for community services being “the first to go”. With local authorities under pressure to rationalise spending against available resources, cutting support to local voluntary organisations appears to be a “quick win”.

Over the past decade, councils have significantly reduced (and in some cases completely withdrawn) the core funding from grants that many local infrastructure organisations have relied upon to provide practical support to the wider local voluntary sector and local communities. The reduction in specific and special grants (mentioned above) has been a key factor. As part of the conditions attached to this funding, local authorities were required to spend a proportion of the grant in the voluntary sector. The reduction in availability of specific and special grants has impacted on local authorities’ capacity to support the voluntary sector.

All of this means that voluntary organisations face increased need and demand for their services, but fewer resources and less support with which to deliver. Local infrastructure organisations have consequently faced a double pinch point: increasing need for support from those local organisations facing reduced resources and increased demand, while at the same time handling their own reduction in resourcing and capacity. Despite this, the sector has shown exceptional resilience and has continued to deliver key services in some of the most difficult times in recent history.

These issues around decreased support and resources highlight the serious threat of losing local infrastructure in some areas. Losing voluntary sector infrastructure from a locality brings with it a destabilising and devastating effect on communities, voluntary organisations and local economies though the loss of services designed to support the most vulnerable people, the lack of appropriate risk management and governance support within the voluntary sector, and the loss of jobs and volunteering opportunities within the sector. The practical and strategic support that local infrastructure organisations provide to local communities and voluntary groups is as essential as infrastructure support from local sources such as chambers of commerce are to commercial business. There needs to be increased recognition of the role local infrastructure plays in ensuring a thriving voluntary sector ecosystem, which in turn benefits and strengthens local communities.

The above points demonstrate the fundamental role that local infrastructure and the wider voluntary sector play in supporting the delivery of key public services. Yet despite this, resources to
support this delivery remain scarce, and the voluntary sector cannot deliver key community and public services unless they are fully funded. Given the position of councils across the country, such resources should come from central government, yet no firm commitment has been made by government to dedicate sustainable and strategic funding for the voluntary sector in the vital support role they play in local communities.

The disconnect between the current model of local government funding and its impact on support for voluntary organisations also appears to be at odds with key national strategies such as last year’s Civil Society Strategy and Loneliness Strategy. This raises the question of if, and exactly how the key pledges in these (such as funding the training of 3,500 Community Organisers by 2020 or addressing complex social issues such as rough sleeping, digital inclusion and healthy ageing) will be met.

**How changes to local government funding have affected business rates**

The withdrawal of government grant funding on the assumption that business rates can fill the gap does not take into account the structural inequalities across local authority areas. In areas which have a thriving private sector the retention of business rates will offer opportunities to generate more income to be spend on local needs, than will be lost from government grant. Conversely, for areas which are already struggling economically, there will be fewer businesses to gain business rates from, meaning the loss of government grant would in fact, mean less revenue for the local authority to spend. In keeping with previous recommendations from this committee, we would also support the previous recommendations of this committee that the Government should ensure that further business rates retention is of net benefit to councils.  

It should also be noted that business rate relief is the most significant tax relief provided to charities, and is vital to ensuring charities remain financially stable. Charities and Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASCs) receive 80% mandatory rate relief, and in addition can receive a further 20% discretionary rate relief from local authorities. This discretionary rate relief alone is forecast by MHCLG to be worth £49 million by 2019-2020 to the charity sector. For many charities this provides a financial lifeline to organisations struggling with an increasingly challenging funding environment and a greater demand for their services.

The discretionary nature of the relief is unique amongst tax reliefs for charities, in that it can change from year to year, providing little certainty and making financial planning increasingly difficult. Furthermore, with local authorities facing significant funding challenges, and each local authority having their own policy on discretionary rate relief, an emerging trend is that of local authorities creating distinctions between different kinds of charity. This has created a postcode lottery for charities receiving the discretionary relief for business rates. For instance, Medway council has decided to only provide discretionary relief to charities which provide services supporting vulnerable people, at the exclusion of charities that provide other services.

---

5 [https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcomloc/552/552.pdf](https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcomloc/552/552.pdf)

Less discretionary relief means fewer resources are available for charities to deliver their charitable objectives, but most importantly it often means that charities have to reduce the support and services they provide to communities in need.

With an increasing tendency towards fiscal devolution, particularly for business rates, the incentive for cash strapped authorities will be to not provide discretionary relief, so as to maximise the potential revenues they receive. A number of authorities have already reduced this relief for charities, or have made plans to do so. A survey of local authorities found that the majority of councils in England, Wales and Scotland do not offer full business rate relief to charity shops.

With more councils being invited to apply for the power to retain business rates, unless there is additional funding for local authorities, this is a trend which is set to continue.7 Less discretionary relief will mean fewer resources are available for charities to deliver their charitable objectives and support communities in need.

Furthermore research from the Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS) has shown that further or full retention of business rates could in fact lead to a greater divergence between funding for authorities in only a few years, with those that have the highest levels of assessed spending need per person being able to raise less revenue than those with relative affluence.8 This would be particularly concerning, as it means that charities working in areas of greatest economic disadvantage are less likely to receive discretionary rate relief than those working in affluent areas. This in turn would impact disadvantaged communities the most: those least able to cope would see the withdrawal of vital services, and the poorest places and the poorest people would be the hardest hit.

How changes to local government funding have affected commissioning practices

Reductions in local authority funding and the move towards increased competitive tendering for the delivery of local services have meant that co-commissioning is extremely price driven. This has moved voluntary organisations into a difficult space where they are forced to compete with the private sector (and sometimes each other) and in effect, become subcontractors to the public sector. Voluntary organisations are using their expertise, their deep connections with communities and their unique skills to deliver services under contract for the public sector in a way that private sector providers often cannot. However, tendering and commissioning processes can be highly problematic, and is sometimes inconsistent with voluntary designed and delivered services. Whilst there is a space for collaborative co-commissioning between the voluntary and statutory sector, the current models of commissioning and procurement are damaging the voluntary sector, harming relationships between the voluntary sector and statutory commissioners. Commissioning processes can often be prohibitive for small local voluntary organisations, forcing some to move away from bidding for contracts altogether.

8 https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/10551
Lessons learnt: the approach the Government should take to local government funding as part of the 2019 Spending Review

Strong local government and charities deliver high levels of value to communities, but need to be properly resourced

Charities, and people themselves, are often left to pick up the pieces where service gaps occur. Communities are under increasing pressure as council services face rising demand and shrinking resources: 86% of charities surveyed by the Lloyds Bank Foundation attribute rising demand to closure of public services\(^9\).

Small and local charities play a vital role in communities which sets them apart from other providers. The Value of Small, independent research by commissioned by the Lloyds Bank Foundation, showed that small and local charities are distinctive in how they work - creating safe, spaces where people feel respected, engaging people for the long term through trusting relationships and acting as the glue that holds services and communities together. These distinctive characteristics of small and local charities enable them to deliver high levels of value to individuals, the economy and communities, whether through reducing demand on other services, attracting in more funds from elsewhere or galvanising volunteers.

76% of these charities surveyed reported a rise in demand for their services\(^10\). This demand is also becoming more complex, with many people needing higher levels of support for longer. Rising thresholds for support and pressures on other public services, as highlighted by the A Quiet Crisis research, mean that for many, charities are the only source of support.

At the same time, small and local charities find it increasingly difficult to access funding – income is the most pressing challenge for 56% of local charities\(^11\). For many years there has been a shift in government funding at both a local and central government level, away from smaller and towards larger charities, to the extent that 84% of local government funding goes to larger, rather than smaller charities\(^12\). As commissioning processes have favoured scale, smaller charities have missed out, driving a lack of understanding about what support is needed and who already delivers it, specifications that prevent them from bidding or processes that place them at a disadvantage. Too often this has led to services that do not meet people’s needs, resulting in a revolving door on demand for services and driving up long term costs.

The quantum of funding should reflect the levels of need, but it is also important that what money is available generates the high levels of individual, economic and wider social value that small and local charities create.

Strong local government, funded sufficiently and delivering effectively is particularly important for those facing disadvantage in some way, delivering some of the most vital services – such as for

\(^9\) nfp synergy grantee survey – not published

\(^10\) nfp synergy grantee survey – not published

\(^11\) Local Giving Local Charity and Community Group Sustainability Report 2017/18

\(^12\) Value of Small
those who are homeless, in the care of the state or fleeing abuse. The challenges facing communities and demand for services is likely to rise in coming years. It is therefore vital to ensure that services are sufficiently funded – taking into account the higher levels of disadvantage and therefore the higher demand for services in more deprived areas, and recognising that these areas are also less able to raise their own funds. Small charities must also be able to access the resources they need – as the Value of Small research shows, smaller, local charities are often the glue that holds communities and services together. Charities and local government rely on each other to work effectively – but both must be properly resourced to be able to deliver the support that communities they serve need.

Local voluntary organisations need to be involved in decision-making on local authority budgets

The current system is proving to be neither sustainable or efficient for local authorities, local infrastructure organisations or the voluntary sector. This in part stems from the UK’s centralised nature of government, compared to the fiscal autonomy and spending power of OECD peers that operate federal systems (e.g. US, Germany etc.) where a middle tier of government oversees control over a wide range of devolved functions and many of the sources of income that enable their delivery.¹³

Local government funding needs to be based on a model that is responsive to and reflective of local need. Given their embeddedness within and deep knowledge of local communities, local infrastructure and other voluntary organisations need to be involved and to play a meaningful role in strategic discussions and decision making on local authority budgets. This shift would help contribute to the development of alternative (and more effective) models of local service delivery, whilst also giving local authorities a better understanding of voluntary sector capacity.

The business rates regime for charities needs to be reviewed

It is clear that there are a number of flaws with the current business rates regime for charities. The next Spending Review presents an opportunity to improve the operation of the regime for charities and government. But most importantly, to ensure that the communities that need them most continue to receive the services and support of their local charities.

A system that would ensure fairness, simplicity and consistency would be to raise the mandatory business rate relief for charities to 100%, replacing the existing provision for 20% discretionary rate relief.

If the additional 20% of business rates is to remain discretionary for local authorities, there should be a mechanism to ensure the revenue raised from charities is used to provide additional support to people facing the greatest disadvantages.

Business rate retention should not be positioned as a funding solution for the removal of central government grants to local authorities. It has been shown to exaggerate the inequalities between places since those areas with greatest need raise the least from business rates. More equitable and

fair central tax-raised redistributive funding is required to address inequalities between localities and the wider inequalities which are increasing across England.

**The barriers to participation in service delivery need to be addressed**

As councils continue to face funding pressures, there are steps that can be taken to allow the voluntary sector to play a bigger role in delivering better, more efficient and responsive public services. In order to do so, government and the voluntary sector need to work in partnership to remove the barriers that prevent organisations from playing their full part.

There are a number of areas where substantial progress could be made, helping commissioners do more with less at a time when they face significant budgetary pressures, while improving public services. Steps include:

- **Strengthening the Social Value Act** by requiring public bodies to ‘account’ for the social value they generate rather than just ‘consider’ it, and extending the Act beyond services to goods and works as well. Commissioners should also ‘account’ for pre-procurement consultation and engagement with users and providers when looking to include social value in a contract.

- **Reducing contract sizes** to enable the participation of charities and other SMEs in public service markets. In recent years the increase in the use of larger value scale contracts has meant that many charities are unable to access the capital needed either to bid for these larger contracts alone or to build sufficiently robust consortia that can. This is resulting in a loss of local and specialist expertise.

- **Engaging in pre-procurement dialogue** with communities and the market, to ensure that services are tailored to the needs of the community and represent good value for money.

- **Rethinking payment by results**, and requiring commissioners to use the National Audit Office analytical framework for decision makers when considering payment by results contracts.\(^{14}\)

- **Ensuring bidding and evaluation requirements are proportionate** to the size and complexity of the contract in question. There are still too many public bodies that insist on applying full EU procurement rules when not required to do so. Similarly, excessive monitoring and evaluation requirements can waste resources and reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

- **Awarding contracts on value, not price**. Public sector procurement is increasingly driven by price, rather than delivering value for money. In some cases, commissioners seeking to achieve broader social value or trial new methodologies - such as social value - have their business cases blocked by risk-averse procurement or finance teams.

- **Increasing transparency in how public services are delivered**. Effective market stewardship is only possible if the government has clear information about the existing provider market, including detailed information about the value of services provided by specific suppliers. Two simple and low-cost reforms would increase transparency:
  
  - The addition of a charity/company number to award notices on the Contracts Finder website.

• The inclusion of a stronger standardised transparency clause in the Crown Commercial Services Model Services Contract.

**Communities need to be strong and resourceful**

Increasingly, the case is becoming clearer for how an ambitious long-term endowment could help those areas that have – to date – missed out on the proceeds of a growing economy.

This could be achieved through the creation of a Community Wealth Fund, tasked with supporting long term, patient investment in the social and civic economy of areas that need it most. This fund would allow place-led change, seeking to empower people to develop solutions and enable communities to develop their own responses.

Some places have been left behind by globalisation as our economic model has not benefitted all communities equally. But areas of deep-seated deprivation can recover through emerging models of local economic development. Communities are seizing opportunities to do things for themselves. New Shared Prosperity Funds, which will replace European Structural Funds, will provide a unique opportunity to support and develop these solutions. But prosperity requires investment in social, not just economic capital.

Unclaimed assets in insurance and pension funds, bonds and stock and shares are potentially worth billions of pounds. The creation of a fund worth £4-5 billion would be possible if a range of resources were brought together. This could include the release of share capital from the private sector, civil society’s stranded assets, other unclaimed assets not yet identified and community assets which already exist at the local level.

A fund on this scale could deliver transformative social, economic and financial impact. It could also support community commissioned services, save assets, build new infrastructure, enhance democracy and build new relationships across society.
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April 2019