

Abingdon and North East Area Committee Agenda



Contact: Susan Harbour
Telephone: 01235 422525
Email: susan.harbour@southandvale.gov.uk
Date: Thursday, 01 March 2018
Website: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

A meeting of the

Abingdon and North East Area Committee

will be held on Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 7.00 pm

Meeting Room 1, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, OX14 4SB

Members of the Committee:

Councillors

Mike Badcock	Vicky Jenkins
Edward Blagrove (Chairman)	Bob Johnston
Alice Badcock	Monica Lovatt
Margaret Crick	Sandy Lovatt
Stuart Davenport	Chris Palmer
Gervase Duffield	Helen Pighills
Katie Finch	Judy Roberts
Robert Hall	Emily Smith (Vice Chair)
Debby Hallett	Henry Spencer
Dudley Hoddinott	Catherine Webber

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email and easy read. For this or any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M Reed".

Margaret Reed
Head of Legal and Democratic

Agenda

Open to the Public including the Press

Council's vision

The council's vision is to take care of your interests across the Vale with enterprise, energy and efficiency.

1. Apologies for absence

To record apologies for absence.

2. Minutes

(Pages 3 - 9)

To adopt and sign as a correct record the Abingdon and North East Area Committee minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2017.

3. Declarations of interest

To receive any declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting.

4. Urgent business and chairman's announcements

To receive notification of any matters which the chairman determines should be considered as urgent business and the special circumstances which have made the matters urgent, and to receive any announcements from the chairman.

5. Public participation

To receive any questions or statements from members of the public that have registered to speak.

6. Community Grants

(Pages 10 - 30)

To consider the communication and grant manager's report.



Minutes

of a meeting of the

Abingdon and North East

Area Committee

held on Tuesday, 12 December 2017 at 7.00 pm

at the Meeting Room 1, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, OX14 4SB

Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Ed Blagrove (Chairman), Alice Badcock, Mike Badcock, Stuart Davenport, Katie Finch, Robert Hall, Dudley Hoddinott, Vicky Jenkins, Bob Johnston, Sandy Lovatt, Chris Palmer and Judy Roberts

Officers: Jayne Bolton, Carole Cumming and Susan Harbour

Number of members of the public: 7

Ab.14 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Margaret Crick, Gervase Duffield, Debby Hallett, Monica Lovatt and Helen Pighills.

Ab.15 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 17 January 2017 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting and were signed by the Chairman.

Ab.16 Declarations of interest

Councillor Bob Johnston declared that he was a member of both Kennington Parish Council and North Hinksey PCC and would stand down from the committee when both applications were considered.

Councillor Dudley Hoddinott declared that he was a member of North Hinksey PCC and would speak on behalf of their application. He would stand down from the committee when the application was considered.

Councillors Emily Smith and Judy Roberts declared that they were both members of the Botley Bridges Steering Group and would step down from the committee when the application was considered.

Councillor Mike Badcock declared that he was a member of the Abingdon Royal British Legion but was able to keep an open mind in relation to their application and was not on the Legion's Management Committee.

Ab.17 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

None.

Ab.18 Public participation

Speakers representing the applicants were present for six of the applications. They also had the opportunity to respond to questions of clarification from the committee. They would speak when their application was under consideration:

Kennington Parish Council: Rachel Brown and Colin Charlett

Cumnor Preschool Nursery: Joanne Fellows

Drayton Village Hall Management Committee: Ann Webb and Sue Stevens

Botley Bridges: Kim Randall and Sue Down

Abingdon RDA: Sally Scott

North Hinksey PCC: Dudley Hoddinott

Ab.19 Community grants

Kennington Parish Council

Councillor Bob Johnston stood down from the committee for this item.

The officer introduced the application by Kennington Parish Council for a New Homes Bonus (NHB) grant of £2,375 towards a £4,750 project to commission a feasibility study to investigate options for rebuilding the pavilion at Playfield Road.

Rachel Brown and Colin Charlett, of Kennington Parish Council, spoke in support of the application. They explained the parish council's budget reserves and how they were allocated. A feasibility study had determined that the project would go ahead, but they were now considering how best to proceed.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 6 points out of a possible 12.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 37.50 per cent of the total cost, capped to £1,781, £594 less than the parish council's request.**

Cumnor Preschool Nursery

The officer introduced the application by Cumnor Preschool Nursery for a grant of £9,900 towards a £26,148 project to improve the outdoor play facilities at the preschool. It was noted that the preschool had applied to both the capital and NHB grant schemes, but the application was recommended for consideration under the capital scheme to allow best allocation of the budget.

Joanne Fellows, Chair of Cumnor Preschool Nursery, was present to answer questions from the committee.

The committee debated the item and agreed with the officer's recommended scores for both the NHB and capital grant applications.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 7 points out of a possible 12, in relation to the NHB application, but to refuse a grant given that the project had been recommended for funding through the capital grants scheme.**
- 2. To approve the officer's recommended score of 5 points out of a possible 9, in relation to the capital grant application.**
- 3. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 28.40 per cent of the total cost, capped to £7,425, £2,475 less than the Cumnor Preschool Nursery's request.**

Drayton Village Hall

The officer introduced the application by the Drayton Village Hall Management Committee for a grant of £1,422 towards a £2,844 project to improve the bar facilities and install a glasswasher at the Drayton Village Hall.

Ann Webb and Sue Stevens, from the Drayton Village Hall Management Committee, were present to answer questions from the committee. They confirmed that there was no financial support available from the parish council for this project.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 8 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To approve the officer's recommended grant of 50.00 per cent of the total cost, capped to £1,422, the amount requested by Drayton Village Hall.**

Botley Bridges

Councillors Emily Smith and Judy Roberts stood down from the committee for this item.

The officer introduced the application by Botley Bridges for a New Homes Bonus grant of £2,024 towards a £4,048 project to provide three ten-week family improvement courses for local residents.

Kim Randall and Sue Down, from Botley Bridges, spoke in support of the application and answered questions from the committee. They confirmed that they were funded through a mixture of grant applications, local fundraising efforts and small family contributions.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 7 points out of a possible 12.**
- 2. To approve the officer's recommended grant of 37.50 per cent of the total cost, capped to £1,518, £506 less than the amount requested by Botley Bridges.**

Abingdon RDA

The officer introduced the application by Abingdon RDA for a grant of £15,625 towards a £137,625 project to create a new indoor arena at the riding school.

Sally Scott, from Abingdon RDA, was present to answer questions from the committee. She provided a funding update and confirmed that no grants had been secured at present as final decisions for a number of applications have not yet been made. She also explained that the indoor arena had multiple uses, and that it was used by groups covering a wider area than Abingdon.

In response to a question from the committee, the officer confirmed that the committee could not allocate more funding to the RDA because of the funding matrix, but that the RDA were welcome to apply to other Area Committees in the Vale of White Horse for further funding.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 5 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 8.51 per cent of the total cost, capped to £11,718, £3,907 less than requested by the RDA.**

North Hinksey PCC

Councillors Bob Johnston and Dudley Hoddinott stood down from the committee for this item.

The officer introduced the application by North Hinksey PCC for a grant of £4,088 towards a £8,176 project to improve the heating, toilets and windows at St. Peter and Paul Church.

Dudley Hoddinott, in his capacity as a member of North Hinksey PCC, spoke in support of the application and answered questions from the committee.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 7 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 50.00 per cent of the total cost, capped to £4,088, the amount requested by North Hinksey PCC.**

Oxford Rugby Club

The officer introduced the application by Oxford Rugby Club for a grant of £2,820 towards a £5,640 project to install a fire safety system and emergency lighting. It was noted that the Rugby Club had applied to both the capital and NHB grant schemes, but the application was recommended for consideration under the capital grants scheme to allow best allocation of the budget.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item and discussed whether Vale of White Horse residents were the primary beneficiaries of the project, or mostly people outside of the district. It was noted that 64% of membership were from the Vale of White Horse.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 7 points out of a possible 9, in relation to the capital grants application.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 50.00 per cent of the total cost, capped to £2,820, the amount requested by Oxford Rugby Club.**
- 3. To amend the officer's recommended score from 7 to 9 points out of a possible 12, in relation to the NHB grant application, but to refuse a grant given that the project had been recommended for funding through the capital grants scheme.**

Abingdon Royal British Legion Club

The officer introduced the application by Abingdon Royal British Legion for a grant of £1,400 towards a £2,800 project to refurbish the gable end on their building.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 5 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 37.50 per cent of the total cost, capped to £1,050, £350 less than the amount requested.**

St. Nicolas Church, Abingdon

The officer introduced the application by St. Nicolas Church, Abingdon for a grant of £4,000 towards a £9,768 project to replace existing seating in the church.

Vale of White Horse District Council – Abingdon Area Committee minutes

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 5 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 30.71 per cent of the total cost, capped to £3,000, £1,000 less than the amount requested.**

Sunningwell Cricket Club

The officer introduced the application by Sunningwell Cricket Club for a grant of £6,692 towards a £13,385 project to install an artificial wicket and practice nets on the existing cricket ground.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 4 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 37.50 per cent of the total cost, capped to £5,019, £1,673 less than the amount requested.**

Stonewater: Abingdon Foyer

The officer introduced the application by Stonewater Limited for a grant of £3,245 towards a £6,491 project to provide residents of Abingdon Foyer with IT and recording equipment.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item. The officer informed the committee that any organisation whose application had been refused entirely can reapply to the Area Committee for the same project at a later stage. The committee agreed to make no changes to the officer's recommendation, but requested that the organisation receive advice on future applications.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 3 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To refuse the application for a capital grant.**

North Hinksey Preschool and Childcare Clubs

The officer introduced the application by North Hinksey Preschool and Childcare Clubs for a New Homes Bonus grant of £20,000 towards a £44,334 project to improve the outdoor play facilities at the preschool.

Vale of White Horse District Council – Abingdon Area Committee minutes

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 8 points out of a possible 12.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 33.83 per cent, capped to £15,000, £5,000 less than the amount requested by North Hinksey Preschool and Childcare Clubs.**

The officer informed the meeting that the committee's remaining capital grant budget was £5,568 and the remaining NHB budget is £16,503, therefore the committee confirmed that they would like to consider further applications for this balance before the end of the financial year.

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm

Abingdon and North-East Area Committee



Report of Head of Community Services

Author: Carole Cumming

Telephone: 01235 422405

Textphone: 18001 01235 422405

E-mail: carole.cumming@southandvale.gov.uk

Cabinet member responsible: Charlotte Dickson

E-mail: Charlotte.Dickson@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

To: Abingdon and North-East Area Committee

DATE: 13 March 2018

Capital and New Homes Bonus (NHB) Grants 2017/18 – Round three

Recommendations

- (a) that the Abingdon and North-East area committee considers the one application for a capital grant and makes an award in line with the approved policy (2015).
- (b) that the Abingdon and North-East area committee considers the three applications for NHB grants and makes awards in line with the approved policy (2015).

Purpose of report

1. To give the committee the information needed to award NHB and capital grants for their area.

Strategic objectives

2. Under the 'sustainable communities and well-being' corporate priority in our 2016-2020 corporate plan we have committed to support community groups through our grants schemes.

Background

3. We opened the NHB and capital grant schemes from 12 January 2018 – 31 January 2018.
4. The Abingdon and North-East area received one eligible capital grant application requesting a total of £5,000 against a budget of £5,568 and three eligible NHB grant applications requesting a total of £15,241 against a budget of £16,503.

5. Officers have evaluated the applications using the scoring matrix in the respective agreed policies. See appendix one for the capital grant evaluation, appendix two for the NHB grant evaluations and appendix three for the percentage of new homes in each parish.
6. In line with the policies, officers have suggested scores and awards for each application for the committee to consider. The committee is invited to review and amend these scores with justification reasons. The final score will place each application into a priority bracket (high, medium and low). These brackets dictate the level of grant that can be awarded.

Financial implications

7. In February 2017, the council set the 2017/18 capital grant budget at £100,000. As per the policy, the Abingdon and North-East area was allocated 42.11 per cent of the available budget (£42,110) to award in capital grants during 2017/18. The committee have already awarded £36,542 during earlier rounds of funding, so have £5,568 available for this round of funding.
8. At the same meeting, the council set a 2017/18 NHB budget of £100,000. The Abingdon and North-East area committee was allocated 34.802 per cent of this (£34,802) to award NHB grants in 2017/18. As per the agreed policy these grants can fund either revenue or capital projects. The committee have already awarded £18,299 during earlier rounds of funding, so have £16,503 available for this round of funding.

Legal implications

9. The council's legal powers to award these grants are contained in section one of the Localism Act 2011 that gives a general power of competence for local authorities.
10. In May 2017, full council delegated authority to three area committees to determine NHB and capital grant applications within the parameters of each scheme's policy.

Risks

11. There are no overarching risks of awarding these grants. Officers have highlighted any risks to individual projects in their evaluation reports.

Conclusion

12. That the committee decide the outcome of the four eligible capital/NHB grants in line with the relevant approved policies.

Background papers

13. Cabinet approval of the capital and NHB grant policies.

Appendix one - Abingdon and North East Wantage Area 2017-18 NHB grants (round three)

officer evaluation report

Ref no.	Organisation	Scheme	Scheme cost	Amount requested	% of cost requested	Suggested score	Suggested award
VCap17-18/72	Wootton Parish Council	Play area equipment and pathways	£10,844	£5,000	46.11%	8	£5,000 (100% of the requested amount, 46.11% of the total cost)
			Total	£5,000	Total suggested		£5,000
						Budget	£5,568
						Balance	£568

Page 12

Scoring and award matrices

SCORE	PRIORITY LEVEL	AWARDS all awards are subject to the available budget. High priorities are awarded before considering the medium priority projects.
7-9 points	High priority	Award full amount requested - budget permitting (capped at 50 per cent of the cost unless we allowed them to request more and they meet the criteria for an exception).
4-6 points	Medium priority	Award between 50 and 75 per cent of the amount requested, depending on their score - budget permitting.
0-3 points	Low priority	No funding.

Extra facilities/activities

Points	Criteria to score	Examples
0	The project doesn't allow any activities to take place or provide a facility for the community's use.	A decorative village sign doesn't allow any community activities to take place or give the community a facility to use.
1	The project replaces existing facilities or allows existing activities to continue. or The project moderately improves a minor community facility or activity.	It replaces furniture in the village hall with like-for-like replacements. Replacing existing park benches with longer-lasting ones.
2	The project moderately improves or extends a substantial community facility or activity. or The project significantly improves or extends a minor community facility or activity. or The project provides a new minor facility or activity for the community.	Replacing the chairs in the village hall with more comfortable ones or improve a play area to cater for more ages. Buying replacement boats for a small canoeing club. Installing three new noticeboards in the village.
3	The project will provide substantial new facilities or activities to the community. or The project significantly improves a substantial community facility.	Creating a brand-new play area where there wasn't one already. Adding a large extension to a village hall.
Deductions	Deduct one point if the project reduces the community activities/facilities on offer. Deduct two points if the project removes a community facility or stops activities taking place without replacing them.	Like a project to overhaul and landscape a car park that reduces the number of parking spaces. Demolishing an old skatepark without replacing it with anything.

Community Benefit

Points	Criteria to score	Example
0	The project offers little or no direct benefit to the community.	A decorative sign or boundary wall with no other purpose
1	A single sport or special interest group, like an art group, will benefit. However, if a sport club wanted to upgrade their pavilion and other groups frequently use it as well, it can score more.	A project to buy cricket pitch covers, IT equipment for a photography club or landscaping a nursery's garden is only benefiting their members/users.
2	Two or more specific groups will benefit. The project will have a significant impact on the health or wellbeing of one group	A football club is upgrading its changing room, which a hockey club also use Specialist equipment for a centre working with severely disabled people.
3	The project will provide a facility that's open/available to anyone to access, (not just members) Limit the maximum score for projects on sites owned by religious organisations to two points, as they can limit who can access them under special rules in the Equalities Act.	Play areas, community building or recreation ground. (e.g. a church hall or Islamic centre)
Deductions	Remove at least one point if the project will reduce (two points if it totally removes) an existing benefit to the community without replacing it. Remove one point if there are concerns over the ownership/lease of the property.	Replacing a recreation ground with tennis courts for a member's club (open community benefit is reduced as only tennis members will benefit going forward). Like the term of their lease is too short or their ownership evidence is unreliable.

Finance

Points	Financial overview
0	<p>They don't have a plan of how they'll fund the rest of the project and haven't secured any other funding yet.</p> <p>They haven't given details of how they'll fund the ongoing maintenance and eventual replacements.</p>
1	<p>They've got a funding plan, but haven't applied for all of it yet.</p> <p>or</p> <p>They've applied for all the other funding needed, but have secured less than 50 per cent so far.</p> <p>They've budgeted for the ongoing maintenance but don't say how they'll fund eventual replacements in the future (if applicable).</p>
2	<p>They've applied for all the funding needed and have already secured over 50 per cent of the balance.</p> <p>They've budgeted for the ongoing costs and have a general idea how they'll fund replacements eventually (if applicable)</p>
3	<p>They've secured all the other funding needed for the project already (including if they're funding the rest themselves).</p> <p>or</p> <p>The organisations has requested 100 per cent of the cost and have provided evidence that they've lost a funder, can't raise money themselves (e.g. via precept) and can't apply for other grants/funding.</p> <p>They've budgeted for the ongoing costs and have a fund/account/pot saving for the replacements in due course.</p>
Deductions	Remove one point if the organisation's finances suggest they could contribute towards the cost but aren't, remove two points if they can afford the whole project without any funding.

Other potential deductions/considerations:

- Their chosen supplier doesn't appear to offer value for money (their other quote was significantly cheaper for the same work).
- They have only provided one quote stating there is no alternative, but officers have found otherwise.
- Their start dates are too soon to work with our decision-making timeline for the scheme, unless we gave them permission to make an exceptional application before submitting their application.
- They are doing lots of small, similar projects instead of doing all the work in one go, which would be more cost effective
- The community don't support the project or would prefer a different solution.

Wootton (Abingdon) Parish Council	Ref	VCap17-18/72
Play area equipment and pathways		

Total project cost	£10,844		
Amount requested	£5,000	Percentage of total cost requested:	46.11%
Organisation's contribution	£5,844	Organisation's latest bank balance	£67,797

Previous grants

2012/13 - £5,000 access road to allotments
2011/12 - £2,000 community centre roof works

Scoring

<p>New facilities or activities This project will deliver the final phase of their play area upgrade by installing a tepee climbing frame (£7,544) as well as paths and seating (£3,300). As this phase will deliver moderate improvements to a major community facility they receive two points.</p>	Score	2/3
<p>Community benefit Although the main benefit is to young people the play area is open to everyone at all times and it has improved the area for adults visiting the area as well as the play equipment, so they receive three points.</p>	Score	3/3
<p>Funding the project They are contributing the remaining 53.89 per cent (£5,844) from their £67,797 reserves. However, if they don't secure enough external funding they will delay some of their other capital works and contribute more to this project. Officers are satisfied that they need external funding for the project after reviewing their financial commitment comments so they receive the maximum three marks.</p>	Score	3/3
<p>Consultation They have consulted a wide range of the community when developing this project. Their last play inspection confirms much of the old equipment needed replacement.</p> <p>Project completion within timeframe The project has been granted a special exemption to start work early as their contractors (who has completed all the other stages of work) must leave site soon and the play area cannot be used until this final stage is complete. This exemption gives no obligation to the committee to award funding and the organisation is aware that if they have started work and the committee does not award a grant they are liable to cover the full costs themselves.</p> <p>Financial and project management plans The parish council will cover the ongoing maintenance in their annual budgets.</p>		
<p>OFFICER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS Officers recommend a grant condition that they must have a satisfactory play inspection carried out before the final grant payment is released.</p>	Total score	8/9
	Suggested grant	46.11% of the total cost, capped to £5,000

Applicant responses

Details of the project	<p>The project is for the final phase of a major play area renovation in Wootton village and will see a Climbing Tee-Pee installed along with landscaping and picnic benches for community use.</p> <p>The previous phases are all nearing completion however the play area will not be able to reopen until this final phase is completed. The previous phases have been funded by WREN/Awards for All funding and parish reserves.</p>
Financial statement from the organisation	<p>Our reserves may appear high, however we are yet to pay for some of the earlier phases of this project (the cost of all phases is over £77,000). Our annual precept covers our general running costs and we have some other designated funds for our Joint Neighbourhood Plan and grass cutting in the parish.</p> <p>These and best practice guidance to hold 6 months running costs in reserve, limits our contribution to the final phase.</p>
Statement about town/parish support	
Community benefit	
Who will benefit from your project?	<p>The play area will be open at all times to all children in the area and their families. We have ensured the area is suitable for a range of age groups and abilities, including disabled children. It is close to local facilities such as the Church, primary school, Cricket Club and allotments allowing parents to allow their children to play safely whilst they are participating in other activities.</p>
How did you identify a need in the community for your project or service?	<p>There has been a strong desire in the community to have decent play facilities and a group of residents set up the group PATCH to develop the project, fundraise and consult with a wide range of children. PATCH members attended various local events and the local school to find out the type of equipment the children wanted. Information about the project was given in the community newsletter and on the website.</p>
What sustainable and/or energy saving measures does your project include or offer?	<p>All timber used in the construction will come from FSC approved suppliers and no native vegetation will be cut down.</p> <p>We are going to use the soil from the excavations at a nearby property for the mound of the slide fixture, therefore negating the needs for traffic movements by bringing soil to the site.</p> <p>Fewer people will use cars to travel to other parks in surrounding villages reducing car journeys and emissions.</p>
Consultation	
What consultation have you carried out with the community or professional advisors?	<p>Local facilities were visited and discussed with those implementing their projects.</p>
New facilities/Activities	
What extra facilities (or equipment) will the project provide?	<p>The overall project will greatly increase the existing playground facilities, which are no longer fit for purpose. It will cater for a range of age groups and abilities, including for disabled children. The public park will be close to the local primary school and open to all children in the area at all times. The new play area cannot reopen until all the phases are complete so this final phase is vital to the project.</p>
What new activities will take place because of this project?	<p>The new facilities provided will allow local children to enjoy a range of new activities in a safe environment and includes items that will allow disabled children to participate in play for the first time. The seating will allow parents to watch their children play in comfort. The pathways will allow easy travel between equipment for users, especially those with mobility issues.</p>

Appendix two - Abingdon and North East Wantage Area 2017-18 NHB grants (round three)

officer evaluation report

Ref no.	Organisation	Scheme	Scheme cost	Amount requested	% of cost requested	Suggested score	Suggested award
VNHB17-18/57	Branches Young People's Support Service (Botley)	Youth café staff and equipment	£18,094	£9,047	50.00%	7	£0
VNHB17-18/58	Kennington Village Hall	Boiler replacement	£12,523	£4,500	35.93%	6	£3,375 (75% of the requested amount, 26.95% of the total cost)
VNHB17-18/60	Abingdon Vale Cricket Club	Movable shed and port-a-cabin	£3,389	£1,694	49.99%	6	£1,270 (75% of the requested amount, 37.47% of the total cost)
			Total	£15,241		Total suggested	£4,645
						Budget	£16,503
						Balance	£11,858

Officer recommended award levels (budget permitting)

9-12 points	High priority	Award as requested, up to 50 per cent of the total cost (budget permitting) unless there are other reasons identified to limit the grant
5-8 points	Medium priority	Only award if there is budget left after the high priorities are settled. Medium priority awards can be between no more than 75% of the requested amount.
0-4 points	Low priority	No funding awarded

Scoring and award matrices

SCORE	PRIORITY LEVEL	AWARDS all awards are subject to the available budget. High priorities are awarded before considering the medium priority projects.
9-12 points	High priority	Award as requested, up to 50 per cent of the total cost (budget permitting) unless there are other reasons identified to limit the grant
5-8 points	Medium priority	Only award if there is budget left after the high priorities are settled. Medium priority awards can be between no more than 75% of the requested amount.
0-4 points	Low priority	No funding awarded

New homes score

Points	Percentage of area's total new homes in the parish the project takes place in
0	Less than 1 % of growth
1	1-10 % of growth
2	11-50 % of growth
3	51 or more % of growth

Extra facilities/activities

Points	Criteria to score	Examples
0	The project doesn't allow any activities to take place or provide a facility for the community's use.	A decorative village sign doesn't allow any community activities to take place or give the community a facility to use.
1	The project replaces existing facilities or allows existing activities to continue. or The project moderately improves a minor community facility or activity.	It replaces furniture in the village hall with like-for-like replacements. Replacing existing park benches with longer-lasting ones.
2	The project moderately improves or extends a substantial community facility or activity. or The project significantly improves or extends a minor community facility or activity. or The project provides a new minor facility or activity for the community.	Replacing the chairs in the village hall with more comfortable ones or improve a play area to cater for more ages. Buying replacement boats for a small canoeing club. Installing three new noticeboards in the village.
3	The project will provide substantial new facilities or activities to the community. or The project significantly improves a substantial community facility.	Creating a brand-new play area where there wasn't one already. Adding a large extension to a village hall.
Deductions	Deduct one point if the project reduces the activities/facilities on offer. Deduct two points if the project removes a community facility or stops activities taking place without replacing them.	Like a project to overhaul and landscape a car park that reduces the number of parking spaces. Demolishing an old skatepark without replacing it with anything.

Community Benefit

Points	Criteria to score	Example
0	The project offers little or no direct benefit to the community.	A decorative sign or boundary wall with no other purpose
1	A single sport or special interest group, like an art group, will benefit. However, if a sport club wanted to upgrade their pavilion and other groups frequently use it as well, it can score more.	A project to buy cricket pitch covers, IT equipment for a photography club or landscaping a nursery's garden is only benefiting their members/users.
2	Two or more specific groups will benefit. The project will have a significant impact on the health or wellbeing of one group	A football club is upgrading its changing room, which a hockey club also use Specialist equipment for a centre working with severely disabled people.
3	The project will provide a facility that's open/available to anyone to access, (not just members) Limit the maximum score for projects on sites owned by religious organisations to two points, as they can limit who can access them under special rules in the Equalities Act.	Play areas, community building or recreation ground. (e.g. a church hall or Islamic centre)
Deductions	Deduct at least one point if the project will reduce (two points if it totally removes) an existing benefit to the community without replacing it. Remove one point if there are concerns over the ownership/lease of the property.	Replacing a recreation ground with tennis courts for a member's club (open community benefit is reduced as only tennis members will benefit going forward). Like the term of their lease is too short or their ownership evidence is unreliable.

Finance

Points	Financial overview
0	<p>They don't have a plan of how they'll fund the rest of the project and haven't secured any other funding yet.</p> <p>They haven't given details of how they'll fund the ongoing maintenance and eventual replacements.</p>
1	<p>They've got a funding plan, but haven't applied for all of it yet.</p> <p>or</p> <p>They've applied for all the other funding needed, but have secured less than 50 per cent so far.</p> <p>They've budgeted for the ongoing maintenance but don't say how they'll fund eventual replacements in the future (if applicable).</p>
2	<p>They've applied for all the funding needed and have already secured over 50 per cent of the balance.</p> <p>They've budgeted for the ongoing costs and have a general idea how they'll fund replacements eventually (if applicable)</p>
3	<p>They've secured all the other funding needed for the project already (including if they're funding the rest themselves).</p> <p>or</p> <p>The organisations has requested 100 per cent of the cost and have provided evidence that they've lost a funder, can't raise money themselves (e.g. via precept) and can't apply for other grants/funding.</p> <p>They've budgeted for the ongoing costs and have a fund/account/pot saving for the replacements in due course.</p>
Deductions	Remove one point if the organisation's finances suggest they could contribute towards the cost but aren't, remove two points if they can afford the whole project without any funding.

Other potential deductions/considerations:

- Their chosen supplier doesn't appear to offer value for money (their other quote was significantly cheaper for the same work).
- They have only provided one quote stating there is no alternative, but officers have found otherwise.
- Their start dates are too soon to work with our decision-making timeline for the scheme, unless we gave them permission to make an exceptional application before submitting their application.
- They are doing lots of small, similar projects instead of doing all the work in one go, which would be more cost effective.
- The community don't support the project or would prefer a different solution.

Branches Young People's Support Service	Ref	VNHB17-18/57
Youth café staff and equipment		

Total project cost	£18,094		
Amount requested	£9,047	Percentage of total cost requested:	50.00%
Organisation's contribution	£3,840	Organisation's latest bank balance	£552
Other funding	£5,600 (£393 more than needed)	All requested but not secured as follows: £2,000 SHOA, £3,000 Foyle Foundation, £400 North Hinksey PC, £200 Cumnor PC	

Previous grants

2016 - £17,075 (split £8,944 NHB for staff manager and £8,131 capital for equipment). Both grants were conditional on securing an 18-month lease before any funds would be released. They were unable to meet this condition and the grants expired in July 2017.

Scoring

% of additional homes in the parish where the project will take place? North Hinksey saw 6.2 per cent and Cumnor saw 28.94 per cent of the area's additional homes, giving a total of 35.14 per cent. This qualifies them to receive two points.	Score	2/3
New facilities or activities This project will go towards the start-up costs (equipment and staff) of a new youth café in Botley, which could be a moderate community facility (especially as it will have limited opening hours, is targeted at a specific group and will not be a free facility (you pay for the goods in the café). This qualifies them to receive two points. However, as they don't currently have a signed lease for a building to operate from there is a risk that the planned activities are not able to be delivered.	Score	2/3
Community benefit The main beneficiaries of the cafe will be young people in the Botley area. There is potential use by the wider community, but this is unconfirmed so has not been reflected in their score. Usually a single user group project would be limited to one point, but as Young People represent a large portion of the community and this project could have significant impact on their wellbeing, officer suggest it received two points. There is a risk that, as they are only expecting to have an 18-month lease and have not provided a long-term forward plan, they don't meet the policy criteria that facilities/activities funded must benefit the community for a minimum of five years. If they cannot confirm how they will benefit the community for the minimum five years they will not meet the policy criteria to received funding.	Score	2/3
Funding the project The organisation intends contributing £3,840, but does not currently have this available (bank balances are currently £552). They have some other external grants awaiting decision. As they have a funding plan, but have secured less than 50 per cent of the other funded needed they receive 1 point in this area. If they have secured more of the other funding, and increased their reserves to cover their contribution when the committee meet this score could be revised. They have not provided all their financial eligibility documents, so they are not fully eligible and we are unable to comment on their financial viability. As they	Score	1/3

<p>don't have two year's accounts, they should have provided a working budget and forward financial forecast.</p>		
<p>Consultation They have carried out reasonable consultation with the community before submitting their previous grant requests.</p> <p>Project completion within timeframe Their start and end dates of 26 June and 22 December 2018 are within the limits of this scheme, but are dependent on securing their other funding and a lease for premises.</p> <p>Financial and project management plans As we did not receive all the financial eligibility documents requested from new organisations we cannot accurately comment on their current and future financial viability (we did not receive their working budget and forward financial plan). This uncertainty around their finances increases the risk of allocating grant funds.</p> <p>Their project management plan only runs to June 2019, which is when their expected lease would expire. This significantly increases the chances that the facilities/activities will not be available for the policy's minimum five years.</p> <p>The organisation does not yet have a secured lease for the café, and are working towards a short-term lease of just 18-months. It is a risk for us to fund these staff and equipment costs without the surety that they have a building to operate in.</p>		
<p>OFFICER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS</p> <p>This application is for the same items they were awarded in 2016. The policy says, 'Organisations cannot apply to this scheme for projects we've awarded grants to before', At it states awarded and not paid they do not appear to be eligible to receive another grant towards these items.</p> <p>In addition, some changes to the policy since their last awards now means that facilities/activities must benefit the community for at least five years. At present their financial and business plans only cover the coming 18 months so there is a risk that they cannot meet this requirement.</p> <p>If the committee wish to award a grant despite the risks and eligibility issues highlighted officers strongly recommend it is conditional on submission of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a signed a lease (for at least 18 months) within three months of the award date 2. a robust forward financial and business plan within three months of the award date. This should cover the next five years and confirm their medium to long-term financial and operational plans. <p>This project scores as a medium priority so if there is budget left after the high priorities are decided and the committee are satisfied the risk and issues have been resolved it can receive a maximum of 75 per cent of the requested amount (£6,805).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Total score</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Suggested grant</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">7/12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Not recommended for funding during this round, but based on their score the maximum we could give is 75% of the request, capped to £6,805</p>

Applicant responses

Details of the project	The vision is to open a Branches Youth Café, serving the wider community with young people at its heart during the West Way development in Botley. Branches Youth Café will be a safe and nurturing place for young people to socialise and to learn skills for life and work. This social enterprise will be open to the community and the construction workforce during the day and will be largely dedicated to young people after school.
Financial statement from the organisation	Financial commitments include SO for accountant, insurance premium and website host. We aim to contribute £2500 from charity auction on 23 February 2018, which is a joint venture with Botley Bridges (formerly the Children's Centre). We can contribute £340 as the income generated from a weekly pop up café in summer 2017. We have been awarded £12,763 from Oxfordshire County Council Communities Fund for building refurbishment which must be spent by 31/03/2018.
Statement about town/parish support	Cumnor Parish Council awarded Branches £200 in 2016/2017 and have asked us to go back to them when the unit is secured. Parish councillors from North Hinksey Parish Council are very supportive and have encouraged us throughout this journey. Branches will submit a bid to NHPC Recreation Committee once we are in occupancy.
Community benefit	
Who will benefit from your project?	Young people aged 12 - 18 (and up to 25 with special needs) Young people on the autistic spectrum utilising specialist skills and knowledge of working with this group The wider community of North Hinksey, Botley and Cumnor Parents of older children through 'Parents Evenings', offering non-judgmental support for parents of teenagers, meeting a need where support for parents of teenagers often falls away and parents often struggle.
How did you identify a need in the community for your project or service?	Branches Youth Café is embedded in the CEP (Community Employment Plan) required as part of planning approval and was identified in the Planning and Construction update by Mace in Autumn 2017 linked to www.westwayconsultation.co.uk . A joint statement was issued with Association of Botley Communities (ABC) to confirm that the community supports the Youth Café. Consultation was carried out with North Hinksey Junior Youth Club and with local people at Branches YPSS community meetings.
What sustainable and/or energy saving measures does your project include or offer?	The Café aims to use locally grown produce donated from allotments whenever possible, to source from local suppliers, and to recycle materials for art work.
Consultation	
What consultation have you carried out with the community or professional advisors?	Branches has consulted with a wide range of professionals including Youth, Opportunities and Engagement department at Oxfordshire County Council; Locality Community Support Service (LCSS); Botley Bridges (formerly the Children's Centre) through sitting on the steering group and joint working; Matthew Arnold School; Thames Valley Police through stakeholder meeting; Parasol Project; Health Visitors. Both Directors are professionally qualified Youth Workers with significant experience in management of children's services and with Masters in Therapeutic Childcare and Community Education.
New facilities/Activities	
What extra facilities (or equipment) will the project provide?	The project will create a new facility for young people and the wider community. Branches Youth Café will become a community hub during West Way redevelopment, providing a uniquely safe and nurturing place for young people to develop new skills, and a much needed social venue for the wider community during the school day. The Café environment will be playful and welcoming and offer fresh and nourishing food in a vibrant setting.
What new activities will take place because of this project?	The project will offer new activities in that young people will be able to access the Youth Café as customers and get involved in many aspects of the operation such as preparing food and customer service. With the support of the Café Manager and volunteers young people will learn skills for life and gain work experience. The Youth Café will be inclusive and offer discreet space for young people with certain special needs.

Kennington village hall	Ref	VNHB17-18/58
Boiler replacement at Kennington Village Centre		

Total project cost	£12,523		
Amount requested	£4,500	Percentage of total cost requested:	35.93%
Organisation's contribution	£5,023	Organisation's latest bank balance	£40,298
Other funding	£3,000	All secured from the Parish Council	

Previous grants

2013 £729 for replacement stage curtains
2012 £2897 for replacement light fittings
2011 £2,250 for fire safety improvements

Scoring

% of additional occupied homes in the parish where the project will take place? Kennington saw 0.78% of the areas additional homes during the relevant period, therefore it does not qualify for any points in this area.	Score	0/3
New facilities or activities This project will replace their existing boiler with a newer, more efficient version. As a minor improvement to a major community facility they receive two points.	Score	2/3
Community benefit The whole community can access the hall and benefit from the improvements to the heating system, allowing them to receive full marks in this area.	Score	3/3
Funding the project They are funding £5,023 (40.11%) from their £40,298 reserves. They have secured the remaining £3,000 from their parish council. They would usually qualify for three points as they have the other funding available, but the policy deducts two points if they can afford the project without external funding, therefore they received one point. If they can provide more details of their other financial commitments when the committee meet this score could be reviewed.	Score	1/3
Consultation They did not consult the public as this type of project does not suit public consultation. They did get advice from an independent heating company who recommended replacement (but are not quoting for the job).		
Project completion within timeframe Their start and end dates of 21 and 22 May 2018 are within the limits of this scheme.		
Financial and project management plans Their project plan is relative to the scale of this project. They will fund the ongoing maintenance from their annual budget.		
OFFICER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS This project scores as a medium priority so, if there is budget left after the high priorities it can receive up to 75 per cent of the requested amount (£3,375).	Total score	6/12
	Suggested grant	75% of the requested amount capped to £3,375

Applicant responses

Details of the project	The boilers in the Centre have been in place since the Centre opened in 1989 and need replacing with energy efficient models
Financial statement from the organisation	<p>Hall reserves are built up from rent from Club Premises & library and used to cover ongoing maintenance & capital expenditure.</p> <p>Following the collapse of the Social Club we had over a year with no income from that source along with extra costs for that building. During this time only essential maintenance was carried out on the Hall building and no major capital expenditure undertaken.</p> <p>We now need to utilise these reserves to replace boilers</p>
Statement about town/parish support	<p>Application for Grant to KPC was approved by the Parish Council at their October 2017 meeting and a cheque issued to Kennington Village Hall Management Committee</p> <p>Copy of Parish Council Minute attached</p>
Community benefit	
Who will benefit from your project?	All users of the Village Hall will benefit from the upgrade facilities. The Festival Group for the elderly will have a warmer room to met in as will the Toddler Group and Ballet Classes
How did you identify a need in the community for your project or service?	<p>The need to replace the boilers was evident after 29years in service</p> <p>With several organisation representative on the Management Committee and 4 Members of the Public elected annually we did not carry out a consultation</p>
What sustainable and/or energy saving measures does your project include or offer?	The boilers will be 2018 energy efficient models
Consultation	
What consultation have you carried out with the community or professional advisors?	<p>We consulted a local heating company who agreed with us that the 29 year old boilers needed replacing</p> <p>They were not invited to tender for the work</p>
New facilities/Activities	
What extra facilities (or equipment) will the project provide?	The project is to replace existing boilers installed 29 years ago with new energy saving boilers
What new activities will take place because of this project?	The replacement of the boilers will enable the many existing activities to continue in a warmer environment

Abingdon Vale Cricket Club	Ref	VNHB17-18/60
Movable shed and port-a-cabin		

Total project cost	£3,389		
Amount requested	£1,694	Percentage of total cost requested:	49.99%
Organisation's contribution	£1,695	Organisation's latest bank balance	£31,985

Previous grants

2015/16 - £2,275 mower
2013/14 - £3,000 pitch covers

Scoring

% of additional occupied homes in the parish where the project will take place? Abingdon saw 27.91 per cent of the area's total additional homes, allowing them to receive two points.	Score	2/3
New facilities or activities This project will buy a shed (£439), which will become a portable scoring hut and port-a-cabin (£2,950) that will house the umpire's facilities going forward, allowing the existing umpire's room to become another changing room. As they have confirmed the project will not allow new activities to take place but will improve facilities for their existing activities they receive two points.	Score	2/3
Community benefit The project will benefit a single sport group (cricket) so their score is limited to one point.	Score	1/3
Funding the project The club are contributing 50.01 per cent from their £31,985 reserves. Based on their other financial commitments comment they could potentially afford this project without external funding. They would usually qualify for three points as they have the other funding available, but the policy deducts two points if they can afford the project without external funding, therefore they received one point. If they can provide more details of their other financial commitments when the committee meet this score could be reviewed.	Score	1/3
Consultation They confirmed that they wanted to provide these facilities at their AGM and ad hoc feedback from members supports this, but no formal consultation was carried out.		
Project completion within timeframe Their start and end dates in May 2018 are within the limits of this scheme.		
Financial and project management plans They will cover the ongoing maintenance from their annual work schedule and budget.		
OFFICER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS	Total score	6/12
This project scores as a medium priority so, if there is budget left after the high priorities it can receive up to 75 per cent of the requested amount.	Suggested grant	37.5% of the total cost, capped to £1,270

Applicant responses

Details of the project	Abingdon Vale Cricket Club are planning on updating the facilities at their home ground at Hales Meadow in Abingdon. We are looking to purchase external portable officers which can be converted into suitable changing and storage facilities for our league cricket umpires. The old umpires facility can then be converted into a dedicated female changing area. We also plan on purchasing a portable shed to contain kit required for the second pitch at Hayes Meadow
Financial statement from the organisation	Abingdon Vale Cricket Club is committed to providing the best facilities it can to its membership, but does not have the cash reserves to purchase everything that is required. It is committed to providing a friendly and enriching experience to all its visitors, but there are many projects required to keep the club running. We are required to ensure we have suitable cash reserves for emergency situations (floodin
Statement about town/parish support	This is the first approach we have made
Community benefit	
Who will benefit from your project?	The main benefactors of this project would be members of Abingdon Vale Cricket Club. The club has 55 adult members, and 130 junior members. Our membership covers a vast array of ages (from 7 to 65), a wide range of social and ethnic groups, and offer cricket to both males and females. The facilities are open to all members, who will benefit from this project.
How did you identify a need in the community for your project or service?	At the clubs AGM in November 2017 it was agreed a new umpires facility would be of benefit to the club, the Cricket Committee then agreed at their January 2018 meeting that it would be of great benefit to convert the old umpires room into a female changing room. Our members have said on numerous occasions a scoreboard would be beneficial on Hays Meadow, and by doubling as a storage facility even more so.
What sustainable and/or energy saving measures does your project include or offer?	The items will come as seen, we may be able to install some energy saving light bulbs but this would be investigated upon delivery of the new umpire facility.
Consultation	
What consultation have you carried out with the community or professional advisors?	We have not needed to provide any public consultation or professional consultation for this project
New facilities/Activities	
What extra facilities (or equipment) will the project provide?	This project will provide new facilities for the umpires to change and have suitable storage. This will enable us to introduce a female changing room, which we hope will provide a welcoming facility for female cricketers. The third part of the project will enable the club to provide a much needed scoreboard on the second ground. This will allow a weather resistant solid structure, and will double as a storage facility when not in use.
What new activities will take place because of this project?	Although this will not provide any new activities, we hope by improving our facilities this will encourage more people to become involved with the club (whether as players or volunteers). We see introducing a female changing room as vital to encouraging more females to become involved in cricket in Abingdon. We already have several girls involved in our youth team, and are committed to providing them with suitable facilities.

Appendix three – percentage of the area’s total new homes falling in each parish

Parish/town	2016 total occupied homes	2015 total occupied homes	Total parish increase in year	Percentage of area's total increase
Abingdon	14,680	14,572	108	27.91%
Appleford	141	141	0	0.00%
Cumnor	2,720	2,608	112	28.94%
Drayton	990	986	4	1.03%
Kennington	1,761	1,758	3	0.78%
Marcham	765	708	57	14.73%
North Hinksey	2,196	2,172	24	6.20%
Radley	1,009	1,006	3	0.78%
South Hinksey	176	171	5	1.29%
St Helen Without	846	846	0	0.00%
Sunningwell	378	374	4	1.03%
Sutton Courtenay	1,127	1,061	66	17.05%
Wootton	1,186	1,186	0	0.00%
Wytham	70	69	1	0.26%
	28,045	27,658	387	100.00%