

Agenda



Contact: Harry Gable
Telephone: 01235 422558
Email: harry.gable@southandvale.gov.uk
Date: 11 July 2018
Website: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

A meeting of the
Faringdon Area Committee
will be held on Monday, 23 July 2018 at 6.30 pm
The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BX

Members of the Committee:

Councillors

Simon Howell (Chairman)	Mohinder Kainth
Eric Batts	Robert Sharp
Roger Cox	Elaine Ware
Anthony Hayward (Vice-Chairman)	

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 - 7)

To adopt and sign as a correct record the minutes of the Faringdon Area Committee meeting held on 18 December 2017.

3. Declarations of interest

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests and other interests 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 8 - 22)

To consider the head of community services' report.



Minutes

of a meeting of the

Faringdon Area Committee

held on Monday 18 December 2017 at 6.30 pm

at The Beacon, Wantage

Open to the Public, including the Press

Present:

Members: Councillors Simon Howell (Chairman), Eric Batts, Roger Cox, Anthony Hayward, Mohinder Kainth, Robert Sharp and Elaine Ware

Officers: Carole Cumming, Harry Gable and Susan Harbour

Number of members of the public: 3

FA.7 Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

FA.8 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2017 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting and were signed by the Chairman.

FA.9 Declarations of interest

Councillors Simon Howell and Elaine Ware declared that they were both members of the Shrivenham Fete Committee and would stand down from the committee when the application was considered.

FA.10 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

None.

FA.11 Public participation

Speakers representing the applicants were present for two 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:

Faringdon Sensory Garden: Melanie Lane and Gerry Millington
Stanford-in-the-Vale Parish Council: Councillor Tina Jenkins

FA.12 Community grants

Faringdon Sensory Garden

Melanie Lane and Gerry Millington, of Faringdon Sensory Garden steering group, spoke in support of both applications made by the Sensory Garden, and answered questions from the committee about both the capital grant and New Homes Bonus applications. Later in the meeting, following debate on their applications, the Chairman suspended the speaking rules to allow the speakers to answer further questions pertinent to new information which they had provided when they initially spoke.

They updated the committee on their current finances, and outlined their funding requirements, as well as projected incomes. They explained that they required £120,000 in construction costs and a further £1000 per month in outgoings. With full funding the project would be completed by 11 November 2018. Maintenance and staffing costs had been costed and included in the figures. The aim of the project was to benefit the community across Oxfordshire. They confirmed that there would be open public access between dawn and dusk and that Tesco had agreed to give the project free and unrestricted access to their car park.

Capital Grant Fund application

The officer introduced the application by Faringdon Sensory Garden for a grant of £4,872 towards a £9,745 project to lay turf in the garden. The officer confirmed that there was no Section 106 funding available for this application.

The committee debated the item. As the speakers had provided substantial new financial information, it was suggested that provisional approval to change the score could be given and then later ratified by officers after consideration of the new information. The officer advised that while this could be considered, there was little precedent to do this and it was not in accordance with delegated powers.

It was agreed that a final decision would be made at the meeting, and that, because the officer was not able to offer a new recommended score without further consideration, no changes should be made to the initial recommendation.

Due to available funding being largely awarded to high priority applications, in accordance with the council's capital grant policy, the committee could only grant £1,233.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 6 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To amend the officer's suggested grant to 12.65 per cent of the total cost, capped to £1,233, £3,639 less than the amount requested.**

NHB Grant Fund application

The officer introduced the application by Faringdon Sensory Garden for a New Homes Bonus grant of £20,380 towards a £40,760 project to lay pathways in the garden.

The committee debated the item.

Due to budget constraints, the committee could only grant £10,505, despite the high priority recommendation received by the application.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 8 points out of a possible 12.**
- 2. To amend the officer's suggested grant to 25.77 per cent of the total cost, capped to £10,505, £9,875 less than amount requested.**

Stanford-in-the-Vale Parish Council

The officer introduced the application by Stanford-in-the-Vale Parish Council for a grant of £10,833 towards a £21,665 project to relocate a pylon on the new recreation ground.

Councillor Tina Jenkins, of Stanford-in-the-Vale Parish Council, answered questions from the committee. She confirmed that the energy provider was unwilling to fund the project, but would carry out the work. The relocation was urgent because no other aspects of the recreation ground renovation could take place before the pylon had been moved. The new pylon would be underground, and would not, therefore, pose a risk to the users of the renovated recreation ground.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 9 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 £10,833, the amount requested by the parish council.**

Southmoor Pre-School Nursery

The officer introduced the application by Southmoor Pre-School Nursery for a grant of £1,037 towards a £2,074 project to provide new computer equipment at the nursery.

The committee was informed that new information had been received since the publication of the report which would have changed the recommended finance score from 1 to 3. This would take the overall recommended score to 6 out of 9, but would not change the recommended priority.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item and agreed to change the score from 4 to 6 out of 9.

Due to available funding being largely awarded to high priority applications, in accordance with the council's capital grant policy, the committee could only grant £263.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To amend the officer's recommended score to 6 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To amend the officer's suggested grant to 25.36 per cent of the total cost, capped to £263, £774 less than the amount requested.**

Shrivenham Fete Committee

Councillors Elaine Ware and Simon Howell stood down from the committee and left the room for this item. Councillor Eric Batts chaired the item.

The officer introduced the application by Shrivenham Fete Committee for a grant of £1,121 towards a £2,242 project to replace the existing band tent and sound equipment.

The committee was informed that new information had been received since the publication of the report which would have changed the recommended finance score from 1 to 3. This would take the overall recommended score to 8 out of a possible 9, and would change the recommended priority from medium to high.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item and agreed to change the score from 6 to 8 out of 9. It was also agreed that funding would only be granted if Shrivenham Fete Committee sought another quote for the work, following concerns over the pricing in the application.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To amend the officer's recommended score to 8 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To amend the officer's suggested grant to 50.00 per cent of the total cost, capped to £1,121, subject to the Shrivenham Fete Committee obtaining a new quote for the price of the work.**

Watchfield Parish Council

The officer introduced the application by Watchfield Parish Council for a grant of £1,147 towards a £2,295 project to purchase and install a defibrillator in the village.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 9 points out of a possible 9.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 49.98 per cent of the total cost, capped to £1147, the amount requested by the parish council.**

Buscot Park Cricket Club

The officer introduced the application by Buscot Park Cricket Club for a grant of £1,439 towards a £2,878 project to provide replacement site screens at the club.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee debated the item.

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.**

Fernham Village Trust

The officer introduced the application by Fernham Village Trust for a grant of £1,818 towards a £3,636 project to renovate the existing leadlight window at the village hall.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee was informed that new information had been received since the publication of the report which would have changed the recommended finance score from 1 to 3. This would take the overall recommended score to 7 out of a possible 9, and would change the recommended priority from low to medium.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To change the officer's recommended score to 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 £1,818, the amount requested by Fernham Village Trust.**

NHB Grant Fund application Watchfield Parish Council

The officer introduced the application by Watchfield Parish Council for a New Homes Bonus grant of £9,999 towards a £33,959 project to make improvements to the play area on Watchfield Recreation Ground.

There were no public speakers present for this item.

The committee was informed that new information had been received since the publication of the report which meant that possible Section 106 funding for this project was no longer available. This did not change the officer's recommended score, but did change the suggested grant to £9,999, the full amount requested by the applicant.

The committee debated the item.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the officer's recommended score of 9 points out of a possible 12.**
- 2. To approve the officer's suggested grant of 29.44 per cent of the requested amount, capped to £9,999, the amount requested by the parish council.**

The officer updated the committee on remaining finance, and informed the meeting that the committee had awarded all of its capital and NHB budgets, so will not open for a third round of applications in 2017/18.

The meeting closed at 8.20 pm

Faringdon 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: Alice Badcock

E-mail: Alice.Badcock@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

To: Faringdon Area Committee

DATE: 23 July 2018

Capital and New Homes Bonus (NHB) Grants 2018/19 – Round One

Recommendations

- (a) that the Faringdon area committee considers the application for a capital grant and makes an award in line with the approved policy (2017).
- (b) that the Faringdon area committee considers the application for a NHB grant and makes an award in line with the approved policy (2017).

Purpose of report

1. To give the committee the information needed to award capital and NHB 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

1. We opened the NHB and capital grant schemes from 25 April to 6 June 2018.
2. The Faringdon area received one eligible capital grant application requesting £6,462 against a budget of £28,886.
3. The Faringdon area also received an application for this project to their NHB scheme requesting £6,462 against a budget of £19,432.

4. Under our current policies the project can only be funded from one of our schemes and can't be part funded from both schemes.
5. Officers have evaluated the applications using the scoring matrix in each agreed policy. See appendix one for the capital grant evaluation, appendix two for the NHB grant evaluation 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 the committee to consider. The committee's final scores will dictate the level of funding the committee can award.

Financial implications

7. In February 2018, the council set the 2018/19 capital grant budget at £100,000. As per the policy, the Faringdon area was allocated 28.886% per cent of the available budget (£28,886) to award in capital grants during 2018/19.
8. At the same meeting, the council set a 2018/19 NHB budget of £100,000. The Faringdon area was allocated 19.432 per cent of this (£19,432) to award in NHB grants in 2018/19. As per the agreed policy these grants can fund either revenue or capital projects.

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 2018, 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, if the project scores sufficient points to receive a grant, the committee awards either a capital or NHB grant to the applicant that has applied to both schemes in line with the relevant approved policy.

Background papers

The latest Capital and NHB grant policies.

Appendix One - Vale Capital 2018-19 (Faringdon Area) - officer evaluation report

Scoring summary

Ref no.	Organisation	Scheme	Scheme cost	Amount requested	% of cost requested	Suggested score	Suggested award (% of total cost capped to max £)
VCap18-19\25	Viscountess Barrington's Memorial Hall Trust	Replacement central heating boilers	£12,925	£6,462	49.996%	6	37.49% of the total cost, capped to £4,846
						Total suggested	£4,846
						Budget	£28,886
						Balance	£24,040

Scoring and award matrices

SCORE	PRIORITY LEVEL	AWARDS (all awards are subject to sufficient budget. Medium priorities will only receive funding if there is budget left after all the high priority projects are awarded).
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 activities/facilities on offer. Deduct two points if the project removes a community facility or reduces/stops existing activities taking place.	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	They don't have a plan of how they'll fund the rest of the project and haven't secured any other funding yet. They haven't given details of how they'll fund the ongoing maintenance and eventual replacements.
1	They've got a funding plan, but haven't applied for all of it yet. or They've applied for all the other funding needed, but have secured less than 50 per cent so far. They've budgeted for the ongoing maintenance but don't say how they'll fund eventual replacements in the future (if applicable).
2	They've applied for all the funding needed and have already secured over 50 per cent of the balance. They've budgeted for the ongoing costs and have a general idea how they'll fund replacements eventually (if applicable)
3	They've secured all the other funding needed for the project already (including if they're funding the rest themselves). or The organisation 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. They've budgeted for the ongoing costs and have a fund/account/pot saving for the replacements in due course.
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.

Viscountess Barrington's Memorial Hall Trust	Ref	VCap18-19\25
Replacement central heating boilers		

Total project cost	£12,925	
Amount requested	£6,462	49.996% of total cost requested
Organisation's contribution	£6,463	Organisation's latest bank balance £70,550

Previous grants

Capital 15/16: £1,266 Update ladies toilet and tree removal to increase pitch space
Capital 16/17 £600 Hall speakers
Capital pre 14/15: £3,635 Update small hall toilets
NHB 13/14: £5,000 New play equipment

Scoring

<p>New facilities or activities</p> <p>The new efficient boilers will replace the two existing ones at the end of their life. These boilers will also have capacity to heat the possible extension to the hall the trust are considering.</p> <p>While the heating of the hall will improve facilities for existing users it will not directly enable new activities to take place and the extension they are considering is not currently guaranteed, limiting their score to 2 points.</p>	Score	2/3
<p>Community benefit</p> <p>The hall is used by a wide number and range of community groups and is available to anyone in the community to access. All hall users are likely to benefit from improved heating. Officers therefore suggest they receive three points.</p>	Score	3/3
<p>Funding the project</p> <p>They are funding the other £6,463 from their £70,550 reserves. Based on the information provided on their other financial commitments, it appears they could contribute more and potentially fund the whole project if necessary.</p> <p>As they have their other funding in place they would usually score three points, however as they may be able to afford the project without funding officers have suggested deducting two points in line with the policy.</p>	Score	1/3
<p>Consultation</p> <p>Feedback from their users on the current heating system helped to prompt this project, together with the boilers being at their end of their useful life.</p> <p>Internal Consultations</p> <p><u>Energy Officer</u> If possible they should include a seven-day timer and an override/boost function for unexpected bookings.</p>		
<p>Project completion within timeframe</p> <p>Their start date in September is the earliest possible under our scheme for a grant of this value.</p>		
DEDUCTIONS, CONCERNS AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	Total score	6/9
A recommendation they consider the sustainability officer's feedback and implement any suggestions where possible.	Suggested grant	Medium priority £37.49% capped to £4,846

Applicant responses

Details of the project	To totally replace existing boilers of which only one is currently operational with two more efficient boilers which include automatic safety features.
Financial statement from the organisation	Expected income for the remainder of this year - £77,000 Expected expenditure for the remainder of this year: 1. Staff - £18200 2. Building Management - £24,000 3. Utilities - £6700 4. Fees (booking system, licences, safety, servicing & testing, insurance) - £6300 5. Grounds Maintenance - £6000 6. Hall maintenance - £6000 7. Equipment for hall and grounds maintenance - £1000 8. Administrative costs - £2900 9. Boiler project - £6463 Total expenditure £77563
Statement about town/parish support	Yes. The Parish Council are sole managing Trustees for the Viscountess Barrington's Trust. They have approved the use of Trust funds for this project.
Community benefit	
Who will benefit from your project?	WI, the Scouting group, Go Active Gold, Amateur Dramatics, Local musicians and choirs, local gardening club, Blood donors, baby and toddler groups.
How did you identify a need in the community for your project or service?	In recent years the hall has been unable to cope with the demand for space. The heating system has struggled to cope with the extensive use of the current facilities. Many activities have left the parish or have not been able to get started. Our emerging Neighbourhood Plan has identified that the hall will not be able to cope once the new houses that are planned have been completed and occupied.
What sustainable and/or energy saving measures does your project include or offer?	We will ensure that the boilers we install are as energy efficient as possible. We have chosen to install Worcester Bosch boilers which are market leaders.
Consultation	
What consultation have you carried out with the community or professional advisors?	A number of complaints from Users regarding lack of or no heat resulted in our attention being drawn by contractors to the age and inadequacy of current Boilers. The eventual breakdown of one Boiler and the lack of spare parts led us to consider replacing the Boiler system.
New facilities/Activities	
What extra facilities (or equipment) will the project provide?	The current boilers are 10 years old. One does not work. The new boilers will provide a more reliable heating system, will improve energy efficiency and will reduce our carbon footprint. The new boilers will have a greater capacity to heat not only the existing hall but the proposed new extension to the hall, which will provide more rooms. These are needed due to the 100% population increase expected within the next 3 years.
What new activities will take place because of this project?	We currently offer spaces for a number of activities but are unable to increase these due to lack of space. The new extension will offer additional space for Zumba, clubsize, rehearsal rooms for music and amateur dramatics, pilates, meeting rooms for societies and baby and toddler groups. We are also a local centre for blood donations and we would be able to offer more space and a more comfortable environment for them.

Appendix two - Vale NHB 2018-19 Faringdon Area - officer evaluation report

Scoring summary

Ref no.	Organisation	Scheme	Scheme cost	Amount requested	% of cost requested	Suggested score	Suggested award (% of total cost capped to max £)
VNHB18-19\16	Viscountess Barrington's Memorial Hall Trust	Replacement central heating boilers	£12,925	£6,462	49.99%	8	£4,846
Total suggested							£4,846
Budget							£19,432
Balance							£14,586

Page 16

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 full amount requested - budget permitting
5-8 points	Medium priority	Award between 50 and 75 per cent of the amount requested, depending on their score - budget permitting
0-4 points	Low priority	No funding

New homes score

Points	Percentage of area's total new homes falling in the parish(es) where the project/work is located
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	They don't have a plan of how they'll fund the rest of the project and haven't secured any other funding yet. They haven't given details of how they'll fund the ongoing maintenance and eventual replacements.
1	They've got a funding plan, but haven't applied for all of it yet. or They've applied for all the other funding needed, but have secured less than 50 per cent so far. They've budgeted for the ongoing maintenance but don't say how they'll fund eventual replacements in the future (if applicable).
2	They've applied for all the funding needed and have already secured over 50 per cent of the balance. They've budgeted for the ongoing costs and have a general idea how they'll fund replacements eventually (if applicable)
3	They've secured all the other funding needed for the project already (including if they're funding the rest themselves). or The organisation 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. They've budgeted for the ongoing costs and have a fund/account/pot saving for the replacements in due course.
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.

Viscountess Barrington's Memorial Hall and recreation Ground Trust	Ref	VNHB18-19\16
Replacement central heating boilers		

Total project cost	£12,925	
Amount requested	£6,462	49.996% of total cost requested
Organisation's contribution	£6,463	Organisation's latest bank balance £70,550

Previous grants

Capital 15/16: £1,266 Update ladies toilet and tree removal to increase pitch space

Capital 16/17 £600 Hall speakers

Capital pre 14/15: £3,635 Update small hall toilets

NHB 13/14: £5,000 New play equipment

Scoring

New Homes in parish(es) Shrivenham saw 14.04 per cent of the new homes in the committee's area, allowing them to receive two points.	Score	2/3
New facilities or activities The new efficient boilers will replace the two existing ones at the end of their life. These boilers will also have capacity to heat the possible extension to the hall the trust is considering. While the heating of the hall will improve facilities for existing users it will not directly enable new activities to take place and the extension they are considering is not currently guaranteed, limiting their score to 2 points.	Score	2/3
Community benefit The hall is used by a wide number and range of community groups and is available to anyone in the community to access. All hall users are likely to benefit from improved heating. Officers therefore suggest they receive three points.	Score	3/3
Funding the project They are funding the other £6,463 from their £70,550 reserves. Based on the information provided on their other financial commitments, it appears they could contribute more and potentially fund the whole project if necessary. As they have their other funding in place they would usually score three points, however as they may be able to afford the project without funding officers have suggested deducting two points in line with the policy.	Score	1/3
Consultation Feedback from their users on the current heating system helped to prompt this project, together with the boilers being at their end of their useful life. Internal Consultations <u>Energy Officer:</u> If possible they should include a seven-day timer and an override/boost function for unexpected bookings.		
OFFICER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS	Total score	8/12
A recommendation they consider the energy officer's feedback and implement any suggestions where possible.	Suggested grant	Medium priority 37.49% of the total cost, capped to £4,846

Applicant responses	
Details of the project	To totally replace existing boilers of which only one is currently operational with two more efficient boilers which include automatic safety features.
Financial statement from the organisation	<p>Expected income for this year - £77,000</p> <p>Expected expenditure for this year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff - £18200 2. Building Management - £24,000 3. Utilities - £6700 4. Fees (booking system, licences, safety, servicing & testing, insurance) - £6300 5. Grounds Maintenance - £6000 <p>Page 12 / 20</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Hall maintenance - £6000 7. Equipment for hall and grounds maintenance - £1000 8. Administrative costs - £2900 9. Boiler project - £6463 <p>Total expenditure £77563</p>
Statement about town/parish support	Yes. The Parish Council are sole managing Trustees for the Viscountess Barrington's Trust. They have approved the use of Trust funds for this project.
Community benefit	
Who will benefit from your project?	WI, the Scouting group, Go Active Gold, Amateur Dramatics, Local musicians and choirs, local gardening club, Blood donors, baby and toddler groups.
How did you identify a need in the community for your project or service?	In recent years the hall has been unable to cope with the demand for space. The heating system has struggled to cope with the extensive use of the current facilities. Many activities have left the parish or have not been able to get started. Our emerging Neighbourhood Plan has identified that the hall will not be able to cope once the new houses that are planned have been completed and occupied.
What sustainable and/or energy saving measures does your project include or offer?	We will ensure that the boilers we install are as energy efficient as possible. We have chosen to install Worcester Bosch boilers which are market leaders.
Consultation	
What consultation have you carried out with the community or professional advisors?	A number of complaints from Users regarding lack of or no heat resulted in our attention being drawn by contractors to the age and inadequacy of current Boilers. The eventual breakdown of one Boiler and the lack of spare parts led us to consider replacing the Boiler system.
New facilities/Activities	
What extra facilities (or equipment) will the project provide?	The current boilers are 10 years old. One does not work. The new boilers will provide a more reliable heating system, will improve energy efficiency and will reduce our carbon footprint. The new boilers will have a greater capacity to heat not only the existing hall but the proposed new extension to the hall, which will provide more rooms. These are needed due to the 100% population increase expected within the next 3 years.
What new activities will take place because of this project?	We currently offer spaces for a number of activities but are unable to increase these due to lack of space. The new extension will offer additional space for Zumba, clubsize, rehearsal rooms for music and amateur dramatics, pilates, meeting rooms for societies and baby and toddler groups. We are also a local centre for blood donations and we would be able to offer more space and a more comfortable environment for them.

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

Parish/town	2016 total occupied homes	2017 total occupied homes	Total parish increase in year	Percentage of area's total increase
Appleton with Eaton	396	398	2	1.12%
Ashbury	256	256	0	0.00%
Balking	40	39	-1	-0.56%
Besselsleigh	29	29	0	0.00%
Bourton	130	131	1	0.56%
Buckland	255	255	0	0.00%
Buscot	87	87	0	0.00%
Charney Bassett	122	122	0	0.00%
Coleshill	75	75	0	0.00%
Compton Beauchamp	32	30	-2	-1.12%
Eaton Hastings	35	35	0	0.00%
Faringdon	3,437	3,438	1	0.56%
Fernham	95	95	0	0.00%
Frilford	88	88	0	0.00%
Fyfield and Tubney	199	199	0	0.00%
Garford	69	69	0	0.00%
Goosey	56	56	0	0.00%
Great Coxwell	132	131	-1	-0.56%
Hatford	36	36	0	0.00%
Hinton Waldrist	146	147	1	0.56%
Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	1,116	1,188	72	40.45%
Little Coxwell	70	70	0	0.00%
Littleworth	95	95	0	0.00%
Longcot	217	218	1	0.56%
Longworth	243	245	2	1.12%
Lyford	23	23	0	0.00%
Pusey	28	28	0	0.00%
Shellingford	80	80	0	0.00%
Shrivenham	1,020	1,045	25	14.04%
Stanford in the Vale	966	975	9	5.06%
Uffington	332	358	26	14.61%
Watchfield	1,003	1,044	41	23.03%
Woolstone	61	62	1	0.56%
Total	10,969	11,147	178	100.00%