

**Committee:** COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

**Agenda Item**

**Date:** 14 SEPTEMBER 2006

**12**

**Title:** AD HOC FUNDING ALLOCATION  
CRITERIA

**Author:** Gaynor Bradley, Leisure & Community  
Development Manager, 01799 510348

Item for decision

---

### Summary

1. The purpose of this report is to assist Members in deciding whether or not ad hoc funding should be awarded by the Community Committee and, if so, to determine a Funding Criteria for future ad hoc requests.

### Recommendations

2. That Members decide
  - i) whether or not this Committee should continue to accept applications for ad hoc funds to community projects outside of the Council's normal budget process and, if so,
  - ii) inform the Operations Committee that such applications will be considered by this Committee, but in the full knowledge that any funding eventually recommended will be subject to either virement possibilities within this Committee's own budget or a justification being made to the Operations Committee and Full Council for additional funding if that is required.
  - iii) that the suggested criteria outlined in this report be adopted as the basis for any such requests being considered, if it is the Committee's policy to consider such requests at all.

### Background Papers

3. Minutes of the Community Committee held on 8 June 2006.

### Impact

- 4.

Communication/Consultation	Any criteria adopted by the Committee would need to be publicised widely but should specify that ad hoc funding requests would only be considered in cases where Members consider the special circumstances of a
----------------------------	--

	request to merit such an award.
Community Safety	Any project must take into account community safety implications
Equalities	Any project must take into account equalities implications
Finance	This report looks at how ad hoc applications for funding could be considered by this Committee, subject to funding being identified from the Committee's own resources, or via separate approval by the Operations Committee and Full Council. Unless the Operations Committee and Council allocate a new global sum for such applications as an ongoing feature of the budget there will always be a need for separate funding to be identified in each case.
Human Rights	Any project must take into account human rights implications
Legal implications	Any project must fulfil legal criteria and be appropriately funded and resourced
Ward-specific impacts	Area Panel support for projects would need to be sought prior to submission of a funding application
Workforce/Workplace	None

## Situation

5. During the past year the Council has received requests for funds to be contributed towards major projects from Community Groups. At the Community Committee held on 8 June 2006 it was resolved that "officers devise criteria by which future applications could be judged".
6. However, it should be noted that the Community Committee does not have any budgetary provision associated with awarding grants. The Council does have a Community Project grant scheme with a maximum award of £3,000 per project. Therefore, it is anticipated that ad hoc funding requests would only be considered in cases where Members consider the special circumstances of a request to merit such an award.
7. It is suggested that if applications to this Committee are to be considered for funding then that should only normally be done during the budget process,

which usually runs from September to February. In practice it is recognised that urgent issues do sometimes arise and that the Council will often be approached for funding that does not fit with the annual budget cycle. The key issue for this Committee is, therefore, whether such applications should be considered at all outside of the budget process.

8. If applications are considered outside of the budget process then the reason why they should be considered should be clearly identified. If the Committee does not decide to consider them it needs to give officers clear authority to reject such an approach at that time, based on the mismatched timescales. It could of course be that some of these approaches can actually be re-scheduled to fit the Council's budget cycle. Any application considered during the budget cycle will, of course, need to get this Committee's support prior to a referral to the Operations Committee and will take its place with the other competing spending pressures the Council faces.
9. Requests for ad hoc funding have been referred to the Community Committee in the past and three projects have previously been awarded significant funding via the Committee process i.e. Stansted Skatepark, Saffron Walden Skatepark and Thaxted Youth Club.
10. As a result of previous funding awards two more applications have been received and reports appear later on the Committee agenda for Dunmow and Stansted Skateparks. The drafted criteria have been applied to the information received to provide Members with a guide as to how they would score if the funding criteria are adopted.
11. Attached at Appendix 1 is a suggested set of funding criteria. It is suggested that a scoring mechanism be incorporated into the evaluation sheet in order to clearly indicate to Members whether or not all of the criteria has been either fully or partly met. It is suggested that applications achieving a score of fully met should be considered for award of the full amount requested. Applications with a part met score should be awarded either 75%, 50% or 25% of the amount requested:
12. If Members agree officers could initially assess the scheme and allocate a score in conjunction with the Committee Chairman prior to the report being constructed and presented to Committee for approval.

## Risk Analysis

13.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating Actions
Formalisation of a Funding Scheme for which there is no budget allocated	High	High	Applications to only be considered during the budget making cycle i.e. September meetings of the Committee so that members can then consider the allocation within the overall budget provision for the next financial year. Additionally, if a budget is allocated to the Committee it would then be possible to ensure that there is a fair distribution of funds amongst the applicants.
Funding allocation is agreed and a Funding Criteria is not adopted	Low	High	Equitable funding criteria would need to be adopted
Unfair distribution of funds could result in dissatisfaction in the community	High	High	To avoid one Ward or Panel Area receiving more funding than another the criteria would need to identify a ceiling on amounts available with applications only being considered in one round per annum.

**COMMUNITY COMMITTEE - AD HOC FUNDING APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM**

**SECTION 1**

*Please provide brief details of the project in this section and attach supporting information separately.*

*Please state if a community project grant has been applied for and if not why*

*Is the Funding being applied for capital or revenue and a one-off cost.*

**SECTION 2**

The **purpose** of Uttlesford District Council is to improve the quality of life of the people who live and work in or visit Uttlesford. The Council has identified five ways in which the quality of life can be improved and applications for funding will need to demonstrate how projects contribute towards these goals.

	<b>GOALS</b>	<b>DEMONSTRATE PROJECT CONTRIBUTION</b>	<b>SCORE</b> <b>5 points per goal</b>
2.1	Provide strong community leadership and openness		
2.2	Protecting and enhancing the environment and character of the district		
2.3	Improving access to value for money services		
2.4	Improving community safety and the health of the population		
2.5	Supporting lifelong learning and developing better opportunities for young people		

**SECTION 3**

	<b>EVALUATION POINTS</b> <b>(Items 3.2, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11 and 3.13 to be allocated a score)</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE YES/NO</b>	<b>SCORE</b> <b>2 points – fully met</b> <b>1 point – part met</b>
3.1	Is the organisation applying for funding a properly constituted body with a bank account/registered charity?  Will that organisation be responsible for the project in the future (if not which organisation will)		
3.2	Evidence provided demonstrating the need for this project		Score
3.3	Positive impact of the project		
3.4	Negative Impact of the project		

	<b>EVALUATION POINTS</b> <b>(Items 3.2, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11 and 3.13 to be allocated a score)</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE YES/NO</b>				<b>SCORE</b> <b>2 points – fully met</b> <b>1 point – part met</b>
3.5	Is planning permission required for this project/development					
3.6	Is it necessary to obtain a lease for land required for this development					
3.7	Evidence provided that three quotations have been sought for the work required					Score
3.8	Evidence of Funding secured - 50% or 75% of funding must already have been raised					Score
3.9	Details of further fundraising being pursued					Score
3.10	Evidence of numbers of individuals likely to benefit from this project					Score
3.11	Management Plan Produced					Score
3.12	Longevity of project					
3.13	Evidence of consultation carried out and outcome of responses provided					Score
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>					
<b>Points Scored</b>		26 - 39	19 – 25	14 – 18	10 – 14	1 - 2
<b>Percentage payment of total requested</b>		100%	75%	50%	25%	Nil