

Minutes



Listening Learning Leading

OF A MEETING OF THE

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT FUND PANEL

HELD AT 10.00AM ON 17 JUNE 2008

AT COUNCIL OFFICES, CROWMARSH GIFFORD

Present:

Mrs E Gillespie (Chairman)

Ms J Bland, Mrs J Carr, Mrs S Cooper, Mr P Cross, Mr J Nowell-Smith, Mr N Odd,
Mrs P Slatter,

Apologies:

Mrs P Dawe, Capt J Flood, Mr M Leonard, Mr M Newland

Officers:

Mrs J Bolton, Mr J Duncalf, Ms S Reid, Ms V Taylor, Mrs J Thompson

4. Minutes, 10 June 2008

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the meeting of 10 June 2008 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign these.

5. Bids for funding from the Community Investment Fund

Mr M Harris, ward councillor, spoke in support of the application from Wallingford Sports Trust.

Mr I Lokhon, ward councillor, spoke in support of the application from St Mary's Church in Wallingford.

- 5.1 The Panel considered the application forms, information from the site visits and the previous meeting, and a table (below) showing the average overall scores for all the applications.

Organisation	Scheme	Scheme Cost £	Grant Sought £	Average Score before Finance	Average score with Finance
Berinsfield Amateur Boxing Club	Extension	343,716	206,230	23	24
Headway	Refurbishments	75,628	41,127	22	23
Wallingford All Weather Pitch	New playing surface	134,875	80,000	20	21
Thame Girl Guides	New HQ	402,176	241,000	20	21
Chinnor Village Hall	Refurbishments	561,058	250,000	20	21
St Mary's Church Wallingford	Refurbishments	515,339	103,068	19	22
Upper Thames Rowing Club	Refurbishments	941,149	188,230	19	22
AFC Henley	Sports Pavilion	154,200	75,000	18	19
Didcot TC	Play Area - Edmunds Park	90,000	54,000	18	19
Thame Town Council	Southern Road play area	179,195	85,000	18	19
Watlington PC	Play area	177,933	106,759	16	17
East Hagbourne PC	Sports Pavilion and project	856,502	250,000	14	17
Thame Youth Theatre	Community Facilities	423,538	250,000	11	12
	Total Amount Sought		1,930,414		

The Panel discussed the overall scores awarded to each application. The Panel then considered each column of the average scores separately across all the applications and made proposals to raise or lower individual scores within each column.

A motion to decrease the score for Headway as it provided a facility for a relatively small proportion of people was not supported.

A motion to increase the score for the East Hagbourne sports pavilion to 19 because it met the key aims of the scheme more fully than the average score indicated was agreed on the Chairman's casting vote.

The Panel agreed to leave the remaining average aggregate scores as shown in the table above unchanged.

5.2 The Panel debated the cut-off scores and funding criteria.

The Panel agreed to set a cut-off score at or below which no award would be made of 15 points including the finance score.

The Panel agreed that projects should be fully funded where possible. Projects were more likely to be completed if the full grant amount sought was allocated, even if this meant funding fewer projects overall. Awards would be made taking account of the funds available and the total score of each project.

5.3 Ms Reid, Assistant Chief Executive, informed the Panel that the Cabinet member for finance had agreed to use the un-spent grants from previous years to fund this round of CIF grants. This allowed the Panel to allocate a further £1.1 million, taking the total funds available to £1.9 million.

Panel members expressed some concern about the lateness of this decision and the lack of consultation. They were concerned about the wisdom and prudence of allocating an extra £1m to CIF grants at this late stage in the process, however worthy the projects were, and especially given the tight financial constraints under which the council was now operating and the £1 million of savings which had to be found from revenue budgets by March 2009.

However, the Panel agreed to allocate the funds in accordance with the new sum of £1.9 million, on the understanding that this money was indeed legally available to the Cabinet member for finance to disburse.

5.4 The Panel considered the amount for each individual award using the agreed average scores. They also agreed conditions on each award. In reaching their decision, they took into account the scores, the scoring criteria and the overall amount of funding available, but were not restricted by these in making their final decisions.

The Panel made the following recommendations:

Berinsfield Amateur Boxing Club – score 24

To award the application from Berinsfield Amateur Boxing Club 60 per cent of the £373,716 estimated eligible scheme costs, up to a maximum of £206,230 towards the construction of an extension to the existing facilities to provide a second boxing ring, increased training area and improved facilities.

To review the grant after one year if the project was not started.

Headway – score 23

To award the application from Headway 54.38 per cent of the £75,628 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £41,127, towards the refurbishment and fitting out of their new building as a centre for acquired brain injuries.

To review the grant after one year if the project was not started.

To note that it was likely that Henley Town Council would extend the lease beyond five years.

Wallingford All-Weather Pitch – score 21

To award the application from Wallingford Sports Trust 59.31 per cent of the £134,875 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £80,000, towards the replacement of the all-weather sports surface at Hithercroft.

To review the grant after one year if the project was not started.

To note concerns raised by members of the Panel over the proximity of the trees to the pitch and the effect of leaf drop and debris on the life-span of the surface.

Thame Girl Guides – score 21

To award the application from Thame Girl Guides 59.92 per cent of the £402,176 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £241,000 towards the replacement of the existing Guide headquarters with a new building.

To add conditions to ensure that a 99 year lease from Thame Town Council was in place.

To review the grant after two years if the project was not started.

Chinnor Village Hall – score 21

To award the application from Chinnor Village Hall 44.56 per cent of the £561,058 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £250,000, towards the costs of refurbishing and extending the village hall.

To add conditions to:

- ensure that authority from the charity commission for extension and evidence of title and were in place;
- place a legal charge on the property.

To review the grant after two years if the project was not started.

St Mary's Church, Wallingford– score 22

To award the application from St Mary's Church, Wallingford 20.00 per cent of the £515,339 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £103,068, towards the refurbishment and re-ordering of the interior of the church building to create a venue for local community use.

To review the grant after one year if the project was not started.

Upper Thames Rowing Club – score 22

To award the application from the Upper Thames Rowing Club 20.00 per cent of the £941,149 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £188,230, towards the refurbishment and extension of the clubhouse.

To add conditions to place a legal charge on the property.

To review the grant after one year if the project was not started.

AFC Henley – score 19

To award the application from AFC Henley 48.64 per cent of the £154,200 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £75,000, towards the building of a new sports pavilion.

To review the grant after one year if the project was not started.

Didcot Town Council – St Edmunds park – score 19

To award the application from Didcot Town Council 60.00 per cent of the £90,000 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £54,000, towards the refurbishment of the play area at St Edmunds park.

To add conditions to:

- provide evidence of additional consultation to show the proposed scheme is supported by the community
- ensure that adequate plans and funding for maintenance, inspection and insurance on a like-for-like basis were in place.

To review the grant after one year if the project was not started.

Thame Town Council – Southern Road play area – score 19

To award the application from Thame Town Council 47.43 per cent of the £179,195 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £85,000, towards the refurbishment of the play area at Southern Road.

To add conditions to ensure that adequate plans and funding for maintenance, inspection and insurance were in place.

To review the grant after two years if the project was not started.

Watlington Parish Council – recreation ground – score 17

To award the application from Watlington Parish Council 60.00 per cent of the £177,933 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £106,759, towards the refurbishment of the recreation ground.

To add conditions to ensure that adequate plans and funding for maintenance, inspection and insurance were in place.

To review the grant after one year if the project was not started.

East Hagbourne Parish Council – sports pavilion and ground – score 17

Not to make any award to East Hagbourne Parish Council. Although the project was above the cut-off score, the Panel considered that the project was not sufficiently financially viable and that while the management team were committed, they were unlikely to be able to deliver a completed project soon. As a result, the Panel decided they did not wish to commit further funds at this time.

Thame Youth Theatre – community facilities – score 12

Not to make any award to the Thame Youth Theatre because it fell below the cut-off for the award of a grant and because of the uncertainty over the finances of the scheme and which parts would be covered by other funds.

The Panel discussed funding part of the scheme or specific elements of the proposal as some of these met the criteria for community use and would be of benefit. However, the decision not to fund any part of the scheme was agreed.

The Panel agreed to recommend Cabinet to allocate £120,000 to fund capital grants under £25,000.

The meeting closed at 12.00 pm

Chairman

Date