

Minutes



Listening Learning Leading

OF A MEETING OF THE

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT FUND PANEL

HELD AT 10.00AM ON 19 JUNE 2007

AT COUNCIL OFFICES, CROWMARSH GIFFORD

Present:

Capt J Flood (Chairman)

Ms J Bland, Mr D Bretherton, Mrs J Carr, Mrs E Gillespie, Ms R Myer, Mr M Newland, Mr J Nowell-Smith, Rev'd A Paterson, Mrs P Slatter, Mrs P Tomlinson

Apologies:

Mr P Cross

Officers:

Mrs J Bolton, Mr D Buckle, Ms S Reid, Ms V Taylor, Mrs J Thompson

4. Minutes, 12 June 2007

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the meeting of 12 June 2007 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign them.

5. Bids for funding from the Community Investment Fund

Mr D Turner, ward councillor, spoke in support of the application from 1st Chalgrove Scout Group.

Mrs A Ducker, ward councillor, spoke in support of the application from St Thomas' of Canterbury Church.

Mr J Cotton, ward councillor, spoke in support of the applications from Berinsfield Amateur Boxing Club and Dorchester Sailing Club.

Mr J Nowell-Smith, ward councillor spoke in support of the application from Little Milton village hall.

Mr P Greene, ward councillor, sent a written submission in support of the application from Aston Tirrold and Aston Upthorpe Parish Council.

- 5.1 The Panel considered the application forms, summary sheets, tables giving the individual scores for each application and a table (below) showing the average overall scores for all the applications.

Ref No.	Organisation	Scheme	Scheme Cost £	Grant Sought £	Average Score before Finance	Average score with Finance
1 1	Berinsfield Amateur Boxing Club	Extension	157,920	77,000	23	24
7 9	Dorchester Sailing Club	New clubhouse	249,957	110,000	21	22
4 5	Little Milton Village Hall	Extension for shop & post office	185,937	92,968	20	21
6 7	Aston Tirrold & Aston Upthorpe P.C	New pavilion & detached garage	425,080	200,000	20	21
2 2	St Thomas' Of Canterbury Church, Goring	Extension for community use	283,470	140,000	16	17
5 6	1st Chalgrove Scout Group	Purchase Site	152,230	60,000	16	18
8 10	Sinodun Players - Wallingford	Wallingford-Corn Exchange refurbishment	458,000	200,000	14	15

The Panel discussed the overall scores awarded to each application.

Some Panel members advocated raising the score for St Thomas of Canterbury Church as the overall score did not adequately reflect the perceived merits of the project.

The Panel then considered each column of the average scores separately across all the applications and made proposals to raise or lower individual scores with in each column (copy attached to the minute book copy of these minutes).

The scores in the 'Broadening the range' column were agreed.

A vote to alter the score in the 'Key aims' column from six to 10 for 1st Chalgrove Scout Group, on being put to the vote, was declared lost

A vote to alter the score in the 'Community participation' column from two to three for St Thomas of Canterbury Church, on being put to the vote, was declared lost

In the 'Local need' column, a vote to alter the score from two to three for St Thomas of Canterbury Church, on being put to the vote, was declared lost. A vote to alter the score from four to two for Berinsfield Amateur Boxing Club, on being put to the vote, was declared lost.

A vote to alter the score in the 'Community benefit' column from two to three for St Thomas of Canterbury Church, on being put to the vote, was declared lost.

The Panel therefore agreed, after careful consideration, to leave the average aggregate scores as shown in the circulated documents unchanged.

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

The Panel agreed to:

- fund all the applications
- consider the size of the award for each application in order of the average score plus financial score
- not to recommend any change to the cut-off score for applications dealt with under delegated powers
- to use the cut-off scores to set the percentage awarded as:

Less than 12 points including finance score	No award
12+	50 per cent of requested amount
15+	80 per cent of requested amount
20+	100 per cent of requested amount

The Panel recognised that projects could not all be fully funded because the amount requested totalled more than the funds available. The Panel agreed for this financial year to make awards totalling up to £688,908, thus leaving £100,000 available to officers to award under delegated authority. Awards were made taking account of the funds available and the total score of each project.

5.3 The Panel considered the amount for each individual award using the agreed average scores and the percentages agreed for each scoring band. They also agreed conditions on each award. In reaching their decision, they took into account these 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 to Cabinet:

Berinsfield Amateur Boxing Club – score 24

To award the application from Berinsfield Amateur Boxing Club 48.76 per cent of the £157,920 estimated eligible scheme costs, up to a maximum of £77,000, towards the construction of an extension to the existing facilities to provide an increased training area and club office.

Dorchester Sailing Club – score 22

To award the application from Dorchester Sailing Club 44.01 per cent of the £249,957 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £110,000, towards the construction of a new club house with training room, providing changing, showering and toilet facilities, a kitchen, dining area, and social area, and converting the existing building into a workshop and store.

Little Milton Village Hall – score 21

To award the application from Little Milton Village Hall 50 per cent of the £185,937 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £92,968, towards the construction of an extension and conservatory to the village hall to house a café, community shop and post office.

To attach conditions:

- that the award be reviewed after twelve months
- evidence must be supplied and agreed by the Council on the new management group being correctly and legally established before commencement of the work.

Aston Tirrold and Aston Upthorpe Parish Council – score 21

To award the application from Aston Tirrold and Aston Upthorpe Parish Council 47.05 per cent of the £425,080 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £200,000, towards the replacement of the existing pavilion with a community building, disabled parking, new access road and garage for storage.

To attach a condition that the award be reviewed after twelve months.

The Panel noted that this was the second application for this pavilion. Members were concerned about the viability of the project given the level of funding required and the previous failure to find sufficient funding.

1st Chalgrove Scout Group – score 18

To award the application from 1st Chalgrove Scout Group 31.53 per cent of the £152,230 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £48,000, towards the costs of purchasing the plot of land on which the Scout headquarters currently stands.

To attach conditions:

- that the award be reviewed after twelve months
- that a charge be placed on the land in order that the Council may recover the value of the grant if the 1st Chalgrove Scout Group should sell the land.

St Thomas' of Canterbury Church, Goring – score 17

To award the application from St Thomas' of Canterbury Church, Goring 39.51 per cent of the £283,470 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £112,000, towards the construction of an extension to the side of the church building to accommodate a servery and two meeting rooms for local community use.

Sinodun Players, Wallingford – score 15

To award the application from Sinodun Players, Wallingford 10.69 per cent of the £458,000 estimated scheme costs, up to a maximum of £48,940 towards the costs of strengthening the load bearing capacity of the first floor rooms, which include the clubroom and wardrobe and to raise the roof to the wardrobe section to increase

space. Access throughout this area includes ramped wheelchair access and a 'Stannah' type stair lift to the first floor, with wheelchairs being provided to assist mobility, thus ensuring access for all. Work to the clubroom will include providing flexible seating and staging, with the installation of cinema and conference facilities. These changes will provide four dressing rooms to meet Child Performance Regulation needs and also the internal layout of the workshop will improve work and storage facilities.

To attach conditions:

- that the award be reviewed after twelve months
- that full information on the project be provided to the Grants Officer in line with that required from other major grant award applications before any funds be released.

The reasons for this decision were:

The Panel were minded to reject the application altogether because it was incomplete. They were concerned that the quotes, financial information and detailed plans for the refurbishment work were missing or incomplete despite the applicant having been given the opportunity to produce these for the Panel. The award was therefore being considered on the basis of uncertain information. However, in this instance, the initial phase of the project was nearing completion, showing that the applicants could deliver such an ambitious project on time and to budget and specification. Despite the lack of information, there was no reason to doubt their ability to complete this second phase.

After discussion and on being put to the vote, the Panel decided NOT to reject the application.

The Panel then considered whether to determine this as phase two of an on-going project or a separate project. Notwithstanding the advice to submit separate applications for each phase of the work, which allowed the applicant to plan the work and raise separate funding for each stage, the Panel decided to treat the two phases as one overall application to the CIF. There was no evidence to suggest that the two phases were separate stand-alone proposals rather than an integrated proposal phased to allow better management of the project.

If the applicant had requested funding for the project as a whole, this would have resulted in an unmanageably large and expensive project. Splitting the work into two phases and requesting funding for each phase allowed the project to proceed. However, given that phase one was not complete, that phase two followed on immediately from phase one, and that the proposals for the two stages had been originally submitted as one and were planned as a whole, it was difficult to justify treating this as two separate proposals and effectively giving a £400,000 limit.

After discussion and voting, the Panel decided to consider this application as part of an on-going project and hence subject to the overall £200,000 cap on a grant award for a single project.

The Panel agreed to reduce the allocation to 80 per cent of the possible £61,175 to maintain consistency with the percentage allocated to other applicants in the 15-20 points range.

The Panel made no recommendation to Cabinet as to the allocation of the remaining £16,092.

6. Changes to the operation of the Community Investment Fund

After discussion, the Panel decided to make the following recommendations to Cabinet for consideration as part of the review of the Community Investment Fund process:

1. The Panel would elect a chairman before the first site visit to assist in the organisation of the site visits and the smooth running of the Panel.
2. The scoring system should be amended to take the average of the individual scores as at present, but discounting the top and bottom scores and taking an average of the middle ten scores only. This would prevent individual high or low scores having undue weight.
3. The definition of separate projects or phased project should be clarified. The Panel recommended that separate projects should be clearly discrete, not inter-related or planned together, and with a clear gap between them. Separate applications for phases of projects could be submitted and considered separately, but were subject to the overall cap of £200,000 for a single project.
4. The Panel should have the right to determine each application presented to them on its merits, including (in cases of doubt or dispute) whether to accept or reject commendable applications which were still incomplete by the Panel meeting date and whether phased applications should be treated as relating to one project or separate projects.

The meeting closed at 12.05 pm

Chairman

Date