

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LEADER****DATE: 4 DECEMBER 2015****LEAD OFFICER: JANE LAST, PROGRAMME MANAGER AND LEAD MANAGER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY AND PARTNERSHIP****SUBJECT: COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS FUND – PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To consider further recommendations for projects to be funded through the Community Improvements Fund 2015-16.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Leader of the Council approve the proposed grant funding set out in Table 1 and considers bids in Table 2 for funding from the Community Improvements Fund Budget.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Approval of the proposed grant funding will enable the Community Partnerships Team to progress with facilitating the grant payments.

DETAILS:

1. The aim of the Community Improvements Fund is to give local groups the chance to improve their areas, make a real difference to people's lives and strengthen the ability of residents to independently enhance where they live. Bids are invited for one-off capital schemes for community improvements (in exceptional circumstances bids for start-up revenue projects are considered)
2. The Community Improvements Fund budget for 2015/16 is £500,000. One project agreed in 2014/15 had not proceeded, so the funds that had been allocated to the project have been added to this, to give a revised fund total for 2015/16 of £550,000.
3. For 2015/16 the decision was taken to accept bids in a single round. Bids were invited from April to July 2015 for amounts between £10,000 and £30,000. A total of 65 bids were submitted, totalling £1,507,182.
4. Bids to the Fund were submitted via the Community Partnerships Team and considered by a Community Improvements Panel consisting of Members supported by officers. Member representatives on the Panel are Pat Frost (Panel Lead), Margaret Hicks, Peter Hickman and Fiona White. The Panel considered all bids submitted against the evaluation criteria outlined in Annex 1. Following the evaluation, which included site visits where appropriate, the Panel met on 9 October 2015 to form their recommendations to the Leader.

5. The Panel's recommendations were put forward for consideration by the Leader of the Council on 29 October 2015, and the Leader approved 23 projects totalling £400,861 of the £550,000 budget.
6. There were three bids that required clarification on whether they were proceeding with the Surrey Community Building Grants Scheme before a decision could be made on whether to fund the project through the Community Improvements Fund.
7. Since the decision making meeting on 29 October, the Wisley and Pyrford Church has decided to withdraw its request for funding as the project had already gone ahead. Therefore the £17,000 that was allocated to the project is also available to be allocated. This means that £383,861 was allocated at the last meeting, with £166,139 remained to be allocated.

Surrey Community Building Grants Scheme update

8. 1st Chertsey Scouts, building a new headquarters. The organisation has confirmed that they will not be proceeding with the Surrey Community Building Grants Scheme and therefore want to proceed with this funding stream. Therefore the recommendation is to proceed with funding this project.
9. Girlguiding South East, providing a new facility at Faurefold. The organisation has decided to withdraw from the Community Improvements Fund and carry on with the Surrey Community Buildings Grants Scheme.
10. Parochial Church Council of Ecclesiastical Parish of St. Peter Woking, toilet refurbishment and improved access. The organisation has decided to continue with the Surrey Community Building Grants Scheme, and therefore the recommendation is not to continue with this project.
11. With the projects that were funded at the meeting on 29 October, and with this recommendation above for the 1st Chertsey Scouts project, the total that would be funded would be £413,861 (£383,861 and £30,000) which would leave £136,139 to allocate.

Recommendations for the remaining funding

12. After all the application forms had been submitted, officers looked at all the bids and assessed them against the criteria, for reference by the Panel. At the last Leader's decision making meeting, officers were asked to identify projects for consideration for the remaining funding.
13. The projects that most met the criteria following those approved at the last Leader's decision making meeting are as follows, and therefore these projects are being put forward for approval.

Table 1

Tandridge Lesiure Trust	Sports Pool Refurbishment	£30,000
Old Reigatian Rugby Club	New playing fields	£20,000
St Mary's Church	Orchard Way Playground	£30,000

Clarendon Childrens' Centre	Outdoor Play area	£26,000
-----------------------------	-------------------	---------

14. If all the above projects were approved to the amount requested, £30,139 would remain to be allocated. The following projects were the next that officers assessed that meets the criteria, and could therefore be considered:

Table 2

Surrey Disabled People's Partnership	Installation of a Changing Places toilet	£25,000
St Mary's Church	Kitchen Refurbishment	£30,000
St Peter's Church, Leverton Hall, Wrecclesham	Improved access (including disabled access)	£20,000

CONSULTATION:

15. The Leader of the Council introduced the scheme, and Members appointed by the Leader sat on the Panel alongside the Community Partnerships Team Leader and the Senior Principal Accountant for Customers and Communities. The Community Partnerships Team liaised with applicants in developing their bids by providing guidance regarding the criteria.
16. Local Members and Local Committee Chairmen were consulted on the bids in their areas. Where bids had an implication on Surrey County Council services, officers within these services were asked to provide objective comments on the bids

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

17. There are no identifiable negative risks attributed to the processing of the Fund. The Council needs to ensure that the payments are processed in a timely manner and for the projects approved. Each of the successful projects will be asked to report back on the outcomes of the funding within 12 months.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

18. The cost of funding the projects approved at the meeting on 29 October 2015 totals £383,861. £136,139 remains to be allocated from the projects above.
19. Given the requirement for grant recipients to meet specified conditions before funding is released, it is likely that a proportion of the allocated funding will not be paid within the current financial year. This will be requested as a budget carry forward into 2016/17 in order to meet the committed funding.
20. All of the bids are subject to the standard conditions of – Subject to all funding for the project being confirmed and receipt of three competitive quotes. Where the grant is funding one element within a larger project, the project commencement

relates to the element being funded, to be assessed by officers. Any additional conditions are included in Annex 2.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

21. The Section 151 Officer's representative has considered all applications listed in Annex 2 and has attended meetings with the advisory panel to provide objective financial advice in relation to the proposed projects.
22. The Section 151 Officer confirms that all material, financial and business issues and risks have been considered / addressed. Where commentaries have been provided to the Panel, quoted shortfalls are based upon position subject to receipt of the Community Improvements Fund grant.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

23. The Scheme of Delegation includes reference to the Fund and authority has been allocated to the Community Partnerships Manager to process the approved funding. There are no further legal or legislative requirements relating to this Fund.
24. These grants are being made by the Council in accordance with its general powers of competence under Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011, under which it is empowered to do anything that individuals generally do and this includes the power to do things for the benefit of persons resident or present in its area.

Equalities and Diversity

25. The Fund is open to groups (not individuals) who are applying on behalf of the community, but is not restricted to any specific groupings within the county.
26. The Community Partnership Team is currently reviewing progress of all projects successful in securing funding in 2014/15. As part of that review the Community Partnership Team will request feedback from applicants on how they felt the funding process worked to identify better methods of communicating with hard to reach groups.
27. An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out on criteria and process for applying for this Fund. It is available online for viewing.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

28. Applicants will be informed whether they have been successful and if so what course of action they need to undertake to receive the funding that has been allocated. This will include asking successful applicants to provide a copy of relevant quotes, where these have not been provided as part of the application. Where bidders have been unsuccessful, they will also be informed of the decision, and will be offered feedback on their application.
29. Each of the successful applicants will be asked to provide evidence within 12 months of expenditure and the achievement of the outcomes set out within the bid form. This will then be included in a future report for the Leader.

30. Information on successful bids are included on the Council's website – www.surreycc.gov.uk/communityimprovementsfund.

Contact Officer:

James Painter, Community Partnerships Manager
Tel: 01372 832539 Email: james.painter@surreycc.gov.uk

Consulted:

Pat Frost (Panel Lead), Margaret Hicks, Peter Hickman and Fiona White (on initial projects). Service Officers where appropriate, and other agencies where appropriate.

Annexes:

Annex 1 - Criteria and Guidance for Community Improvements Fund
Annex 2 – Community Improvements Fund Panel Recommendations

Sources/background papers:

- Community Improvement Fund Application Forms
- Community Improvement Fund Criteria and Guidance
- Community Improvement Fund Assessment summary documents

This page is intentionally left blank