

**TEESDALE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Report To: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
6 October 2008**

**From:** Lead Member for Resources: Councillor G K Robinson

**Ward Member:** All

**Subject: SMALL GRANTS FUND**

---

**1.0 SUMMARY**

1.1 This report seeks approval for the transfer of £5,000 from contingency into the small grants fund for allocation by the Grants Sub-Committee.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)**

**2.1 It is recommended that**

**2.1.1 £5,000 is transferred from contingency to the small grants fund.**

**3.0 LINK TO CORPORATE KEY PRIORITIES/AMBITIONS**

3.1 Priority: All

3.2 Ambition: All

3.3 Outcome: Community groups, not for profit organisations and individuals receive financial assistance in contributing towards the Council's priorities.

**4.0 BACKGROUND**

4.1 Grants, contributions and donations are reviewed annually as a part of the budget setting process. It was determined during the budget setting process for 2007/08 that this review should be undertaken by a Grants Sub-Committee, which was then established.

4.2 The Grants Sub-Committee considers each application using a scoring methodology that assesses the proposal in relation to the following criteria:

- Links to the corporate priorities – are there any, does the project partially meet a priority, does it clearly deliver one
- Evidence of need – is there any, how strong is it
- Other funding – what percentage of the project costs are requested, have other organisations been approached

- Sustainability – will funding be required in future years, will it reduce, will self financing be achieved
- Value for money – what evidence is there that value for money is being achieved, how strong is this evidence
- Quality of life impact – will the project improve the quality of life for a single ward or group or more than one, how many
- Risk – what is the impact on the project if the grant requested is not approved or is reduced
- Equality and diversity – is the project/activity available to all irrespective of race, sex, marital status, disability, religion, age, sexual orientation or political belief.

The score awarded to the application then determines if the application is successful and influences the level of grant allocated.

- 4.3 The Grants Sub-Committee recommended to Council that budgets of £98,000 and £68,400, for revenue and capital respectively, should be established for 2008/09 and this recommendation was agreed. Although the majority of these budgets were already allocated by the Grants Sub-Committee using the above process, the £98,000 budget for revenue included a contingency of £1,294 for allocation during the year as further applications are received. This contingency was then increased by £1,463 due to an underspend on the arts grants budget in 2007/08.

## **5.0 CURRENT POSITION**

- 5.1 A significant number of further applications have been received since the budget was approved and the contingency has now reduced to £341 with a number of applications still to be considered. It is therefore recommended that the budget for small grants is increased to enable grants to be awarded where applications meet the agreed criteria contained in the grants scoring methodology.

## **6.0 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 Financial Implications:

A balance of £60,000 remains within the contingency, this would reduce to £55,000.

- 6.2 Risk:

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Implications</b>
Grants are not allocated to projects that are consistent with the Councils priorities	Reputational, Financial	Priorities may not be achieved, value for money may not be maximised, projects that are consistent with priorities may not proceed due to lack of funding

- 6.3 Equality and Diversity: The equality and diversity implications of all applications are considered
- 6.4 Human Resources: None
- 6.5 Community Safety: None
- 6.6 Legal Issues: None

**Background papers:**

1. Revenue and Capital Budget 2008/09 – Executive Committee 11 February 2008

**Author:** Joanne Kellett  
Chief Finance Officer  
01833 696234