



Meeting: **SHIRE Community and SHIRE Environment Grants Scrutiny Review Panel**

Date/Time: **Wednesday, 12 April 2023 at 1.00 pm**

Location: **Sparkenhoe Committee Room, County Hall, Glenfield**

Contact: **Damien Buckley (Tel: 0116 305 0183)**

Email: **Email: damien.buckley@leics.gov.uk**

Membership

Mr. C. A. Smith CC (Chairman)

Mr. G. A. Boulter CC Mr. P. King CC
Mr. D. Harrison CC Ms. Betty Newton CC

AGENDA

<u>Item</u>	<u>Report by</u>
1. Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 March 2023.	(Pages 3 - 8)
2. Declarations of Interest.	
3. Exclusion of the Press and Public.	
<i>The press and public are likely to be excluded during the following items of business in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1982:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>SHIRE Community Grants: Feedback from Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Organisations and Grant Beneficiaries</i>• <i>SHIRE Environmental Grants: Feedback from Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Organisations and Grant Beneficiaries.</i>	
4. SHIRE Community Grants: Feedback from Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Organisations and Grant Beneficiaries.	(Pages 9 - 28)



Any additional written statements will be circulated prior to the meeting.

(Exempt under Paragraphs 1, 3 and 10)

5. SHIRE Environment Grants: Feedback from Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Organisations and Grant Beneficiaries. (Pages 29 - 38)

Any additional written statements will be circulated prior to the meeting.

(Exempt under Paragraphs 1, 3 and 10)

6. Issues Raised During the Meeting and Further Information Required.

7. Actions from the Meeting held on 23 March 2023. (Pages 39 - 54)

8. Date of Next Meeting.

The next meeting will be held on 15 May 2023 at 10:00am.



Minutes of a meeting of the SHIRE Community and SHIRE Environment Grants Scrutiny Review Panel held at County Hall, Glenfield on Thursday, 23 March 2023.

PRESENT

Mr. D. Harrison CC
Mr. P. King CC

Ms. Betty Newton CC
Mr. C. A Smith CC

Apologies

Mr. G. A. Boulter CC

In attendance

Tom Purnell - Assistant Chief Executive
Zafar Saleem - Head of Service, Communities, Policy & Resilience
Noel Singh - Funding Manager
Andy Hayes - Funding & Grants Officer (Via Microsoft Teams)
Rosemary Whitelaw – Democratic Services Officer
Damien Buckley – Democratic Services Officer
James O'Brien - Team Manager, Environment Policy & Strategy
Anna Low - Team Manager, Waste Policy & Strategy
Nailesh Ramaiya - Environment & Waste Management Technician (Via Microsoft Teams)
John Levison - Senior Initiatives Officer, Waste Policy & Strategy (Via Microsoft Teams)
Kristy Ball - Team Leader, Communities Team
Mike Thompson - Communities Business Partner, Communities Team
Kate Revell - Head of Service (Commissioning and Quality), Adults and Communities
Rachel Cheney - Lead Commissioner, Adults and Communities
Simon Dalby - Strategic Lead - Community Delivery, Public Health
Anna Christie - Operations Manager - Local Area Co-ordination, Public Health

1. Election of Chairman.

RESOLVED:

That Mr. C. Smith CC be appointed Chairman for the duration of the Scrutiny Review Panel.

Mr C. A. Smith CC – in the Chair

2. Declarations of Interest.

Mr. P. King CC declared a non-registerable interest as a recent member of the Charnwood Institute of Financing who were in receipt of a grant from this scheme.

3. Scoping Template for the Scrutiny Review Panel.

The Panel considered a document previously agreed by the Scrutiny Commissioners setting out the scope of the Scrutiny Review Panel. A copy of the document marked 'Agenda Item 3' is filed with these minutes.

RESOLVED:

That the Scoping Template for the Scrutiny Review Panel be agreed.

4. Conduct of Scrutiny Review Panels.

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Executive which outlined the procedures for conducting Scrutiny Review Panels which were to be predominantly held in public session. A copy of this briefing paper marked "Agenda Item 4" is filed with these minutes.

RESOLVED:

That the procedures for conducting Scrutiny Review Panel meetings be noted.

5. Draft Work Programme for the Scrutiny Review Panel.

The Panel considered a draft work programme for the Scrutiny Review Panel. A copy of this paper marked "Agenda Item 5" is filed with these minutes.

RESOLVED:

That the Draft Work Programme for the Scrutiny Review Panel be agreed.

6. Overview of the SHIRE Community Grant and SHIRE Environment Grant programmes.

The Scrutiny Review Panel received a presentation which provided an overview of the SHIRE Community Grant and SHIRE Environment Grant programmes.

The Chairman thanked officers for the presentation and noted the diversity that the grant schemes offer.

- i. The proposal to cease delivery of the SHIRE Community and Environment Grant programmes with immediate effect had been part of the Council's MTFS 2023/24 – 2026/27 and members suggested that the financial position would need to remain a key consideration in determining the future of both grant programmes in 2023/24 and onwards. Members highlighted the importance for the Council to prioritise social care, education, and other statutory services which it must deliver, against a backdrop of difficult financial circumstances. Members also noted that the County Council was not the only organisation providing funding via grants and that most projects would be able to find alternative sources of funding.
- ii. In response to member concern regarding the Council's financial position, officers explained that the budget for the SHIRE Community Grant scheme had been set by members, originally at around £1million in 2011, although the rate had fluctuated year on year. During 2020/21 and 2021/22 the grant budget was higher due to additional investment in grants to support with COVID-19 and had reduced to £600k in 2022/23. The Council's departments would usually award contracts to charities and social enterprise organisations for the delivery of services; the grants

were seen as complementary to these. A member suggested that there would be a need to consider the Council's budget against the social responsibility in supporting vulnerable people and community groups.

- iii. It was suggested that there could be an opportunity for the grants budgets to be reduced rather than ceasing delivery of the schemes. Suggestions for cost cutting measures and how the budget for the grants could be reduced would be considered by officers and potential options for this would be provided at the meeting on 12 April 2023.
- iv. Members raised concern over the costs associated with administering the grant schemes, in particular staffing costs. It was explained that exact costs were not available at the time, but members noted that the officer posts involved in the administration of the grants also had other areas of work included within their job descriptions. Officers agreed to supply members with a breakdown of costs associated with administering the grant schemes at the meeting on 12 April 2023.
- v. In response to a question regarding the number of organisations that had submitted repeat requests for funding and the frequency of these requests, it was explained that the majority of applications had been from new applicants. However, some organisations who had benefited from the grant schemes had submitted a repeat request, which would usually be for different purposes than that previously. Members noted that the issue of repeat funding had previously been considered, but repeat requests were not prevented, particularly if the project was felt to be beneficial and supportive of the main objectives of the grant scheme. Officers did query the reasons for repeat requests and would promote other avenues of funding. Members expressed their concern regarding repeat requests for funding and officers agreed to provide members with the number of organisations that had submitted repeat requests and the frequency of these requests at the meeting on 12 April 2023.
- vi. The grant schemes had primarily focussed on supporting vulnerable people and communities in line with the priorities in the Council's Strategic Plan but had on occasion awarded funding to parish and town councils, albeit a small number, and larger charitable organisations, where the projects also supported these groups, such as programmes delivering food provision. However, members raised concern at this and questioned whether these authorities and organisations should allocate funding from their own budgets or from alternative sources. Officers agreed to provide the number of applications for the SHIRE Community Grant from larger organisations or precepting authorities at the meeting on 12 April 2023.
- vii. A member suggested that the grants had provided a positive impact on vulnerable groups, and organisations which may have not been in a position to deliver services without the funding and asked that the wider impact of the grants, not just the value for money, be taken into account by the Panel. Officers advised that some business intelligence data relating to grants performance was available although it was difficult to quantitatively measure impact and value for money. Members noted that the impact of the grant schemes and value for money would be illustrated by evidence which would be presented by departmental officers within the Council, Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VSCE) organisations and Grant beneficiaries, as well as other grant funders, partners and stakeholders.

RESOLVED:

That:

- a) The Overview of the SHIRE Community Grant and SHIRE Environment Grant programmes be noted;
- b) The number of organisations that submit repeat requests for funding and the frequency of these requests be provided on 12 April 2023;
- c) The number of applications from larger organisations or precepting authorities (both actual number and percentage), be provided on 12 April 2023;
- d) The administrative costs of running the SHIRE Community Grants be provided on 12 April 2023;
- e) Qualitative and quantitative data to demonstrate the impact and value for money of SHIRE Community and SHIRE Environment Grants be provided on 12 April 2023;
- f) Suggestions for cost cutting measures and how the budget for SHIRE Community and SHIRE Environment Grants could be reduced be provided on 12 April 2023.

7. Receive feedback from departmental officers.

The Scrutiny Review Panel received feedback from departmental officers regarding the impact and value for money of the grants programmes and investment into the local Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector and how the grants programmes support the achievement of departmental strategic objectives.

The Chairman welcomed officers from Adults and Communities, Public Health, and the Chief Executives Departments for this item.

Adults and Communities

- i. Members noted that the grant scheme had had a positive impact on services in Adults and Communities by contributing to community based approaches and complementing mental health provision and the early intervention and support offer. The Department currently had minimal involvement in the running of the grants scheme but would be happy to provide more direct support. Officers felt that the scheme ran well and captured the enthusiasm of communities to improve local wellbeing. Schemes funded by the grants had supported the Department in meeting its objectives of preventing and reducing people requiring social care support and delaying this before the Department would need to provide costly support packages.
- ii. A member expressed concern that the SHIRE grants were being relied on to deliver the Department's objectives and expressed the view that projects that supported Departmental priorities should be funded from the core budget. The member also expressed concern that the use of grant funding could result in a 'postcode lottery' for services. Officers advised that the one of the benefits of the grants was that they allowed the community to be innovative and generate their own projects. Communities often had a better understanding of their own needs than the County Council did.

Public Health

- iii. Members noted that the grant scheme had supported the Public Health department by providing funding to help people to maximise resources to support themselves during challenges with health services, to assist with COVID-19, to help reduce the effects associated with the cost of living, in providing mental health support, and through providing dynamic support to individuals and communities at the earliest possible opportunity. The Department had minimal involvement in the delivery of the grant scheme, other than providing some assistance with relevant funding decisions, but would welcome the opportunity to work closely and collaboratively in how grants are utilised, if the scheme were to continue.
- iv. Officers felt that creativity could be stifled through the commissioning of services and welcomed the role of the grants scheme in transferring power to communities and enabling them to be creative. Health inequalities were widening, and the grants scheme provided an opportunity for projects to support people at an early stage and for low costs.

Chief Executives

- i. A member raised concern that the grants had been used to help the Council to meet its priorities and asked how these priorities had been determined. Members were assured that the biggest priority was the Council's MTFs challenges, but it was equally important to meet priorities around providing core services. The Council's Strategic Plan 2022-26 set out the Council's long-term vision and priorities, supplemented by departmental plans. Officers agreed to provide members with evidence of how the grant schemes support and complement core services at the meeting on 12 April 2023.
- v. In response to a question regarding whether there had been a proportional split between different types of projects supported and if projects in different areas of the county were awarded funding equally, it was explained that this was not the case. Applications were considered on case by case basis. Most funding was awarded to projects supporting children and families and the largest proportion of funding had been awarded to organisations in Charnwood. The Lead Member for Community and Staff Relations was responsible for approving the grants criteria each year. It was suggested that the grants criteria and awarding process could be streamlined to ensure that funds would be distributed more proportionately.
- vi. Members suggested that Parish and Town Council's should allocate their own funds to support community groups through their precept rather than applying for grant funding. Members were assured that the Communities Team supported Parish Councils with budgeting and precepting and encouraged them to involve their communities in the process.

RESOLVED:

That:

- a) The feedback received from departmental officers regarding the impact and value for money of the grants programmes and investment into the local Voluntary,

Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector, as well as how the grants programmes support the achievement of departmental strategic objectives, be noted;

- b) Evidence of how the grant schemes support and complement core services be provided on 12 April 2023;
- c) Consideration be made as to whether the grant schemes should have priority themes or proportional splits.

8. Date of Next Meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the next meeting of the Scrutiny Review Panel would take place on Wednesday 12 April at 13:00.

13:00 - 14:36
23 March 2023

CHAIRMAN

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 3, 10 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 3, 10 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

SHIRE COMMUNITY AND SHIRE ENVIRONMENT GRANTS SCRUTINY REVIEW
PANEL

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

ACTIONS FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 23 MARCH 2023

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to set out a response to some of the issues raised at the meeting of the SHIRE Community and SHIRE Environment Grants Scrutiny Review Panel.

The information is set out in the tables below, in headings relating to the agenda items from the meeting.

Item 6: Overview of the SHIRE Community Grant and SHIRE Environment Grant programmes.

SHIRE Community Grants

Action	Response
<p>Number of organisations that repeat requests for funding and the frequency of these requests.</p>	<p><u>In terms of Numbers of Grants Awarded:</u></p> <p>In 2021-22, a total of 169 grants were awarded.</p> <p>In 2022-23, a total of 152 grants were awarded.</p> <p>Total grants awarded in both years = 321</p> <p>Across this period, 58 organisations received two grants in consecutive years. This represents 18% of the number of grants awarded.</p> <p><u>In terms of amounts awarded:</u></p> <p>In 2021-22, £897,500 was awarded in total (169 grants).</p> <p>In 2022-23, £612,485 was awarded (152 grants)</p> <p>In total, £1,509,985 was awarded across both years.</p> <p>Of this total, £689,000 was awarded to 58 organisations for consecutive grants in both years. This represents 45.6% of the total budget awarded across both years.</p>

<p>Number of applications from larger organisations or precepting authorities (both actual number and percentage).</p>	<p>In 2022-23, £612,485 was awarded for 152 grants.</p> <p>Of these 152 grants, 19 of the organisations reported income of over £500,000 in their most recent financial reports, which equates to 12.5% of grant recipients.</p> <p>Of the £612,485 awarded in 2022-23, £104,500 was awarded to organisations with reported income of over £500,000, which equates to 17% of the grant budget awarded.</p> <p>Of these 152 grants, 3 were awarded to Town/Parish Councils, equating to approx. 2% of grants awarded. The total awarded across the 3 grants was £5,115, representing less than 1% of the overall budget awarded.</p>
<p>Administrative costs of running the SHIRE Community Grants</p>	<p>1 x G13 Manager (50%) = £24,470 1 x G10 Officer (50%) = £17,367 Total Officer Time spent on SHIRE Grant Programme 2022-23 = £41,837</p> <p>In addition (from April 2021 – March 2024):</p> <p>*2 x G7 Admin Officers (100%) = £46,398 *Note these posts are time limited, and funded with external monies (Covid Grants), and not LCC budgets</p> <p><u>Tasks include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing an email inbox and recording details of applications received • Dealing with grant related enquiries • Undertaking initial eligibility checks for grant applications received • Preparing papers and recording notes for grant decision meetings • Preparing grant offer / reject letters, sending out letters and collating paperwork from grant recipients • Setting up suppliers on Oracle Fusion, requesting/processing payments, and ensuring recipients are paid • Ongoing monitoring of projects awarded funding (over a 12 month period) including requesting evidence of expenditure, checking evidence against agreed grant awards, dealing with

	<p>discrepancies, escalating any issues, requesting Grant Outcome Reports, and reporting trends, issues and challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributing to the development and maintenance of various spreadsheets with information about organisations awarded grant funding • Dealing with and responding to any other ad hoc requests for information about organisations awarded funding.
--	--

Qualitative/quantitative data to demonstrate the impact and value for money of SHIRE Community Grants

Year	Budget Available	Budget Allocated	No. of Projects Funded
2016-17	£420,000	£448,501	93
2017-18	£420,000	£420,188	104
2018-19	£350,000	£367,588	78
2019-20	£350,000	£386,715	90
2020-21	£2,594,190	£2.6m	379
2021-22	£900,000	£897,500	169
2022-23	£612,485	£600,000	152

A Tableau dashboard detailing numbers/amounts of grants awarded over the last 4-5 years is available [here](#)

A range of case studies have been provided within the slides presented to the first Scrutiny Review Panel meeting on Thursday 23 March 2023.

Grants have been awarded to voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) sector organisations for delivery of prevention/early intervention based health and wellbeing projects/services, including:

- Projects for vulnerable and disadvantaged young people (including those who are NEET, those involved in anti-social behaviour/crime, those with SEND issues and those from complex family backgrounds)
- Community-based Mental Health recovery and wellbeing services
- Projects supporting people who are experiencing financial hardship, energy and fuel poverty
- Projects which help to reduce loneliness and social isolation in communities
- Projects for people of all ages experiencing a range of disabilities/long term health conditions
- Services for people experiencing homelessness
- Services for people with substance use issues
- Services for people who have been victims of domestic and/or sexual abuse/violence

Examples of outcomes achieved include:

- Improved health, wellbeing and quality of life for vulnerable and disadvantaged people
- Vulnerable and disadvantaged people are safer, less isolated, confident and independent
- Disadvantaged groups have access to appropriate information/services and are empowered to participate fully in society

- Reduced inequality, and increased opportunities for vulnerable/disadvantaged people and communities to develop positive lifestyle choices,
- Less reliance on Council and other public services, particularly high-cost health and social care services
- Individuals who are NEET, including disadvantaged young people, have improved opportunities to access education, training and employment
- Reduction in crime, offending and anti-social behaviour in communities
- Communities/community organisations take responsibility for identifying solutions to local issues
- Stronger voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) sector

Suggestions for cost cutting measures/how the budget for SHIRE Community Grants can be reduced.

It has already been proposed to award smaller grants in 2023-24 (max £5,000), which will enable a larger number of organisations to benefit from grants

Further options for consideration could include:

- a) Reduce capital budget by a further £50k
- b) The SHIRE Grant (revenue) budget was increased by £150k in 2022-23. A reduction to the current budget of this amount could be considered, so the revenue budget would be reduced to £350k.

SHIRE Environment Grants

Action	Response
<p>Number of organisations that repeat requests for funding and the frequency of these requests.</p>	<p>Over the 13 years of the scheme (2009-2022): 11 organisations put in repeat applications. Total No of repeat applications was 17. Out of which: - 8 organisations put in 1 repeat application - 1 organisation put in 2 repeat applications - 1 organisation put in 3 repeat applications - 1 organisation put in 4 applications</p> <p>Total no of grants offered is 217. 7% of awarded applications were repeat applications.</p> <p>Note: Organisations are not able to put in more than one application each year.</p> <p>The SHIRE Environment Grant is part of several initiatives that are designed to support communities to take positive action on waste and the environment. Part of this is taking organisations on a journey to understand their impact on the environment, and what they can do to minimise that impact. Therefore, we are comfortable in supporting repeat applications where appropriate and where they meet the eligibility criteria of the scheme and sufficiently demonstrate good use of the funding.</p>
<p>Administrative costs of running the SHIRE Environment Grants.</p>	<p>The estimated cost of administrating the scheme has been calculated at £14,998.</p> <p>This includes time spent processing applications, preparing for each funding round including comms, online workshops, general administration, and management time checking and approving projects.</p> <p>The above figure also includes on-costs of between +38% and +41% depending on grade.</p>
<p>Qualitative/quantitative data to demonstrate the impact and value for money of SHIRE Environment Grants</p>	<p>The methodology used to assess the impact and value for money of projects varies depending on project type. All projects are assessed/scored against a range of assessment criteria (See Appendix).</p>

	<p>All projects are assessed firstly to ensure the organisation and project is eligible and that all required supporting information has been suitably provided.</p> <p>All projects are then assessed against the extent to which they meet or achieve criteria such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary outcomes • Secondary benefits • Degree of quality of resident involvement and behavioural change • Level and type of community use of the building/property/land • Robustness of evidence demonstrating ability to meet future running or maintenance costs and requirements • Level of project risk • No of volunteers engaged in projects • Sustainability of project • Advertising and marketing of engagement activities <p>In addition, for energy projects they are assessed against the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPCs or DEC's (Energy Performance Certificates, Display Energy Certificates) must be provided showing the energy performance of the building • Estimated financial savings per year • Estimated CO2 savings • Payback period • Value for money (CO2kg/£) - total cost • Value for money (CO2kg/£) - grant request <p>For biodiversity projects they are also assessed against the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which project is supporting a wider strategic agenda such as part of enhancing a Priority Habitat Network, Living Landscape, River Catchment Restoration Plan, Strategic Green Infrastructure identified within a local plan
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any surveys showing that sites are important for wildlife that it manages, improves or expands habitat or supports specific species • Hectares/m2 of land to be improved <p>For waste projects there is also a post-project evaluation form which includes questions on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What activities have taken place and what did they involve • Who was involved in the project • How many volunteers were involved • What other agencies/organisations did you work with? • What differences has your project made? • Do you have any measurable data? • What impacts and benefits has the project achieved for the community? <p>In addition: Projects are only paid the funding awarded on receipt of evidence that the project has been delivered as described and, on the expenditure, agreed in the award letter.</p> <p>Since the current version of the SHIRE Environment Grant commenced in 2019 on average 55% of applications have been approved indicating the effectiveness of the assessment process in ensuring, where possible funding is awarded to the projects that most meet the requirements and objectives of the scheme.</p>
<p>Suggestions for cost cutting measures/how the budget for SHIRE Environment Grants can be reduced.</p>	<p>Options to consider could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce the amount of funding available from £40,000 to £30,000 - Reduce the maximum grant award from £3,000 to £2,500

Item 7: Receive feedback from departmental officers regarding:

- **the impact and value for money of the grants programmes and investment into the local Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector;**
- **how the grants programmes support the achievement of departmental strategic objectives.**

Action	Response
Evidence of how the grant schemes support and complement core services	<p>The SHIRE Grant programme has been established to ensure grant funded projects support the key strategic aims/objectives of our departments, but also complement the delivery of LCC services, along with services which are externally commissioned.</p> <p>A good example is around money/debt advice services. The Council currently commissions Citizens Advice Leicestershire and Rutland along with Charnwood Citizens Advice Bureau to deliver money/debt advice services around the County. However, the demand for such services is clearly greater than what the CABs can realistically meet. Therefore SHIRE Grants have been utilised to fund smaller, more localised debt advice services in parts of the County where this is significant need, and where other local debt advice organisations are based who can provide such services.</p> <p>Other examples of SHIRE Grant funded projects which complement existing provision include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • projects which engage young people who are involved (or at risk of involvement) in anti-social behaviour/crime through diversionary activities • projects which provide parenting support to families from deprived/ disadvantaged backgrounds • smaller, localised drop in services for people with dementia and their carers • projects supporting carers, to complement existing commissioned services which provide support to carers • drop in services and projects for people with mental health issues, e.g. therapeutic services, along with other non clinical mental health support such as arts based, mindfulness, gardening, growing or other nature based activities
Consider whether the grant schemes should have priority themes or proportional splits.	For the 2023-24 SHIRE Community Grant programme, we are proposing to focus the grant awards on the following 4 themed priorities:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supporting vulnerable people and communities to manage the impacts of the cost of living crisis 2. Support for community-based projects and activities which improve mental health and wellbeing, including projects which reduce loneliness and social isolation 3. Projects for vulnerable and disadvantaged children and young people (and their families) 4. Projects supporting people with disabilities and/or long-term health conditions <p>Proportionate splits of the budget against set priorities has been attempted in the past. Unfortunately this was not successful.</p> <p>SHIRE Grants are very much demand led and based on who chooses to apply in any given grant round and where the organisation is based/where they are proposing to run their project activities/ where the beneficiaries are from. Dividing the budget on a geographical basis would be difficult for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are more VCSE organisations operating in some districts/boroughs in comparison to others 2. There would be no guarantee/assurance that equivalent numbers of eligible applications would be received from each area 3. Such an approach would disadvantage organisations, if we were to limit the number of grants/amounts to be awarded per district/borough as a number of organisations would miss out on the opportunity to secure a grant <p>It is also worth noting that most District/ Borough Councils also run their own Community Grant programmes.</p>
Evidence from the Children and Families Service	This has been requested.

Conclusion

Members are requested to consider whether the additional information provided is sufficient or whether there are areas where further information is needed.

Officers to Contact

Zafar Saleem
Head of Communities, Policy & Resilience
zafar.saleem@leics.gov.uk
0116 3054952

James O'Brien
Team Manager, Environment Policy & Strategy
james.obrien@leics.gov.uk
0116 305

SHIRE Environment Grant Scheme Assessment Form. Project details

Application reference:	
Applicant name:	
Project title / Description:	
Total cost of project:	
Value of grant requested:	
%	
VAT included	
VAT excluded	

PART 1: Assessment against grant requirements (Application must pass all requirements to be eligible unless exception has been agreed with Team Manager)		Pass	Fail	N/A	Panel comments	Further information from application
1	Will the project benefit the residents of Leicestershire?					
2	Is the applicant eligible? (Type of organisation and signed constitution and/or charitable status)					
3	Have all required permissions and consents been considered?					
4	Does the project meet one or more of the primary outcomes?					
5	Have all the costs been supplied and are they eligible?					
6	Has the required match funding been secured or has adequate evidence been provided for how it will be raised?					
7	Can the project be completed within 12 months of the grant offer? *					
8	Has the applicant supplied at least 3 valid quotes? (for items over £500)					
9	Does the project involve the community or raise awareness?					
10	Does the project have monitoring and evaluation mechanisms?					
11	Does the project avoid replicating / conflicting with current projects in the area?					
12	Are there any specific reasons why the Council should not invest in this project / activity or organisation?					
13	Does the project have support from their local Leicestershire County Councillor?					
14	Has the organisation considered any reasonable adjustments in order to ensure the project / activity is accessible and avoids discrimination to all groups with protected characteristics. These characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.					

Part 1: Additional requirements for building energy and biodiversity projects

15	Is the property / land eligible?					
16	Is the property owned, under the control or leased for at least 10 years by the applicant? *					
17	Does it meet recommendations of the Energy Audit / EPC / DEC, recommendations report in priority order? *					
18	Are copies of the previous 12 months energy bills provided, and has confirmation been given that future energy bills will be provided?					
19	Does the bid include details of maintenance beyond the grant (Clause 5.2 in the guidance)					
20	Is the site already designated nationally or is there local evidence that the site work has received relevant consents - Natural England, Local Authority licensing (Clause 5.4)?					
21	Has the project included a risk assessment (Clause 5.10)?					
		Pass	Fail			

Result
Completed by:
Checked by:

*Exceptions may be allowed. Specify in comments

PART 2a: Assessment of application quality (Only complete if application has passed Part 1)

	Criteria	Scoring Basis	Assessment Score	Score	Panel Comments	Further information from application
1	How many primary outcomes does the project meet?	· 1 outcome	1			
		· 2 outcomes	2			
		· 3 outcomes	3			
		· 4 outcomes	4			
2	How many secondary benefits does the project meet?	· 0 secondary benefits	0			
		· 1 secondary benefit	1			
		· 2 secondary benefits	2			
		· 3 secondary benefits	3			
3	Degree of quality of resident involvement and behavioural change	· Low	1			
		· Medium	2			
		· High	3			
4	Provision of evidence demonstrating that the project has met its outcomes	· No evidence	0			
		· Unable to provide evidence	1			
		· Indirect	3			
		· Direct	3			
		· Both direct and indirect	5			
5	Clear and detailed project outline	· No	0			
		· Yes	1			
6	Level of project risk (How likely is it that the project will not achieve the grant fund outcomes?)	· High	0			
		· Medium	1			
		· Low	2			
7	Does the project complement existing services?	· No	0			
		· Yes	1			
8	Sustainability of the project	· One off project	1			
		· Sustainable with additional funding	2			
		· Sustainable with no additional funding	3			
9	Advertising and marketing	· No advertising or marketing	0			
		· The project will be advertised and marketed	1			
10	Does the project show new sustainable innovative solutions?	· No	0			
		· Yes	1			

Total **0**
Out of **24**

PART 2b: Project specific criteria: BUILDING ENERGY PROJECT Assessment of application quality (Only complete if applicable and application has passed Part 1)

Key Information		Figures Provided	Comments			
Estimated financial savings per year						
Estimated CO2 savings						
	Criteria	Scoring Basis	Assessment Score	Score	Panel Comments	Further information from application
1	Payback period (Total project costs / Annual saving)	· None provided	0			
		· Between 3-10 years	1			
		· Less than 3 years	3			
2	Value for money (CO2kg/£) (based on total cost)	· Very low VFM	0			
		· Low VFM	1			
		· Medium VFM	2			
		· High VFM	3			
3	Value for money (CO2kg/£) (based on grant request)	· Very low VFM	0			
		· Low VFM	1			
		· Medium VFM	2			
		· High VFM	3			
4	Level and type of community use of building/property	· Low level and type of community use	1			
		· Average level and type of community use	2			
		· High level and type of community use	3			
5	Robustness of evidence demonstrating ability to meet future running or maintenance costs and requirements	· No consideration of meeting future costs	0			
		· Minimal consideration for meeting future costs	1			
		· Reasonably sound basis for meeting future costs	2			
		· Good sound basis for meeting future costs	3			

Total **0**
Out of **15**

PART 2c: Project specific criteria: BIODIVERSITY PROJECT Assessment of application quality
(Only complete if applicable and application has passed Part 1)

	Criteria	Scoring Basis	Assessment Score	Score	Panel Comments	Further information from application
1	Does the project support a wider strategic agenda such as part of enhancing a Priority Habitat Network, Living Landscape, River Catchment Restoration Plan, Strategic Green Infrastructure identified within a local plan (Clause 5.6)?	No	0			
		Yes	3			
2	Has the bid submitted evidence of demand for the intervention? Surveys showing that the site is important for wildlife that it manages, improves or expands habitat or supports specific species (Clause 5.3)?	No	0			
		Yes	3			

Total	0
Out of	6

Summary

Members of assessment panel	

		Results	Comments
PART 1: All Projects	Pass / Fail	0	
PART 2a: All Projects	Score /24	0	
Part 2b: Building Energy Projects (Project specific criteria)	Score /15	0	
Part 2c: Biodiversity Projects (Project specific criteria)	Score /6	0	

Recommendation / Conditions	
------------------------------------	--

Grant Approval (HoS Environment & Waste Commissioning)	
Name:	
Signed:	
Date:	

Grant Approval (Team Manager)	
Name:	
Signed :	
Date:	