Cabinet



Title of Report:	Recommendation of the Grant Working Party: 5 September 2016 - Rural Initiatives Grant Scheme			
Report No:	CAB/SE/16/	050		
Report to and date:	Cabinet	18 October 2016		
Portfolio holder:	Robert Everitt Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities Tel: 01284 769000 Email: robert.everitt@stedsbc.gov.uk			
Chairman of the Working Party:	Angela Rushen Grant Working Party Tel: 01284 386647 Email: angela.rushen@stedsbc.gov.uk			
Lead officer:	Davina Howes Head of Families and Communities Tel: 01284 757070 Email: davina.howes@westsuffolk.gov.uk			
Purpose of report:	On 5 September 2016, the Grant Working Party considered the following substantive items of business: (1) Rural Initiatives Grant Scheme: Update; and (2) Community Chest 2016/2017: Monitoring and Evaluation			
	Recommendations emanating from discussions during Item (1) above are provided for Cabinet's consideration below.			
Recommendations:	It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that the criteria for the Rural Initiative Grant Scheme (RIGS) be amended so that the maximum amount that may be applied for under this scheme is reduced from £10,000 to £7,500, as detailed in section 1 of Report No: CAB/SE/16/050.			

Key Decision:		Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which				
(Check the appropriate		definition? Yes, it is a Key Decision - \square				
box and delete all those		-				
that do not apply.)	INO, IL IS	No, it is not a Key Decision - $oximes$				
Consultation:		Portfolio Holder and Grant Working Party				
Alternative option	ı(s):	• To				
		tha	that may be applied for under RIGS of			
		£10,000; how		owever the revised threshold of		
	£7,500 would help to increase the					
		-	projects that may receive funding from			
•			finite ring-fenced capital allocation.			
Implications:						
Are there any financial implications?			Yes ⊠ No □			
If yes, please give details			Funding for RIGS capital projects is			
			required to be allocated from the			
			funding pot available and within			
			the minimum and maximum			
			funding thresholds set in the approved criteria.			
Are there any staffing implications?		Yes □ No ⊠				
If yes, please give of		0113:				
Are there any ICT implications? If		` If	Yes □ No ⊠			
yes, please give det	•		•			
Are there any legal and/or policy		Yes □ No ⊠				
implications? If yes, please give		-	•			
details						
Are there any equality implicatio		ions?	Yes □ No ⊠			
If yes, please give details			•			
Risk/opportunity assessment:		it:	(potential hazards or opportunities affecting			
Risk area Inherent level of		vel of	corporate, service or project objectives) Controls Residual risk (after			
RISK al Ca	risk (before	vei oi	Controls	controls)		
	controls)			30.10.313)		
Excessive funding	Medium		Reduce maximum	Low		
allocations of grants			threshold to £7,500			
over £7,500 and up to $£10,000$ resulting in a			to enable a greater division of the entire			
rapid depletion of		RIGS fund between a				
finite funding RIGS			greater number of			
pot Ward(s) affected:			applicants. All Wards			
Background papers:		None				
		to be	None			
published on the website and						
included)						
Documents attached:			None			

1. Rural Initiatives Grant Scheme: Update (Agenda Item 6 - Narrative Item)

- 1.1 On 5 September 2016, the Working Party received and noted a narrative item which provided an update on the Rural Initiatives Grant Scheme (RIGS) and the projects that had recently received funding.
- 1.2 RIGS is a one-off match-funding grant scheme which is available to match fund rural projects alongside other funding streams. Under the current criteria, grants of between £250 and £10,000 may be applied for, which must be used for a specific capital project and contribute to the Council's strategic priorities. Larger grants of over £4,000 are reserved for village halls and recreational facilities, but smaller grants can be used for a wide variety of other schemes which benefit rural communities.
- 1.3 A balance of £52,370.56 currently remains in the RIGS fund; however this budget allocation is a limited capital sum and once all funding has been allocated to projects, no additional monies will be forthcoming.
- 1.4 A suggestion was made at the meeting by the officers to reduce the maximum amount that may be applied for under this scheme from £10,000 to £5,000, which would help enable the total balance remaining to be allocated to a greater number of projects and for RIGS to continue for a longer period.
- 1.5 Match-funding for projects may therefore take longer to be sought; however, officers will continue to support parishes and community groups to access appropriate funding sources and dedicate sufficient time to ensuring other essential elements are in place for enabling the project to come to fruition.
- 1.6 The Working Party considered however, that a maximum of £5,000 was too low, as Members felt this could restrict the development of some projects altogether. An alternative proposal of £7,500 maximum funding was therefore agreed, as set out in the recommendation contained on page one of this report.