

**SOUTHERN RURAL COMMITTEE  
25 SEPTEMBER 2014**

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**AGENDA ITEM No.**

**8**

**TITLE OF REPORT: JOHN CLEMENTS/CODICOTE SPORTS CENTRE – UPDATE AND GRANT APPLICATION**

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF POLICY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

PORTFOLIO HOLDER: COUNCILLOR TONY HUNTER, COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND RURAL AFFAIRS

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 To update the Southern Rural Committee on progress toward the development of the proposed John Clements Sports Centre at Codicote.
- 1.2 To provide members of the Southern Rural Committee with a progress report toward funding secured, pledged and still awaited, in order to inform the latest application for NHDC grant funding toward this facility.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the Committee note progress to date toward the provision of a new sports and community facility for Codicote, to be a memorial to the late John Clements.
- 2.2 That the Committee, after due consideration of officer comments and recognising that the scheme is in an early stage of development, consider an award from revenue funds available to go toward fittings and furnishings for the centre once the main building works are completed.

**3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 To ensure that Members of the Committee have an informed position on the matter at hand, in order to consider an appropriate level of grant award.
- 3.2 The awarding of financial assistance to voluntary organisations and the use of discretionary spending allows the Committee to further the aims and Priorities of the Council.

**4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 As this is a project instigated designed and proposed by the community, alternative options are not appropriate, other than suggestions provided by NHDC officers (and referred to in relevant areas) regarding funding, design and operational issues.

## **5. CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND WARD MEMBERS**

- 5.1 The various proposals referred to within this report have been discussed with previous and existing Portfolio holders, not only for Community Engagement and Rural Affairs, but also Leisure and Environmental. There have been funding discussions between officers and external funding groups/advisors, such as Sport England, North Herts CVS etc, as well as on-going discussion with the Codicote Parish Council and ward members.

## **6. FORWARD PLAN**

- 6.1 The proposals in this report do not constitute a key decision and therefore have not been included in the Forward Plan.

## **7 BACKGROUND**

- 7.1 In 2005, the Codicote Parish Council agreed to investigate the replacement of the aging green 'portakabin' type clubhouse which currently remains in use by the village for a range of activities. The proposed new facility was intended to better serve the residents of Codicote and the immediate catchment area of surrounding villages. A survey of the local population was conducted which identified that residents wished to see a facility which could provide a range of indoor sports, such as football, basketball, volleyball, badminton, hockey, gymnastics, plus aerobics and other fitness activities, all of which require a multi use sports hall with supporting facilities.
- 7.2 The Recreation Committee originally managed the project on behalf of the Parish Council. The Parish Council agreed at its October 2009 meeting to make a contribution of £29,000 towards the overall budget requirements.
- 7.3 Following an application to the North Herts LSP, a provisional 'pledge' of £60,000 capital funding for the Codicote Sports Centre (referred to as the John Clements Sport and Community Centre by way of memorial to the late John Clements of Codicote) was recommended by the North Hertfordshire Partnership (LSP) as part of the first round of 'Performance Reward Grant' allocations on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2010.
- 7.4 The pledge was made against the following proposal – The project had planning permission for the demolition of existing structure and rebuild of a much larger, two storey sports and social centre on the same site. The build and allied costs were estimated at £1.7 million, with a target for completion of November 2011. It was noted at the time that whilst there was, and continues to be, significant partner support for the capital proposal for the build of the John Clements sports and social centre at Codicote, it was recognised that this presented considerable risks in terms of commitment to spend and its future operation.
- 7.5 The Local Strategic Partnership agreed that the conditional award of £60,000 should be set aside for the Centre. The first condition was that no physical payment would be made before April 2011. The second, that the payment was subject to the project receiving a 'substantial commitment' of funding from other sources by the end of April 2011. This approach was endorsed in full by the NHDC Cabinet, who were required to endorse the expenditure of the PRG under the terms of the grant (NHDC Cabinet July 2010).

- 7.6 The Codicote Sports Centre also secured a provisional award of £50,000 PACIF (Parish Amenity and Capital Investment Funding) funding from the Council in March 2011. This award was made with similar conditions attached, that there had to be significant additional funding secured before any payment from NHDC would be made, but in this case with a deadline of the start of April 2012. This was also to ensure any expenditure of this portion would align with the criteria attached to PACIF.
- 7.7 In March 2011, the Council's Cabinet noted that the proposed £60,000 capital allocation toward the Codicote Sports Centre project still remained subject to a report back to the LSP; at Cabinet later in 2011, it was agreed that the project must demonstrate any progress with the scheme or, following expiry of the condition applied, that the capital sum pledged would be returned to the authority for reassigning to other projects under the terms of grant.
- 7.8 On review in May 2011, it was agreed at the LSP Board of partner agencies, that 90% of the necessary funding should be in place by April 2012 in order for the project to retain the set aside 'Performance Reward Grant' (PRG) funding. (90% of the estimated construction costs of £1.7 million would be £1.5 million). Any consideration of continuation of the PRG grant would be reviewed and agreed by the LSP after the deadline had passed. This extension acknowledged that a decision on an application to Sport England, for £350,000, had yet to be made. An initial decision, not to support the bid was confirmed by Sport England in autumn 2011. This was due to concerns regarding the capacity of the project to raise additional, match funding, but with agreement that the date for Sport England's next decision-making round would be announced by April 2012. The project would then have a second opportunity to apply. The subsequent extension of deadline was agreed with LSP partners to enable this funding to be pursued further, whilst reiterating to the project manager/fund raiser that extending the offer of the Performance Reward Grant funding could not be indefinite.
- 7.9 Council officers received an update from the project manager on the latest position concerning this scheme in April 2012. At that point, the total funds that had been raised at that time were £49,389, of which £19,000 had been spent on planning, marketing and fund raising. Therefore, as of April 2012, the funds that remained that would contribute to the construction of the proposed Sports Centre totalled **£30,389**. The second bid to Sport England had also proven unsuccessful. The feedback received was that '***The project did not result in facilities of regional significance for a minimum of two national governing bodies of sport; the focus was on delivery of a sport at a local level.....the project did not provide enough assurance that the full funding would be secured from other parties***'.
- 7.10 With only a total of £357,000 – that being £30,389 cash, and pledges £326,500 - this did not achieve the 90% of the necessary funding in place by April 2012 to retain the PRG funding. Whilst the commitment to pledge money shows local support to a project, it is vital that in order to secure additional grant funding, all such pledges are collected and shown to have been 'banked' and not simply promised. Larger funders especially require a much greater degree of certainty.

- 7.11 The John Clements Centre originally secured planning permission for the original proposal, i.e. Offering a multi use sports facility, and a number of rooms and opportunities for social activities, including a function area with bar, the latter offering the greatest opportunity to recoup running costs. NHDC Officers had explored the possibility of developing the project in a modular manner i.e. ground floor only with option to expand upward later, providing a degree of opportunity to earn towards the subsequent build phase. This later phase could then take place primarily as the economic climate changed. The Project Manager rebutted this, stating that only the original mix of sports hall and community centre developed as one could generate the necessary revenue to make the project viable.
- 7.12 In light of this information, it was agreed at the 24<sup>th</sup> April 2012 LSP meeting of partner agencies, that the following conditions would be applied:
- **that the partnership support the extension of this award in principle, but only until the end of June 2012, to allow the decision regarding the next £100k grant to be made, and to line up with any proposed withdrawal of the Council's PACIF pledge of £50k too.**
  - **Were the pledge of £60,000 to remain in place until June 2012, that a further condition that a 'significant further sum bringing the total available to 50% that estimated as being required' should be evidenced at the end of June 2012, which acknowledged the substantial the gap which would still exist between the sum received and that required to complete the project**
- 7.13 At the June 2012 Cabinet meeting a request for Cabinet approval was made: ' that officers formally withdraw the Performance Reward Grant provisional award of £60,000 to the proposed Codicote Sports Centre at the end of June 2012, should the group not be able to demonstrate by 30<sup>th</sup> June receipt of sufficient additional funding.'
- 7.14 However prior to the report being presented, under 'public participation', the Project Manager referred Cabinet members to the project group having more recently developed a revised plan for the construction of the proposed sports and community centre.
- 7.15 The Project Manager provided papers to Cabinet members at that meeting that outlined a two phased project. The first phase to start in early 2013 and the second phase at a later date, funds permitting. The first phase comprised of the construction of the community/social aspect of the building only. The construction for the sports hall and corresponding changing rooms would only take place in phase two. The papers indicated that the estimated cost of construction for phase one would now be below £700,000. It was at this point, that the Project Manager intimated that on this basis, the John Clement Community Trust had achieved the condition made by the LSP of achieving the 50% (£357,000 of pledged funds including the PRG funds) of funding to be in place by June 2012.

- 7.16 Officers were not privy to these revised papers, prior to the Cabinet meeting and so their content was not reflected in the report that recommended a withdrawal of PRG funding at the end of June 2012. However, Cabinet were made aware that whilst officers had requested the John Clements Centre project be reconsidered as a two (or more) phase building project on several previous occasions, the project manager had consistently upheld this would not be possible as it would increase costs and reduce the viability of the overall project. There was also a degree of risk that were the social/community and bar area only to be developed, then funding committed so far toward a 'sports facility' could be put at risk.
- 7.17 The Project Manager also advised Cabinet that there were currently four bids outstanding, amounting to around £200,000. Six further funders (value £150,000) had indicated the Trust should re-approach them when 50% of the funds were in place. There were also two other funds (worth £150,000), one where the Trust had been asked to re-apply soon and the other to apply to a new capital fund by September 2012. In addition, the Trust would approach again its existing 5 pledgers of £150,000 for additional funds in support of a two phased approach. This amounted to 17 known funds and a potential of £650,000, and that the Trust believed £350,000 of these new funds could be raised by early 2013 to commence Phase 1 of the scheme.
- 7.18 The then Portfolio Holder for Community Engagement and Rural Affairs noted the recommendation to withdraw funding, but in view of the very recent change of approach, was minded to allow the Trust a further, short, period of grace. Cllr Cowley therefore, recommended that the Local Strategic Partnership be requested to retain the £60,000 funding for a further period of 3 months from 30<sup>th</sup> June 2012, (therefore until the end of September 2012), to enable the submission of a new Business Plan for the proposed Sports Centre based on a phased approach for development of the scheme. Cabinet therefore supported the following resolutions:
- (1) That the North Hertfordshire Local Strategic Partnership decision to continue with the Performance Reward Grant pledge of £60,000 for the proposed Codicote Sports Centre, but only until the end of June 2012 latest, be noted; and**
- (2) That the Local Strategic Partnership be requested to retain the £60,000 funding for a further period of 3 months from 30 June 2012, to enable the submission of a new Business Plan for the proposed Sports Centre based on a phased approach for development of the scheme.**
- 7.19 The Cabinet resolution of the Portfolio holder was tabled at the September LSP meeting for discussion. This was that '*the Local Strategic Partnership be requested to retain the £60,000 funding for a further period of 3 months from 30 June 2012, to enable the submission of a new Business Plan for the proposed Sports Centre based on a phased approach for development of the scheme*'.
- 7.20 The Local Strategic partnership did not support the extension of this award in principle. It agreed that it would return the capital sum of £60,000 to the general account for PRG and award to other projects as the June 2012 deadline had now expired, and without sufficient certainty regarding additional funding being secured.

- 7.21 The Head of Policy and Community Services therefore wrote to the Project Manager in October 2012, to confirm that both the PACIF and Performance Reward Grant had been withdrawn. A meeting was held in May 2013 between relevant NHDC officers, members and the Project group. This meeting discussed the possibility of other funding being made available towards the proposed centre and the now phased construction of the centre.
- 7.22 A revised business plan with a phased build was submitted on the 7<sup>th</sup> June 2013 for review. This was carefully reviewed by NHDC officers. The assessment was that the business plan did not provide sufficient evidence of future sustainability or income and therefore could not guarantee the completion of the Phase Two works. Further, the 'evidence' of need remained insufficient, based primarily on anecdotal statements regarding provision of diversionary activities, to reduce ASB, reduce teenage pregnancy etc, when no significant level of either existed; there has always been, and remains, a deficit of statistical evidence of potential sports need, specific facilities which could be provided at the location to address any deficit, which would generally be required especially by 'sports' funders.
- 7.23 The Parish Council remain committed to the project, with a continuing wish to replace the existing facility with a more modern, but sustainable one. A Parish council meeting held in September 2013 to discuss the proposed sports and community centre was ultimately abandoned due to the conduct of members of the public, who continued to disrupt the discussions. A meeting was subsequently convened on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2013 at NHDC by the Head of Policy and Community Services to bring the Parish Council and their project group together to achieve a common 'vision' and to gain agreement from all parties on a single proposal. Sport England, recipients of a number of grant applications to date, were also represented at this meeting and were able to offer guidance regarding their criteria for funding, recognising as they do too that there is a need for many rural 'sports' facilities to offer a bar facility to achieve sufficient income to cover running costs, but that a sports facility cannot and should not be heavily reliant on such income.
- 7.24 Thereafter, it was agreed that a single storey building should be built in one phase. Copies of the plans were submitted to NHDC and Sport England for consideration. The new building estimate for the centre as proposed was £580,000.
- 7.25 A revised supporting business plan was submitted to NHC for assessment in March 2014 (dated the January 2014 business plan). NHDC officers reviewing the operational proposals felt that the business plan was very similar to that seen the previous June, with a number of unknown factors still present and still with considerable reliance placed on income from bar/drink sales, which is not entirely in synergy with the principle of a healthy sports facility.
- 7.26 Sport England subsequently published official notification that it had awarded a grant of £50,000 towards the John Clements Centre. However, Sport England as funders are generally last to contribute their award, requiring other funders to contribute toward the earlier phases of any construction project. This provides greater surety that their small grant awards contribute toward only the most viable projects which 'cross the finishing line'.

## 8 CURRENT POSITION

- 8.1 Full Planning Permission has been granted for the development of a new Sports and Community Hall at the existing site on Bury Lane Codicote, alongside the existing facility. The original planning permission related to the original, larger facility, being developed further across the plot, and thus that original planning permission will now need to be withdrawn by application, and subject to relevant planning fees, which do not currently show in the 'build cost' estimates.
- 8.2 The land on which the facility is to stand is owned by the Codicote Parish Council and therefore negotiations have been on-going in regard to the John Clements Trust securing the lease to enable development to take place. These negotiations recently concluded and the lease is now agreed, albeit there have been legal fee costs to both parties which may affect the sum ultimately available toward the build costs identified; we understand this may reduce the amount remaining by contribution from the Parish Council to around half that originally anticipated, leaving an additional gap for which funding will need to be secured.
- 8.3 With regard to funding now 'in the bank' we are attaching the latest breakdown of receipts into the Trust's bank accounts (appendix A) which show that they have approximately £153k on deposit. With the Sport England sum of £50k confirmed, this brings the total available to £203k, toward an estimated build cost of £497,940, under JCT agreement with the preferred building contractor.
- 8.4 Pledges from personal contributors have still not been secured and shown in the bank account; we understand that a number of these contributors wish to remain anonymous benefactors, albeit the Money Laundering Regulations under which the Codicote Parish Council must abide require that the source of such pledges must be revealed, at least to their auditor, to ensure appropriate financial governance is in place. There is also a risk that not all of those originally pledging to support the scheme will now come forward as their financial position may well have changed in the intervening years, during which the original scheme has been developed, changed and resubmitted.
- 8.5 The proposals as now made and which have secured full planning permission are not in the original 'four court' configuration which could have brought the greatest degree of financial gain.

The size of the hall is important, as it permits a range of different sports to take place in a single facility, and also meets the criteria which relevant sports leagues require for formal competition. Sport England (SE) guidance states that the dimensions of a single badminton court are 13.4m x 6.1m x 6.1m high. As badminton is seen as the sport which has the most influence over the design of sport halls, this is a good benchmark to adopt. SE guidance regards the single badminton court space as the smallest practical multi-sport space. Therefore, for a small hall the minimum dimensions for a hall to accommodate one badminton court are as follows:

It continues that distance between each baseline and wall should be 2m each side. So the total length should be 17.4m (13.4+2+2).

The distance between each side-line and wall should be between 1.5m – 2m each side. Therefore the minimum width would be 9.1m (6.1+1.5+1.5).

Therefore the overall minimum dimensions, according to SE, are 17.4m x 9.1m x 6.1m high. The guidance states that this area will accommodate the following range of activities:

Badminton	Yoga
Short mat bowls	Playgroups
Gymnastics	Table Tennis
Aerobics/keep fit	5 a side football
Martial Arts	Short tennis
Judo	Fencing

It does also state that other more social activities (receptions, weddings etc) can be held, and we understand will be the intention. However, the hall as proposed is the absolute minimum requirement for a sports hall to be feasible.

#### 8.6 Overview of current sports hall provision within the District

There are 11 sports halls in North Herts on 9 sites providing for the needs of the wider community, although 5 are on school sites, with limited access, and only 3 traditional local authority 'public' halls.

There is a significant surplus of overall supply compared with demand, though this is less marked when 'comfortable' levels of use are considered. Satisfied demand is very high compared with the average, and unmet demand consequently low. Most of this unmet demand is caused by the distance/time that residents have to travel to halls, particularly for those without a car, though there is a significant proportion (20%) due to lack of capacity at some halls, particularly the main local authority facilities.

There is insufficient unmet demand in any one location to justify additional halls for this reason. Relative share of sports halls confirms that North Herts residents' availability is at about the national average.

Overall throughput at existing halls is generally below 'comfortable' levels of use though some halls are operating at or beyond their capacity.

North Herts exports much demand outside of the district, and therefore relies on neighbouring LA areas to accommodate some of its demand. Only about 60% of total demand generated in the district is met and retained there.

Accessibility to sports halls is good for most local residents. The level of satisfied demand for sports halls in North Herts is at a level that is unlikely to be exceeded (it is never possible to meet all demand, mainly for reasons of accessibility), and additional halls in other locations cannot be justified at the present time.

However the three main local authority sports halls are operating at capacity, and additional space could therefore be considered, either on these sites by increasing capacity, or by improving community access to other halls on school sites.



- 8.7 NHDC officers have most recently secured the project group's latest business plan regarding the anticipated operation of the centre. It shows that the surplus from operation of the current facility has already diminished in recent years, falling from £9,200 in 2011, to £3,100 in 2012 and for 2013, declined to just £2,300 profit. The plan anticipates greater surpluses going forward, with a trajectory from £2,700 in 2015 to an estimated £10,300 in 2018 but there are currently no indications what proportion of this would be attributed to events/bar sales and how much to income from sporting use, court hire etc. Whilst it is only right that the income generated from events and alcohol sales contribute to the running costs of the sports centre, there cannot be too high a reliance on such sales, especially when one considers that a number of local pubs already exist and at times struggle to maintain profitability.
- 8.8 There remains insufficient evidence of 'need' for certain sports within the business plan. There is a wealth of information available from Sport England and similar groups' studies which could be used to demonstrate areas of need, or sports for which there remains inadequate provision.

In terms of current need, the NHDC Sports Facilities Strategy 2013 – 2031 concludes that the existing level of demand from within the district through applying a Sports Facility Calculator model, is for about 8.5 large 4-court halls.

The model suggest that there is some export of demand to sports halls outside the district, mainly because some residents in the rural parts of the district adjacent to especially Luton and Stevenage are likely to use facilities there.

- There is slightly below average supply of sports halls in North Herts compared with the average.
- Accessibility is good and most residents at least in towns are within a reasonable walking distance of a sports hall.
- Because of the availability of halls just outside the district, relative share for local residents is quite high.

For these reasons, satisfied demand overall is very high, and there is insufficient unmet demand over the whole district at present to justify any additional sports halls.

Capacity is not used up overall, but some facilities particularly the 3 main halls within the district are operating at or above their capacity, so additional space could perhaps be focused at these sites by increasing capacity, or by improving community access to other halls on school sites.

Current provision of sports halls is deemed therefore adequate overall, but this relies on all existing halls being available in some degree to community use. If the main local authority halls alone are considered, there is a deficit in provision. Better use of school halls is required to maintain this level of provision at present, and avoid existing halls being overused.

Based on the results of the planning tools models used within the Sports Facilities Strategy the current provision of the equivalent of 8 sports halls is broadly in balance with local demand for demand for 8.5 halls, so long as all halls contribute towards community use, and some demand continues to be met in neighbouring local authority areas. Current level of provision therefore is the equivalent of about 1 4-court hall per 15,300 people.

- 8.9 It is our understanding that this project would commence building on site from 15<sup>th</sup> September 2014, with the funding which is currently available to it; Codicote Parish Council have agreed a 'step in' clause with the project team, which means that should the project start to fail or be unable to complete, they will take the building over. Similarly, should the sports and social centre fail to return a profit; it will remain the responsibility of the Parish to finance any shortfall, so this still represents considerable risks to the Codicote Parish Council financially.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The Terms of Reference in relation to Area Committees confirm that they may establish and maintain relationships with outside bodies/voluntary organisations which include discretionary grant aid/financial support. However, this does not include grants for district wide activities.
- 9.2 Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 provides that the Council has power to do anything that individuals generally may do, which builds on the powers in section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 which gives power to do anything the Council considers likely to promote or improve the economic, social or environmental well-being of its area. This would apply on the basis that financial assistance to voluntary and community organisations improves the economic, social or environmental well-being of the District or part of it.
- 9.3 Section 137 Local Government Act 1972 provides specific authority for the Council to incur expenditure on anything which is in the interests of and will bring direct benefit to its area. This includes a charity or other body operating for public service.
- 9.4 The Committee has delegated powers to administer funds from the budgets described, provided they meet the financial criteria as set out for area committee revenue and capital expenditure (outlined in Financial Implications below).

## **10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 Given that there still remains a degree of uncertainty about the remainder of funding toward this project being secured before anticipated build commences, any funding which NHDC contribute should be subject to relevant conditions in order to ensure the authority's grant is protected from use on a project which may not complete.
- 10.2 In advance of granting any award to the project, NHDC, or at least the Parish Council, must also be provided with information in regard to the source of any anonymous benefactors, to ensure compliance with relevant Money Laundering and other relevant financial regulations.
- 10.3 NHDC has continued to invest significant sums in its rural areas in recent years; Codicote as a parish has received £52,427 over the past ten years toward a number of schemes, including remedial works at the Peace Memorial Hall, the Codicote Local History Society, Codicote Village Day, Codicote Youth Rugby Club and to the Parish Council under the Environmental Improvement Fund for litter picking in the village. There also remains an offer of £10k-£12k toward DDA improvements to the Peace Memorial Hall, which is funding set aside from Rural Halls Capital Scheme.

- 10.4 Under the Council's existing grants policy, and in particular the *criteria* under which Area Committees can commit funds, the following sections would need to be considered/fulfilled in order that any award could take place.

*(Excerpts from Revised criteria for Area committee grants 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2009)*

### **3. TYPES OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING**

#### **10. Area Committee Major Works Schemes**

- *This category is concerned with building construction, maintenance and highways works that Committees may wish to support up to a maximum value of £20,000 in any one year.*
- *Requests for such schemes are likely to come from Hertfordshire Highways who may be seeking partner funding for particular projects.*
- *Area Committees themselves may also wish to make a contribution to the refurbishment of premises at a cost that is outside the capital programme de minimus level of £28,000 for building works or £15,000 for equipment or vehicle purchase. (NB These de minimus levels are now no longer valid)*
- *Funding for these works can be either on a whole or part/matched project basis and will reflect revenue contributions to bigger capital schemes.*

#### **11. Area Committee Major Community Development Schemes**

- *This category allows Area Committees to commission bigger community development projects, including staffing costs, either on a one-off basis or within a defined timescale up to three years. This three year funding is renewable following a review and evaluation of the project.*
- *The maximum value of this scheme would be £20,000 for a single scheme in any one year. Funding would allow for interim measures to be put in place to pilot or support larger projects.*
- *Schemes of more than one year would be managed through a Service Level Agreement in the longer term.*
- *Funding for these types of schemes can be either on a whole or part/matched project basis.*

- 10.5 Officers would advise that in regard to the grant application as submitted the committee may wish to consider the option under 10 above re the provision of a revenue contribution to a larger capital scheme; this would enable the committee to contribute not toward the physical build of the facility (capital) but toward final fittings and 'furnishing' once the facility is available for use (revenue).

- 10.6 This would also ensure that the committee is compliant with Financial Regulations and Contract Standing Orders in regard to the use of revenue/capital, as the remaining budgets available within the Southern Rural Area Committee are revenue only.

Breakdown of Unallocated Southern Rural Grant Budgets 2014/15 to date:-

Former MoU budget	£3990
Youth & Sport budget	£2717
Community Projects budget	£3716
Main Development budget	<u>£18790</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>£29,213</b>

### **11. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 This project has not been recorded as a risk on Covalent, the Council's Performance & Risk system as it represents a risk to the Codicote Parish Council/John Clements Charitable Trust.

- 11.2 Funding has previously been allocated to this scheme by NHDC and other bodies, although subsequently withdrawn (and reallocated to other projects ready to progress) due to lack of scheme progress. Consideration should be given as to whether the overall scheme position has fundamentally changed since then in terms of likelihood of completion.
- 11.3 By making any investment at this stage, before all relevant funding for build costs has been secured, NHDC could be seen to be risking investment of public money in something which may well not complete. It may therefore be prudent to make it a condition of any award that it will be paid only when there is sufficient evidence all other funding is in place. The additional risk of course is in making any award which is against the agreed policy of the Council, the authority could lay itself open to additional, significant calls for funding from other North Herts parishes.
- 11.4 Given that there remain a number of unknown, personal grant contributors to this project, members should be advised that it will be a condition of making any grant that those contributors are identified, at least to the Parish Council (but their names not made public) in order to ensure there is no potential 'conflict of interest' which may arise, or that any individual or organisation contributing does so in conflict with the principles of the local authority.

## **12. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1 The Equality Act 2010 came into force on the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010, a major piece of legislation. The Act also created a new Public Sector Equality Duty, which came into force on the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011. There is a General duty, described in 12.2, that public bodies must meet, underpinned by more specific duties which are designed to help meet them.
- 12.2 In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty, public bodies must, in the exercise of its functions, give due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 12.3 The proposed redevelopment of the Codicote Sports and Social Centre could provide a facility which can be used by a wide range of the local community, different age groups, ages etc. However, this should be complementary to the use by others in the local community of facilities such as the Peace Memorial Hall, in its more central location in the village.

## **13. SOCIAL VALUE IMPLICATIONS**

- 13.1 As the recommendations made in this report do not constitute a public service contract, the measurement of 'social value' as required by the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 need not be applied, although equalities implications and opportunities are identified in the relevant section at paragraphs 12.

## **14. HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1 There are no pertinent Human Resource implications associated with any items within this report

## **15. APPENDICES**

15.1 Appendix 1 Grant Summary Form

## **16. CONTACT OFFICERS**

16.1 Author: Liz Green, Head of Policy & Community Services  
Telephone: 01462 474230  
Email: [liz.green@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:liz.green@north-herts.gov.uk)

16.2 Contributors: Reuben Ayavoo, Policy Officer  
Telephone: 01462 474212  
Email: [reuben.ayavoo@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:reuben.ayavoo@north-herts.gov.uk)

Anthony Roche, Acting Corporate Legal Manager  
Telephone: 01462 474588  
Email: [anthony.roche@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:anthony.roche@north-herts.gov.uk)