

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP SCHEME – PROJECT ASSESSMENT****11 April 2006****Applicant:** Aston on Trent Memorial Hall Management Committee**Project:** "Fit for Purpose" – The internal refurbishment of the Memorial Hall

The purpose of this assessment is to establish whether the "fit for purpose" project application from Aston on Trent Memorial Hall Management Committee is an eligible application for funding from the Community Partnership Scheme.

The main issue raised by the panel was whether the items submitted for funding approval in the second application from the applicants were also submitted as part of the original Memorial Hall application in 2004/05.

By reviewing the content of both applications the following has been ascertained:

The original application focused on the structural elements of the building work and was supported by a QS estimate for works totalling £375,000, which did not include any of the items contained within the second application although it did include units, hob etc for the kitchen. The additional item included in the original application costing was professional fees of £19,000.

Confusion arises as in the costing section of the original application mention is made of refurbishment costs of £50,000 plus VAT although these are not supported by any quotes. Further in the QS estimate the cost of preliminaries is £50,000 and it may be that an interpretation or addition error has been made.

In the original application we therefore have costs taken from the QS paperwork as follows:

|                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Building Works | £314,669        |
| Preliminaries  | £50,000         |
| Contingencies  | £10,000         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>£374,669</b> |

We also have a budget written down in answer to Question 3.2 as

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Refurbishment                          | £50,000         |
| Sub total                              | £375,000        |
| VAT                                    | £9,000          |
| Professional Fees (architects, QS etc) | £19,000         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                           | <b>£403,000</b> |

The second application contains the following costs:

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Fittings  | £11,400        |
| Furnishings   | £6,250         |
| Kitchen Equipment (not installation of units)                       | £2,100         |
| Other Specialist Equipment (projector screen, office equipment etc) | £1,921         |
| Redecoration  | £1,870         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>£23,541</b> |

Also worthy of note in relation to the main issue are the following points:

Reference is made within the original application to storage, disability and kitchen requirements in terms of the consultation and overall need of the project but as stated above these requirements are not included in the QS provisions.

Note is made in the Business Plan submitted with the original allocation that funding needs to be set aside for "future major refurbishment"

There is no direct mention of a phase 2 in the original application.

The external funding for the 2 applications are totally distinct and separate.

In terms of other issues raised by the application:

**Different phases of a project being submitted and considered separately.** A precedent has been set. The scheme has supported two applications for different phases of both the redevelopment of West St Methodist Church project and The Dalbury Lees Village Hall project. This process/strategy is not precluded in the scheme guidelines and phasing is currently promoted as a project development option to applicants (subject to certain provisos) by officers.

**Applicants receiving two grants for the same project in a single year.** Does not apply as original grant was in 2004/05

## **Conclusions**

Although both applications support the same overall project, it is fairly clear that the costs can be separated out to relate to different phases within that project. However the misalignment of supporting evidence and stated project costs within the original application causes difficulty in determining categorically to what extent refurbishment costs were part of the original bid.

Evidence within the applications plus project updates and correspondence suggests that some refurbishment was always envisaged as a further stage to the project.

What can be assured is that to complete the project to the standard and specification desired by the community then further funding is required with or without further support from the Community Partnerships Scheme.

The scheme budget, guidelines and precedents are not barriers to assessing the application at a future panel meeting, however the Committee needs to determine whether the second application is sufficiently different and discrete to warrant a potential second award from the scheme.