Minutes of meeting held on Wednesday, 4 February 2015 at 6.00 pm

Present:—
Councillors David Tutt (chairman and leader of the council), Gill Mattock (deputy chairman and deputy leader of the council), Margaret Bannister, Troy Tester and Steve Wallis.

(An apology for absence was received from councillor Carolyn Heaps).

50 Minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2014
The minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2014 were submitted and approved and the chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record.

51 Declarations of interests by members.
Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests (DPIs) by members as required under section 31 of the Localism Act and other interests as required by the council’s code of conduct and regulation 12(2)(d) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.

No declarations were made.

52 Future arrangements for the council's building control services.
52.1 Cabinet considered the report of the senior head of community. In April 2011 Eastbourne Borough Council and Wealden District Council had entered into a 5 year partnership agreement for the joint provision of building control services across the respective districts. The partnership had worked successfully for the past 4 years, however the building control market had grown rapidly and with increased competition from private companies providing building control services and pressures on budgets, councils were facing a reduction of their market share as well as increasing costs.

52.2 To assist in reducing current and future financial pressures it was proposed that the partnership set up a wholly owned local authority company. Taking advantage of recent developments in public procurement law, this company would then be able to operate more fully in the building control market by offering additional services such as new house warranties, and warranties for extensions and other works, sound resting, fire risk assessments, access audits, energy performance certificates and standard assessment procedure calculations for energy use. The revenue raised by offering these additional services could be used to off-set the increasing financial burden of the non-chargeable
work the council was obliged to undertake to meet its statutory obligations.

52.3 Current costs of delivering the non-chargeable aspects of the service were in the region of £199,000 split (£127,000/£72,000 Wealden/ Eastbourne). Without mitigating the threats coming from the private sector, both councils were at risk from increased costs in performing their statutory building control duties. The objective would be for costs to remain at the current level and for a reduction over time.

52.4 Resolved (key decision): (1) That the principle of setting up a wholly owned local authority company for building control services subject to a business case, legal advice and proposed governance arrangements be endorsed.

(2) That the senior head of community be given delegated authority to work with Wealden District Council to develop the business case, for consideration at a future Cabinet meeting

53 Corporate performance - Quarter 3 2014/15.

53.1 Cabinet considered the report of the deputy chief executive and chief finance officer and senior head of corporate development and governance reviewing the council’s performance against corporate plan priority indicators and action targets; financial performance of general fund revenue expenditure, housing revenue account and capital programme; and treasury management activities for the third quarter of 2014/15. Throughout the year, performance against these key indicators and milestones was reported to cabinet on a quarterly basis and to scrutiny committee members each month.

53.2 Devolved budget scheme progress was highlighted; with a record 80 projects funded and a total spend to date of £81,537. The projected general fund revenue outturn showed an underspend of £187,000. This was within 1.1% of the net budget and was within an acceptable tolerance level. The contingency allowance currently stood at £112,950; £40,000 of which had been earmarked for use leaving a balance of £72,950 for funding any future unforeseen one off areas of expenditure during the remainder of the year. The projected outturn for the housing revenue account indicated a surplus of £104,000. Actual expenditure on the capital programme, at 47% of the budget, was lower than expected as a number of schemes had been delayed. The 2014/15 programme would be re-profiled to reflect start dates and planned works.

53.3 Other performance matters highlighted included:
- Time taken to process housing and council tax benefit claims where migration to a new system had necessitated a close down period and resultant backlog of work.
- Good collection fund and investment performance.
- The impact of tenant refusals on the decent homes programme.
- The increase in the number of fly-tipping reports being received as a result of the new report-it app.
52.4 Resolved (key decision): (1) That the performance against national and local performance indicators and actions from the 2010/15 corporate plan (2014 refresh) be agreed.

(2) That the general fund, housing revenue account and collection fund financial performance for the quarter ended December 2014, as set out in sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the report be agreed.

(3) That the transfer to and from reserves as set out in appendix 3 to the report be approved.

(4) That the amended capital programme as set out in appendix 4 to the report be approved.

(5) That the treasury management performance as set out in section 7 of the report be agreed.

54.4 The budget proposals included:
- No increase in the council tax in 2015/16.
- Overall savings totalling £1.5m (9% of the net budget).
• Efficiency savings of £1 (6% of the net budget).
• Inflation of £0.6m (4% of the net budget).
• Other recurring service growth of £0.4m.
• Non recurring service investments of £0.5m.
• General reserves averaging in excess of £4m (against a minimum recommended of £2m).
• Capital receipts of £0.8m invested in new capital schemes.

54.5 The budget represented management of financial risks by:
• Building on a favourable outturn position.
• Balancing the base budget requirement without needing to use reserves for recurring expenditure.
• Identifiable and deliverable savings with accountability and no general unidentified targets.
• Reserves well above the minimum level.
• Zero basing of minor reward grants.
• Providing the funding required for the DRIVE change programme to deliver the future savings required by the MTFS via the strategic change fund.

54.6 The underlying methods of local government financing were changing significantly from 2013/14 and 2014/15 onwards and included the wrapping up of grants in the base "Start Up Funding" notably:
• The localisation of council tax grant (previously £1.2m).
• The council tax freeze grants.
• Some new burdens grants.

For Eastbourne the headline figures of the government settlement were:
• A reduction in revenue support grant (RSG) of £1.2m (30%).
• Partially offset by new homes bonus (NHB) (additional £0.2m in 2015/16).

54.7 The national non-domestic business rate base had increased slightly (£0.2m), largely as a result of the inflationary increase which had been capped at 2%. In addition to the formula grant, the government was financing the cost of a 1% increase in council tax (£86,000) which it had confirmed would be put in the base for 2016/17 and beyond. The government had announced that Eastbourne would receive £1.1m in total of NHB due to the growth in housing in the area and the further reduction in empty properties. The grant was paid in tranches for six years. The 2015/16 figure included five tranches. The funding was not guaranteed beyond a 6 year horizon for each tranche. The projected award for 2016/17 was £1.3m. The government was financing the additional NHB from reductions in RSG, therefore, whilst volatile, it was currently the preferred method of distribution of resources.

54.8 No increase in council tax for 2014/15 was proposed and this would result in an unchanged band D rate of £224.19. The council was required to give an indication of likely future council tax rises. It was still expected that council tax would rise by no more than 2% per annum for each of the next three years. This was the government’s target for inflation and also the current ceiling on rises that would otherwise require a referendum in order to exceed. Within this context, for
2015/16, the council would raise £7.3m from its share of the council tax. This was determined by multiplying the council tax base of band D equivalent dwellings by the band D tax rate of £224.19. This was unchanged from the tax base setting report submitted to cabinet on 10 December last. In addition, there was a distribution of £24,000 payable by the council to the collection fund due to a small collection fund surplus.

54.9 A summary of the resources available was given, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>£’m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government formula grant</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained business rates</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New homes bonus</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council tax freeze grant</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council tax</td>
<td>(7.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total resources available (rounded)** (15.2)

In order to achieve a balanced budget without using reserves, the council would need to set a net expenditure budget for 2015/16 of £15.2m.

54.10 In addition to the general grant distributed through the new formula grant system, which was given towards financing the council’s net expenditure, the government also provided some specific grants. These specific grants would fund in part or in full, service costs.

Grant 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>£’m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing benefit subsidy</td>
<td>(c.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing benefit administration</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53.11 Housing benefit subsidy was intended to reimburse the Council for the awards of benefit it made to eligible tenants in both the private and public rented sector. Not only is this by far the largest single specific grant that the council received, but it was performance related. The council had improved its performance in recent years. A new system of universal credits was due to be completed in October 2017 which would see the caseload moved to the Department for Work and Pensions. Responsibility for council tax benefit had now devolved to a local level. Housing benefit administration grant funded the cost of administering the national housing benefit and local council tax support schemes (a reduction of 15% from the 2013/14 funding) It was noted that the former homelessness grant (to assist with prevention and to find alternative accommodation other than bed and breakfast) had now been subsumed into the main grant system.

54.12 In December, cabinet had put forward their draft budget proposals, the main movements since then were detailed in appendix 1 to the report as summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement from 2014/15 base budget</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Change in resources:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue support grant and new homes bonus</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly refuse collection grant</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained business rates</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council tax – increase in tax base</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost increases:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unavoidable costs increases and changes in income</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Savings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency savings</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Income/other changes</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced contributions to reserves</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54.13 Details of proposed growth and savings were given in full in appendix 2 to the report. The proposals set out in the report would allow full council on 18 February to approve a balanced budget in line with available resources and without the need to use reserves.

54.14 The council now followed a rolling 3-year financial planning cycle and the service and financial plans had been set out in detail for 2015/16. The next MTFS was due in July and would project forward a further 3 years and continue to provide the basis of service and financial planning for the medium term. It was noted that the significant level of the savings required for the next MTFS had already been identified. Further reports to cabinet would detail the business plans under the council’s transformation programme (DRIVE). The government had set out a revised 4-year programme of reductions in funding and the Council’s current MTFS already took this into account. The change programmes in place, such as the agile working programme and the sustainable service delivery strategy (SSDS) and the rest of the DRIVE programme, would deliver savings over and above the minimum in order to create headroom for investment in priority services.

54.15 The council sought to set an operational budget with careful consideration of known risks, but accepted that this could not cover every eventuality. As a consequence the council sets a contingency budget and holds a minimum level of general reserve as a hedge against additional and significant financial turbulence.

54.16 The report detailed the principal financial risks the council was likely to face, as follows:

- Housing benefit subsidy performance.
- Inflation on goods and services.
- Income from services linked to customer choice (theatres, tourism; sports centres, car parking).
- Demand led services.
- Legal challenges.
- Savings being delayed.

On an exception basis, information on each of the risk areas identified above, together with any new and significant risks that might emerge over the course of the year, would be included in each financial
performance report to cabinet and scrutiny during the 2015/16 financial year. A corporate contingency budget of £152,000 for unbudgeted expenditure or reductions in income had been allowed. This was in addition to the known inflation that had been built into service budgets.

54.17 The chief finance officer was obliged to report on the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, and determine the minimum level required. There was no statutory minimum requirement, but reserves must be set at a prudent level given the activities of individual councils and potential liabilities that they faced or might face in the future i.e. a risk based approach. The council’s earmarked reserves were reviewed at least annually for adequacy. If at any time the adequacy was in doubt the chief finance officer was required to report on the reasons, and the action, if any, that he considered appropriate. The council would always seek to contain any unforeseen additional costs within allocated annual budgets, including the contingency budget. However, it was proposed that in addition the minimum level of general reserves be set at £2m (as detailed in paragraph 6.5 of the report).

54.18 The following reserves had been set aside in addition to the general reserve in order to facilitate projects under the DRIVE programme. The available balances at 31 March 2015 were projected to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>£’m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic change</td>
<td>To fund internal projects under DRIVE</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic regeneration</td>
<td>To promote economic growth</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The council had followed a process of consolidating its reserves into the corporate reserves above. This better facilitated corporate priority planning. The only other reserves that the council held had specific obligations attached (e.g. Section 106/partnership contributions).

54.19 The principles for formulating the capital programme were set out in the budget report to cabinet last December and the updated programme was given in appendix 3 to the report (proposed new schemes were shown in bold text ) and showed a projected outturn for 2014/15 of £7.394; a total budget for 2015/16 of £16.548m; £13.089 for 2016/17; and £4.271m for 2017/18. The council had a policy of only using borrowing for schemes that were ‘invest to save’ and could generate enough savings or additional income to service the financing costs. In addition to schemes that qualified for borrowing, the council had a further £800,000 of capital receipts to apply to the programme. No uncertain future capital receipts had been factored into the available resource so there would be opportunities to supplement the programme as the 3-year period progressed. Potential disposals would be identified through the asset management plans.

54.20 The HRA capital programme was set out in another report on the agenda (minute 56 below) and was financed entirely from HRA
resources. Once approved it would be amalgamated with the general fund programme.

54.21 Councillor Mattock commented that the steps taken by the council in previous years had ensured the making of significant efficiency savings allowing the council to adjust to the continuing reduction in government funding, the impact of inflation and growth in demand for services, with no increase in the borough’s proportion of the council tax for the sixth year running and increased spending in a number of priority areas.

*54.22 Resolved (budget and policy framework): *That full council, at their meeting on 18 February 2015, be recommended to approve the following:

(a) A general fund budget for 2014/15 (revised) and 2015/16 (original) as set out in appendix 1 to the report, including growth and savings proposals for 2015/16 as set out in appendix 2 to the report.
(b) No increase in the council tax for Eastbourne Borough Council resulting in an unaltered ‘Band D’ charge of £224.19 for 2015/16.
(c) A general fund capital programme and financing 2014/18 as set out in appendix 3 to the report.

55 * Treasury management and prudential indicators 2015/16.

55.1 Cabinet considered the report of the deputy chief executive and chief finance officer seeking approval to the council’s borrowing and investment strategies in line with legislative and other regulatory requirements as described in the report. The council was required to receive and approve, the prudential and treasury indicators and treasury strategy as part of the budget setting process each year. This covered:

- the capital plans (including prudential indicators);
- a minimum revenue provision policy (how residual capital expenditure was charged to revenue over time);
- the treasury management strategy (how the investments and borrowings were to be organised) including treasury indicators; and
- an investment strategy (the parameters on how investments were to be managed).

*55.2 Resolved (budget and policy framework): *That full council, at their meeting on 18 February 2015, be recommended to approve the following:

(a) The treasury management strategy and annual investment strategy as set out in the report;
(b) the methodology for calculating the minimum revenue provision set out at paragraph 2.3 of the report;
(c) the prudential and treasury indicators as set out in the report; and
(d) the specified and non-specified investment categories listed in appendix 3 to the report.
56.1 Cabinet considered the report of the senior head of community and deputy chief executive and chief finance officer in respect of the rents, service and other charges to be set for all of the council’s housing tenants. The report outlined the revenue account budget proposals for 2015/16 and housing capital programme 2014/17 and arrangements for agreeing Eastbourne Homes Limited’s (EHL) management fee and delivery plan.

56.2 From the 1 April 2012 the way that council social housing was financed was changed and the HRA became self financing. This meant that expenditure had to be entirely supported from rental and other income. The main tool for the future financial management of the HRA was the 30 year business plan which had been approved by cabinet on 8 February 2012. The introduction of HRA self financing did not end the requirement to maintain a statutory ring fenced HRA and the council was still required to maintain a separate account for the income and expenditure on council housing. The report reflected the recommendations made by Eastbourne Homes in relation to the increases in rent levels, service and other charges.

56.3 The HRA revenue budget (appendix 1 to the report) had been produced based on the policies set out in the HRA 30 year business plan and showed an overall surplus of (£296,130) for 2015/16. This was mainly due to a number of favourable factors including the rent and service charge review, the change in requirement for the provision of bad debts and the savings from treasury management activities on borrowing.

56.4 The council had been following the government’s guidance for rents for social housing since December 2001. Under the HRA self-financing settlement the government had assumed that rent convergence would be achieved in 2015/16. In May 2014, the government issued new guidance setting out its policy on rents for social housing from April 2015. The new guidance simplified the approach to setting the rent for each property. The government recognised that some properties would not have reached their formula rent by April 2015 and recommended that rent only moves up to formula rent when the property was re-let following vacancy. It was noted that most the council’s properties had reached convergence; those remaining properties below would now achieve convergence at a slower rate. The new guidance suggested an increase of 2.2%. In order to reduce the number of properties trying to reach their formula rent, it was recommended that council rents were set at a slightly higher level with an average increase of 2.28%. This would leave 5.87% of housing rents outstanding to converge.

56.5 Service charges, heating and water charges were fixed weekly amounts set at a level to recover the expected actual cost to be incurred for the respective properties in the forthcoming year. Garage rents were
recommended to increase in line with the average increase in housing rents 2.28%.

56.6 Total budgeted expenditure on the HRA capital programme was planned at £9,668,512 for 2015/16. The major works element of the programme was in line with the asset management plan and the self financing business plan model with funding from the major repairs reserve. Cabinet had previously agreed a total budget of £12.1m for the housing and economic development programme (HEDP) out of the total allowance of £20m. This had now been profiled to reflect the expected spending timetable and will be funded from borrowing and HCA grant.

56.7 The proposed Eastbourne Homes Ltd. base management fee was recommended to remain at the 2014/15 level of £6,714,000, however an additional £520,000 had been proposed to meet the current pressure on the maintenance budget. The fee of £140,000 to support the work of the HEDP team had now been amalgamated into the management fee. The total proposed fee for 2015/16 was £7,375,000.

56.8 Scrutiny committee, at their meeting on 2 February 2015, noted the report and asked for further information regarding opportunities to support local companies through investment and local labour agreements.

*56.9 Resolved (budget and policy framework):* That full council, at their meeting on 18 February 2015, be recommended to approve the following:

(a) The HRA budget 2015/16 and revised 2014/15, as set out in appendix 1 to the report;

(b) that rents are set in line with the rent convergence target of 2016 set by government resulting in an average increase in rents of 2.28%;

(c) that void HRA properties which are due for re-let are moved to target rent automatically;

(d) that service charges for general needs properties are increased by 2.31%;

(e) that service charges for older persons’ sheltered accommodation currently available for let are increased by 2.57%;

(f) that heating costs are set at a level designed to recover the estimated actual cost;

(g) that water charges are set at a level designed to recover the estimated cost of metered consumption;

(e) that garage rents are set to increase by 2.28% in line with the average increase in housing rent;
(f) that delegated authority be granted to the senior head of community, in consultation with the lead cabinet members for community services and finance and the chief finance officer to finalise Eastbourne Homes’ management fee and delivery plan; and

(i) the HRA capital programme as set out in appendix 2 to the report.

57 * Adoption of the Eastbourne community infrastructure levy (CIL) - charging schedule.

57.1 Cabinet considered the report of the senior head of regeneration, planning and assets. The community infrastructure levy (CIL) allowed local authorities in England and Wales to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects. It effectively replaced much of the existing process of planning obligations commonly known as 'section 106' agreements. The primary use of CIL was to gain financial contributions from certain types of viable development to help fund new or improved strategic infrastructure required to support the growth identified in a local authority’s core strategy. CIL placed a charge per square metre on development. It would not be the sole funding source for all infrastructure delivered, but would supplement other public sector revenue streams.

57.2 The council had prepared a community infrastructure levy (CIL) charging schedule which is proposed for adoption. This document had undergone extensive public consultation in line with the CIL regulations, and had been through the relevant examination stages. The examination was dealt with via written representations, and the production of matter statements in November/December 2014. The council received the examiners final report on 12 January 2015 which concluded that the charging schedule, subject to one modification, was sound and should be adopted by the council.

57.3 The council had proposed rates of £50 per square metre for residential (C3) development, and £80 per square metre for retail (A1-A5) development. All other uses would be subject to no charge. The rates would be charged in all parts of the borough excluding those that were within the South Downs National Park.

57.4 The examiner’s report recommended a modification, now made, to exempt residential apartments from CIL liability. It was felt that the evidence demonstrated that the CIL charge would affect the viability of apartment development, which would in turn prevent that type of residential development coming forward for development.

57.5 The proposed rates were justified by evidence and ensured that they did not compromise the ability for the council to deliver its spatial development strategy. It was in the interest of the council to adopt the charging schedule on 1 April 2015, at which date further significant restrictions are placed on Section 106 agreements.
57.6 Planning committee, on 3 February 2015, had also received a report on this matter and had noted the contents.

**57.7 Resolved (budget and policy framework):** That cabinet endorse the community infrastructure levy charging schedule in line with the recommendations of the examiners final report and recommend full council to adopt and come into force as from 1 April 2015.

### 58 Exclusion of the public.

**Resolved:** That the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as otherwise there was a likelihood of disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. The relevant paragraph of schedule 12A and description of the exempt information are shown in minute 59 below. (*The requisite notices having been given under regulation 5 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.*)

### 59 Small grants to voluntary organisations 2015/16.

59.1 Cabinet considered the report of the senior head of community on the small grants element of the community grants programme. It was proposed that a budget of £60,000 be made available. Given the financial constraints on the Council at present, the proposed budget continued to protect the voluntary and community sector as a whole from significant reductions in spending on their activities by this Council.

59.2 In addition to the small grants programme, cabinet had previously agreed major grants for the three years from 2013/14 to 2015/16 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen’s Advice Bureau</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex Credit Union</td>
<td>£ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>£ 19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne &amp; Wealden YMCA</td>
<td>£ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3VA</td>
<td>£ 14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£203,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59.3 It was reported that the council also supported voluntary and community organisations in a variety of other ways including:

- The award of rent support grants to some organisations occupying Council properties to the value of £148,250.
- Discretionary rate relief awards to voluntary and community sector occupying premises in the town with a budget in 2013/14 of £41,671.
- The council’s housing service awards grants totalling £58,500 for work to prevent homelessness using funds provided for this purpose by the Department of Communities and Local Government.
- Allocation of £90,000 each year to the council’s devolved ward budget scheme, with ward councillors were able spend up to £10,000 on quick fix one-off works or initiatives to improve the...
lives of local residents. Local residents could make suggestions on how this money should be spent by contacting their local councillor.

In total the council’s direct support to voluntary and community organisations amounted to over £541,521.

59.4 Fifty two expressions of interest were submitted totalling £322,924. Thirty three organisations had submitted eligible applications and were therefore invited to apply in full. Twenty eight full applications were received then requesting £144,733, more than twice the amount of grant funding available. Of these, two were found to be ineligible for funding under the small grants programme.

59.5 The current community grants policy agreed by cabinet in 2012 set out the eligibility criteria for applications. These were designed to reflect the limited budget available and the wide demand for funding within the voluntary and community sector. The aim was to ensure that resources were spent where services were most needed and that robust arrangements were in place for managing any grant. Applications for large capital items could not be considered. Similarly applications for services which duplicated existing services and were available and funded elsewhere were ineligible. There must also be a clear financial need for funding and organisations with large unrestricted reserves or which made a significant surplus could not be funded. The policy also excluded any organisation which itself awarded grants to other organisations. Applicants were also required to have adequate governance and equality policies in place.

59.6 Sixteen expressions of interest with a total value of over £133,000 were deemed to be ineligible this year and a further two applications with a total value of £16,000 were deemed to be ineligible at the second stage of the process. Details were given in the report.

59.7 The following recommendations were made by the Grants Task Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act on It</td>
<td>£2,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern</td>
<td>£1,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bespoke</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgemere Centre</td>
<td>£3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Stuff</td>
<td>£3,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant Sports</td>
<td>£  880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Resource International</td>
<td>£4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Edinburgh Open Award Centre</td>
<td>£2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne and Wealden MS Society</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Access Group</td>
<td>£1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Street Pastors</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Survivors Group</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Swimming Club</td>
<td>£  750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Voluntary Lifeguards</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edible Eastbourne</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodbank</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends, Families and Travellers</td>
<td>£4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf Hall</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Trust</td>
<td>£4,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managing Bipolar £3,600  
Mediation Plus £3,800  
SASBAH £1,875  
Shinewater Shaftesbury Centre £1,268  

**Total value of grants recommended £60,000**

The recommended allocations reflected the relevance of the application to the priorities agreed and the quality of the application itself.

59.8 The following organisations would not be awarded a small grant in 2015/16:

- Mobile Memories
- Friends of Seaside Recreation Ground
- The Eastbourne Ethnic Minority Society

59.9 Cabinet noted that some of the applications recommended for approval were from organisations that had also been successful in receiving additional grant funding from other sources. However, it was noted that, as part of the community grants process, organisations were encouraged to seek other forms of grant in order to reduce the pressure on the community grants fund. Nevertheless, it was considered prudent to ensure that, in future years, the community grants application process should include a requirement for applicants to declare any other grants being sought or having been awarded in that financial year and the details of those applications, so that the Grants Task Group would have the fullest possible picture when considering applications. It was also noted that grants were awarded subject to the condition that they were used for the purposes as set out in the applications and that officers would continue to liaise with recipients to ensure that was the case.

59.10 **Resolved (key decision):** (1) That the proposals for the award of small grants as recommended by the Grants Task Group and detailed in paragraphs 59.7 above be approved.

(2) That the reasons given by the Task Group for the allocation of funding based on an assessment against the criteria set out in the council’s community grants policy be endorsed.

(3) That the remaining eligible applications as detailed in paragraph 59.8 above be refused.

(4) That the process for considering community small grants in future years incorporate the requirement for applicants to declare details of other grant applications in the same financial year.

(5) That it be noted that the foregoing resolutions are subject to the approval by full council at their meeting on 18 February 2015 of the council’s budget for 2015/16.
(Notes: (1) Exempt information reason 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority) holding that information).
(2) The above minute and associated report to cabinet was made public following the cabinet’s decision.)

The meeting closed at 6.45 pm

Councillor David Tutt
Chairman