



Report to Policy Committee

Author/Lead Officer of Report: Sarah Lowi Jones (Economic Policy Officer)

Tel: 0114 223 2368

Report of: *Kate Martin (Executive Director, City Futures)*

Report to: *Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee*

Date of Decision: *11th September 2023*

Subject: *Economic Recovery Fund Round 2 – Scoring Outcome*

Type of Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken	Initial	<input type="checkbox"/>	Full	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Insert EIA reference number and attach EIA: 2315				
Has appropriate consultation/engagement taken place?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-				
<p><i>“The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”</i></p>				

Purpose of Report:
 This report provides an overview of progress to deliver the second round of the Economic Recovery Fund (ERF) now that the application and scoring phases are complete. The report lists the outcomes of the scoring process for all applications and provides information about the geographical spread and make-up of the areas that applied for funding. The report marks the point at which ERF moves from the application and scoring phases into the contracting phase, which will enable successful projects to start delivering improvements and activities in their areas.

Recommendations:
 Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee is asked to:

- Note that Finance Committee have been asked (at their meeting on 11 September 2023) to approve the allocation of funding to areas offered over £50,000 (up to £200,000) and, subject to due diligence and other checks being undertaken to the satisfaction of the Director of Economic Development, Culture and Skills, for SCC to enter into a funding agreement with an appropriate lead organisation for each of the areas listed in the table below:

Project Area	Funding Offer (final figures TBC)
Crookes	£90,000
Darnall	£100,000
Harborough Avenue	£70,000
Heeley & Newfield Greens	£100,000
London Road	£142,355
Northern Avenue	£66,818
Spital Hill	£74,470
Westfield	£71,456
Woodhouse	£70,000

2. Note the areas listed in the table below have been allocated funding of up to £50,000 subject to due diligence and other checks being satisfied:

Project Area	Funding Offer (final figures TBC)
Abbeydale	£37,682
Banner Cross	£36,198
Broomhill	£40,250
Chapelton	£49,644
Ecclesfield	£38,857
Firth Park	£39,932
Greenhill	£50,000
Hackenthorpe	£49,573
Hillsborough	£46,022
Infirmery Road	£32,116
Lowedges	£37,321
Middlewood	£48,971
Stannington	£49,962
Walkley	£35,052

Background Papers:

[Sheffield Covid-19 Business Recovery Plan \(October 2020\)](#)

[Sheffield City Council One Year Plan \(2021/22\)](#)

[Form 2 Executive Report – Covid-19 Economic Recovery Fund \(03/11/20\)](#)

[Form 2 Executive Report – Sheffield Covid Business Recovery Plan: Phase 1 Recovery Delivery Programme \(09/06/21\)](#)

[Budget amendment approving the £2m allocation to build on the work of ERF \(02/03/22\)](#)

[Report to Economic Development and Skills Committee – 9th June 2022 – \(Economic Recovery Fund 2022-23\)](#)

[Report to Economic Development and Skills Committee – 19th October 2022 \(Decision to approve the second round of the Economic Recovery Fund\)](#)

[Economic Recovery Fund – Evaluation of Round 1](#)

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed.	Finance: Natalia Govorukhina
		Legal: Kieran McGaughey
		Equalities & Consultation: Ed Sexton
		Climate: N/A
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>		
2	SLB member who approved submission:	Kate Martin
3	Committee Chair consulted:	Cllr Martin Smith
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Committee by the SLB member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	Lead Officer Name: Diana Buckley	Job Title: Director of Economic Development, Culture and Skills
	Date: 31/08/2023	

1. PROPOSAL

Background

- 1.1. The Economic Recovery Fund (ERF) is a unique, innovative grant fund that aims to support local economic recovery in district and local centres. It was developed as a flagship part of the city's Covid [Business Recovery Plan](#).
- 1.2. The first round of funding launched in March 2021 and supported 26 projects with grants of up to £50,000 (small) and up to £200,000 (large). It is overseen by a Steering Group made up of Councillors, senior officers and four private/community sector representatives:
- Cllr Martin Smith (Chair of Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee – EDPS)
 - Cllr Minesh Parekh (Deputy Chair of EDPS Committee)
 - Cllr Henry Nottage (Group Spokesperson on EDSP)
 - Diana Buckley (Director, Economic Development, Culture and Skills)
 - Carl Mullooly (Head of Local Area Committee Team)
 - Ben Morley (Head of Strategic Development and External Programmes)
 - Javed Khan (Metro Bank)
 - Shahida Siddique (Faith Star)
 - Amy Tingle (City Cabs)
 - Tom Wolfenden (Sheffield Technology Parks)
- 1.3. In February 2022 Full Council approved a further £2m to support a second round of ERF. Work to develop the second round was led by the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee, with the support of the Economic Recovery Fund Steering Group. Several workshops were held over summer 2022 to shape and define Round 2. The outcome was presented at the Committee's meeting on 19th October 2022, where key changes were approved.
- 1.4. ERF2 was designed around a number of phases, as below:

Application phase	9 February - 31 st May
Scoring phase	June-July
Contracting phase	August-September
Delivery phase	No earlier than September 2023 and completed no later than end September 2024

- 1.5. The application and scoring phases have now been completed and this report provides an overview of the outcomes of the process so far. The approval requested of Finance Committee will allow the project to formally move into its next phases: contracting, then delivery.

Application Phase

- 1.6. During the application phase efforts were made to engage with high street businesses across the city and encourage anyone interested in applying to come forward. As well as delivering a communications campaign that targeted messages to local businesses, Business Sheffield utilised its 6 Business Information Officers to help raise awareness and provided support to prospective applicants. They talked to businesses across the city to gauge interest and offer support, information and bid writing capacity. The team were fundamental in the delivery of many applications that came forward.

- 1.7. A team of 5 Application Development Workers (ADWs) were deployed from April and allocated to teams that requested additional support, which they provided flexibly and responsively according to the needs of the team. They worked successfully with 26 different project teams.
- 1.8. The central team recorded nearly 100 enquiries about the Fund during the application phase and met all requests to meet, share information, offer guidance and support, as well as reading draft applications and providing detailed feedback.

Scoring Phase

- 1.9. A total of 49 applications were received, of which 8 were judged to be ineligible and were not scored. The other 41 applications were scored and moderated by the ERF Steering Group collectively using the process described in Appendix 1. The outcome of that process is shown in Appendix 2, which lists the projects that passed scoring, passed scoring subject to conditions, did not pass scoring or were ineligible for the Fund.
- 1.10. The total value of the 23 projects that passed scoring exceeded the available budget by nearly £1m so the Steering Group agreed an approach to reducing individual project budgets, to ensure value for money and that the successful projects could all benefit from a share of the funding. The outcome of that process is also shown in Appendix 2 in the column 'funding offered'.¹

Contracting Phase

- 1.11. All projects have been informed of the outcome of their application to ERF2. Unsuccessful applicants have been introduced to LAC Teams to ensure they have a point of contact going forward and to explore, where possible, other opportunities to deliver elements of these projects. Business Information Officers are also ready to pick up with those businesses and ensure they feel supported and are aware of the Business Sheffield offer.
- 1.12. The ERF Project Team have been working with successful projects over summer to share the feedback and further questions from the ERF Steering Group, set out the next steps and support teams to get their projects ready for contracting. This will include carrying out due diligence and other checks on the proposed Lead Organisation and, where necessary, the submission of further information, amended applications and budgets.
- 1.13. Once the Director of Economic Development, Culture and Skills is satisfied SCC will contract (a Funding Agreement) with the Lead Organisation. For any area that does not have a suitable Lead Organisation in place an organisation will be provided for them. This organisation will be appointed through an SCC led procurement. It will therefore take longer to enter into the delivery phase for these projects than for areas in which SCC can contract directly with a local organisation.

¹ It is important to note that the funding offer listed above may vary in the final contract as details continue to be finalised with projects.

Delivery

- 1.14. Once in contract, projects will enter into the delivery period and payments will be made to the Lead Organisation in line with the schedule in the Funding Agreement. Projects will be monitored on a regular basis (monthly project updates and quarterly financial monitoring) and the programme will be overseen by the ERF Steering Group. Regular updates will also be provided to the Economic Development and Skills Committee.
- 1.15. The delivery period runs from September 2023 (or whenever a project enters into contract) until the end of September 2024 when all project activity needs to be completed. An in-person induction will be offered (alongside written guidance) to all funding recipients and a programme of sessions scheduled to provide capacity building and up-skilling opportunities for those teams.
- 1.16. A closedown period will then take place between October 2024 – January 2025 to ensure that all relevant monitoring evidence and completion statements are submitted.

Shape of the ERF2 programme

- 1.17. Each of the 23 individual projects forms the ERF Grant Fund programme (made up of the District and Flexible Funds). Members have been clear that they hoped to see a wide geographical spread of applications across the city and good representation from areas counted amongst the most deprived. This informed the focused approach taken in the application phase to provide proactive and supportive help to any area interested and keep an overview of where applications were being discussed.
- 1.18. The spread of applications across the city by LAC area – both successful and unsuccessful – are set out below in Table 1 (see also the map at Appendix 3). This shows a fair spread across the city. The North East, South West and South East have 2 projects each compared to the 4 or 5 that were successful in North, East, South and Central. No city-wide projects were successful.
- 1.19. The number of successful projects in each LAC area funded in Round 1 (not shown in the table) show an improvement particularly in the representation of North and South LAC areas, which both have in total three more funded projects than in Round 1. The numbers are in line with previous numbers for all other LAC areas (within 1 +/-).

LAC Area (successful projects)	Pass	Pass with conditions	Fail	TOTAL
North (Stannington, Middlewood, Ecclesfield, Chapeltown)	3	1	6	10
North East (Spital Hill, Firth Park)	1	1	5	7
East (Northern and Harborough Avenues, Woodhouse, Darnall)	2	2	2	6
South East (Westfield, Hackenthorpe)	2	-	2	4

South (Greenhill, London Road, Lowedges, Abbeydale, Heeley/Newfield Green)	3	2	5	10
South West (Crookes, Banner Cross)	-	2	2	4
Central (Infirmary Road, Hillsborough, Broomhill, Walkley)	4	-	2	6
Citywide	-	-	2	2
TOTAL	15	8	26	49

1.20.

In terms of looking at the applications by Indices of Multiple Deprivation Table 2 below shows that ERF2 has had a strong reach into deprived areas of the city.² 43% of all applications were received from areas in the city that are amongst the 10% most deprived in England (decile 1) and 67% of applications were received from areas in the city that are amongst the 50% most deprived in England (deciles 1-5). This suggests there is a particular need and demand for making improvements in these areas:

IMD DECILE	No. apps	As %	Bottom / Top 50% (no.)	As %
1	21	43	33	67
2	7	14		
3	3	6		
4	0	0		
5	2	4		
6	2	4	16	33
7	4	8		
8	2	4		
9	4	8		
10	1	2		
N/A (city-wide)	3	6		
TOTAL	49	100	49	100

1.21.

Of all applications received from areas in IMD deciles 1-5, i.e. areas amongst the most deprived, there was a 55% success rate (45% fail rate). For areas in IMD deciles 6-10, less/least deprived areas, 38% were successful compared to 62% that failed (see Table 3). While a great deal of effort went into engaging a wide range of areas in the city, there is likely to be a range of reasons for this data. This will be explored as part of the evaluation of the Fund. However, it does show that applications from areas amongst the most deprived in the city have not been disadvantaged through the application or scoring process as they have a higher success rate than areas that are less deprived.

² Several areas sit across or at the border of one or more areas with a different IMD; these are shown in appendix 2.

	Successful	Fail	Total	Success rate
Bottom 50% (decile 1-5)	18	15	33	55%
Top 50% (decile 6-10)	5	8	13	38%
N/A (city wide)	0	3	3	0

- 1.22. In terms of areas that had funding previously, direct comparisons are difficult to draw as while some areas applied again the project team or Lead Organisation may have changed. However, the four large projects from Round 1 (Broomhill, Firth Park, Hillsborough, Walkley) were excluded from the District Centre Fund and limited to applying for a small grant of up to £50k in the Flexible Fund, given they had already received a significant investment. They were all successful in passing scoring and receiving a funding offer.
- 1.23. Three Round 1 projects that had small grants previously applied for larger grants in the Round 2 District Centre Fund and were successful though with reduced funding offers (Spital Hill, Woodhouse, Chapeltown).
- 1.24. In two cases an existing project area/team created new collaborations in adjacent areas with distinct projects planned (e.g. Hillsborough extending into Middlewood and Walkley into Infirmary Road).
- 1.25. In total, of the 23 successful projects 16 were from areas not funded in the first Round (i.e. 70% of successful projects are 'new' to ERF).

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

- 2.1. The Economic Recovery Fund was a key project of the city's Business Recovery Plan and contribute to the following strategic priorities that sit within it:
- Stimulating demand in the local economy
 - Opening our city and district centres safely and securely
 - Stimulating investment in culture to help rebuild confidence and visitor numbers
- 2.2. The Fund will directly deliver against the following outcomes and actions in the Business Recovery Plan:
- Our places, in the city centre, district centres and in local neighbourhoods, adapt to the changing economy
 - Visitors and residents will be able to visit, learn about and enjoy the cultural, leisure and green spaces that Sheffield is renowned for.
 - Businesses have the confidence, information, support and infrastructure they need to operate through and beyond the current crisis, to adapt to changing circumstances
 - Business failure rates amongst profitable and productive companies are minimised and good quality jobs are safeguarded.
 - Opportunities to rebuild and renew our economy whilst becoming a cleaner and more sustainable city, are seized.
- 2.3. ERF will also contribute to the Council's Delivery Plan, across the following three strategic objectives:

- Fair, inclusive and empowered communities
- Strong and connected neighbourhoods which people are happy to call home
- Clean economic growth

3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

3.1. The development and delivery of the second round of ERF funding has been agreed in consultation with the ERF Steering Group and Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee. As part of that process the findings of a comprehensive evaluation that included interviews with funded projects, businesses, SCC staff and others were considered.

4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

4.1. Equality Implications

4.1.1. An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed. The main risks around ERF and EDI currently are around:

- Different sections of local communities feeling that they can be part of and are welcome to participate in the development of projects.
- Ensuring project teams consider accessibility issues in their communications and project delivery (for example in event delivery).
- That focus and efforts promised in proposals are followed through into delivery and sustained throughout that period.

4.1.2. An action plan has been identified to mitigate these risks that includes:

- Ensuring projects considered inclusion as part of their proposals (which was scored alongside sustainability and legacy statements) and brief guidance on what to consider was included on the application form.
- Embedding expectations around running projects in an open and inclusive way, with accessibility issues considered, as part of the Funding Agreement each project will sign.
- The project team will ask each project about their specific EDI actions regularly as part of the monitoring process and encourage teams to take this into account during the delivery of their projects. The actions will those described in the application form and seen as a minimum, as scope and support will be given for developing additional inclusive and accessible ways of working.
- A training session on EDI and accessibility will be offered as part of the induction process for all projects.
- The evaluation team will be asked to evaluate (where this is possible) EDI impacts of ERF projects individually and as a programme.
- Any central communications delivered will take into account the make-up and needs of the target audience.
- These actions and any arising issues relating to EDI will be reviewed by the ERF Steering Group regularly.

4.2. Financial and Commercial Implications

4.2.1. The £2m funding identified for ERF Round 2 is the Council's own funding from the New Homes Bonus and was agreed by Council during the budget-setting

process in February 2022. Therefore, there are no outside sources, special conditions or clawbacks to take into account.

- 4.2.2. See Table 4 below that gives the ERF2 budget headlines. The total value of grant funding offered for all successful projects is £1,376,679 (including both District and Flexible funding streams) leaving unallocated balance of £73,321 across those streams combined. The Match Fund Pot of £260k also remains unallocated. The other project costs include employee, communication, evaluation and other fees, and are £291,263 in total including £50,000 contingency set aside for the ERF Round 2 so that any unforeseen costs or additional activity can be covered. To note, any decision to use this contingency will be made by the Director of Economic Development, Skills and Culture in consultation with the Steering Group (that includes the relevant Elected Members).

Table 4: ERF2 - Budget

Funding streams

District Fund (£1.25m available)	£1,215,423
Flexible Fund (£200k available)	£161,256
Match fund (not yet allocated)	£260,000

Project costs

Staffing and internal fees	£162,313
Comms costs (not incl. officer time)	£15,000
Application Development Workers	£32,687
Evaluation	£30,000
Contingency	£50,000

TOTAL	£1,926,679
District and Flexible Grant remaining	£73,321

- 4.2.3. The amount of the grant awarded for successful projects will not be increased in the event of any overspend by the recipient in its delivery of the funded activity. Each project will need to manage activity within the allocation they are awarded. All projects include their own contingency and ongoing monitoring will be required to ensure this risk is minimised.
- 4.2.4. The payment of the Funding under the terms of the funding agreement is believed to be outside the scope of VAT unless otherwise agreed, but if any VAT shall become chargeable the payment of the Funding shall be deemed to be inclusive of all VAT and SCC shall not be obliged to pay any VAT over and above the agreed funding allocation.
- 4.2.5. Underspend from ERF Round 1 is in the process of being finalised and will be rolled into the budget for ERF Round 2. Any decision as to how to use that funding will be taken by the relevant Committee or under officer delegation as appropriate, with recommendations of the ERF Steering Group considered and consultation with Members as needed (Steering Group has no formal decision-making powers).

4.3. Legal Implications

- 4.3.1. The Council has no specific powers or duties to deliver economic regeneration. The Council is able however to undertake the grant activity being noted in this report by virtue of Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011. This provides Local Authorities with a “general power of competence” and allows them to “do anything that individuals generally may do”.
- 4.3.2. Funding recipients will be required to enter into a suitable funding agreement. All organisations receiving funding under the project, or any other benefit, will be assessed on a case-by-case basis by the Senior Programme Manager aligned to the ERF Project Team to ensure compliance with the subsidy control rules.

4.4. Climate Implications

- 4.4.1. An Initial Climate Impact Assessment has been undertaken and the overall impact of ERF proposals is thought to be carbon neutral, with some potential for modest positive impacts. The main areas in which impact is expected include:
- The installation of bike racks in some areas and encouraging local people to use active travel where possible.
 - Increasing the number of double aperture bins so that recycling is an option for pedestrians passing through the public highway.
 - Greening of local public spaces (through, for example, the delivery of planting schemes and installation of trees).
 - The consideration of use of resources in the delivery of events (avoiding single use plastic, for example and encouraging active travel to events).
 - The offer of training on climate awareness/sustainability for all successful projects.
- 4.4.2. The evaluation team will be asked to consider the impact of ERF projects individually and collectively (where possible) as part of this piece of work.

5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Programme

- 5.1. As noted, a range of options for delivering ERF2 were considered over summer and autumn 2022. Several alternative ways of delivering the second round of funding were considered as part of this process and proposals were made in relation to changing and improving the second round of funding. These were approved by the EDSP Committee at its meeting on 19th October 2022. This approach has subsequently been enacted so the proposals here are the outcome of an agreed process.

Outcomes

- 5.2. Because the Fund was oversubscribed, Steering Group had to look at ways of managing that and ensuring funding offers were within the available budget and made in a fair way (as described in appendix 1).
- 5.3. Alternatives to that included the following, but the agreed approach was felt by the Steering Group to be a balanced, individualised and fair way of dealing with the budget pressure that took into account the specific elements within each project and strengths and weaknesses. It was felt that any blanket measures

would cut across these nuances and lead to outcomes unreflective of their scoring judgements.

Alternative	Rationale	Why rejected
Making a blanket cut to all projects that passed scoring	To reduce the overall funding ask to keep within the budget	Projects had different strengths and weaknesses and this tactic felt unfair and arbitrary to the Steering Group
Raising threshold at which projects would have passed	To reduce the number of projects that would receive funding	Project that passed scoring not receiving funding – Steering Group wanted to maximise the number of areas that could benefit from the Fund
To remove specific types of activity from all budgets	To reduce the overall funding ask and limit specific activity	This would have potentially been applied unequally across projects, depending on whether they had included the activity in their proposals or not

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1. This report updates the Committee on the progress of this project, which the Committee approved on 19th October 2022. This update marks a key milestone in the project cycle, at the transition from application and scoring to contracting and onwards to delivery. The Committee will be kept updated as the project continues to develop.

Appendix 1: ERF Scoring Process

1. Overview

- 1.1. The ERF is a competitive grant fund, so scoring is an important part of the process as it decides which projects will be awarded grant funding and to what level.
- 1.2. The aim of the process is to ensure that projects are fairly and robustly evaluated on: value for money, fit with the Fund's objectives, are deliverable, fairly distributed across the city (and that no groups are disadvantaged by the process) and to ensure the steering group had confidence in the teams' ability to deliver the project as outlined.
- 1.3. The process also ensures that applications meet the four eligibility criteria:
 - The project team is a collaboration that includes businesses and represents their views.
 - The project is aimed at benefiting local businesses in the target area or sector.
 - The lead organisation that will receive and manage the funding can be named.
 - ERF funding is needed to make the project happen.

2. Process

- 2.1. The scoring process for ERF was updated and refreshed for the second round of funding. The fundamentals remained the same as:
 - the process is owned by the ERF Steering Group, who undertake scoring collectively; and
 - applications are assessed on set criteria (based on the sections of the application form) and scored out of 5, with a minimum pass mark of 3 for each.
- 2.2. The main change between the first and second rounds is that applications were divided between Steering Group 'teams' to reduce the administrative burden on this senior level group and keep the process moving as quickly as possible. An additional moderation process was put in place to ensure consistency across the teams.
- 2.3. A Councillor, Senior Officer and private/community sector representative were included in each scoring team to ensure a breadth of perspectives. Scoring teams were:

Team 1	Team 2	Team 3
Cllr Smith	Cllr Parekh	Cllr Nottage
Diana Buckley (SCC)	Ben Morley (SCC)	Carl Mullooly (SCC)
Javed Khan (Metro Bank)	Shahida Siddique (Faith Star)	Amy Tingle (City Taxis)
	Tom Wolfenden (Sheffield Tech Parks)	
ERF Project Team (all meetings): Sarah Lowi Jones, Ian Holmes		

- 2.4. The scoring process functioned as follows:

ERF 2 Scoring Process

Preparation

- Practice scoring session for ERF Steering Group
- Confirmation of any potential conflicts of interest (e.g. Councillors did not score projects from their wards)
- Applications checked for eligibility
- Applications assigned to scoring teams (x3 teams that all included a Councillor from the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee, senior Council Officer and private/community representative)

Scoring

- Steering Group teams assign scores collectively to eligible applications in meetings
- Each section (including the budget) attracts a maximum score of 5, with a pass mark of 3
- Any individual section failing to meet the minimum score means the application fails
- The minimum score to pass across the 6 sections of the scoring pro-forma is 18
- Conditions, changes to scope, budget or ways of working for individual projects specified by scoring teams

Moderation

- Selection of applications moderated in meeting of all Steering Group members to ensure consistency
- Applications ranked and the total funding ask of successful projects calculated
- Steering Group reserved the option of using geography and factors such as the prevalence of areas with high scores in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation to ensure there is a fair spread across types of area in the city, though this was not needed
- Additional principles around how to reduce budgets and de-scope projects (to respond to budget pressure) agreed

Revision

- Project Team enacted the changes required by Steering Group to budgets to achieve funding offers that fit the available budget
- Outcomes agreed creating three core groups: unsuccessful projects; successful projects that can move forward to contracting with no/limited conditions or changes; and, successful projects that will require revision before contracting can begin
- All applicants informed of the outcome from the scoring process and next steps

Contracting/ Decision

- Contracting discussions to take place to finalise details and set out SCC's requirements/terms and conditions
- Projects awarded up to £50k to be signed off by the Director of Economic Development, Skills and Culture when ready
- Projects between £50-200k to be approved by Finance Committee (11 September)

Project revisions

2.5. The overall funding ask of projects that passed scoring was £2.384m, which far exceeded the available funding of £1.45m. In order to maximise the number of groups that could benefit from ERF funding, ensure all projects represent value for money and that funding offers fit within the available budget it was necessary for the Steering Group to consider how individual applications should be de-scoped to reduce this £1m pressure.

2.6. This was done on the basis of some key principles, that any individual funding offer should:

- be reflective of the feedback and scoring given by Steering Group
- be deliverable and proportionate to the scale of the project and area
- offer value for money and be as well costed and realistic as possible
- should ensure all activity is eligible for ERF funding
- not be based on blanket cuts, nor any set percentage rate reduction applied across the board
- reflect the small grant threshold of the District Centre Fund where they are marginally over, or where the activity proposed fits better as a small rather than large grant (e.g. if a funding ask is £53,865 then it should meet the £50k threshold)
- unsuccessful projects that could not be funded through ERF should be supported to explore other options via the Local Area Committee teams in the first instance, or signposted to external sources of funding where appropriate, with help offered to enable teams to navigate any relevant application process.

2.7. Steering Group also provided guidance in specific areas:

- Websites design and creation will not be supported as it does not represent value for money and there is significant risk around their longevity and impact
- Marketing budgets should be proportionate (reduced if necessary) and should prioritise content generation over social media management.
- Shop front schemes have, generally, been poorly defined despite the high funding ask. Broadly it was agreed that these budgets be slimmed down and further detail requested from project teams during the contracting process on how they will be delivered.
- Street art projects are likewise generally quite expensive and can be scaled down to comparable costs seen in ERF1.
- As Christmas lights on lamppost columns are expensive and short-term, where both lamppost lights and shop front decorations have been included, lamppost lights should be removed in favour of assets that

would be owned and maintained locally. Where there are other pressures lamppost lights can be de-scoped.

- Flexible Fund (though not under pressure) should be scrutinised in the same way as the District Centre Fund for fairness to all applicants, the majority of whom will need to accept some reduction in the funding offer.

2.8. In sum, Steering Group highlighted where some budgets were unrealistic, had activity that was over costed and/or elements that were felt to be poor value. This guidance allowed the Project Team to assess budgets in detail in a balanced and individualised way, to enable a significant portion of the original funding ask has been scaled back.

Economic Recovery Fund Scoring Pro Forma

Application Summary and Background

Project Title:	
District/Flexible:	
Lead organisation:	
Total Requested:	
Additional documents:	(list)
Project summary:	
Ward profile (link):	
Officer views/liaison:	

1. Purpose

Why is it needed?

Is it clear what issues, needs, opportunities and priorities this project is aimed at addressing?
How far is evidence available to support assertions made?
How far have the applicants engaged with their business community – are we confident that this proposal reflects their views?

Mark out of 5

Comments:

2. Summary of project

Is it clear what this project will deliver?
How far does it seem to be realistic and deliverable?
How do the applicants propose the project be delivered/managed – does this give us confidence in their process?

Mark out of 5

Comments:

3. Project Team

<p>Are we clear who the steering group/project team/delivery group are for this project?</p> <p>Do we have confidence that between the proposed group there are the skills and capacity to deliver an ERF project?</p>	Mark out of 5
<p>Comments:</p>	

4. Project funding and budget	
<p>How realistic are the costs as set out in the budget?</p> <p>How far are we comfortable that the costs represent value for money?</p> <p>Are the salary/management costs within the accepted range (up to 15% and up to 5%) and how far have they built in an appropriate contingency?</p> <p>How far does the sequencing of activity/costs convince us of the robustness of their budget and planning?</p>	Mark out of 5
<p>Comments:</p>	

5. Outputs and Impacts	
<p>How far does the project align to the relevant objective(s) of the Fund?</p> <p>How far do we accept the broader benefit/impact of this proposal?</p> <p>To what extent are we convinced by the sustainability/inclusion and legacy statements and how far the applicants have engaged with this issue?</p>	Mark out of 5
<p>Comments:</p>	

6. Project Management	
<p>How convincing is the proposed plan and have the applicants sufficiently considered: how they will communicate with, engage and involve local businesses; how they will work as a management team; the financial management processes/responsibilities required; who will deliver the activity; how suppliers will be appointed etc.</p> <p>How convincing is the group's thinking on milestones and risk identification/management?</p>	Mark out of 5
<p>Comments:</p>	

--

Overall assessment	
What is your level of confidence in this proposal? What are your main concerns? What are its key strengths?	Overarching Score /30
Comments for feedback:	

Scores for each section will be given out of 5, as follows:

Score	Description of Response
1	Unacceptable Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response, or • Not in alignment with the information set out in the guidance • Response not relevant or question not answered Completely unsatisfactory suggesting the applicant would have serious difficulties delivering the project, or has provided no relevant information at all.
2	Poor Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is partially in alignment with the Fund and guidance but there are significant gaps • The response has deficiencies, e.g. supporting evidence is minimal, relies on assertion Indicates that the applicant would meet only some of the proposals some of the time. Considerable work would be needed with the applicant to expand on information provided in order for the information to indicate that standards are likely to be met.
3	Acceptable Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is in alignment with the aims of the Fund • Some shortfalls but any concerns are of a minor nature Further evidence may be required but confident that the applicant will be able to deliver the proposal. Further work may be needed to ensure that delivery will be consistent
4	Good Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is in alignment with the Fund • Good supporting evidence which is relevant, credible and supports claims Indicates that the applicant has fully understood the aims of the Fund and can apply and deliver all the elements of their proposal. A small amount of work may be required in non-key areas to minimise any risk of delivery failure
5	Excellent Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response is in alignment with the aims of the Fund • Offers relevant detailed evidence and rationale to support their claims • Demonstrates a wholly comprehensive understanding of the aims of the Fund Indicates that the proposed approach will result in the project aims being met and exceeded.


Appendix 2: ERF2 Applications and Scoring Outcomes

Project Name	Fund	Funding ask (APPLICATION)	LAC area	ERF1 Y/N	Scoring Outcome (pass/fail)	Funding offered	Large/small
Crookes Collective	District	£199,962	South West	N	Pass - CONDITIONS	£90,000	Large
Discover Darnall	District	£199,569	East	N	Pass - CONDITIONS	£100,000	Large
Harborough Avenue	District	£98,922	East	N	Pass	£70,000	Large
Heeley & Newfield Greens	District	£200,000	South	N	Pass - CONDITIONS	£100,000	Large
London Road	District	£199,597	South	N	Pass	£142,355	Large
Northern Avenue	District	£66,818	East	N	Pass	£66,818	Large
Revive Woodhouse 2	District	£99,384	East	Y	Pass - CONDITIONS	£70,000	Large
Spital Hill	District	£158,213	North East	Y	Pass - CONDITIONS	£74,470	Large
Westfield Matters	District	£85,000	South East	N	Pass	£71,456	Large
Banner Cross	District	£122,725	South West	N	Pass - CONDITIONS	£36,198	Small
Choose Chapeltown	District	£200,000	North	Y	Pass - CONDITIONS	£49,644	Small
Connecting Stannington	District	£49,962	North	N	Pass	£49,962	Small
Ecclesfield High Street	District	£49,985	North	N	Pass	£38,857	Small
Family Friendly Firth Park	Flexible	£49,332	North East	Y	Pass	£39,932	Small
Growing Greenhill	District	£50,150	South	N	Pass	£50,000	Small
Hackenthorpe Traders Connect	District	£70,088	South East	N	Pass	£49,573	Small
Hillsborough Together	Flexible	£50,998	Central	Y	Pass	£46,022	Small

Independent Abbeydale	District	£198,424	South	N	Pass - CONDITIONS	£37,682	Small
It's All About Broomhill	Flexible	£49,120	Central	Y	Pass	£40,250	Small
Lowedges Boost	District	£37,321	South	N	Pass	£37,321	Small
Middlewood	District	£53,391	North	N	Pass	£48,971	Small
Next Stop Infirmaroy Road	District	£38,471	Central	N	Pass	£32,116	Small
Walkley Working	Flexible	£49,559	Central	Y	Pass	£35,052	Small
Attercliffe Community Garden	District	£163,577	East	N	Fail		
Beautiful Beighton	District	£49,884	South East	N	Fail		
Buchanan Parade Development	District	£153,660	North East	N	Fail		
Clearly, We're Crosspool	District	£52,471	South West	N	Fail		
Family fun at Margetson Shops	District	£199,719	North East	N	Fail		
Fresher Frecheville	District	£119,502	South East	N	Fail		
Fulwood High Street	District	£200,000	South West	N	Fail		
Local Social	District	£162,173	Multiple / City Wide	N	Fail		
Longley 4 Greens	District	£126,025	North East	N	Fail		
Nether Edge Pocket Park	District	£13,402	South	Y	Fail		
Proud of Page Hall	District	£40,891	North East	Y	Fail		
Revitalising Jordanthorpe	District	£169,469	South	N	Fail		
Revive Gleadless Valley	District	£60,384	South	N	Fail		
Sharrow vale	District	£59,363	Central	N	Fail		
Shiregreen Matters	District	£112,190	North East	N	Fail		
This is Woodseats	District	£205,000	South	N	Fail		
Wisewood	District	£40,003	Central	N	Fail		
York House	District	£50,000	East	N	Fail		

Bridge The Gap	Flexible	£48,736	North East	N	Ineligible		
Creative Owners Health & Wealth	Flexible	£50,000	Multiple / City Wide	N	Ineligible		
Sheffield Food Mile	Flexible	£49,928	South	N	Ineligible		
Highlighting Heeley	District	£47,500	South	N	Ineligible		
Brighter Burngreave	District	£200,000	North East	N	Ineligible		
Exchange Street	District	£50,000	Central	N	Ineligible		
The Local Tote	Flexible	£8,963	Multiple / City Wide	N	Ineligible		
Happy Bodies Strong Minds	District	£200,000	South	N	Ineligible		

Appendix 3: Map of ERF Applications by Outcome and IMD (Pass/Pass with conditions/Fail)



Area	Status	IMD Decile	
1 – Margetson Crescent (Parson Cross)	FAIL	1	
2 – Crosspool	FAIL	9	
3 – Sharrow Vale Rd	FAIL	9	
4 – Crookes	PASS CONDITIONS	9	or 6/7
5 – Hillsborough	PASS	2	
6 – Shiregreen	FAIL	1	
7 – Firth Park	PASS	1	
8 – Spital Hill	PASS CONDITIONS	2	
9 – Woodseats	FAIL	7	or 5/9
10 – Wisewood	FAIL	3	or 5/8
11 – Middlewood	PASS	2	or 8/9
12 – Greenhill	PASS	10	or 5
13 – Jordanthorpe	FAIL	1	
14 – Westfield	PASS	1	
15 – London Rd	PASS	3	or 2/6
16 – Abbeydale Rd	PASS CONDITIONS	5	or 2/6
17 – Heeley and Newfield Green	PASS CONDITIONS	1	
18 – Stannington	PASS	7	or 8
19 – Banner Cross	PASS CONDITIONS	9	or 10
20 – Chapeltown	PASS CONDITIONS	5	or 2/8
21 – Harborough Avenue (Manor Park)	PASS	1	

Area	Status	IMD Decile	
22 – Frecheville	FAIL	6	or 8
23 – Attercliffe	FAIL	1	
24 – Fulwood	FAIL	8	or 10
25 – Walkley / Upperthorpe	PASS	1	or 2
25 – Infirmary Road	PASS	1	or 2
26 – Woodhouse	PASS CONDITIONS	2	
27 – Nether Edge	FAIL	7	or 5
28 – Beighton	FAIL	6	
29 – Hackenthorpe	PASS	3	or 4
30 – The Food Mile	FAIL	2	or 3/5/6
31 – Lowedges	PASS	1	
32 – Buchanan Rd (Parson Cross)	FAIL	1	
33 – Northern Avenue (Manor Park)	PASS	1	
34 – Broomhill	PASS	8	
35 – Darnall	PASS CONDITIONS	1	
36 – Gleadless Valley	FAIL	1	
37 – York House	FAIL	1	
38 – Ecclesfield	PASS	2	or 5
39 – Page Hall	FAIL	1	
40 – Longley	FAIL	1	
41 – Local Social	FAIL	2	

This page is intentionally left blank