



APPENDIX ONE.

**SMALL GRANT APPEAL, SG 1213 22, 79<sup>TH</sup> URC SCOUTS, “FLYING HIGH 2013” – REPORT.**

1. Introduction.

1.1 79<sup>th</sup> URC Scouts submitted an application for £2,500.00 to the Small Grants scheme towards the cost of their annual Gang Show, this year entitled “Flying High 2013”. The application stated that, if a grant were awarded, they would accept a minimum of 50%, £1,250.00.

1.2 The application went to the Grants Assessment Panel (“the Panel”) at its meeting held on Monday March 4<sup>th</sup> 2013. The Panel’s decision was not to award a grant.

1.3 Valid applications totalling £25,391.05 were considered by that meeting with £10,306.25 in the budget.

1.4 79<sup>th</sup> URC Scouts lodged an Appeal, in accordance with the Council’s Grants Appeal procedure.

1.5 In considering the Appeal it is noted that the Community Chest application was successful and a grant of £1,000.00 was awarded.

2. Methodology.

2.1 The investigation has been based on an examination of all relevant documents pertaining to the application and the appeal.

3. Appeal - summary<sup>1</sup>.

3.1 The appellant states that they consider that the Panel failed to take relevant information into account, and that a different decision would have been reached had they done so.

4. Appeal – examination.

4.1 The Appeal argues that the Cultural Grant application was withdrawn, no application was made, and therefore it should not have been part of the Panel’s considerations.

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the Appeal document submitted is attached for reference.



## APPENDIX ONE.

### Response.

- a) The Cultural Grant application was made. However, it was submitted after the deadline and could not be considered by the Panel at the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013 meeting, and was withdrawn by the applicant on being informed of that.
- b) It is valid for the Panel to consider whether an application would be more appropriate to be considered for a different grant scheme, and therefore not to award a grant. In this case, therefore, it was entirely appropriate for the Panel to consider whether this Small Grant application would have been more appropriate for consideration under the Cultural Grants scheme.
- c) It is the responsibility of applicants to ensure that they submit their completed application forms by the required date.
- d) I do not, therefore, find that I can uphold the Appeal on this ground.

4.2 The Appeal argues that the Community Chest and Small Grant applications were each directed to meet the criteria of each scheme, and therefore each should be considered on its own merits.

### Response.

- a) Both applications were considered using the respective processes for each grant scheme, and in each case the fact that an application had been made for the same project to the other scheme was a factor; for the Council not to have done so could be considered negligent.
- b) Both application forms appear to be identical in content – the project summary and budget are the same on both.
- c) There does not appear to be any specific element of the project that each application was targeted for, i.e. each application asking for different elements of the budget.
- d) Although both application forms appear to be identical, they both meet the respective criteria sufficiently to be considered. That in itself is no



## APPENDIX ONE.

guarantee that a grant will be awarded, and therefore is not in itself grounds for an appeal.

e) In considering the Appeal it is noted that the Community Chest application was successful and a grant of £1,000.00 was awarded.

f) I do not, therefore, find that I can uphold the Appeal on this ground.

### 5. Appeal – conclusions.

5.1 I do not find that the grounds on which the Appeal has been made can be upheld.

Cllr. Joan Winfield,  
Chair,  
Grants Assessment Panel.  
18<sup>th</sup> April 2013.