

## Local Improvement Fund 2021/22: Cross-Party Advisory Panel Recommendations

|   | <b>Amount Requested</b> | <b>Advisory Panel Recommendation</b>                                    | <b>Panel Feedback</b>  |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Central</b>  |                         |   |  |
| Application 1 – Creating a wildlife sanctuary at Sickle Street  | <b>£28,835</b>          | <b>FUND</b>   | Overall a positive application, creating a community space, helping residents engage with wildlife.  |
| Application 2 – Update the outdated weather pitch / astro turf on West End Street   | <b>£65,000</b>          | <b>DO NOT FUND</b>  | The panel agreed that the application required additional design work. It would also be helpful to consider what the wider use of the grounds may be. The panel raised concerns about the use of match funding that hasn't been secured yet, adding risk to the successful delivery of the project. The panel recommended the application be deferred to a future funding round, so the concerns raised can be fully answered. |
| Application 3 – Fully repair the ongoing issues within the OBA Millennium Cultural Centre                                 | <b>£37,500-£108,200</b> | <b>FUND</b><br>(Advisory Panel recommend providing £50,000 LIF funding) | There are some financial figures included in the application, though it is not clear how they break down, or the link between the different elements of the bid and the benefits<br>The panel agreed that the project was important for the local community so proposed allocating £50,000 to the project to enable the delivery of urgent works.  |
| <b>East</b>   |                         |   |  |
| Application 4 – Refurbishing existing street furniture and community notice boards at Stoneleigh and Whitehall Lane parks | <b>£56,310</b>          | <b>FUND</b>   | The panel agreed that it was important to ensure a fair allocation of funding between the two parks, based on the priorities outlined in the funding applications. This needs to be agreed by ward members.  |
| Application 5 – Saddleworth Historical Society Holly Bank Project   | <b>£60,587-£79,502</b>  | <b>DO NOT FUND</b>  | The Advisory Panel felt that the project had merit. However, they felt that the level of benefit compared to cost was lower than other projects and therefore would not be as impactful.   |

|  |                |                    |   |
|--|----------------|--------------------|---|
|  |                |                    | They recommended that the project be looked at again in future if more LIF funding were available.  |
| Application 6 – Carry out essential repairs to Friezland arena   | <b>£18,410</b> | <b>FUND</b>        | The panel recognised the positivity of the project, especially as the group have already actively sought other funding to support the delivery of the project. The panel felt that the application was incredibly positive, helping refurbish a well-used community asset.  |
| Application 7 – Deliver improvements to child safety and road congestion along Rowland Way and Medlock Way | <b>£22,930</b> | <b>FUND</b>        | The panel agreed that this was a positive application, recognising that improvements would lead to greater child safety in the area.  |
| Application 8 – Repairs and refurbishment of Springhead Community Centre                                   | <b>£10,000</b> | <b>FUND</b>        | The panel agreed that the refurbishments would help to continue providing an important community facility, so recommended allocating funding,   |
| Application 9 – Belmont Ave. open space improvements   | <b>£35,200</b> | <b>DO NOT FUND</b> | <p>The panel agreed that the application has merit but raised concerns about funding. Could grant funding be explored to support the bid?</p> <p>The panel agreed that if this is a safety issue (the path is unsafe), it should not be funded by the LIF. It is recommended that Members discuss with Highways, so a safety assessment can be undertaken.</p> <p>If the pathway improvement element of the project was removed, the remaining application would be Revenue and not eligible for the LIF.</p> <p>The panel recommended seeing if Pocket Park funding be explored. Officers were requested to provide feedback directly to the applicant, so that other funding sources could be considered, including a future bid to the LIF if appropriate.</p> |
| Application 10 – Lydgate Leaving Lockdown  | <b>£20,000</b> | <b>FUND</b>        | The panel agreed that the application was well developed, and welcomed the additional funding secured from a range of other sources to supplement the funding from the LIF.   |
| <b>North</b>   |                |                    |   |

|  |                        |   |  |
|--|------------------------|---|--|
| Application 11 – Improve traffic management on the approach to Tandle Hill   | <b>£36,000</b>         | <b>FUND</b>   | The Panel agreed the expanded project had significant merit and approved funding it.   |
| Application 12 – To make the road to St Paul’s School safer for young people | <b>£6,900</b>          | <b>FUND</b>   | The Panel expressed some concerns that the funding requested would make delivery very tight. They agreed however that the project has significant merit and should be supported.   |
| Application 13 – Salmon Fields Highway Improvement                           | <b>£25,000</b>         | <b>FUND</b><br>(Advisory Panel recommend providing £20,000 LIF funding) | The Panel welcomed the project but felt that it would be most appropriate to utilise £20,000 of LIF funding on the project and to source the remaining £5,000 locally.   |
| Application 14 – Improvements to Dogford Park                                | <b>£34,800</b>         | <b>FUND</b>   | The Panel welcomed the project, providing funding both to address safety issues and to improve the aesthetics and usability of the park.   |
| Application 15 – HCP Tennis Courts   | <b>£27,724-£47,600</b> | <b>DO NOT FUND</b>  | The Panel felt that the lower cost option would not prove economical in the long-run, but that the higher cost option was too great a proportion of the funding for the potential benefit in comparison to other bids.   |
| Application 16 – George Street Pitch   | <b>£5,990</b>          | <b>FUND</b>   | The Panel welcomed the project as an efficient use of funds and agreed to support it.  |
| Application 17 – Crompton Cemetery Improvements                              | <b>£12,850</b>         | <b>FUND</b>   | The Panel was positive about improving Crompton Cemetery, recognising it as an important community asset. The Panel agreed to spend £12850 on the project.   |
| <b>South</b>   |                        |   |  |
| Application 18 – Refurbish Progress Community Hub                            | <b>£20,000-£25,000</b> | <b>FUND</b><br>(Advisory Panel recommend providing £20,000 LIF funding) | The Panel agreed for £20,000 to be spent on this project, subject to a definitive quote being provided, having funding contingent upon agreement on what will be delivered and the agreed contractor having sound financial history.<br><br>Members agreed that there needs to be additionality. |

|   |                |             |  |
|---|----------------|-------------|--|
| Application 19 – Fitton Hill and Hathershaw Bulldogs, restoring community base  | <b>£20,636</b> | <b>FUND</b> | The Panel welcomed this project and the additional funding sources the applicants had secured and agreed to support its progress.  |
| <b>West</b>   |                |             |  |
| Application 20 – Traffic Calming and Road Safety Scheme Burnley Lane Chadderton | <b>£44,146</b> | <b>FUND</b> | The Panel were happy to support the scheme which will significantly improve road safety in Chadderton  |
| Application 21 – Traffic calming across the Firwood Park Estate                 | <b>£30,000</b> | <b>FUND</b> | The Panel supported the project which combines funding from the LIF to funds allocated from the Capital Programme to achieve significant benefits.   |
| Application 22 – Nile Mill Engine House Restoration                             | <b>£20,000</b> | <b>FUND</b> | Members felt that the Council should support the project and building by funding it. Members agreed that funding the project through the LIF has the potential to unlock further funding from elsewhere. |
| Application 23 – Reimagining Chadderton District Centre                         | <b>£25,000</b> | <b>FUND</b> | The Panel was happy to support this project which they felt would be highly beneficial for Chadderton town centre.   |