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NOT CONFIDENTIAL

Introduction

Full Council decided (FC181211/451) that consideration should be given to re-introducing leisure fees, but introducing a grant-awarding scheme alongside this to assist clubs who have been proactively using the leisure fee waiver to boost their membership and reinvest in their sport. This would bring the total grants budget to £80,000. It was suggested that this figure remains under review and is reduced where possible.

Subsequently, Full Council decided (FC190122/486.1h) that fees would be reintroduced for the 2019-20 budget and would be counteracted by a leisure grant for clubs.

This paper aims to set the policy for delivery of this decision.

Details

The following financial information should be noted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Information</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure income 17-18 = £29,800 (budget at year start)</td>
<td>Grants linked to sports clubs 17-18 = £0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure income 18-19 = £0</td>
<td>Grants linked to sports clubs 18-19 = £370 (Sp Nest Bowls Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected leisure income (including RPI increase for years 18-19 and 19-20) = £31,615</td>
<td>Grants linked to sports clubs 19-20 = maximum of £23,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

1. That the grants budget of £23,615 is ring-fenced and is treated as a maximum total payable to sports clubs which use Lowestoft Town Council facilities.
2. That the grants are only applied where there is a track-record of an established club attracting new members/users and/or investing in improvements to facilities, from the opportunity provided through the savings in fees in 18-19.
3. That the proportion of the grant will be informed by the respective proportion of the fee income but will also take into account the degree to which opportunities were taken as per 2 above. For example, a club that has a track-record of particularly positive delivery on new members/users (a major priority for the Council) and has a particularly good plan for further work, might well take a high proportion of the ring-fenced grant budget.
4. That grants are unlikely to be paid to any club that treated the withdrawal of fees as a windfall and/or whose resultant activities had a negligible positive impact on membership, use or facilities.
5. That grants will not be paid to private individuals; an established club with appropriate policies and governance arrangements is required for access to a grant.
6. That clubs are written to explaining the new policy, made within the context of challenging budgetary decisions for the Council, and advising of the grant application process.

Note: There has been no decision to continue to allow the public to play without charge. The budget was based on the total leisure income in 17-18, including the income from the public, with the addition of RPI for 18-19 and 19-20.