

## Capital Criteria Matrix

## Appendix 7

Funding Criteria Questions	Alleygating Fund (£15,000)	Burley Early Years (£30,000)	Improvements to grass verges/ footpaths/ highways (£20,000)	Headingley environmental improvements (£50,000)	Little Woodhouse Play Area (£60,000)	Al Haqq School (£30,000)
a) Does the project contribute to the main themes of the Area Delivery Plan?	5	5	5	5	5	3
b) Will the outcomes of the project contribute towards the Council's Corporate aims?	5	5	5	5	5	3
c) Will the project bring additional benefits/ Services to the area?	3	5	3	3	5	3
d) Does the project meet an identified community need?	5	5	3	3	3	3
e) Does the project benefit the whole, BME or deprived communities?	3	5	3	3	5	5
f) Is the project sustainable?	3	5	3	3	3	5
g) Have clear targets outcomes been set?	3	5	5	5	1	3
h) Does the project demonstrate value for money?	5	5	3	5	5	5
i) Does the project meet an identified gap in project delivery, not already filled in this year's allocation?	1	5	5	5	5	1
j) What are the risks involved with project delivery, are they kept to a minimum?	5	5	3	3	1	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>34</b>
Scope for a lesser amount?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Implication of a lesser amount	Match funding through Community Safety would be reduced resulting in fewer schemes	Understanding that funding committed, therefore already spent	Reduced number of schemes able to be funded	Match funding for the Headingley Town and District Centres scheme. A reduction in the amount would reduce the scope of the project	This is the minimum amount that would allow a play area to be created	£25,000 would be the minimum amount needed in order to carry out the project. Match funding from the Muslim Council

## Capital Criteria Matrix

## Appendix 7

Funding Criteria Questions	Becketts Park Play Area (£50,000)	Little London Multi Use Games Area (£10,000)	Kirkstall Valley Park (£30,000)	Woodhouse Ridge Improvements (£9,100)	Silk Mills Play Area (£59,847)
a) Does the project contribute to the main themes of the Area Delivery Plan?	5	5	5	5	5
b) Will the outcomes of the project contribute towards the Council's Corporate aims?	5	5	5	5	5
c) Will the project bring additional benefits/ Services to the area?	3	5	5	3	5
d) Does the project meet an identified community need?	5	5	5	3	5
e) Does the project benefit the whole, BME or deprived communities?	5	5	5	3	5
f) Is the project sustainable?	5	5	3	5	3
g) Have clear targets outcomes been set?	3	3	3	3	5
h) Does the project demonstrate value for money?	5	5	5	5	5
i) Does the project meet an identified gap in project delivery, not already filled in this year's allocation?	5	5	5	3	5
j) What are the risks involved with project delivery, are they kept to a minimum?	5	5	3	5	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>46</b>
Scope for a lesser amount?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Implication of a lesser amount	Total cost = £125,000. £75,000 S106 from Filter Beds scheme expected end 06/early 07. The remaining S106 isn't expected until 2008, if well-being isn't approved the project cannot be completed until after this. If it is approved, then design and feasibility can begin immediately and the project is not awaiting the second wave of S106.	Amount requested already reduced from £20,000. Need to secure a further £20,000 funding (including this bid) for the project to go ahead. Awaiting funding confirmation from both Leeds Federated Housing and the Football Foundation to make up the remaining £10,000	£20,000 would allow access issues to be tackled, such as cycle tracks	A lesser amount would mean a reduction in the amount of equipment purchased.	This is the minimum amount that would allow a play area to be created.