

## **Assessment process for the LPW Roof Repair Fund – first round (early 2015)**

*Firstly all applications were checked against the programme's core eligibility requirements:*

- *whether they were formally designated as a listed building;*
- *whether the place of worship was used solely or mainly as a public place of worship, and used for worship at least six times a year (the exception being buildings owned or vested in specific charities that look after redundant places of worship)*
- *whether the applicant organisation responsible for maintaining and repairing the place of worship*
- *whether the project was for repairs to the roof/rainwater disposal system*
- *whether the work had been identified in a professional report as being necessary within the next five years*
- *whether the applicant was in receipt of a grant from a statutory agency or Lottery distributor that was still in delivery and not complete*
- *for a grant of between £10,000 - £100,000*
- *not for an Anglican or Catholic Cathedral in England, a school or hospital chapel or privately owned.*

*If applications met these requirements they then considered the following in order to determine the level of Delivery Risk and level of Sustainability Risk, and the overall Value for Money:*

- *The relative urgency of the identified repair needs*
- *Why public money was required*
- *Whether the project was well planned*
- *Whether the project was financially realistic.*

*Projects where the repair work was stated in the application form as being needed within 1 – 2 years had a greater priority than those where the repair was identified as being needed within a longer time frame.*

*To identify delivery risk, they looked at how well the project was planned and costed, including the amount indicated for fees and contingency, whether the project met the focus of the scheme, whether there was a clear project timetable, whether the applicant had identified and established a mitigation for risks to the delivery of the scheme, the level of secured funding, whether there was a competent professional advisor involved, whether there was support from the diocese or equivalent, and whether they demonstrated that the work would follow best conservation practice.*

*To identify sustainability risk, they considered the level of funds available to the parish are (unrestricted funds and funds in the accounts), the support from the diocese including confirmation that there are no plans for reordering that will affect the church, the extent to which the project will meet the repair needs of the building, confirmation of maintenance plans.*

*Risks were marked as Low, Medium or High, with Low being the most desirable.*

*They then looked at the overall Value for Money, by considering whether the grant applied for was realistic, for work that would make a real difference to the building, with realistic partnership funding, whether that partnership funding included a contribution from the parish and how many days the place of worship is open to the public.*

*The grants budget was allocated on a pro-rata basis, reflecting the number of applications and the size of the grant request in each of the devolved administrations and the English Regions.*

*Based on talk by Richard Bellamy to members of HRBA, June 2015*