

Rent subsidy application

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Property Name & Address | Community Café |
| 2. Market Rent & Valuation Date | £20,000 per annum. |
| 3. Applicants Details (including charity No., main contact etc) | Fictional Charity number:XXXX Contact - XXXXX |
| 4. Applicants proposed use of the building | Community Café |
| 5. Governance arrangement | Registered Charity |
| 6. Supporting Evidence submitted <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Business plan• Copies of audited accounts (3 years for established / or projected 3 year cash flow) | Supporting Evidence provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accounts - actuals for 2018/19 and forecast for 2019/20.• Report from charity outlining the cafes performance, current finances, projections for 2019/20 and case studies. |
| 9. Directorate sponsor (relevant organisational Director i.e. Childrens services etc) | Adult social care |
| 8. Qualifying test: | The predicted income is sufficient to cover the property at market rent, however when all other costs and expenditures are |

| | |
|---|--|
| Does the organisation have sufficient core funding to cover the property market rent? | taken into account the café is running at a loss greater than the market rent. |
|---|--|

A. Financial Resources

| | Weighting | Justification | Score |
|---|---|---|-------|
| % of total project capital costs secured | 100% - 20 | | |
| | 75% - 15 | | |
| | 50% - 10 | | |
| | 25% - 5 | | |
| | Less than 25% - 0 | | |
| | | | |
| Sustainability of future revenue income stream for the business | Strong evidence - 20 3 year projections provided show income exceeding on-going costs | | |
| | Good evidence - 15 3 year projections show good evidence of revenue meeting on-going costs | | |
| | Some evidence - 10 limited evidence of revenue meeting on-going costs | | |
| | Little evidence - 5 on-going costs exceed substantiated revenue levels | Accounts show that the cafe made a loss during 2018/19. The forecast provided for 2019/20 shows a greater loss than that made in 2018/19. | 5 |
| | No evidence - 0 no evidence presented | | |

B. Contribution towards Portsmouth City Councils Priorities

| | Weighting | Justification | Score |
|--|---|---|-------|
| How does the organisation support the Council in meeting its corporate priorities and objectives | Strong Evidence - 20 Clear and demonstrable evidence on how the organisation helps the council to meet many of its priorities | | |
| | High Evidence - 15 Clear and demonstrable evidence on how the organisation helps the Council to meet at least one of its priorities | Evidence shows the organisation helps the Council meet the following priority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make Portsmouth a City that works together, enabling communities to thrive and people to live healthy, safe and independent lives. | 15 |
| | Some Evidence - 10 evidence shows to some extent how this organisation helps the Council meet at least one of its priorities | | |
| | Little Evidence - 5 Limited information on how this organisation helps or could help the Council meet at least one of its priorities | | |
| | No Evidence - 0 No evidence provided on how the organisation | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | helps the Council meet any of its priorities | | |
| | | | |

C. Benefit to Portsmouth as a whole

| | Weighting | Justification | Score |
|---|---|--|-------|
| How does the organisation support Portsmouth as a whole | Strong Evidence - 20 Clear and demonstrable evidence on how the organisation benefits the community and the City | | |
| | High Evidence - 15 shows how the organisation benefits the community and the City, but could be better evidenced | | |
| | Some Evidence - 10 shows to some extent how this organisation benefits the community and the City, but could be better evidenced | <p>The café employs individuals who are recovering from the effects of poor mental health, addiction and homelessness with case studies provided.</p> <p>There is little evidence to show the impact that the café has on the wider community.</p> | 10 |
| | Little Evidence - 5 Limited information on how this organisation benefits the community or the City | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | No Evidence - 0 No evidence provided on how the organisation benefits the community | | |
| | | | |

D. Detriment if unable to provide service from selected building

| | Weighting | Justification | Score |
|--|---|--|-------|
| What would be the detrimental impact on the Council and the City if the organisation was unable to carry out services from the asset | Very significant impact - 20 Clear and demonstrable high negative impact on the Council and the City | | |
| | Notable impact - 15 shows clearly a notable to high impact on the Council and City | There is a strong chance that there will be some reputational damage to the Council. | 15 |
| | Some impact - 10 shows there would be some negative impact on the Council and City | | |
| | Little Evidence - 5 Limited impact demonstrated through submission | | |
| | No Evidence - 0 No evidence of negative impact on either Council or City. | | |

Scoring Matrix

| 100% | No rent payable | Percentage Score |
|----------|-------------------|------------------|
| 90 - 99% | 10% rent payable | |
| 80 - 89% | 20% rent payable | |
| 70 - 79% | 30% rent payable | |
| 60 - 69% | 40% rent payable | |
| 50 - 59% | 50% rent payable | 56.25% |
| 40 - 45% | 60% rent payable | |
| 30 - 35% | 70% rent payable | |
| 20 - 25% | 80% rent payable | |
| 10 - 19% | 90% rent payable | |
| 0 - 9% | 100% rent payable | |

The '% of total project capital costs secured' has been deemed non applicable to this application and has therefore not been included. The scoring has been adjusted accordingly and the percentage calculated on a potential total score of 80.

Score = 45/80

= 56.25%

Resulting in a recommended 50% reduction to the market rent.