

Scoring will be according to the following criteria, with scoring from 1 to 5, weighted for each category. In the case of a tie and limited budget available to fund all, those projects who align best with the Town vision & strategy, or a theme clearly communicated at the start of the round, will be given preference.

**Community Impact (60%)**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>1 – Poor</b>	Minimal or unclear community benefit. The project’s impact is short-lived, limited in reach, or poorly aligned with local needs. Little or no evidence of inclusion, equity, or meaningful change for participants.
<b>2</b>	Exceeds criteria for a score of 1, but does not fully meet criteria for score of 3.
<b>3 – Fair</b>	Clear and positive benefits to a defined community group. The project addresses a recognised need and considers inclusion, though its reach or depth is limited. Benefits may be short-term but could still be worthwhile and relevant.
<b>4</b>	Exceeds criteria for a score of 3, but does not fully meet criteria for score of 5.
<b>5 – Strong</b>	Significant or transformational, well-evidenced impact, either broad and accessible to many, or deeply beneficial for a smaller or underrepresented group. Demonstrates strong understanding of community needs, promotes inclusion and equity, and creates meaningful, lasting value (even if not permanent).

### Innovation and Creativity (15%)

Score	Descriptor
<b>1 – Poor</b>	No innovation or limited originality. The project repeats existing work, potentially with small new elements, but largely conventional or duplicative.
<b>2</b>	Exceeds criteria for a score of 1, but does not fully meet criteria for score of 3.
<b>3 – Fair</b>	Some innovative aspects; brings modest improvement on existing practice.
<b>4</b>	Exceeds criteria for a score of 3, but does not fully meet criteria for score of 5.
<b>5 – Strong</b>	Clearly innovative and creative. Significantly different from past efforts. Introduces new approaches, partnerships, or creative solutions to local issues. Can have strong potential to inspire or transform how things are done.

### Delivery (15%)

Score	Descriptor
<b>1 – Poor</b>	Unclear, unrealistic or basic plan with with significant gaps in costs, budgeting, timescales, or delivery capacity.
<b>2</b>	Exceeds criteria for a score of 1, but does not fully meet criteria for score of 3.
<b>3 – Fair</b>	Reasonably clear plan; timelines and costs broadly realistic, but some uncertainties about delivery capability.
<b>4</b>	Exceeds criteria for a score of 3, but does not fully meet criteria for score of 5.
<b>5 – Strong</b>	Well-developed plan with clear timelines, realistic and transparent costs, and strong evidence of delivery capability.

### Financial Need (10%)

<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>1 – Poor</b>	Limited or unclear evidence of financial need. Budget lacks detail or transparency. The organisation should be able to fund the project from its own reserves or other sources, with little or no justification for seeking Town Council support.
<b>2</b>	Exceeds criteria for a score of 1, but does not fully meet criteria for score of 3.
<b>3 – Fair</b>	Some evidence of financial need. Budget is broadly clear, with partial identification of other funding sources. The organisation provides some justification for the grant request, including use of reserves, though this may lack detail or be only partially convincing.
<b>4</b>	Exceeds criteria for a score of 3, but does not fully meet criteria for score of 5.
<b>5 – Strong</b>	Clear and well-evidenced financial need. Detailed and transparent budget with realistic costs and identified funding sources. Demonstrates that Town Council support is necessary to deliver the project, with appropriate use of reserves or a strong justification where reserves or surplus exist.