

# CIL Spending Panel Monday, 17th February, 2025 at 10.00 am in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ

# Reports marked to follow on the Agenda and/or Supplementary Documents

1. Late correspondence in relation to this round of funding (Pages 2 - 5) (Please note there are a couple of points changed and some minor clarifications)

#### **Contact**

Democratic Services
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
King's Court
Chapel Street
King's Lynn
Norfolk
PE30 1EX

Tel: 01553 616394

Email: democratic.services@west-norfolk.gov.uk

## CIL FY25 1 Spending Panel – Late Correspondence

#### SLT:

After the report was published, Senior Leadership Team met and briefly discussed the CIL applications. No comments have been put forward to Spending Panel, as the team are aware of our upcoming governance review and their comments from the previous meeting are still relevant – please see appendix.

#### Application changes:

Once the report had been published, we received further clarifying comments from some applicants, which has resulted in a couple of changes to the scoring. Please note the following:

- Thornham Village Hall application for £157k moved from 15 points to 13. This is
  due to including a previous CIL grant (£70k, allocated in October 2024) within their
  match-funding. The amount of external match-funding has meant they now score 3
  points for this area. Please note appendix with applicant's comments relating to their
  match-funding.
- Upwell PC application for £8,750 (insulation & remedial work) moved from 12 points to 11. This is due to recalculating the match-funding, which should have been 4 points not including the parish precept.

#### Application notes:

Please note the following clarifications to applications:

- BCKLWN application for £58k the planning permission referred to in this application has now been granted as of 06.02.25.
- South Creake PC for £11k confirmed that the County Cllr funding is £1,500 from Cllr Chenery
- Little Massingham PC for £27k clarified that phase 1 will be undertaken by the PC, this application is phase 2 and will link Great Massingham with Little Massingham, completing the paths within Little Massingham. Please note applicant's email below.

# Appendix 1: SLT Comments from FY24\_2

"The Senior Leadership Team (officer group), have reviewed the valid applications and made the following comments:

- Some projects are in areas without development, which doesn't align with the purpose of CIL, 'infrastructure to support new development'.
- Have alternative funding streams been explored, apart from information submitted, relating to matchfunding, there are no details relating to other alternative funding sought for each scheme.
- Some of the projects appear to be "nice to have" and not necessarily required or necessary to support new development
- Parishes may consider increasing their precepts, to fund some of the projects.
- Concerns raised relating to public safety, what would happen if these projects do not receive funding.
- There are many carpark resurfacing projects, concerns raised about whether this is an appropriate use of CIL and how these projects will be maintained once completed.
- Some of the 'green solar panels & heating' could potentially be funded in the latest round of WN UKSPF programme for 24/25. Which now includes a funding allocation for a <u>Go green Communities grant scheme</u>, to support decarbonisation of community buildings in West Norfolk, working in partnership with Community Action Norfolk (CAN).
- Larger long term projects, that align with the Corporate Objectives, scored very low compared to the smaller more community based schemes.
- Concerns were raised relating to the wider community benefit of some of the higher scoring projects, which appear to be based on the quality of the submitted application, and a great deal of weight is also given to speed of delivery, which may not always be the best measure.
- Community benefit is not currently scored so the wider impact/benefits are not taken
  into consideration. Whereas Local support is scored based on the type of evidence
  submitted, not the value of the support.

General comments made on the importance of identifying strategic infrastructure projects, and of setting aside CIL for these projects. It was recognised that this would need to come through a review of the CIL governance arrangements."

## Appendix 2: Thornham email

"We have so far raised / committed £309,000 out of the total build cost (to complete fit out) of £466,000 (66%). We were focussed on getting enough funding to make the Wind and Water Tight building (£309,000) and are now starting to focus on raising the difference, so we can have a fully completed and multi functional building.

We are in the early stages of this fund raising for the Internal Completion of the new pavilion. We had originally asked KLWNBC for £50,000 as we are also approaching other grant providers, individuals and also arranging direct fund raising activities. At your kind suggestion we increased this application to £157,000, this would fund the vast majority of the Internal works, although we will and would continue to fund raise, even if we received the £157,000 to ensure the long term sustainability and to provide future funding for start up events etc.

We are not quite sure how best to answer your question on match funding and we do not want anything to count against our bid. Overall we have raised 66% of the total that we need for full completion. As we stated in our bid we have a number of fund raising activities, in parallel to our CiL bid, in motion, (although none are completed yet) including:

- Race Night, specifically to raise funds, sponsored by Thornham Deli, we hope to raise £3,000. This is already well supported and takes place on February 28th 2025.
- We have approached a number of specific individuals for donations, to date we have raised £400 (in one week), although this process has only recently begun. We raised over £60,000 through private donations in our previous appeal and we would hope to get a significant sum this time as well.
- We have put in grant applications for a further £48,000 to the Garfield Weston foundation and hope to hear back within eight weeks.
- We are in the early stages of an application to Norfolk County Council and believe we have their support, although we have not yet had a commitment from them
- We are applying to Awards for All and Sport England for specific funding
- We have arranged with a local builder for a donation for kitchen equipment, which will be fitted free of charge by Thornham Cricket Club (value c £15,000)
- We are approaching Norfolk County Cricket Board for help with the changing room fit out, a value of around £20,000, we are in the process of submitting a formal bid

THVPF ourselves hope to have surplus funds that we can commit to the Internal fit out of the pavilion, through a number of non-specific increase funding actions and events we have taken over the last three months. We would hope to be able to commit a further £20,000.

We recognise that match funding is key, but it is difficult to produce that in these early stages of our fund raising efforts.

As a final thought I would say that, were we to be allocated the £157,000, this would be superb news for TVHPF, the village of Thornham and surrounding areas. We would have complete assurance that we could complete and finish the build in one go, possibly having a fully functional pavilion up and running by the Autumn, and thus able to provide a better and much wider variety of services to our community and the wider North West Norfolk Coast.

Yes, the £118,000 includes the previously given £70,000."

# Appendix 3: Little Massingham email

"This application is for phase 2 and it will link Great Massingham together safely along station road our bit continues to the bottom part of Little Massingham and almost joins to an existing footpath which runs to the old station house.

Phase 1 & 2 completes the paths within Little Massingham.

We are hoping to persuade Harpley PC to carry out the phase 3 as a permitted footpath, as it is within their Parish boundary. Some people are already using the route informally without the land owner getting upset. However it is over rough ground and is only fit to use by able body people."