

## **Task Group – Distribution Proposals**

Based on discussions at the last Task Group Meeting on 04 December, the officers have prepared a summary of the submitted proposals, for the next meeting on 9 January 2020.

To assist future discussions, the officers have produced a perceived pros and cons list and some notes on each submitted proposal. These details have been prepared without prejudice, and are aimed at supporting the task group and not to give weight to any specific proposal.

The proposals are based on a projected income of £1m.

### **Proposal 1 – Split 60/20/20:**

#### **Strategic Projects 60% £600k**

- 2 x £200k Controlled by BCKLWN
- 1 x £200k 3<sup>rd</sup> party controlled and monitored by BCKLWN
- Fund matched by recipient.
- Allocated to:
  - Education related to employment (post 18 college based education)
  - Transport, linked to Lynn Transport Plan
  - Environment – green areas linked to Climate Change Policy

#### **Community Projects 20% £200k**

- Parish(es)/Ward requests
- £10k and £50k (Max 20/Min 4 Projects)
- Identified through the Local Plan
- To support infrastructure
- Parishes to contribute subject to budget constraint
- Scope:
  - Education (local initiatives)
  - Health
  - Economic Development

#### **Smaller Projects 20% £200k**

- Very local projects
- Parish Council and other organisation requests
- £1k - £2k (Max 200 projects)
- Fund matched by recipient
- Scope:
  - Community Facilities
  - Green Infrastructure
  - Open Space and Leisure
  - Community Transport

- Surplus to be devolved to Community Projects Fund

**Pros:**

- Overall
  - Projects, no matter where in the Borough, would have the same opportunity to get CIL funding
  - Match funding will make the CIL fund go further and show buy in from the recipient party
- Strategic Projects:
  - scope could be reviewed annually to meet changing corporate priorities
  - could support the Local Plan developments
- Community Projects & Smaller Projects:
  - the scope seems to match Parish Council possible projects
  - will spread money to different projects and places
  - scope could be reviewed annually to meet changing Parish priorities

**Cons:**

- Strategic Projects:
  - may be too restrictive to stipulate specific cost e.g.£200k per project
  - excluding NCC may not be in the best interest of the community
- Community projects:
  - education/health – State Aid (cannot subsidise private businesses)
- Smaller Projects:
  - potential admin burden of 200 projects

**Notes:**

- Overall: Maybe more weight given to areas with significant development taking place
- Strategic Projects: Maybe have more flexibility and not stipulate specific cost per project.
- Smaller Projects: Maybe increase the maximum from £2k to £10k
- Community & Smaller Projects: Payment on completion of project, to reduce monitoring/admin requirements

**Proposal 2: All Parishes**

Based on merit including where significant development has taken place, reflecting planning application approvals.

**Pros:**

- Simple and makes sense to match planning development

Cons:

- Distribution not as obvious – could be perceived as less transparent
- Difficult to scope/set selection criteria

Notes:

- The selection criteria of a % split option, could give more weight to areas with significant development taking place.

### **Proposal 3 - Split 3 ways:**

**1/3 £333k** – Requests up to £1,000 (possible 333 projects at 1k)

**1/3 £333k** – Requests between £1,001 and £10,000 (possible 33 projects at 10k)

**1/3 £333k** – Major projects over £10,000

Pros:

- Simple division of funds
- Transparent

Cons:

- Difficult to scope/set selection criteria
- Heavy admin burden due to large amount of projects
- Will not reflect strategic level spending to support development

Notes:

- Similar to proposal one but less money spent on larger infrastructure projects