

Appendix D – Pros and cons of current and alternative approaches to WDBC grant schemes

Scheme	Approach	Pros	Cons	Recommendation
TAP Fund	Link Meeting (current approach)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Ownership' by Town/Parish Councils at local level - Link meetings are considered an example of collaborative working - Officer administration is limited to summarising grants, troubleshooting and making payments - Officers can quickly get updates about criteria/changes to Town/Parish Councils via the Link administrator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Link Administrator costs of £2,125 p/a are taken from the TAP fund - WDBC officers lose ability to weed out the weaker applications - Some Link meetings are more time consuming to assist than others - Lack of consistency in approach by Link Meetings 	<p>Retain current approach</p> <p>Officers will continue to engage with DCC with respect refinements of the approach and criteria</p>
	WDBC officers attend Link meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Ownership' by Town/Parish Councils at local level - Link meetings are considered an example of collaborative working - WDBC officer on hand to address concerns/remind of criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unlikely to save the c.£1,800 p/a as minute taking, etc. still required, so additional officer cost - Risks WDBC officers getting dragged in to petty debates – may confuse rather than clarify - Perception of WDBC officers interfering 	Do not follow this approach
	Decisions made by DCC/WDBC Members at a quarterly/biannual/annual meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear deadlines and decision making process - More likely to be consistent application of criteria across the Borough - A level playing field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WDBC will have to deal with accusations of some parishes losing out - Might be perceived as taking decision making away from the local level - Not light touch 	Do not follow this approach
	Allocate pro-rata £s per Town/Parish based on elector numbers and either pay direct to Town/Parish or officers check proposed projects before paying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Towns may welcome due to level of funding and ability to deliver larger projects - Town/Parishes would welcome direct control of funds - Would assist with delivery of projects where Town/Parish Council struggle to find a collaborating partner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less accountability/ability to enforce criteria - Small parishes likely to lose out/be unable to deliver any meaningful projects due to size of electorate - Loses the collaboration aspect of the Fund 	Do not follow this approach
Community Projects	Capital scheme (current approach)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports variety of new/improved community infrastructure - Draws in significant match funding - Light touch, quick turnaround of applications - Clear guidance which is easily understood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has been undersubscribed in some previous years - No revenue aspect to the fund - Match funding requirement may rule out some applications 	<p>Better promotion of the scheme (alongside other grant schemes)</p> <p>Incorporate Sports grant into this scheme</p>
	Funds devolved to Members locality budget (c.£1K per Member) – decisions made by Members, payments made by officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members have control of the budgets, and can spend according to perception of local need - Reduces administration for officers - Potential for collaboration with adjacent Members (although probably unlikely) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less accountability (potential audit concerns) - Difficult to apply impartiality - Reduces ability to fund larger projects and limits match funding - Likely some Members will be over-subscribed, others underspent 	Do not follow this approach
	Exclude applications to the Community Project Grant Scheme from projects within Dartmoor National Park which have already received support from the DNPA Sustainable Communities Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoids double funding the same project with funds from the same source (New Homes Bonus monies) - Ensures a level playing field across the Borough (i.e. regardless of being sited inside/outside DNP), redressing a current disadvantage to projects outside DNP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduces ability of projects to secure match funding locally – occasionally projects would lose out (e.g. Walkhampton Village Hall successfully secured £10K from both funds in 2017) 	Exclude applications to the Community Project Grant Scheme from projects within DNP which have already received support from the DNPA Sustainable Communities Fund
	Set up a revenue budget of £5,300 and a maximum grant of £500, including in kind contributions. (And ring fenced VIA funding - if not used by VIA to be transferred to this revenue budget)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could support wider variety of projects (e.g. charities that provide mental/health/wellbeing support) - Recognises that facilities require maintenance, or may have officer/professional costs to facilitate projects - Likely to have some local economic benefit - Supports community cohesion and vibrancy - May sustain valued local arts and heritage events - Inclusion of 'in-kind' as match funding may enable more projects to meet project costs and apply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Might lead to a reliance by annual events/festivals on this fund, with less focus on achieving sustainability - May have an annual underspend (noting level of previous applications in Appendix B) - Possible reliance on 'in-kind' funds as opposed to drawing in external funding 	As funds are readily available due to capital underspend follow this new approach but review in 12-18 months to assess whether £5,300 funding level is appropriate.

Sports	Capital and revenue (current approach)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applications tend to be a split of capital (kit/facilities) and revenue (training) – a split that seems to meet needs of small and growing clubs - The scheme is for small grants which suits the needs of grassroots sports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Underspend in recent years - Requires sports development officer support to maximise ability of clubs to spot opportunities and have confidence to apply for funds - Not sufficiently benefiting the clubs that need this type of funding 	<p>Incorporate £6,130 of this fund into Community Projects Scheme amending criteria accordingly, and retain a revenue budget line of £2K to cover training cost applications</p> <p>Seek to ensure that OCRA perform their role of signposting and supporting for community groups within their existing SLA with WDBC (and also new SLA with Tone Leisure) with respect to sports development. Encourage them to be proactive in maximising uptake of this scheme</p> <p>Officers and Members to proactively promote the scheme to groups they consider eligible</p>
	Transfer funds to Okehampton Community Recreation Association (OCRA) for administering on WDBC's behalf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OCRA are performing the role (albeit at a much reduced cost) of the previous WDBC Sports Development Officer and are well placed to signpost and support clubs in applying to this fund - Would maximise likelihood of funds reaching clubs that need them the most - Likely to give clubs the confidence to apply for funds – perception of dealing with a 'community recreation group' as opposed to 'the Council' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would incur a Management Fee - Reduces ability for Members/officers to influence decision making - Would require monitoring by officers, so may not reduce administration - Arguably OCRA should be undertaking this role already through their SLA with WDBC, and also their SLA with Tone Leisure - Less recognition of these funds being from the Council (i.e. good PR) 	<p>Do not follow this approach</p> <p>BUT, seek to ensure that OCRA perform their role of signposting and supporting for community groups within their existing SLA with WDBC (and also new SLA with Tone Leisure) with respect to sports development. Encourage them to be proactive in maximising uptake of this scheme</p>
S106 Community Facilities Fund	Capital fund (current approach) administered via the s106 CFF application process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports projects which mitigate the pressures of new residents on local facilities by enabling new/improved facilities – allows targeting towards projects which would meet CIL regulation requirements - Town and Parish Councils are aware of the available funding - Not proactively promoted as an open grant schemes – reduces administration/time dealing with unsuitable applications - Robust and transparent process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited awareness in the community of the fund - Some suitable projects may miss out on funding 	<p>Retain current approach</p> <p>Create a WDBC webpage advising of available funds and include on one-page summary of WDBC grant schemes</p> <p>Ensure Town and Parish Councils and Ward Members are kept up to date on available s106 funds</p>
DNP Sustainable Communities Fund	Capital fund administered by DNPA officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No administration for WDBC - High number of good quality applications - WDBC Ward Members consulted on applications in their respective areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for double funding projects already supported by WDBC Community Project Grant scheme - Responds to local need, and applicant groups have support of a DNPA officer 	<p>Retain current approach</p> <p>Request that DNPA do not support projects already in receipt of a grant offer from the WDBC Community Project scheme</p>