



**Note of the meeting of the Neighbourhood CIL Panel for Bath
held on Monday, 26th April, 2021
in Zoom Online - Private**

Meeting Attendance

In Attendance

Councillor Rob Appleyard

Councillor Colin Blackburn

Councillor Jess David

Dave Dixon

Roger Driver

Mark Hayward

Robin Kerr

Apologies Received from

Councillor Sue Craig

1. Financial Overview

The panel were provided with an updated overview of the current financial position. for Bath CIL funding. Before any recommendations from this meeting were made the balance stood at £124,197.07.

The funding available has increased largely down to two previously approved applications no longer being able to deliver the projects. These were £5,000 to Julian House and £80,000 to the Newbridge Rotunda project.

At the previous meeting an application was agreed for the Rosewarn Park MUGA. A miscalculation was made by the applicant which led to the VAT element of the funding not being included. The panel were written too and asked if they would support making a recommendation for an additional £9,000 to allow the project to move forward. All responses had agreed, and nobody objected. The panel was asked to confirm if they were still happy with this decision, and all were in favour.

2. Improving the Gore, Bear Flat

The panel in principle felt that this project was worthy of support but there needed to be several points clarified before a positive recommendation could be made.

- Clarity around how the position of the setting up of the CIC who would be managing the finance.
- A better understanding of what support has been agreed with Wessex Water around relocation of the large green valve box. Additionally, an approximate cost for the work that Wessex are contributing.
- The project costs need to be reviewed and confirmed.
- A better understanding of how the project is being supported locally, the costing for any voluntary work that has already taken place and is planned.
- The suggestion was made that the project may wish to consider all the aspects that are needed to achieve the bigger outcomes for The Gore.
- The panel asked what local fundraising ideas had taken place or were being planned to contribute to the overall scheme. It was also suggested that the applicant may want to apply for funding from the World Heritage Enhancement Fund.
- The suggestion was made that making a feature of the fountain could be considered as has been done at a location on Walcot Street in Bath.
- Based on the current proposal the panel would be prepared to ringfence £3,000 but are mindful that once resubmitted this will probably change.

It was agreed that the application would not be recommended at this stage, but the Council Officers would feedback to the applicant and bring back further information to panel members.

Improving the Gore, Bear Flat – Follow Up Agreed Recommended

Clarity around how the position of the setting up of the CIC who would be managing the finance.

Confirmation that the CIC application has progressed.

- A better understanding of what support has been agreed with Wessex Water around relocation of the large green valve box. Additionally, an approximate cost for the work that Wessex are contributing.

Wessex Water costs are now included in the proposal. Wessex Water has provided costs incurred and projected future costs which I have included in Section 4.

- The project costs need to be reviewed and confirmed.

Confirmation of the original and wider project costs have been included.

- A better understanding of how the project is being supported locally, the costing for any voluntary work that has already taken place and is planned.

Resident quotes and volunteer contributions are now included in the application.

- The suggestion was made that the project may wish to consider all the aspects that are needed to achieve the bigger outcomes for The Gore.

The updated application places more emphasis on the overall Vision and CIO, emphasising that this application is the initial funding to support the wider project.

- The panel asked what local fundraising ideas had taken place or were being planned to contribute to the overall scheme. It was also suggested that the applicant may want to apply for funding from the World Heritage Enhancement Fund.

The update has highlighted BFA contributions to date and possibly for the future in the costs section (Section 4)

- The suggestion was made that making a feature of the fountain could be considered as has been done at a location on Walcot Street in Bath.

This has been discussed and additions such as this will be considered.

- Based on the current proposal the panel would be prepared to ringfence £3,000 but are mindful that once resubmitted this will probably change.

The wider aims are set out, the application amount is for £5,000.

The revised application which contains the additional information that was discussed.

- Robin Kerr - I am now content with this.
- Roger Driver - Have we enough in the budget to give the higher amount? If we have, I'm happy to support this.
- Councillor Jess David - I am still rather torn about the wider community benefit of this project. Do you know of any other sources of money for heritage projects?
My preference would be to offer part-funding unless we feel neighbourhood CIL is the only available money.
- Councillor Rob Appleyard - Okay now have a clearer idea after speaking with a ward Cllr. I feel comfortable supporting the work the stonemason will undertake with the proviso that WW have committed to moving their box once stability to the Gore is established. I would not think supporting addition elements such as highways work etc is in our focus on this one.
- Councillor Colin Blackburn - Regarding this application, whilst I understand the desire to improve this realm and the engagement of Wessex Water is very positive, I can't see much community engagement for this and their efforts to promote the project, its aims and fundraising potential is not really evident, bar a small donation from the association. Apart from the aesthetic improvement, I find it hard to see the community benefit from a spot on a junction that is barely noticed and rarely walked to. Having said my bit here, if the panel are mindful to provide some support, I would go along with it but would prefer we keep our original suggested contribution and see how active they can become to raise the rest to get the project done.

3. Friends of the Jewish Burial Ground

This application received overall support from the panel. The panel did ask for clarity on several points

- It needs to be confirmed that the burial ground does not have any obligations from the Council to manage it as a closed site as per The Church of England sites.
- The Council are not obliged to support the site in any other way.

The panel agreed to recommend a grant of £9,612 to the Jewish Burial Ground.

*Following the panel meeting Council Officers were able to confirm that on both points raised by the panel that the Jewish Burial Ground does not receive any other support through the Council.

4. Bath Shed Group Workshop at Bath City Farm

The panel felt that they would be supportive of making a recommendation for Bath City Farm to receive the grant for £9,645 towards the provision of the premises for the Bath Shed.

The panel asks that there is agreement for shed to stay in place for an agreed period of time.

5. Weston Hub and Moravian Church

The panel found the application was trying to do too many things. The different elements need to be split into several different applications.

The site at Penn Hill is noted by the panel to have been previously handed over by the Council as a community asset transfer.

Clarity on the applications need to be clear and be agreed by the accountable bodies. Mark Searle is the PCC for All Saints Church in Weston.

The panel asks for the following points to be carried out before any recommendation can be put forward.

- The applications to be separated into different applications and resubmitted
- The priorities from the community to be clearer
- The accountable bodies for the projects to be clear
- Smaller items to be funded in other ways

It was agreed that the application would not be recommended at this stage, but the Council Officers would feedback to the applicant and bring back further information to panel members.

Weston Hub and Moravian Church – Follow Up Recommended

- The applications to be separated into different applications and resubmitted

Both applications have been fully costed.

- The priorities from the community to be clearer

The public consultations were all undertaken by Future Weston, and this is mentioned in both applications.

- The accountable bodies for the projects to be clear

The bank details are now shown for the two churches, who will each supervise the works on their own property.

- Smaller items to be funded in other ways

The other three items have been removed, to make the applications simpler.

The revised applications which have been separated into two separate applications and contain the additional information that was discussed.

- Robin Kerr - I am now content with this.
- Roger Driver - Thank you for the work that you have done on this and for the clarifications. In general, I am happy with the application but have a few questions about the accountable bodies for both applications. Because both have clear accountability structures and both indicate that it is the churches who are the applicants, not the people named (noting neither indicate their position in those churches), please could a supporting letter be provided from the Parochial Church Council (PCC) in regard All saints Weston, and the

Church Committee from the Moravian Church which clearly indicates that the application is from them and that they are the accountable body.

Because it is public money, we are handling it is important for us to do due diligence and establish the clear accountability line because it is in their accounts that there will be visibility of the money being received as restricted income and how it is spent. If this

applies to other applicants, can I ask that this be applied in similar fashion either by requesting a supporting letter on the application form, or in the supporting documentation making it clear that it will be needed.

- Councillor Jess David - I am happy to support this one.
- Councillor Rob Appleyard - I feel that as this is now two applications the panel should discuss at the next meeting
- Councillor Colin Blackburn – No response yet received.

6. Workhouse Burial Ground, Odd Down

The panel felt that they would be supportive of making a recommendation for Bathscape to receive the grant for £6,800 towards the Workhouse Burial Ground project in Odd Down Bath.

7. Administration Assistant to support the SCP Co-ordinator

The decided that this application would not be recommended for funding.

It was felt that although there was previous funding for the same role several years ago it is now felt that the request does not fit with the priorities of CIL.

It was felt that if this role remains it should come out of the organisations core funding. The panel do not feel it is right to repeat the funds for a salaried position.

The engagement results achieved over the last two years does not appear to have filtered through from the support that has been previously provided. The initial funding was given to prove what more could be achieved; it is not clear that this has not happened.

The application does not demonstrate achievements or contributions made from any other organisations.

8. Enhancing the Pitch - Bath City Football Club

The panel were supportive of making a recommendation of a grant £9,950 to Bath City Football Club for restoration to the football pitch drainage.

Several points have been requested by the panel:

- How the club are planning to attract additional people who participate needs to be explained better.
- Confirmation of additional funding needs to be in place before funding would be released.

It was agreed that the application would not be agreed at this stage, but the Council Officers would feedback to the applicant and bring back a revised application. It time allows the panel will review the revised application by email before the end of May 2021.

It was agreed that the application would not be recommended at this stage, but the Council Officers would feedback to the applicant and bring back further information to panel members.

Bath City Football Club for restoration to the football pitch drainage – Follow Up Recommended

• Clarity on how the club is planning to attract additional people who participate needs to be explained better.

The revised application contains a broader explanation of the community impact of the club being successful with this application.

• Confirmation of additional funding needs to be in place before funding would be released. This has been explained and we have been assured that the other finance will be available.

The revised application now contains the additional information that was discussed.

- Robin Kerr - I am now content with this.
- Roger Driver - I am happy for this application to proceed.
- Councillor Jess David - Happy with this one, thank you.
- Councillor Rob Appleyard - Not sure what the club is putting into this. I understand the community participation and the volunteer involvement, but I would have expected an identified maintained figure to show as a contribution at least. It would be useful for context to know the amounts the club has received from previous grants via the council.
- Councillor Colin Blackburn - I know how hard the club are working on the aims they state and how tough it has been last season. I am happy for this funding to be awarded but would ask we get some sort of signage up to recognise the contribution.

9. Summary of follow up to the initial meeting

The responses from the panel members have been reviewed by the supporting Council Officers and for the three projects applications that have been committed on, these have received a level of support to recommend these for funding.

Once recommendations are approved through a single member decision all successful applications have a grant agreement which is sent to the body responsible for the funds and delivery of the project. This has to be signed and returned before funds are released.