



PART A:	MATTERS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS
REPORT TO:	POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
DATE:	14 FEBRUARY 2013
REPORT OF THE:	HEAD OF ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE JULIAN RUDD
TITLE OF REPORT:	EVALUATION OF THE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT FUND
WARDS AFFECTED:	ALL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To review the impact and performance of the Council's Community Investment Fund (CIF).

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that:

- (i) the outcomes and conclusions of this review be noted and taken account of in decisions regarding the use of New Homes Bonus funding allocations for 2013/14 onwards;
- (ii) the CIF Panel ceases to operate following its March 2013 meeting; and
- (iii) that funds allocated for distribution by the CIF panel be managed by the Commissioning Board from 2013/14 onwards.

3.0 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 In reflection of the decision to invest part of the Council's 2011/12 New Homes Bonus allocation into a CIF, it was resolved by this Committee, on the 4 April 2012, that operation of the CIF Panel should include a review and evaluation in January 2013.
- 3.2 Subsequently Council approved in principle 'that the entire [2012/13 NHB] allocation, subject to making provision for continuation of CCTV and Norton Skateboard Park, of £439,779 is ring-fenced into a Ryedale Development Fund for spending on projects which deliver or protect employment within Ryedale'. As a result of this decision Policy and Resources will make decisions on the allocation of the Ryedale Development Fund. Therefore there is no longer a requirement for a

separate CIF Panel and it is recommended that this working party of P&R ceases after its March 2013 meeting.

4.0 SIGNIFICANT RISKS

- 4.1 The significant risk associated with this report is the impact of the reduction in potential funding for the voluntary and community sector that results from the end of the CIF. This has the potential to affect the reputation of the Council and to impact on the facilities and activities of Ryedale's communities. This funding change may also impact upon the services provided by the voluntary and community sector, which have been supported via a Community grant fund.
- 4.2 This risk is mitigated by the remaining circa £50K of grant funding for community projects that was operated through the CIF Panel but which is drawn from the Council's revenue budget i.e. it is not funded through NHB. It is recommended in this report that this funding is transferred to the Commissioning Board for distribution (together with any CIF funds remaining after the March 2013 meeting of the CIF Panel). Members may wish to consider further mitigation of this area of risk when making decisions about the allocation of the NHB allocation for 2013/14 and beyond.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The general principles upon which the CIF was established include targeting funds at projects which contribute to the achievement of the Council's priorities, build community capacity and have a demonstrable positive impact on the communities of Ryedale.
- 5.2 The CIF fund is also linked to the Council's corporate strategic objective: 'to develop the leadership capacity and capability to deliver future improvements.'
- 5.3 Through the consultation undertaken as part of the recent scrutiny review into the role of the Council in supporting the Voluntary and Community Sector it became apparent that organisations rely on the funding offered by the Council. Continuity in core funding was seen as key to sustaining organisations allowing these organisations to plan for the future and employ people. The project funding was also valued in that if the Council gave a grant it helps to give a project a seal of approval and helps to pull in other funding.

REPORT

6.0 REPORT DETAILS

- 6.1 The Council decided to utilise part of the New Homes Bonus (NHB) allocation for 2011/12 to establish a Community Investment Fund to operate initially for one year from April 2012.
- 6.2 In establishing the NHB the government initially stated that its purpose is to 'ensure that the economic benefits of growth are returned to the local authorities and communities where growth takes place'.
- 6.3 The stated aim of the Community Investment Fund (CIF) is to contribute to the delivery of the Council's priorities and supporting parish councils and voluntary and community organisations to deliver projects which meet the needs of communities.
- 6.4 This report reviews and evaluates the impact and performance of the CIF panel since

its establishment.

Resources to be Allocated

6.5 The Community Investment Fund consists of £247,826, comprising of:

a) an allocation of £201,606 from the 2011/2012 New Homes Bonus to finance the fund as follows:

(i) Pot 1 Community Budgets - That £100,803 be distributed to applicants who are Parish Meetings, Parish or Town Councils, or groups of these, on a geographic basis to those wards in which the development took place which generated the new homes bonus [The parishes within a ward are able to bid for a maximum of the amounts detailed in Annex B];

(ii) Pot 2 Community Grants - That £100,803 be distributed to other projects whose applicants may be parish meetings or Parish or town councils, properly constituted organisations and may include, Voluntary Organisations and Community Groups, the District Council, North York Moors National Park (where the project is for the benefit of communities in Ryedale).

b) A sum of £46,220 allocated from the main grants fund (used to support cultural facilities such as village halls, sport and recreation facilities, play facilities and projects supporting the arts and culture) to be managed by the fund under the same principles as pot 2 above.

Funding Priorities and Application Process

6.6 The funding priorities and application process for the Community Grants (Pot 2) that were agreed at the 4 April 2012 meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee can be found at Annex C.

6.7 Following the meeting of the CIF Panel on 25 April 2012, there have been two meetings held of the CIF Panel (17 July 2012 and 9 January 2013) at which funding has been allocated.

Pot 1 – Community Budgets

6.8 The 25 April 2012 meeting of the CIF Panel considered and agreed the CIF application forms and process, for both Pot 1 and Pot 2. Although the 4 April 2012 meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee agreed the criteria for operation of the CIF Panel (reproduced at Annex C), it was the first meeting of the Panel that agreed the information and application forms to be sent out to applicants for both Pot 1 and Pot 2.

6.9 Ryedale's town and parish councils and meetings, who all received an invitation to apply, were informed that:

"The communities of Ryedale have been invited by Ryedale District Council to take part in a programme where Community Projects can share in a pot of money allocated by Ward. The xxx Ward has been allocated £xxx from the Community Investment Fund....Final decisions will be made by the Community Investment Fund Panel. The set of bids prepared by the parishes within the Ward will be presented to the panel by the local Ward Member on behalf of the communities represented within the Ward."

6.10 In terms of the projects that could be funded the criteria set by the CIF Panel was that:

“The projects, activities or services to be considered by the fund can be varied and diverse but must be able to meet one of the following criteria:

- a. extends or expands existing service provision to new users
- b. delivers a project or service which can be clearly demonstrated as community priorities
- c. can demonstrate community support and participation”

6.11 In taking this approach the CIF Panel set very broad parameters for the projects that could be funded under Pot 1. It was also made clear that a specified allocation of funding had been made to that Ward for projects of this nature.

6.12 In addition, the CIF Panel on 25 April 2012, resolved to ‘where possible, promote and adopt Option 2 [Community Budget Approach] but will recognise that we will accept direct applications’. This was reflected in the information set out in the application forms that is included in Annex D.

Community Budget – (Pot 1) - Outcomes

6.13 At Annex E is a summary of grants awarded under Pot One, by Ward. No Pot One grants were awarded at the July 2012 meeting of the Panel, however the January 2013 meeting of the Panel considered applications for £57,882 from ten of the eighteen Wards. The Panel supported all but one of the applications and awarded a total of £48,860. This leaves £51,943 to be allocated at the final meeting of the CIF Panel in March 2013. Six of the eighteen wards have taken up all of their allocation and eight wards are yet to have any applications considered.

6.14 There has been a variety of Pot One projects put forward for funding, from new floral displays, benches and notice boards to works to village halls and equipping a community park. These types of projects are all in line with the aspirations for the use of the fund expressed by the government in its guidance on the use of the NHB.

6.15 Whilst the review of the process by Rural Action Yorkshire (see Annex F) demonstrated levels of community participation in the bids were very variable, the bids put forward under Pot One were able to demonstrate one of the three specified criteria. Indeed, many of the proposals were drawn for a Parish Plan or similar exercise, and this Pot has been of some value in achieving identified community priorities.

6.16 Whilst a variety of different approaches were taken within communities to agreeing the Pot One proposals to be put forward for that ward, and despite extensive assistance from Rural Action Yorkshire, only one took a participative budgeting approach. This was the only ward in which the Panel did not support all of the Pot One applications put forward with a decision deferred pending further information in order that this be re-considered at the March 2013 meeting of the Panel.

6.17 A clear obstacle to awarding funding to communities based on wards is that there is no accountable body at that level (other than in some of the towns). The responsibility for co-ordinating bids was placed on the ward member (or members) for each ward. The allocation of funding becomes competitive between the parishes involved instead of being purely focussed on the quality of the proposals themselves. However, as shown in Annex F in a number of wards the need to collaborate on the development of a set of bids has resulted in the establishment of regular meetings between a ward member and the parishes they represent, strengthening communication across wards and improving dialogue with the local member.

6.18 In addition to the above issues in terms of the operation of the Community Budgets

(Pot 1), Members should be aware of the recent proposal by planning minister Nick Boles in relation to the 'meaningful proportion' of revenue received through CIL. The Minister announced that local communities would receive up to 15% of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) raised in their Parish, rising to 25% if they have a Parish Council / Neighbourhood Forum and have produced an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

Pot 1 – Conclusions

- 6.19 The difficulties associated with ward-based budgeting, such as the lack of an accountable body at a ward level, together with the broad criteria set for the Pot 1 approach, could support the discontinuation of the Community Budget approach and Pot 1. Proposals by Government to allocate a portion of Community Infrastructure levy to local communities through the 'meaningful proportion' would present an opportunity for parishes and wards where development has taken place to receive the benefits of growth directly without the need for Pot 1.
- 6.20 A legacy of the Community Budgeting approach supported by Pot 1 is the establishment of parish forums led by the ward member in some wards and there is enthusiasm for continuing with these. This approach could be encouraged across Ryedale and would support the Councils approach to parish liaison.

Pot 2 – Community Grants

- 6.21 Annex D contains extracts from the application forms for Pot 2 grants. This shows the variation in approach between Pot 1 and Pot 2 criteria.
- 6.22 At Annex E is a summary of grants awarded under Pot Two. The entire allocation of £147,023 has been spent following the January 2013 Panel, with 12 grants (totalling £107,718) awarded at the July 2012 Panel and a further 8 grants (totalling £39,305) awarded at the January 2013 Panel. A further 23 grants were refused funding over the course of the two meetings of the Panel, including all applications for funding Christmas lights and several for works to village halls.
- 6.23 The grants awarded range in size from £800 to £21,000. The largest grants awarded are for the following purposes:
- Wheels to Work Moped Loan Scheme (£21K)
 - Support for community development and funding advice (£13K)
 - Refurbishment of a village hall (£10K)
 - Development of counselling service (£10K)
 - Extension and renovation of a Village Hall (£10K)
 - Support for community volunteering (£9.5K)
 - Support for community development (£9K)
 - Instruments for a Youth Band (£9K)
 - Catalogue a local social history collection (£8.75K)
 - Positive activities for those with mental health issues (£7.5K)
 - Community and Sport Club (£7K)
- 6.24 The Pot 2 Grants were required to reflect the Council's priorities and the approved applications are divided between these priorities as follows (note some grants reflected more than one priority):
- To meet housing need - 2 grants
 - To support the conditions for economic success – 9 grants
 - To have a high quality clean and sustainable environment – 2 grants
 - To encourage active and safe communities – 22 grants

- 6.25 However, a closer analysis of the £147,023 of Pot 2 grants shows that the principal purpose of each of the 20 approved grants divides into the following areas:
- Village halls / sports clubs – 5 grants / £37,743 (26%)
 - Arts and culture – 1 grant / £8,750 (6%)
 - Community development – 11 grants / £77,730 (53%)
 - Supporting economic activity – 3 grants / £22,800 (15%)
- 6.26 The approved Pot 2 grants were therefore heavily skewed towards community development, with a number of grants showing side benefits for economic or cultural purposes but with a main purpose of community cohesion and the welfare of residents. This focus on community development is, however, consistent with many of the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny review of the role of the Council in supporting the Community and Voluntary sector in Ryedale (see Annex G).
- 6.27 An analysis of applications for CIF Pot 2 shows:
- 44 applications considered
 - 20 applications approved
 - 24 applications refused
 - £147,023 grant aid awarded from Pot 2
 - £784,163.77 total amount of funding levered into Ryedale
 - 18.75% average intervention rate from RDC CIF (i.e. leverage of 1:5)
- 6.28 This compares to the five years (2003-08) of previous operation of a CIF Panel:
- Total budget of £790K
 - 160 applications considered, with a total value of bids £2.8m
 - 97 awards made over the five years £790k
 - Total value of projects funded of £4m achieving leverage of 1:5
- 6.29 In order to assess the detailed impact of funding a number of the approved projects, a review has been undertaken (at Annex H) of the expected outcomes of several Pot 2 schemes. These show that the CIF grants will deliver significant benefits for communities within Ryedale, including assistance for vulnerable and / or isolated people and increased cohesion. There are also economic and cultural benefits achieved through the CIF grants – although supporting economic activity in Ryedale is not the predominant outcome of the CIF.

Pot 2 – Conclusions

- 6.30 Members have resolved to utilise the 2012/13 NHB allocation for a Ryedale Development Fund.
- 6.31 RDC has a long tradition of supporting community development and of operation of CIF. Ryedale is the second mostly sparsely populated District in the country, with many isolated rural communities. It is also an area with notably low household incomes. Members will wish to consider, through decisions on future use of NHB and in setting the Council's budget, whether there is a need to supplement the currently circa £50K within the revenue grant pot that was allocated to the CIF Panel to distribute. This funding will be the primary source to support community development following the decision to allocate CIF to projects which deliver or protect employment within Ryedale ('the Ryedale Development Fund').
- 6.32 In line with the recommendation of the O&S Committee to move towards provision of grants through one body within the Council (see Annex G), this revenue grant pot should be transferred to the Commissioning Board. Additional resources from other

sources could be added to supplement this revenue funding as they become available e.g. contributions from Community Infrastructure Levy or future allocations from the NHB.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The following implications have been identified:

a) Financial

This report assumes a continuation of non-NHB budgets that were allocated for distribution by the CIF Panel. These will be transferred to the Commissioning Board for allocation.

b) Legal

No significant legal implications.

c) Other (Equalities, Staffing, Planning, Health & Safety, Environmental, Crime & Disorder)

There are potential implications of the end of CIF for community support, services and facilities in Ryedale, including for the less able and for the vulnerable and physically isolated. The potential to militate against such impacts is addressed in the Risk Matrix at Annex A.

Julian Rudd Head of Economy and Infrastructure

Author: Julian Rudd, Head of Economy and Infrastructure
Telephone No: 01653 600666 ext: 218
E-Mail Address: julian.rudd@ryedale.gov.uk

Background Papers:

- § [P and R 4 April 2012 –Establishing the CIF Panel](#)
- § [P and R 4 April 2012 -Minutes](#)
- § [Council 17 May 2012 – Minute 51](#)
- § [Council 17 May 2012 – Agenda Item](#)

CIF Review - RISK MATRIX – ANNEX A

Issue/Risk	Consequences if allowed to happen	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation	Mitigated Likelihood	Mitigated Impact
Impact of the reduction in potential funding for the voluntary and community sector that results from end of CIF.	Potential to affect reputation of Council and to impact on facilities and activities of Ryedale's communities,	4	D	Mitigated by the remaining circa £50K of grant funding for community projects that was operated through the CIF Panel but which is drawn from the Council's revenue budget i.e. it is not funded through NHB.	3	C
	This funding change may also impact upon the services provided by the voluntary and community sector, which have been supported via the CIF.			Members may wish to consider further mitigation of this area of risk when making decisions about the allocation of the NHB allocation for 2013/14 and beyond.	(2)	(B)

Score	Likelihood	Score	Impact
1	Very Low	A	Low
2	Not Likely	B	Minor
3	Likely	C	Medium
4	Very Likely	D	Major
5	Almost Certain	E	Disaster

ANNEX B

POT 1 Ward Allocations

Ward	Allocation
Amotherby	5,646
Ampleforth	3,581
Cropton	3,218
Dales	1,730
Derwent	7,224
Helmsley	1,789
Hovingham	2,003
Kirkbymoorside	10,502
Malton	6,192
Norton	15,238
Pickering	10,381
Rillington	6,131
Ryedale SW	911
Sherburn	1,761
Sheriff Hutton	3,157
Sinnington	4,614
Thornton Dale	8,529
Wolds	8,196
	Total 100,803

**FUNDING PRIORITIES AND PROCESS FOR CIF
(AS AGREED AT 4 APRIL 2012 P&R COMMITTEE)**

- Applications will be considered for both capital and revenue projects which meet the eligibility criteria.
- Revenue grants will be awarded for a maximum period of two years
- The panel will meet if there are funds remaining unallocated at the scheduled time of the meeting.
- The fund will be operated by the “Community Investment Fund Panel” which will be made up of 7 Members (nominations made by Council in line with requirements of political proportionality) and will be advised by the appropriate officers.
- The fund will be administered by the Community Partnerships Officer under the management of the Head of Policy and Partnerships.
- The CIF Panel will meet three times per civic year to a schedule agreed by Council
- The impact and performance of the fund will be monitored on an ongoing basis by the CIF Panel and reviewed and evaluated in January 2013.

EXTRACTS FROM APPLICATION FORMS FOR POTS 1 AND 2

COMMUNITY BUDGETS – POT 1

“The Council is providing support to communities to work together to develop a set of bids for projects which have community support and for which the local Parish Council or Parish Meeting will be the accountable body. This process is called community budgeting....and would be supported by Rural Action Yorkshire and your local Ward member/s and could work as follows:

1. The Parish Councils in the Ward meet to form a task group and to plan the project to suit the local communities in your Ward. The task group would invite proposals for the use of the fund, arrange for an assessment process for proposals and arrange a decision making event
2. Public meetings would be held to:
 - Explain the community budget process to the community
 - Get the community thinking about useful projects they would like to see funded through the CIF
3. Project nomination forms are received by each Parish Council from applicants
4. The assessment process is undertaken by the task group of Parish Council representatives and the Ward member/s
5. The decision making event takes place using open public voting to prioritise the set of projects which should receive the CIF funding for the Ward
6. The Ward member/s submits the set of projects to the CIF panel who endorse the projects
7. Funding for successful projects is awarded to the lead parish for each project

This process has been used successfully in a number of parishes in Ryedale and helps communities to identify projects which are supported by members of the community and has been published in best practice guides on participatory budgeting.’

COMMUNITY BUDGETS – POT 2

“The projects, activities or services to be considered by the fund can be varied and diverse but must be able to show that they make a positive contribution to at least one of the Council’s stated priorities as follows:

To meet housing need

Helping people to access a suitable home or remain in an existing one, preventing homelessness and supporting independent living.

To support the conditions for economic success

Providing opportunity for people, increasing skills and wage levels with better jobs

To have a high quality clean and sustainable environment

Maintaining the quality of our local environment and increasing pride of place

To encourage active and safe communities

Encouraging active lifestyles in communities where people feel safe

To transform the Council

Supporting services which are important to communities and are accessible and meet local needs

And that meet one of the following criteria:

- a. extends or expands existing service provision to new users
- b. delivers a project or service which can be clearly demonstrated as community priorities
- c. can demonstrate community support and participation”

SUMMARY OF CIF GRANTS AWARDED (AS OF FEBRUARY 2013)

Available Allocation	£247,826
Allocated from POT 1	£48,860
Allocated from POT 2	£147,023
Remaining to Allocate (ALL POT 1)	£51,943

POT 1

Ward	Available Allocation	Allocated	Balance Unallocated
Amotherby	5,646	5,646	-
Ampleforth	3,581	3,581	-
Cropton	3,218	800	2,418
Dales	1,730	157	1,573
Derwent	7,224	-	7,224
Helmsley	1,789	-	1,789
Hovingham	2,003	2,003	-
Kirkbymoorside	10,502	1,480	9,022
Malton	6,192	-	6,192
Norton	15,238	6,326	8,912
Pickering	10,381	10,381	-
Rillington	6,131	-	6,131
Ryedale SW	911	-	911
Sherburn	1,761	1,761	-
Sheriff Hutton	3,157	-	3,157
Sinnington	4,614	-	4,614
Thornton Dale	8,529	8,529	-
Wolds	8,196	8,196	-
Totals	100,803	48,860	51,943

POT 2

Recipient	Allocated
Swinton & District Excelsior Band	9,000
Wilton Village Hall	10,000
Ryedale Community Transport	21,000
Yorkshire Cajun	800
Ryedale Voluntary Action	9,580
Ryedale Voluntary Action	13,030
Sight Support Ryedale	3,500
Next Steps	7,470
The Woodhams Stone Collection	8,750
Fadmoor Village Hall	10,000
Rural Action Yorkshire	9,000
Kirkbymoorside & District Playgroup	5,588
Sherburn PFA	7,155
Rural Arts	2,500
Live Music Now	5,000
Great Habton Village Hall	5,000
Pickering & District Rotary Club	3,650
Malton Racing Association	1,000
Elim Ryedale	5,000
Ryedale Counselling Service	10,000
Total	147,023

REVIEW OF COMMUNITY BUDGETS POT 1 APPROACH BY RURAL ACTION YORKSHIRE

Background

The communities of Ryedale were given the opportunity to take part in a programme where Community Projects could share a pot of money allocated by Ward.

Rural Action Yorkshire (RAY) would provide support and encouragement to get the parishes and their RDC Ward councillors to meet and identify projects that would give community benefits and could demonstrate support.

The Wards of Pickering, Malton, Norton and Ryedale South West were not included in this process therefore leaving fourteen to be contacted.

The Process

Initially all Ward Councillors were contacted and asked for their advice and support as to how they would like to proceed.

In eight Wards it was decided to hold a series of meetings with the Parish Council representatives to look at finding ways of working together to come up with a project or projects that wherever possible, would bring benefits to all the parishes in the Ward.

The original idea was to use a process called Participatory Budgeting (PB) where the local community groups would be invited to submit bids for all or some of the money. The residents would be given the opportunity to vote for their favourite projects at a public event. However it soon became clear that there was limited interest in this method and it would only work in Wards where there were a small number of parishes and sufficient funds.

The only Ward to use PB was Kirbymoorside which includes Kirbymoorside and the villages of Wombledon & Welburn.

It was decided that the Parishes along with the Ward Councillor would decide the best ways to spend their allocation and look at projects that could benefit more than one Parish or look to themes, such as reducing traffic speed, supporting Community Buildings, or involving Young People.

Positives

The Parishes that did meet and work together produced some excellent project ideas and so far four Wards have decided to continue to meet together once or twice a year with the RDC Ward Councillor and the NYCC Ward Councillor. Already 4 meetings have been arranged for March 2013. It appeared easier for the Parishes who had previously carried out community consultation such as a Parish Plan to be able to identify possible projects and provide evidence of support from the community

The CIF Pot 1 has funded projects that are important to the communities and in most cases could demonstrate support through Parish Plans. The application process was straightforward, with help and advice available from both RDC & RAY. It is now getting increasingly difficult for rural communities to access funding for projects to support community facilities and improve their environment, as these are often seen as neither new or innovative projects.

Challenges

The Wards of Ryedale are made up of parishes that are geographical dispersed and historically many have not worked together before so this concept was difficult to sell. Some felt that the paperwork sent out to the Parish Clerks was complex. Ryedale includes a number of Parish Meetings that do not hold regular meetings.

Seven Wards had decided to use some or all of their allocation to purchase portable speed matrix signs that could be moved round the parishes. However after a delay in seeking clarification on this it became clear that NYCC would not approve the purchase of the speed matrix signs, stating that it would result in proliferation of signs across Ryedale that would lead to a reduction in their effectiveness. These Wards then had to look at alternative projects and this took longer than anticipated.

The Kirbymoorside PB process proved to be challenging, although every effort was made to try to make the process fair for both Kirbymoorside and Wombleton.

Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Key Recommendation

The contribution of the Voluntary and Community Sector is highly valued in Ryedale. The Council should help to sustain the Voluntary and Community Sector by providing financial and officer support.

Recommendations to Commissioning Board

1. The Council should undertake a review of how it core funds organisations with a view to commissioning/contracts ensuring continuity for organisations and giving notice of any changes in line with the North Yorkshire Compact. This allows organisations to employ people and plan for the future.
2. Core funding for a longer time with more notice of change (i.e. 4 months minimum), linked to commissioning/procurement processes
3. Investigate how the Council could help support Ryedale Voluntary Action to encourage volunteering in the Ryedale area.

Recommendations to Policy & Resources Committee

4. Grant schemes should be streamlined making it easier for organisations to access and, all decisions should be made by one panel i.e. the CIF panel.

Recommendations to Commissioning Board and Policy & Resources Committee

5. Development officers are essential in helping to develop projects within the voluntary and community sector and this role is highly valued by the sector. The Council should continue to provide development officers and continue to support their provision within the voluntary sector.
6. The Council should make it clear what its funding priorities are and what outcomes it is trying to achieve.
7. The Council should ensure that it is clear with all contracts and grants what it expects and monitor/evaluate/performance manage the outcomes accordingly ensuring Value for Money in the investment made.
8. Maintain a small grants element in all grant programmes.

9. The Council should take every opportunity to co-ordinate funding and evaluation processes with other funding bodies, for example, lists of projects supported and case studies illustrating the impact of the funding awarded should be published on the Council website.
10. The Council should use every opportunity to promote and champion Ryedale and all that it has to offer. It should also support, celebrate and recognise the value and contribution of the voluntary and community sector.
11. When considering future budget decisions, the Council must recognise that the funding available to the VCS to meet the needs of communities in Ryedale is reducing. The Council has a role in championing the needs of Ryedale with other funders.

Recommendations to Management Team

12. The Council should ensure that any changes to the services it provides are clearly communicated to all those affected. This includes maintaining lists of key contacts with good signage for all services on the Council's website.
13. Investigate better use of the Council's website for communicating and advertising appropriate events on behalf of the voluntary and community sector.
14. Undertake joint member and officer training regarding funding schemes, priorities and processes for those members and officers directly involved with grant making.
15. Investigate the possibility of supporting VCS organisations with specialist skills available within the Council.
16. Review to be undertaken to define the members roles as champions and board members of voluntary and community organisations.

CASE STUDIES OF POT 2 PROJECTS

Case Study – Wilton Village Hall

Completed by: Sarah Lally-Marley Funding Advisor, Ryedale Voluntary Action

Organisation: Wilton Village Hall

Date: October 2012

Grant received from RDC Community Investment Fund: £10,000 to go towards funding an extension to the village hall which will provide indoor toilets and an updated kitchen area.

Project background

Following the results of a Parish Plan survey completed in 2008, it became evident that Wilton residents valued their village hall, which is the only community facility in the village and wished to see it updated to bring it up to the standard expected by users. Although some initial improvements were made to the hall the committee lacked the funds to continue. In 2011 the committee engaged the advice and support of Ryedale Voluntary Action to put together a funding strategy, where the decision was also made to follow up consultation in the parish plan with a household survey, which would provide up to date information on the needs of the community.

The community consultation process brought the village closer together and as a result a number of new groups were born including children's art and craft classes, a local history group and fitness classes for older residents, as well as a number of fundraising events. Once able to demonstrate a strong community need for an updated village hall the committee began their approach to funders including Ryedale District Council. As a result of their efforts they received £10,000 from the CIF which will enable them to begin the vital improvements required in order to provide a warm, comfortable and safe environment for users. The overall achievements of the committee also saw Wilton crowned 'Village Hall of the Year' at this year's Ryedale Rural Awards.

Community benefit

The funding received from CIF provided the village hall committee with both the encouragement to continue their project and the endorsement they needed to receive funding from other funding providers such as the LEADER programme and Yorventure.

Quote from Richard Davies, Wilton Village Hall Building Committee:

"As a result of the grant we received from Ryedale District Council we have been able to begin our first steps in updating our village hall. The grant has not only provided us with the support needed to encourage other funders to contribute to the project, but it has been a vital and much appreciated boost to our efforts to make Wilton Village Hall a first class community resource for the residents of the Wilton community."

Future of the project

The village community have become closer and as a result are working together, sharing ideas and addressing needs of local residents. Although the project is ongoing it now has the involvement of the whole community in the decision making process and overall use of the hall as the only community facility in the village – There is no shop, post office or pub in the village and the hall has gone a long way to tackling the problems of rural and social isolation that some residents were experiencing. As soon as all their funding is received they are looking to provide further services that are lacking for local residents and community

consultation has already taken place to determine what is wanted, which is being incorporated into their overall business plan.

CIF 2012/13 Case Study: 2012 10 RVA Funding Advice (2 year project)

Completed by: Jos Holmes, Economy and Community Manager, RDC

Organisation: Ryedale Voluntary Action

Date of Review: January 2012

Total Cost of Project: £57,343

Grant requested from CIF £28,670

Grant received from CIF: £13,030

Project background: The Development Worker provides funding advice and governance advice to voluntary and community groups throughout Ryedale. The service is provided 4 days per week and the external funding was coming to an end.

Community benefit and Outcomes: Voluntary and community based groups have an experienced and knowledgeable professional to support their activities, including increased sustainability. The CIF provided RVA with 2 days per week funding advice (50% of the Funding Advisors time per week), therefore the total number of groups supported as a result of the CIF funding was 17 in the period July-Dec 2012.

Additional outputs:

- Governance/start up support for: **3** new groups
- Funding advice and support for:
 - o **3** community sports projects
 - o **3** health and social care related projects
 - o **4** village hall projects
 - o **4** heritage/arts based projects

Future of the project: RVA are working with the new Clinical Commissioning Groups to support funding for the remaining 50% of the post, when it takes over the role of the PCTs in March 2013.

CIF 2012/13 Case Study: 2012 09 RVA Volunteer Centre (2 year project)

Completed by: Jos Holmes, Economy and Community Manager, RDC

Organisation: Ryedale Voluntary Action

Date of Review: January 2012

Total Cost of Project: £31,425

Grant requested from CIF £15,958

Grant received from CIF: £9,580

Project background: The Volunteer Centre matches people wanting to volunteer, with organisation's seeking assistance. Potential volunteers may require support with confidence

building and skills development prior to taking up a volunteer position, and recipient organisations need to be trained to successfully host a volunteer, particularly if they have learning needs or are new to the workplace.

Specific outcomes were the payment for an administrator for 2 days p.w, 25% of the Co-ordinator's costs and 2 outreach days p.a.

Community benefit and Outcomes:

Our most important function is to match both individuals and groups interested in volunteering with appropriate voluntary work in the local community. We hold information on a comprehensive range of opportunities and offer potential volunteers support and advice matching their motivation to volunteer, with appropriate volunteering vacancies. However, in the past due to time and staff constraints, we have not had the capacity to concentrate on much more than brokerage. The impact of the extra funding from CIF is that we have been able to give a more comprehensive service and to work in a more in depth way across a larger field also encompassing new projects.

During the period July 1st 2012 to December 31st 2012, due to an additional member of staff in the volunteer centre, we have seen an increase in the numbers of volunteers placed and new organisations registered. In Jul to Dec 2011 we registered and placed 72 volunteers and added 13 organisations to our database. In the corresponding period 2012, we registered and placed 85 volunteers and added another 17 organisations to our database. We already work with most volunteer using organisations in the district, so finding and adding another 17 is a real achievement. The number of volunteer using organisations that currently are registered with us and use our service is 121. The number of volunteering opportunities that we currently have advertised on do-it is 194. The number of volunteers that we currently have on register is 556.

We stimulate and encourage local interest in volunteering and community activity. This includes promoting and marketing volunteering through local, regional and national events and campaigns and raising awareness about the national brand for volunteering. The CIF fund has contributed to enabling the volunteer centre to pay for a stand at Ryedale Show 2013, to pay for the use of the RYEPOD on that day, and for the staffing of the exhibition. The stand is £350.00 and hire of the RYEPOD £245.00.

Future of the project: The project will continue for a further year, although the parent organization may merge with other infrastructure organisations through the 'Creative change' project.

Case Study – Fadmoor Village Hall

Completed by:	Gail Cook, Community Partnerships Officer, RDC
Organisation:	Fadmoor Village Hall
Date:	January 2013
Total cost of project:	£22,409.00
Grant Requested from CIF:	£19,048.50
Grant received from LEADER:	£8,322.00

Grant received from RDC Community Investment Fund: £10,000 to go towards refurbishment of existing village hall which includes new double glazed windows, insulation, new central heating system and oil tank.

Project background

Following the results of a Parish Plan Survey and Action Plan completed in 2012, it was highlighted that the village hall was in desperate need of updating. Complaints were made mainly about the dampness, lack of heating and the time needed to heat the hall. It was also evident that there was a strong need for a refurbished village hall and which in turn would increase the usage by the residents of Fadmoor and Gillamoore.

Community benefit

Fadmoor public house closed in 2010, therefore, the village hall is the only social meeting place in the village.

The funding received from CIF provided the village hall committee with the confidence to apply to other funding streams and was therefore successful with a LEADER grant.

The impact of this project will deliver reduced isolation, increased social interaction between young and elderly.

Quotes from the village hall committee and residents of the Fadmoor community:

“The grant has provided the residents of Fadmoor community with a lovely warm community building; the grant also encouraged other funders to contribute to the project” (Village Hall Committee)

“The hall has a much nicer feel, no damp smell and is warm. The heating system is easy to use” (60th Birthday Party organiser)

“The hall feels much better and is nice and warm. The heaters and hot water in the toilets are a massive improvement.” (Karen Stanley Christmas Party)

“The damp smell has gone and the hall feels warm but not too overpowering” (Funeral Tea)

“The heating system is working well during this very cold time. There is no risk of the pipes freezing up again like they did 2 years ago” (Member of Village Hall Committee)

Future of the project

The village hall can now offer a facility that is flexible enough to meet the current needs of existing and new users. The project has had the involvement of the community of Fadmoor through consultation, sharing ideas and fund raising activities. This facility will assist in tackling issues such as rural and social isolation of some residents. Phase 2 of the project will include refurbishment of the kitchen and toilets.

Ryedale Voluntary Action - Case Study – RDC Community Investment Fund

Name of organisation supported: Ryedale Community Transport

Type of organisation: Registered Charity & Company Limited by Guarantee

What it does: Ryedale Community Transport (RCT) provides a wide range of community based transport solutions for those residents who do not have private transport or are unable to access public transport, including a volunteer car scheme, ring and ride and a Wheels to Work Scheme. They currently have 670 service users.

Problem/issue: RCT experienced some major cuts in funding from NYCC which affected both their core revenue costs and the vital services that they provide, such as the Wheels to

Work Scheme that provides mopeds for young people, enabling them to travel to and from work for an affordable cost.

Funding received from CIF: £21,000 towards the Wheels to Work Scheme.

Outcome:

For RCT

- The income from CIF has enabled RCT to continue to provide their popular Wheels to Work scheme and allow them the opportunity to work towards a longer term funding strategy which will provide them with a more secure future.

“This grant will provide us with vital funds to ensure that even more Ryedale residents can benefit from this effective and popular scheme which allows them to take advantage of the work, education and training opportunities that are available to them if they have the means to travel more easily. Without the CIF grant the project would have proven to be unsustainable and ultimately would have wound up in 2015.”

(Steve Mellalieu, Chief Officer, Ryedale Community Transport)

For beneficiaries:

- RCT has been able to purchase five new mopeds, enabling them to increase their Wheels to Work Service which will benefit a large number of Ryedale residents.
- Residents living in rural communities without their own transport will have greater opportunities to find and retain employment and access training.

Compiled by Sarah Lally-Marley