

Appendix 2 Engagements and lessons learned

Core funded partners – face to face meetings on site.

Completed:

- Trinity Winchester
- Winchester Live Theatre Trust
- Unit 12
- Winchester Churches Nightshelter
- The Carroll Centre
- Citizens Advice

Core funded non -partner workshop - attended by:

- Home Start Hampshire
- Winchester & District Young Carers
- Live at Home
- Street Reach
- Home Start Winchester
- Winchester Youth Counselling
- Blue Apple
- Winnall Rock Scholl

Corporate meetings held with officers

- Business rates

Economic development

- Environment services
- Housing
- Community Development
- Finance & Town Forum Members

- Hampshire Council County - community grants lead
- Crowdfund platform provider
- Online survey to all Ward Councillors and Parish Councils

Summary of lessons learned

Funding	Process	Communication
Core funded - Partner Organisations		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value the core funds as no other grants support this element. Lever additional funds by having the Council “backing”. Enables the organisations to concentrate on the people and not spend time fund raising. About being able to become sustainable – given the time to do so 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want longer agreement for stability and planning. Sometimes it may not be possible to deliver on the exact way set out in the grant – due to changes / unplanned events etc. Need to be able to flexi and make changes during the grant period. Do not report on the whole business – only what is in the agreement so missing the leverage effect of the full delivery. Consistency and support creates partnership. Partnership with aligned objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proud to be a partner. Members need to celebrate the outcomes. Hold a workshop on what could be done / not just what has happened. WCC should better celebrate the outcomes as our successes. Communication is key. Cllr support has been very much appreciated and welcomed – also in role of approaching to offer help. Advocacy to others is important.
Core funded – Other Organisations (smaller)		
As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of monitoring is quite high for value of grant – annual report would be good approach. Lottery is a good practice example. Delivery is constrained by tying to meet Council objectives rather than what the service needs are. Would be better to co-design the outcomes and would give better understanding of the business. Organisations are not able to tell the Council about emerging issues or feedback on other activities / issues – this should be built into the monitoring process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting face to face is a benefit and enable the organisation to highlight what else has been achieved and what else could be done. An exchange of ideas. Organisations are not aware of the range of services or organisations the Council supports / delivers to see where activities would complement No networks anymore and a much reduced number of agencies to make referrals. Interested in a network being established.
Members		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider local grant events one in each Parish – as a promotion and for organisations to bid for the money on the day – “the great grant give-away”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single application for City Council – remove duplication of Town Forum applications. Finance – confirm the appropriate risk / due diligence threshold. Need a mechanism to respond to local / unplanned requests for project support – that is simple, fair, transparent etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce an Annual Report – to demonstrate the range of clients helped, their spread across the district and the impacts and outcomes achieved in comparison across organisations. have an annual celebration event that showcases what the Council has supported and what organisations have achieved – awards

Funding	Process	Communication
Officers		
<p>Link grants to new Council housing schemes – supporting local projects in the community.</p> <p>Business rates relief is an effective way to offer grant as Council contribution is 40% - Could also look to be more targeted in the range of reliefs offered to support policy priorities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not stated a policy on the level of reserves required or which is appropriate (or too much). • Although current grant programme has a cap of no more than twelve months. • Process and policies – more guidance to staff. • Commonly understood definition of grant and commissioning • Business rates relief application should be on online. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship to remain with lead officer / team. • Mechanism for centrally collecting information, reporting and providing oversight. • Business rates scheme is not proactively promoted.

Summary of Councillor and Parish Council survey

1. All responses stated that they have an active voluntary and community sector in their community.
2. In response to the issues they address and who they support, the general response was that a variety of groups within each community were supported, particularly the elderly and the young, but generally meeting the needs of the particular area.
3. 13 out of 18 responses said that an activity or service had been stopped that was beneficial to the local community. Lack of volunteers/support and funding appear to be the main factors causing activities to cease. A few responses mentioned the cost of insurances and safety requirements being too much for certain activities.
4. In terms of issues that need resolving in each community, there were several themes such as:
 - a. A lack of community spirit – it was suggested that this seems to be more evident in areas with new housing and younger families who are mostly not interested in volunteering or being as involved in the local community as the older generation who are becoming increasingly limited in their ability and mobility.
 - b. Community activities that are able to cover the wide range of age groups and needs within a community.
 - c. Some specific issues regarding speed limits and traffic calming measures.
 - d. Lack of sufficient regular public transport also seemed to be a recurring theme.
 - e. A few responses requested a look at funding for the repair or expansion of village halls/community centres, and help with making them viable (e.g. Winnall community centre).

5. There is general consensus that Parish Council meetings are good for providing evidence of the above issues.
6. Responses related to signposting the Council to statistics on issues in specific areas were mixed and quite vague. Using police speed checks and SLR readings was suggested. Parish plan updates were mentioned as possibly containing more detail on a specific area and its issues. There were many suggestions to access deprivation data (especially in areas such as Winnall), NHS statistics, or any specific statistics that demonstrate the changing sociodemographic of the Winchester district. Mental and general wellbeing for health statistics would be useful for supporting activities.
7. In terms of being aware of the support available for communities to empower themselves, 8 out of 18 said they didn't know where to go for support. A few knew where to go but didn't feel that was helpful. One Parish Council was very pleased with the support received from their WCC councillor.
8. 7 out of 18 responses said they did know that there is a funding search tool (www.idoxopen4community.co.uk/winchester) on the Council's website.
9. 10 out of 18 responses said they were aware that there is a dedicated support service contracted by WCC and provided by Community First, but only 6 of them have used the service. 3 of those gave positive feedback and the other 3 didn't know or state if the help had been useful. (reason to use Community First as gateway)
10. 17 of the 18 responses were aware of the funding streams made available by the Council for communities to access.
11. When asked how best the grant scheme can help address community issues, many of the responses said that grants were helpful but publicity and advertising them was difficult, as well as a perceived lengthy process. A suggestion for more simplicity with regards to grants was made.
12. In terms of how to make the grant scheme more effective, simplicity, publicity, advertising and information from the Council were suggested. Site visits were also suggested as a good idea.
13. 5 out of 18 use the WCC website to find out about grants available from the Council. Many said they found out by asking or only when told. One response described the grant system as open and informative and headed up by a good team. A few are informed via the Parish Clerk.
14. 12 out of 18 actively promote the grants in their ward. Of those that said no, many said they would like more information with suggestions of information that could go into parish magazines or on social media. Regular updates to Parish Clerks were also suggested and one response asked for more direct contact from officer.
15. In response to what communication they would like to receive about the different grants the Council awards, there were the following suggestions:
 - a) A grant section update at the end of the weekly DSU.
 - b) Direct emails to Ward Councillors.
 - c) Regular updates to Parish Clerks and direct information to Parish Council.
 - d) For Councillors to be more informed.

Current community grant funding profile

Core Partners

Live Theatre Winchester Trust	£188,000
Citizens Advice Bureau	£168,000
Winchester Churches Nightshelter	£14,200
Trinity	£85,000
Unit 12	£16,000
Carroll Centre	£11,000
Home Start MV	£9,000
Home Start WD	£8,300
Age UK mid hants	£6,500
Live at home	£6,500
Youth Counselling	£6,000
Winnall Rock School	£6,000
Street Reach	£5,500
Blue apple	£5,500
WD Young Carers	£4,000
Total - Core	£539,500

Funding Types Definitions

Source: Guidance: Government Functional Standards for General Grants, July 2018, Cabinet Office.

As referenced in the Civil Society paper, the recently published Government guidance for departments for creating and issuing grants, helpfully defines the different forms of award:

Competitive: all general grants should undergo a competition process by default, except where a Direct Award can be justified. Examples of Competed Awards:

- **full competition:** where organisations compete against each other for a single grant, in response to a published advert and pre-published award criteria; or
- **challenge fund:** where applicants compete against pre-published criteria for portions of a pot of funding, which has been earmarked for a particular purpose and where repeat bids are permitted.

Direct Award: in some circumstances, a grant may be awarded without competition.

Examples include:

- awarding a grant to an organisation that is the only provider of the service that the grant is being set up to fund;
- awarding a grant to an organisation which inhabits a unique position or offers a particularly specialist function;
- awarding a grant to an organisation which has a track record of excellence in a particular area;
- if the value of the grant is low and the cost of approaching the market through a competition would exceed the benefit to be gained from competition between suppliers;
- there is extreme urgency, where such urgency was not foreseeable and was not as a result of any action or inaction on the part of the grant award department; or
- in the event of market failure.

Criteria Grants: these grants are usually not competed, as they are created with set qualifying criteria. As long as the applicant meets the required criteria, the recipient receives the funding, e.g. grants to assist those affected by flooding.