

Zero Carbon Communities Grant Round 3 Proposed changes

Table1:

Scoring Criteria		
Previous (Round 2)	Proposed (Round 3)	Reasons for change
Community Buildings (40%)		
Reduced use of fossil fuel energy in community buildings (33%)	Estimated reduction in carbon emissions as a result of project. <i>Please show how this has been calculated e.g. from an energy survey</i> (33%)	<i>By focusing on carbon emissions, we increase understanding of these. The figure will allow a rough value for money calculation to be made by dividing the reduction by the cost.</i>
Increased awareness of energy improvements to buildings by the wider public (33%)	If successful, how will you publicise the work carried out to the building to inspire and encourage others to do similar projects? (33%)	<i>Makes it clearer what we are expecting</i>
Additional value (33%)	This section is an opportunity to provide details of additional value which could include funding contributions or contributions in kind, eg volunteer time/expertise from other sources, collaboration between organisations, and/or evidence of local and/or Member support. In order to score highly, we encourage applications requesting >£5k to seek part funding/in kind contributions (33%)	<i>Makes it clearer what we are expecting</i>
Tree-planting/Nature (40%)		
Reduced CO2 in the atmosphere and new habitats for wildlife (33%)	Expected Benefits e.g number and sizes of trees to be planted (where relevant), wildlife benefits, what plans are in place to manage the area and what are the long-term prospects for the site? (33%)	<i>No easy way to calculate CO2 sequestration so ask for number of trees and their sizes as a proxy</i>

Increased awareness of the importance of trees and habitat creation by the wider public (33%)	How has the community been involved in drawing up these proposals and what plans are there for community involvement in the project in future? (33%)	<i>New questions are more specific</i>
Additional value (33%)	As per Community Buildings section (33%)	<i>As per Community Buildings section</i>
Cycling projects	Other projects (20%)	
Reduction in miles travelled in private vehicles (33%)	How will the project result in reduced carbon emissions? Estimated reduction in carbon emissions as a result of project. (33%)	<i>By focusing on carbon emissions, we increase understanding of these. The figure will allow a rough value for money calculation to be made by dividing the reduction by the cost.</i>
Increase in take-up of cycling by people who would not otherwise cycle (33%)	How has the community been involved in drawing up these proposals and what plans are there for community involvement in the project in future? If successful, how will you publicise the work carried out to the building to inspire and encourage others to do similar projects? (33%)	<i>Makes it clearer what we are expecting</i>
Additional value (33%)	As per Community Buildings section. Plus what additional value do you think your project provides? (33%)	<i>As per Community Buildings section but also gives the applicant an opportunity to think about co-benefits.</i>
Additional changes		
Grant open for 3 months (e.g. 1 st July- 30 th Sep 2020)	Grant open sooner (e.g. 1 st April-30 th June 2021)	<i>Gives those people going away over the summer more time to prepare their applications</i>
Community building application categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy survey • Energy conservation or efficiency measures • Solar PV and/or battery storage system for solar PV 	Any community building project which results in a reduction in energy use and/or generation of renewable energy or heat	<i>Provides more choice to suit the needs of the community building while still resulting in a reduction in carbon emissions</i>
No maximum amount given for each stream; funded	Separate out allocation of funding:	<i>Makes it easier to allocate funding</i>

projects decided using overall scores	Community buildings (40%) Nature (40%) Other projects (20%) If insufficient applications received for a particular stream, funding could be moved	
GAC members' recommendations for funding based on highest scores given by officers for <i>all applications</i>	GAC members' recommendations for funding based on highest scores given by officers for <i>applications within each stream</i>	<i>Makes it easier to allocate funding</i>

Alternative Options:

The following funding options have also been considered for round three and include reasons why they are not the preferred options:

Funding options

Option 1: Change the grant scheme so that it is a rolling scheme like the Community chest with money being allocated twice a year. *Disadvantage:* Fluctuations in numbers of monthly applications might not necessarily see the best projects being funded. Would need continual monitoring and may require more officer time. Publicity would have less impact.

Option 2: Change the grant scheme so that it is a three-year funding scheme with funding released annually (e.g. similar to the service support grant scheme). *Disadvantage:* Some projects would not require three years for completion.

Funding Amounts

Option 1: Change Funding amount (e.g. between £1,000 to £7,000*) to allow for more projects to be funded. *Disadvantage:* Larger projects would not get 100% funding so may not apply; however, they could still be part funded.

*Average amount applied for in round 2 was £6,518 and the median amount was £4,934

Option 2: Specify all applications would need to include details of match funding/in kind contributions e.g. 50% ***Disadvantage:* Some community groups may not have any spare money or ability to fundraise, so would not be eligible

** 25 out of 45 round 2 applications included part funding. Of these projects, the average part fund was 33% of the total project cost.