



BASINGSTOKE CANAL JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 15 July 2022

Lead Officer: James Taylor

Tel: 01252 370073

Email: James.Taylor2@hants.gov.uk / james.taylor@surreycc.gov.uk

9

Potential funding sources for the Canal Partnership

Key issue

This paper is in response to items on funding for the Canal in the Committee’s action tracker (A4/19 and A1/21). It seeks to consolidate previous discussion about alternative funding sources.

Sources of funding

The following is a brief synopsis of the types of funding which might be available and its possible purpose on the Canal. It should be noted that the majority of the schemes will not replace Business as Usual “revenue” funding to pay staff or employ contractors to do regular maintenance works, funding is primarily geared towards capital projects to provide brand new infrastructure.

Source	Quantum	Use	Who might lead for the Canal
Development - CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy)	£-££	Capital and major maintenance: CIL funds are held by Local Planning Authorities - schemes are added to standing lists, but many are oversubscribed leading to competition.	Strategic Manager / BCA can recommend schemes where these might meet CIL criteria. ¹
Development - S.106	£-£££	Capital schemes required to mitigate for a specific development.	Strategic Manager / BCA supported by BCS volunteers and SCC / HCC Officers react to proposed schemes.

¹ SCC now require all CIL applications affecting SCC land to be assessed centrally.

Development - Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	£-££	Funding from development to enhance biodiversity. Guidance indicates that already protected sites such as SSSI will not be funded. This only leaves the Woking Section of the Canal as a potential beneficiary.	Strategic Manager / BCA Officers work with Woking Borough Council and SCC Officers to identify potential biodiversity enhancement schemes in Woking.
Development - SANGS	£-££	Funding from development as an alternative greenspace to Thames Basin Heath SPA sites.	Canal fails the criteria to become a SANG on a number of counts - already attractive, high use, linear route, and a protected site.
Heritage Lottery Fund	£-£££	Capital schemes to enhance public engagement with heritage. Projects are very competitive and difficult for the public sector to obtain.	N/A - Not suitable for the Canal at present. BCS would be best placed to bid for any schemes that are identified.
Private Trusts and Specialist Grant givers	£-££	Capital schemes that chime with the grant giver's charitable aims - which vary quite widely.	BCA or BCS as specific projects are identified
BCS	£-££	As a charity the BCS can give grants for capital projects or fund anything which benefits the Canal.	BCS decide on which if any projects to fund.
Countryside Stewardship and Environmental Land Management Scheme (ELMS)	£	Agri-environment based grants from NE / DEFRA aimed primarily at improving farming practice	N/A - not a good fit for the Canal's needs
EU Growth Fund	££	Primarily aimed at rural business growth - Not yet replaced by UK Government	N/A - previous Canal based bid failed - no longer available
Community Foundations SCF/HIWCF	£	Capital grants for Heath & Wellbeing and Environment projects.	
Targeted Community Funds	£	Both SCF / HIWCT will hold and administer a targeted fund for the Canal. This will only fund capital projects. Will require a funding source to generate the fund	Currently not set up - would only be useful with a source of income (see membership, crowd funding, wills etc)
Membership	£	Can fund revenue or capital schemes - or could be used to create a community fund specifically for the Canal.	BCS are best placed to develop a membership scheme

		Memberships are hard for local authorities to do well due to public attitudes to provision of services.	
Crowd Funding	£-£££	To be successful there needs an identifiable purpose or cause for the public to buy into. Lends itself to capital schemes but can be used for any purpose. Local authorities are not best placed to use this route.	BCS are best placed to campaign for causes
Wills and legacies	£-£££	Estates are frequently left to charitable causes - both the BCA and BCS receive occasional small amounts for people wanting to remember the canal.	BCS are best placed to target wills and legacies to support specific campaigns
Levy on development	££-£££	Whilst this could provide substantial income for a Community Fund - there is no legal mechanism to enable this at present.	Requires political lobbying for primary legislation. Would compete for other environmental causes.

Funding from development

Funding as a result of development often needs to be reactive to development proposals - as mitigation against increased use or other harmful effects; schemes may not be appropriate unless there is a need for mitigation. There has been a mixed result of success and failure in obtaining s.106 depending on the competing demands of other mitigations relevant to the development (eg: SANGS, parks, public rights of way, other greenspaces). All s.106 schemes must be directly relevant to the development which is funding it.

Other strands of development funding, such as CIL may be open to canal related schemes, but are competitive and will be considered alongside other priorities for the owners and local authorities. These will not replace revenue funding.

SANGS and BNG are largely not open for the Canal due to its conservation designations.

Conclusion

Most sources of external funding are for “capital” type projects not to replace revenue funding. In many instances capital projects are not what is required to make the Canal Partnership financially sustainable - although the purchase of replacement equipment such as the dredger or weedcutter vessels might fit some funding streams.

In other instances, a capital project might defer the need of maintenance some years down the line (eg: to upgrade a length of towpath to accommodate new development), or be required to mitigate for a development happening close to the Canal.

This page is intentionally left blank