



**Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> April 2010**  
**Local Action Group Event**  
**Feedback from Workshop Discussions**

**Training and skills provision – priority 3. Should this be specific and related to local employment opportunities, and are taster sessions and introductory courses appropriate?**

- Training for jobs tailored to employment needs is important in areas such as crafts and forestry. Very little has come forward from the forestry sector and the Executive Group needs to look at why. Who is best placed to deliver this type of training?
- There is also a need for higher level ICT training so people can work from home.
- Training should be specific and should look at local employment needs / opportunities. A range of skills is important as the range of opportunities is wider than ever.
- The LEADER network could be valuable for communication.
- Taster sessions and introductory courses can introduce new areas of employment and increase skills base.
- Work could also be done to help identify transferable skills and introduce people to different types of employment.

**Are there any priorities you feel we should have more focus on?**

- Need to be flexible in all things.
- Tourism need to be encouraged.
- CO2 reduction should be a priority and would like to see an increased number of applications in this area.
- Need to try and persuade more inexperienced groups to apply for funding.
- Youth in rural areas
- Priority 3 – Skills and training in jobs for young people particularly in rural areas. Most existing schemes are in towns.

**We are aware that not all community projects can identify problems that need solving and would like to support projects that build on the assets and strengths that they possess. How should we approach projects that don't show need and are just about trying something new or nice?**

- Would like to see applications focus on the main asset of places – the people.
- New or nice ideas are not a problem – innovation is good.
- Need to produce a definition of 'innovative'. Is this something new to the area or a totally new idea or concept?

- Look at other areas to measure success eg: successful outcomes. See if outputs can be extracted easily but without changing the project. By highlighting success in other areas it might be easier to justify risky or innovative projects.
- Projects need to show sustainability.

**Village Halls / Community Buildings. Should there be a cap on the number of village hall / community buildings supported each year? Should there be a limit on the size of grants?**

- This should depend on what the village hall requires, location, possible sharing of resources and local support.
- There should be a good geographical spread of projects.
- Generally we need to remain flexible and not take projects on a first come first served basis. Each project should be assessed on its merits.
- There should be no definite ceiling to the size of grants as this may stifle good ideas. We should however keep the advisory limit of £30,000 and look for value for money.
- It is increasing difficult to find match funding so we need to look for other ways to measure commitment.

**Now the programme is up and running, should we consider setting intervention rates?**

- An advisory intervention rate could be helpful. This would encourage projects to demonstrate they had looked for match funding. But match funding can be difficult to find.
- Can projects demonstrate their commitment in other ways eg: volunteer time?
- Intervention rates can be a barrier.
- Sometimes it's difficult for small groups to get funding.
- Complex projects requiring a lot of funding must have match funding and show community involvement.
- Good outputs (eg: economic) could be 100% funded.

**Small scale community transport schemes – priority two. What type of projects could this include?**

- Wheels to work.
- Help towards driving lessons.
- Use of local taxis and increased publicity of these services.
- Use of local authority transport when it is not in use.
- Could school transport be used to transport young people (up to 19 years old) to their job, training, apprenticeship etc?

**Should we have a call for projects under priority 4? What types of projects could this include?**

- Often this type of project is seen as very expensive – need to encourage ‘small scale greening’.
- Energy efficiency savings should be encouraged.
- New builds in villages should be encouraged to have green measures included from the planning stage.
- Consensus was reached that yes we should. However the costs of such schemes, along with current legislation (listed building status etc.) could deter communities developing climate change initiatives.
- Does (or should) the LEADER Executive have an environmental ‘check list’ by which to assess the projects under consideration?
- Labour, knowledge and expertise are also commodities that can be recycled, not just raw materials and waste. LEADER should be looking to harness the talents within local communities, not pay to bring expertise into communities.
- Should be looking to support schemes which raise awareness and understanding of what is on offer from local authorities and Energy Trusts with regards to recycling, fuel poverty and alternative technologies.
- Should be supporting small scale projects that have an impact on social cohesion, health & well-being and the sustainability of communities, regardless of the impact on the environment (‘gestures can have an impact as well as solutions.’) Such projects include community allotments, coppicing and village orchards.

#### **How do we encourage small community projects to link with each other?**

- Doesn’t seem to be any help for East Cleveland groups. Don’t know who to ask. Small groups don’t know about funding – they find out by chance.
- Groups would probably like to work together but feel they are competing with each other for funding.
- Heritage projects usually link up very well.

#### **How do we spread the word about LEADER more effectively at a local level?**

- Groups that have already received funding should talk to new groups.
- More workshops and local events to attend with information about the process, forms etc are needed.
- Promotional videos / dvd’s.
- Need to look at the language used and make it more user friendly eg: ‘village renewal’.
- Those projects that have either been successful in applying for funding or those that have been completed as a result of LEADER funding should be celebrated more widely.
- Details of the LEADER programme should be included in Parish newsletters and voluntary sector bulletins (if not already.)

- A need exists to reduce the ‘mystique’ that still surrounds LEADER funding – where it comes from, what it is for, how much can be claimed and who can apply? This could be done through a series of road shows across the LEADER area similar to the one held in Moorsholm.
- LEADER should seek to invest time & effort to enhance the ‘skills of interpretation’ of local communities to ensure that the LEADER programme is well understood.

**Bearing in mind we can not support private businesses directly, how can we encourage projects under priority 9?**

- Needs excellent partnership working to bring groups, users and businesses together.
- There are lots of different interpretations and understandings of the terms ‘sense of place’.
- A programme of small activities can help build up this idea of sense of place over time – difficult to roll it out in one go.
- Should encourage projects that give communities the necessary skills ‘to do the job’ – ie. LEADER should be promoting schemes that invest in learning & skills provision (including apprenticeships) that is appropriate to the job opportunities available in the community.
- Encourage schemes that appoint ‘ambassadors’ to promote tourist destinations, cultural/heritage events and business sectors.
- LEADER should also allocate funds to projects that seek to improve access to, and awareness of, services, facilities, community activities and social enterprises.