

# LEADER North York Moors, Coast and Hills

## LAG Executive Group Meeting

28<sup>th</sup> May 2009, 13.00 pm

### National Park Office, Helmsley

**Present:**

**LAG Executive Members**

Malcolm Bowes (Chair)	Elected	Public or non public
Peter Spencer (Vice Chair)	Appointed	Tees Valley RCC
Peter Barfoot	Appointed	NYMNP
Liz Dowson #	Appointed	Scarborough BC
David Pybus	Appointed	Business – Cleveland Potash
Cllr George Dunning	Appointed	Redcar and Cleveland BC
Sarah Robinson	Appointed	Rural Action Yorkshire
Will Terry	Appointed	Farming - NFU/CLA
Claire Gallagher	Elected	Environment
Rachel Donkersley	Elected	Young People
Phil Bustard	Elected	Voluntary/Community
Eleanor Dowsland	Elected	Voluntary/Community
Patrick Holdsworth	Elected	Voluntary/Community
Janette Holt	Elected	Voluntary/Community
Marian Wheeler	Elected	Voluntary/Community

**Support Group**

Doff Pollard*	Tees Valley Rural Community Council
Julie Laverick*	North Yorkshire County Council
Mairi Macintyre*	North Yorkshire County Council
Mike Horrocks*	LEADER Programme Manager
Amy Thomas *	LEADER Programme Officer
Lynne Watson*	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

\*non-voting  
# 3 members share 1 vote.

**1. Apologies:**

Peter Cole #	Appointed	Hambleton DC
Jane Johnson #	Appointed	Ryedale DC
Linda Bell	Elected	Voluntary/Community
Fraser Hugill*		North York Moors National Park
Rita Lawson *		North Yorkshire County Council

**2. Matters Arising**

**MH** announced that the new LEADER website should, hopefully, be 'up and running', within the next three weeks.

### 3. Programme Report – Verbal NYCC and NYMNPA

**JL - NYCC** informed the Executive Group that the Annual Review Meeting with YF on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2009 had taken place. The review revolved around the 'milestones' and 'achievements', with some discussion surrounding the reprofiling of the funding. Approval is being sought from YF to reduce the 09/10 budget to around £200,000 with the balance added towards the end of the programme. An update was given on the Service Level Agreement, which is, at present, in draft form with the Lead Partner.

**MH – NYMNPA** was able to inform the Executive Group that, to date, 52 Project Idea Forms have been received. 23 of these applicants have been provided with the full LEADER Application Form for completion. 2 projects have already submitted their completed Application, and there is the possibility of another 2 or 3 submissions prior to the next Executive Group Meeting. The LEADER fund has generated a great deal of interest from potential applicants. If all applicants were to be considered it could 'possibly' be beyond the capacity of the programme. Therefore, project selection in line with the Local Development Strategy should be given great consideration.

### 4. Broadband and LEADER Involvement

**MB** 'declared an interest', as he is actively involved in the Bilsdale Broadband group

**MH** has received several expressions of interest on this subject. As it is a very broad ranging topic his advice would be to first find out as an Executive Group what the current situation is at the local and regional level with regard to development of broadband provision. Once the various gaps in knowledge had been identified and filled then the Executive would be able to take a view on where its support could be directed.

**MB** welcomed comments from the Executive Group  
Salient points were as follows:-

- The existing network of fibre optic cable is still relatively unknown to the community, so the extent and coverage must first be identified.
- Surveys on the Broadband issue are already 'in progress', and a government report on the subject is due for release in two weeks.
- NYCC should be the first 'port of call', for information from NYNET on the fibre optic cable network, before further 'involvement with broadband.
- Are there other, more appropriate funding sources who will fund broadband projects?
- As a LEADER programme, priority should be given to Applicants who are already proactive but need 'extra' cash.
- A small group in Scotland have paid for the laying of 'fibre optic cable' (at a cost of approximately £25,000), which linked to their local exchange. This group should be contacted for their advice, and information on the costs of the procedure.
- Need to know what the options and limitations are.

**MB** asked for volunteers from the members of the Executive Group to form a 'Task Group'. This group would seek answers to the above questions. 5 Executive members volunteered, **PH, LD, MW, WT** and **ED**. **JL** agreed to pursue information from NYNET.

**ACTION: The 'Task Group' to pursue information required to resolve the 'Broadband' issue and answer questions raised by the Executive Group.**

**5. Feedback from RCC's on 'Advisory Service Proposal'**

**MH** confirmed that a completed 'Project Idea Form' had been received and a full 'Application Form' has been issued.

**6. Update on Community Enhancement Project**

**PBa** gave an update of the Community Enhancement Project to the Executive Group. The project, in its present form cannot be operated by one group. He reconfirmed the main problem was regarding the 'Accountable Body' status and the main recipient, or 'end beneficiary' of work. The new draft proposal seeks to establish R&CBC, NYCC and NYMNPAs as accountable for any works within their boundaries. These recipients would have to bankroll any works within their boundaries. **PS** also suggested that TVRCC could act as an accountable body if required. **PBa** informed the Executive Group that it is still in the early stages of discussion with delivery partners, and indicated that it could be early September 2009 before an Application would be submitted.

**7. Training for Executive Group**

**MH** provided a 'Training List' which was circulated to all members of the Executive at the meeting. Each member was requested to put a 'tick' at the particular option(s) of interest, in order of priority, and return it to **MH** at the end of the meeting.

It was agreed that the next training session be held on the 29<sup>th</sup> June, 9.30a.m. to 1 p.m. All agreed that the priority for this session should be understanding the project appraisal and approval procedure.

**MW** kindly offered the premises at Margrove Park for the training session on 29th.

**8. Any Other Business**

Project Form

The Executive Group members had discussions surrounding the 'Project Form' and the associated 'Training Session'.

Salient points were as follows:-

- The 'Project Form' should be referred to as an 'Aide Memoire' not a 'Scoring Sheet'.
- The information supplied as guidance in the form comes directly from the LDS.
- It is not a 'rigid' list for the Executive Members but an 'aide' to be used prior to discussions.
- Clarification was sought on Section 21 of the 'Application Form'. It 'indicates' that an Applicant should 'tick' only one of the twelve LEADER priorities that it mainly contributes towards. This conflicts with the 'Project Form' which could be seen to be assessing a project on 'how many' of the priorities it contributes towards. The recommendation was made that the applicant should 'highlight' the 'main' priority and 'tick' the other priorities.

- The Gateway check/eligibility criteria is met by a project contributing to at least one priority, a project is not 'scored' on meeting that criteria. Ticking other priorities would however give 'added value'
- The Executive Group would not receive an 'Application Form' which had not already met the required eligibility criteria.
- Debate surrounded the issue of whether or not the 'Application' and/or the 'Guidance' was suitably worded. It was agreed that the wording of Section 21, which was open to misinterpretation, be amended before the training session.

**Proposal: Any wording open to misinterpretation in the Application Form or Guidance to be amended.**

**Action: NYCC Officers delegated to amend if required, and report back any changes to the next Executive Group Meeting.**

- Should an Applicant who is also a member of the Executive Group attend a training session, which may give them an unfair advantage over other Applicants? It was agreed this would not be an issue for two main reasons. Firstly, if a member was the Applicant they would have to declare an interest and would not participate in any discussion about the project. Secondly, the appraisal process and blank form are publicly available so anyone can request a copy.
- The training session was not just about helping the Executive member but about training them to help other groups/individuals in the community. It was agreed that all of the Executive Group should attend the training Session.

#### Great Yorkshire Show

**MH** reminded the Executive members that there were still some free tickets, limited to 8 per LAG, available for the Great Yorkshire Show on the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2009. Yorkshire Forward has a stand and will be providing a lunch, where there will be the opportunity to have an informal talk with other LAG's. Four members of the Executive Group wished to attend, they were **MB, PS, PBu**, and **ED**, who would contact **MH** with confirmation. As 3 tickets remained it was suggested that the wider LAG be approached by email.

**Action: LAG Members to be notified by AT of the opportunity to attend (by email) – responses needed by Friday 5<sup>th</sup> June.**

**PBa** queried whether similar opportunities to attend events, would be available with 'One North East'.

#### Attendance at Other Shows

The subject of attendance at agricultural shows was raised by **MB**. **MH** informed the Executive Group that they would like to place LEADER information on the North York Moors National Park Authority trailer to each of these events. **MH** had a list of forthcoming events and will send out with the minutes.

### **9. Date, Time and Venue of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 14 July 2009, 10.00 a.m. - 12.00, at NYMNPA Offices, Helmsley.

Signature: .....

Malcolm Bowes, Chair

Date: .....