

LEADER North York Moors, Coast and Hills

LAG Executive Group Meeting

27th August 2009, 2.00pm - 4.30pm

Margrove Park Village Hall

Present:

LAG Executive Members

Malcolm Bowes (Chair)	Elected	Public or non public
Liz Dowson #	Appointed	Scarborough BC
Jane Johnson #	Appointed	Ryedale DC
David Pybus	Appointed	Business – Cleveland Potash
Cllr George Dunning	Appointed	Redcar and Cleveland BC
Sarah Robinson	Appointed	Rural Action Yorkshire
Claire Gallagher	Elected	Environment
Linda Bell	Elected	Voluntary/Community
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
Rachel Donkersley	Elected	Young People
Fraser Hugill	Appointed	NYMNPA
Doff Pollard	Appointed	Tees Valley RCC

Support Group

Rita Lawson *	North Yorkshire County Council
Julie Laverick*	North Yorkshire County Council
Mairi Macintyre*	North Yorkshire County Council
Jos Holmes	Ryedale DC
Mike Horrocks*	LEADER Programme Manager
Amy Thomas *	LEADER Programme Officer

*non-voting

3 members share 1 vote.

1. Apologies:

Peter Spencer (Vice Chair)	Appointed	Tees Valley RCC
Peter Cole #	Appointed	Hambleton DC
Will Terry	Appointed	Farming - NFU/CLA
Peter Barfoot	Appointed	NYMNPA

New substitutes Fraser Hugill (NYMNPA), Doff Pollard (TVRCC) and Jos Holmes (RDC) were introduced to the Executive.

2. General Feedback From the Executive Meeting 14th July

2.1 Positives taken from the last meeting by the group were as follows:

- Had a thorough discussion and worked hard.
- It took a long time but was expected because these were the first applications.
- The appraisal document from **NYCC** was very helpful.
- Respect for each others views.
- Local knowledge and variety of skills within the group was beneficial – this shows the strength of the LAG. It was noted however that local knowledge needs to be objective not subjective so must be factual, not prejudicial.
- Trying to juggle good projects with expenditure needs.

2.2 Areas of 'Room for Improvement' were discussed and the following points made:

- Good discussion was held and a decision was made, but too long was spent thinking about the wording to go back to the applicant. However, it was felt by some Executive members that it was important to get this right, especially for small groups who may be new to the grant application process.
- Need to be clear why a project is being rejected before rejecting it. This reason to be clear at the meeting as it needs to be robust.
- Too much emphasis on match funding – it would be easier to ignore this and leave it to officers.
- Need to focus on what is important about these projects. Some elements of the process/decision making took a long time but should get quicker with time/practice.
- In some cases the process took a while because some of the projects were very large. Can we encourage large projects to submit applications for just a small discreet element that is LEADER appropriate? However, some Executive members would prefer to see the whole project so they can see the bigger picture.
- **RL** suggested that it is sometimes difficult to take out the LEADER element – if this is done the project can appear as incomplete, less cohesive etc.

2.3 **DPy** requested if Executive members could receive copies of the letters sent to applicants.

RL responded and said that copies of the letter sent could not be shared.

If Executive members are approached by applicants to discuss the decision or reasons for a decision, they should be encouraged to contact **MAH** to discuss instead.

2.4 **MAH** outlined the action points he and AET had taken away from the last meeting and were working on.

- Encourage applicants to look at promotion and marketing
- Help applicants to be more realistic with output figures and look into creating some guidance for applicants.
- The Programme Manager/Officer need to see all the final applications so we are in a better position to answer any questions.

3. Value for Money

3.1 The cost of goods/services is covered by the appraisal process. The appraisal will pick up where items are over £1,000 and require three quotes, and this will be commented on in the appraisal document.

- 3.2.1 Salary costs can sometimes appear to be high, but the appraisal will look at the job description, the employing organisation etc in relation to this. The appraisal will also look at the cost of admin/overheads etc in relation to the role/post. Executive members are encouraged to voice opinions/concerns if they believe a cost to be too high, but they should not debate how much they think this should be.
- 3.2.2 **SR** suggested that a training session on FCR may be worthwhile for the Executive at some time in the future.
- 3.3 It should also be noted that applicants will need to prove what expenditure has taken place. They will not automatically get the full amount approved, and so will need to provide evidence such as pay slips, bank statements and invoices.
- 3.4 Match funding and planning permission requirements are also checked at the appraisal stage. If there is a time lapse this will be noted on the appraisal document. Approved applicants will have one month to secure any outstanding funding or the required planning permission.

4. Cost of Project Delivery

- 4.1 **MAH** discussed with the Executive the idea that different organisations operate in different ways. Large organisations have the ability to absorb costs such as management, finance and admin more easily than others, and it is generally accepted that small organisations will need to cover all costs and overheads.
- 4.2 **MAH** encouraged Executive members to look at the LDS to see how projects can be measured against the needs, priorities etc of the programme. Pages of the LDS to note in particular are p23 – Target Groups, p72/73 – Envisaged Activities and p145 onwards – Emerging Geographical Priorities.
- 4.3 It was proposed that a review of the 'LEADER Picture' takes place after the 15th September meeting. A mid-term evaluation will also need to be prepared to show money committed and spent against the objectives and priorities.

5. Conditions and Rejections

- 5.1 The subject of Conditions and Rejections was discussed by the Executive. Any condition applied to a project and in an offer letter must be SMART so it can easily be implemented, monitored and evaluated.
- 5.2 In the case of planning requirements, match funding, quotes etc, these conditions will be picked up during the appraisal and noted on the appraisal document and will automatically be included in the conditions of offer. All conditions (along with the signed acceptance letter, completed CReg form etc) must be discharged before a project can start.
- 5.3 The Executive can add additional conditions to a project but they must be positive and constructive.
- 5.4 Recommendations can also be made. These act more as feedback to an applicant and can offer them advice on good practice. For example if a project involves children it can be suggested that an applicant puts in place the appropriate child protection policy, has the relevant insurance etc.

The session then moved onto a formal meeting.

6. Programme Report – Verbal Update from NYCC and NYMNP

- 6.1.1 **JL** informed the Executive that if both the projects on today's agenda are to be approved this would leave £375,877 to be committed from 2009/10.

A meeting between NYCC and YF has been arranged for 29th September to discuss re-profiling. Whilst YF have indicated that this year's funds must be spent or they will be lost, **RL** will continue the discussion to request the ability to re-profile. It is possible for the Executive to over allocate funds as some projects will under spend, we may be able to access under spend from other LEADER programmes, the start dates of some projects can be pushed back, or we have the ability to allocate money from next financial year.

Currently NYCC have 19 projects to appraise for the September Executive meeting. Whilst 12 will definitely be presented, there is every likelihood that the remaining 7 applications will also have supplied the required information and will be ready for the meeting.

- 6.1.2 It was suggested that due to the volume of applications expected in September, a second Executive meeting be held on 28th September. Further details and confirmation will follow.
- 6.1.3 **MAH** provided a brief update to the Executive. 80+ Project Idea Forms have been received to date and an additional 10 full applications for the October Executive are anticipated.

7. Declarations of Interest

Project Ref.	Project Name	Exec.Member Initials
LDR/M/0910/009	Training Loftus and East Cleveland	GD, DPd
LDR/M/0910/004	Lythe Village Hall Development Project (Resubmission)	DPy

8. Applications for Consideration

8.1 LDR/M/0910/009 Training Loftus and East Cleveland

Grant requested: £98,068 (36.83%)
Total Project Cost: £266,248

- 8.1.1 **DPd and GD** 'declared an interest' in this project and left the meeting room.
- 8.1.2 Final recommendation was to support the application.
- 8.1.3 The project was approved a grant of £98,068
- 8.1.4 **DPd and GD** re-entered the room.

8.2 LDR/M/0910/004 Lythe Village Hall Development Project (Re-submission)

Grant requested: £61,300 (24.79%)
Total Project Cost: £247,188.90

8.2.1 **DPy** 'Declared an Interest' in this project.

8.2.2 **MAH** noted that following the Executive's recommendations the applicant had removed the relevant contingency costs, the car park costs, decoration costs, plus another £1,000 of costs.

8.2.3 Final recommendation was to support the application.

8.2.4 The project was **approved a grant of £61,300**.

9. Feedback from Great Yorkshire Show

9.1 **PH, MB, ED** and **PB** attended the YF organised event at the Great Yorkshire Show. Feedback from the event was that it was a useful session to meet other LAG members, to see how different programmes operated and to discuss common issues such as Village Halls and covering core costs.

10. Parish Caretakers Scheme Proposal

10.1 **MAH** had prepared and circulated a report proposing that an event be held on 23rd September to bring Parishes together and provide information about caretaker schemes and how LEADER had the potential to contribute.

The Executive **supported the proposal in general** but did not confirm how much the total LEADER pot of funding would be. It was agreed it would be somewhere in the region of the amount outlined in the proposal but would be confirmed at a later meeting.

MAH and **SR** left the meeting at this point.

11. Broadband – Feedback from Task and Finish Group

11.1 **PH** summarised the report circulated to members with this meetings papers. There has been a recent Government agreement to fund network structures, therefore the report recommends that the Executive should only be concerned with looking at small 'end of network' schemes in later years, and in the meantime we should be better prepared to point the groups looking at larger, more strategic projects in the direction of more appropriate organisations/funding.

11.2 **MB** thanked the sub-group for an excellent report and the recommendations in the report were supported by the Executive.

12. Community Enhancements Scheme Update

12.1 **MAH** prepared a report for the Executive which was discussed as an item for information. Currently legal issues prevented the National Park from delivering this

project across the wider LEADER area, and at the moment there is no other way of delivering this project.

Currently a scheme from the National Park will be coming forwards to the September Executive meeting to deliver this project but only within the National park boundary. If any other organisation is interested in delivering this project in another area, they need to contact officers.

13. Date, Time and Venue of Next Meeting

Tuesday 15 September 2009, 10.00 a.m. - 12.00, at NYMNPA Offices, Helmsley.

Signature:

Malcolm Bowes, Chair

Date: