

# LEADER North York Moors, Coast and Hills

## LAG Executive Group Meeting

15<sup>th</sup> September 2009, 9.30 am to 2.00 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
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
Will Terry	Appointed	Farming - NFU/CLA
Claire Gallagher	Elected	Environment
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

#### Support Group

Rita Lawson *	North Yorkshire County Council
Mairi Macintyre*	North Yorkshire County Council
Mike Horrocks*	LEADER Programme Manager
Amy Thomas *	LEADER Programme Officer

\*non-voting

# 3 members share 1 vote.

### 1. Apologies:

Peter Cole #	Appointed	Hambleton DC
Linda Bell	Elected	Voluntary/Community
Julie Laverick*		North Yorkshire County Council

### 2. Notes from the Executive Group Meeting 27<sup>th</sup> August 2009

2.1 The notes of the meeting of 27<sup>th</sup> August 2009 were not sent out to the Executive Group members, but could be collected at the end of the meeting.

### 3. Matters Arising

3.1 There were no matters arising.

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

4.1 RL informed the Executive .

4.2 MH gave a brief update on project activity since the last Executive meeting. There have been 91 'Project Interest Forms' submitted, and 47 full application forms handed out to date, 27 still to be returned. This is inclusive of those to be presented at this meeting. He informed the Executive Groups that there was a 'time lag' involved when putting pressure on applicants to reduce their costs, but there are now more lower value projects being submitted.

4.2.1 RL handed the Executive Group members a spreadsheet 'update' from JL.

#### 5. Declarations of Interest

Project Ref.	Project Name	Exec.Member Initials
LDR/M/0910/007	Sustainable Community Halls – Re-submission	PS, SR
LDR/M/0910/010	Grosmont Heritage Park and Playspace	
LDR/M/0910/011	Mulgrave Community Research Project	LD, DP
LDR/M/0910/012	North York Moors Railway – 'Horizons'	PBs
LDR/M/0910/025	Odin's Voice	GD

#### 6. Applications for Consideration

##### 6.1 LDR/M/0910/007 Sustainable Community Halls –Re-submission

Grant requested: £89,600 (83.27%)  
Total Project Cost: £107,600

6.1.1 PS, and SR 'declared an interest' in this project and left the meeting room.

6.1.3 The project was approved a grant of £89,600.

6.1.4 PS, and SR re-entered the room.

##### 6.2 LDR/M/0910/010 Grosmont Heritage Park and Playspace

Grant requested: £164,042 (88.54%)  
Total Project Cost: £185,282

6.2.3 The project was rejected.- The main concern was the level of funding being requested, and that evidence was insufficient to demonstrate that this was an 'exceptional' project. The Executive also expressed their concerns over the lack of evidence in respect of closer partnership working with NYMR and the complementarities and linkages that could be made. Other issues that led to a decision of rejection was the cost of the artwork and whether LEADER should be paying for this and no demonstrable evidence in respect of a forward plan for the on-going maintenance of the play area. However, the Executive also agreed that if the applicant wished to submit an application for a more modest request of

**funding, i.e. perhaps a discrete element of the overall scheme this would be welcomed.**

**PB** entered the meeting and gave apologies for late arrival

**6.3 LDR/M/0910/011 Mulgrave Community Research Project**

Grant requested: £66,955 (71.26%)  
Total Project Cost: £93,955

6.3.1 **LD** 'declared an interest' in this project and left the room. **DP** spoke in favour of the project then also left the room.

6.3.3 The project was **approved a grant of £66,955 subject to confirmation of match funding, and on the recommendation of the Executive that the project be innovative and community led.**

6.3.4 **LD** and **DP** re-entered the room.

**6.4 LDR/M/0910/012 North York Moors Railway –'Horizons'**

Grant requested: £100,000 (32.62%)  
Total Project Cost: £685,000

6.4.1 **PBs** 'declared an interest' in this project and left the room.

6.4.3 **The project was approved a grant of £100,000, subject to confirmation of match funding, and subject to North York Moors Railway submitting revised milestones/plan that demonstrate clear proposals as to how the £10k LEADER funding in Years 2 and 3 will be utilised; specifically in respect of the two LEADER priorities 'Sense of Place' and 'Circular walks'. Responsibility for ensuring this condition is discharged delegated to RL/MH and e-mail notification to Executive.**

6.4.4 **PBs** re-entered the room.

**6.5 LDR/M/0910/014 Hustwaite Orchard Co-operative**

Grant requested: £32,295 (65.79%)  
Total Project Cost: £49,086

6.5.3 The project was **approved a grant of £32,295.**

**6.6 LDR/M/0910/015 Thirlby Community Recreational Field Project**

Grant requested: £35,917 (100%)  
Total Project Cost: £35,917

6.6.2 **The project was approved a grant of £35,917, but excluding the cost for the electricity supply. The recommendation of the Executive was that the applicant**

explored the feasibility of alternative ways to supply the electricity, i.e. solar panels. The outcome of this exploration will be dependent as to whether the £7k withheld should be reinstated. Responsibility for ensuring this recommendation is discharged delegated to RL/MH and e-mail notification to Executive.

**6.7 LDR/M/0910/017           INSPIRE-ED**

Grant requested:       £11,290 (31.44%)  
Total Project Cost:    £13,290

6.7.2 The project was approved a grant of £11,290, with the recommendation that every effort is made to ensure that hard to reach groups are targeted.

**6.8 LDR/M/0910/018           Sneaton Village Hall Refurbishment – Final Stage**

Grant requested:       £15,550 (86.15%)  
Total Project Cost:    £18,050

6.8.2 The project was approved a grant of £15,550.

**6.9 LDR/M/0910/024           Community ECO Project**

Grant requested:       £24,372 (87.51%)  
Total Project Cost:    £27,850

6.9.2 The project was rejected. The Executive considered that the project was weak in respect of evidence of need; that it lacked tangible outcomes and that there was duplication of activity potentially available from the Local Authority and/or other organisations.

**6.10 LDR/M/0910/025         Odin's voice**

Grant requested:       £19,000 (79.17%)  
Total Project Cost:    £24,000

6.10.1 **GD** 'declared an interest' in this project and left the room. **PS** had involvement with the project (non-prejudicial) remained and chose not to vote.

6.10.3 The project was rejected - The Executive acknowledged there 'was need' but that this proposal did not demonstrate the identification of the project 'by the community'.

6.10.4 **GD** re-entered the room

**7. Parish Community Caretakers Projects**

7.1 Key discussion points:-

- Decision by the Executive on how much financial support to be given – agreed in principle at last meeting.

- Talk to be given by Parish Clerks on the PCC scheme and LEADER. Contact with TVRCC who gave update on Parish Caretaker in East Cleveland giving similar talk.
- Funding 'Ceiling' –clarification required for groups pre application - £6,000 (Total Project Costs), with LEADER contribution of £4,500 considered adequate if person to be employed is to be part-time.
- Clarification required on what Parish councils 'can' apply for – importance of small jobs/maintenance?
- 'Fit' with LEADER –should this be a statutory requirement of the Parish?- no.
- Two meetings (Exec.Group or Sub-Group) in October or December required to discuss all issues
- Eligible parishes in the LEADER Areas
- Town Councils to evidence the benefit of their being in scheme..
- Project should be innovative – linkage of parishes.
- Parish Councils need to consider 'liability'- who can do what.
- Job role of Caretaker
- Issues to be decided:- value for money; partnership working; type of activities; and parish contribution (is this long term?).

**ACTION: MH to come back with a report on the endorsement of the figures necessary**

## **8. Any Other Business**

- 8.1 **RL** discussed the year end and the funding process with the Executive Group. They were informed that Yorkshire Forward must have 'money' spent and processed by the end of February 2010.
- 8.2 **PBt** indicated that if overcommitted this year, further funding may be available to 'pull down' from 'RDP for England'.
- 8.3 **DP** was of the opinion that there may be enthusiasm amongst the Executive Group to visit specific projects. **PBt** suggested these visits should incorporate several projects, not just one per visit.
- 8.4 **GD** said he may be unable to attend the meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2009, due to other work commitments
- 8.5 **MH** typed up some notes for the Executive Group to take on their way out, and reminded them also to collect the packs of 'Promotional Material' supplied.
- 8.6 **RL** handed out copies of the notes on the 'Executive Group Meeting/ Training Session, 28<sup>th</sup> August 2009'.

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

Monday 28th September 2009, 9.30 am - 2.00 pm, Hovingham Village Hall, Hovingham.

Signature: .....

Malcolm Bowes, Chair

Date: .....