



North York Moors, Coast & Hills LEADER Programme
Executive Group Meeting
NPA Offices, Helmsley, 10.00 – 3.00pm
20th January 2015

Notes of the meeting

Attending:

Name	Representing
Steve Arnold	Community and Voluntary Sector
Chris Barkas	Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Liz Barker	North Yorkshire County Council / York, North Yorkshire & East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership
Malcom Bowes	Community and Voluntary Sector
Angela Brockbank	Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Nick Cooke	Forestry
Liz Dowson	Scarborough Borough Council
Tony Gatehouse	Community and Voluntary Sector
Helen Gundry	Community and Voluntary Sector
Heather Heward (advisory)	Tees Valley Local Enterprise Partnership
Helen Kemp	Hambleton District Council
Anna Lupton	Tourism and the Visitor Economy
Helen Patchett (non-voting)	North Yorkshire County Council – Accountable Body
David Renwick	North York Moors National Park Authority
Peter Spencer	Tees Valley Rural Community Council
Abigail Stokell-Beckett	Micro and Small Businesses
Jo Swift	Micro and Small Businesses
Will Terry	Agriculture
Amy Thomas (non-voting)	LEADER Co-ordinator / Programme Manager
Howard Wallis	Ryedale District Council
Will Watts	Tourism and the Visitor Economy

Apologies:

Name	Representing
Robin Asquith	Agriculture
Tina Chamberlain	Rural Action Yorkshire (post meeting)

(1) Welcome and apologies

Apologies had been received from Robin Asquith, agriculture representative.

David Renwick (DSR) introduced himself and explained that he would Chair this first meeting whilst no contract was in place with DEFRA yet. At the next meeting on 8th April, the Group would elect a Chair and Vice Chair, and this would give the Group a chance to get to know people at this meeting, to come up to speed with LEADER and the Programme and to consider whether they would like to put themselves forward for Chair or Vice-chair.

He asked individuals to introduce themselves, stating which sector or organisation they represented.

(2) What is LEADER?

Helen Patchett (HP) presented the background to LEADER, explaining the principles behind it, how it differs from other funding streams in ethos, and putting it into context of other European funding. She explained the national picture and showed a map of LEADER areas in the region, demonstrating how much geographical coverage LEADER had. Also discussed was co-operation projects and how they would operate.

Notes were circulated on the presentation (attached to these minutes).

Points that were raised by the Group subsequent to the presentation were as follows:

- Potential for co-operation projects were already being discussed between LEADER Co-ordinators in the north of England, i.e. from the Peak District to Northumberland. A good network exists and ideas are being put forward at this stage;
- The Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) covering both Tees Valley and York, North Yorkshire and East Riding would be involved to ensure maximum complementarity with main programme activities – any links need to be made to avoid duplication, and LEADER can add value and disperse the main programmes to the more rural areas;
- It was noted that the new LEADER Programme would be very different in emphasis to the last one, and comments were made that it was very positive to have retained Amy Thomas as Co-ordinator;
- District and Borough councils advised of their strategies and funding allocations for the various areas, which would potentially provide match funding to some of the more strategic projects; and
- It was noted that whilst the final allocation will be given as a finite budget, there was opportunity last time to draw down further funds as other Programmes underspent. To do this again, the Programme will not only have to demonstrate spend but also that it can achieve the outputs required for that spend.

(3) Virtual Tour of the Area

3.1 Each representative of Hambleton District Council (HDC), Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC), Scarborough Borough Council (SBC), Ryedale District Council (RDC) and North York Moors National Park Authority (NYMNP) gave a slideshow of photographs to introduce all members of the Executive Group to the vast and diverse LEADER area. Each talked through the characteristics, strengths and opportunities of their area and the point was made that the differing needs of the small localities within the LEADER area needed to be borne in mind when making decisions on applications.

Subsequent to the presentations, the Group discussed:

- The issue of access to work;
- The ability to retain and attract a young workforce;
- Skills shortages in certain sectors, e.g. engineering;
- Housing issues; and
- The fact that this Programme has limited money to spend in specific priorities, and has to achieve specific outputs for this, therefore will not be able to address a multitude of issues.

(4) North York Moors, Coast & Hills LEADER Programme Structure and Governance

4.1 Amy Thomas (AET) presented the structure that linked the Local Action Group (LAG), the Executive Group, the Lead Partner and Accountable Body, and DEFRA. She explained the roles and responsibilities of each and subsequently circulated a hand-out to show (attached to these minutes for ease of reference).

4.2 HP briefly went through the main points that would feature in the Terms of Reference. A full Terms of Reference would be presented for consideration, discussion and approval at the next meeting on 8th April. Particular attention would be given to a robust definition of and guidance for Declarations of Interest.

Action: Helen Patchett

It was also agreed that a more general Register of Interest would be completed on an annual basis.

Action: Amy Thomas

4.3 One of the points of the Terms of Reference was regarding the ability to co-opt additional non-voting members for the purposes of specific expertise or in consideration of certain projects either for a time limited period or for a longer duration as appropriate. DSR reiterated this point and suggested that Executive members could propose areas where co-option was appropriate.

Two members of the Group expressed disappointment that a representative had not been elected from the new cluster of parishes in Southern Scarborough and queried how this area could be represented as the Programme progresses. There was a general recognition that some areas (geographic or thematic) had specific needs or challenges that may require wider input.

It was also pointed out that names should not be raised specifically in this context, and there was a need to follow a process if representation of a geographical or thematic gap was felt to be in existence.

It was suggested that within the Voluntary / Community sector, the votes could be looked at again and the candidate from this geographic area that had received the most votes could be invited to join. HP suggested that a geographical vote could be put again to the LAG if this was felt necessary, as a representative would not necessarily be about the Voluntary / Community sector, it could be from business, farming or tourism, for example. It was also suggested that a representative from this area may not need to be included as a co-opted non-voting member of the Executive Group, but it may be more appropriate to include representatives within a Task & Finish Group to develop calls for projects, or as a driving force on the ground, to develop project interest.

It was agreed that the Lead Partner would put forward a paper regarding the potential co-option of representation for the eight Southern Scarborough parishes with potential solutions, to be discussed at the next meeting on 8th April.

Action: David Renwick / Amy Thomas

(5) Decision Making Process

5.1 AET ran through a flow chart outlining the process a project application would go through from initial idea to delivery of the project, and gave some points on what to think about when decision-making.

It was requested that example projects be brought to the next meeting, so that the Group could trial assessing applications and going through the decision making process. This was agreed.

Action: Amy Thomas / Helen Patchett

It was also agreed that further guidance would be provided on outputs, in particular the definitions that Defra provides.

Action: Helen Patchett

(6) Programme Administration

6.1 AET briefly provided some information on a number of administrative issues, including travel claims, meeting dates, confidentiality and data protection issues.

6.2 All members will be asked to sign a Data Protection proforma agreeing that they will not share or distribute any information they received which contains personal contact details, financial details or any business data. AET will provide a copy of the proforma at the start of the next meeting.

Action: Amy Thomas

Lunch was provided.

(7) The North York Moors, Coast & Hills LEADER Programme In-Brief

7.1 AET led the Group through the six Programme Priorities as defined in the Local Development Strategy (LDS), as highlighted the ones that had been given the highest priority for an earlier start. This would be discussed further later in the agenda.

7.2 HP continued by outlining the financial profile as shown in the LDS which was submitted to Defra in September 2014, showing the budget divided into 6 priorities, plus an allocation for the management and administration of the Programme. For this budget, outputs were expected to be achieved, and the outputs submitted in the LDS were discussed. It was noted that as a result of a larger number of LEADER Programmes being approved by Defra than originally anticipated, the budget the NYMCH LEADER Programme will receive will reduce from £3.2m to between £2.1-2.4m, and outputs will be re-negotiated accordingly. There will be no spend on project related activity before June / July but the Programme can spend against the Management and Administration budget at risk.

7.3 AET talked through the way that projects could be developed (animation options) and how the strategic projects could feed into this work. Three main options were outlined:

- a) Programme Procured Projects - Projects which are designed, to a greater or lesser extent by the Executive Group, and put out to open tender for an external organisation or group of organisations to deliver. We can procure projects based on desired outcomes or outputs we would like to see the project achieve, or based on a pre-determined budget (or even both!).
- b) Calls for Projects - These can be open or targeted calls designed by the Executive Group with support from the Programme staff – possibly with input from the LAG and Officer Support Group. Calls would be time limited, with potential applicants being given a deadline by which to make applications.
- c) Co-operation Projects - These can be informal i.e.: where two or more Programmes agree a consistent approach to an issue or both deliver similar projects which deliver similar actions, or they can be more formal. This will involve developing our project along with a number of

partner LEADER Programmes either locally, regionally, nationally or trans-nationally, and then making an application to an additional central Defra held pot of funding to deliver any activity. This pot is estimated to be approx. £2million for all English LAG's. The Programme would however have to resource and fund the costs of project development.

7.4 Discussion of the Communications Plan was postponed until the April meeting.

Action: Amy Thomas

(8) Year One Delivery Activity (January 15 to March 16)

(a) Agricultural Productivity Commissioning

8.1 AET presented a paper outlining two main options for how the Programme could proceed with a procured project under the Farm Productivity priority. The options presented were a culmination of the consultation events and subsequent meetings between a range of public and private sector representatives, and local farmers.

8.2 After much discussion, it was agreed that a Task & Finish Group would do more research to build on the work already done. The group agreed Option 1 presented in the paper was the preferred approach which would involve proceeding with the development of a specification without the need for a pre-feasibility stage. They would start to form a specification, including a description of the issues and opportunities in this sector. The Group's conclusions would be presented at the April meeting for consideration by the Executive Group as a whole.

8.3 Volunteers for the Task & Finish Group were Will Terry, Nick Cooke and Anna Lupton. The Group would be supported by Amy Thomas, and the absent agricultural representative, Robin Asquith, would be invited to join that Group. The membership would be supplemented with other interested individuals who have been involved to date as well as appropriate members of the wider Local Action Group. A meeting date and agenda will be established and circulated.

Action: Will Terry, Nick Cooke, Anna Lupton, Amy Thomas

(b) Rural Tourism Commissioning

8.4 As with above, Amy Thomas presented a paper on possible ways forward for activity under the Rural Tourism Priority.

8.5 After much discussion around branding, the provision of support and advice to businesses, ensuring activity links to the other LEADER priorities and sectors, the Group agreed that a Task & Finish Group would work on this priority. Volunteers for this Task & Finish Group were Jo Swift, Anna Lupton, Helen Gundry, Peter Spencer, Will Watts and Liz Dowson, again to be supported by Amy Thomas. The membership would be supplemented with other interested individuals who have been involved to date as well as appropriate members of the wider Local Action Group. Again, a meeting date and agenda will be circulated.

Action: Jo Swift, Anna Lupton, Helen Gundry, Peter Spencer, Will Watts, Liz Dowson, Amy Thomas

(c) Calls for Projects

8.6 It was agreed that a wider call for projects would not be possible before the next meeting and it would unlikely to be something that could be progressed prior to the May elections, so the Group would concentrate on the above two strategic projects at this stage. AET suggested that at this

stage it might be appropriate for the two Task and Finish Groups to also consider the possibilities for initial calls for projects to potentially take place later in the year.

8.7 The group discussed the issue of business support to make the best use of broadband and a more general discussion about broadband and accessibility issues ensued. It was suggested that the company providing such business support linked to broadband roll-out be invited to submit a brief report to the next Executive Group to further inform the group. The report should cover a summary of the activity that they have been involved with, for whom, the benefits, and what opportunities there are for post March 2015 when their current funding ends. Depending on the outcome of any discussion at the next Executive the company may be invited to attend to provide information on the project however any such project would likely need to fit within a wider call for projects in this area, but the need for any call would need to be balanced with the priorities of the Programme and the things which were set out in the LDS. However, it was noted that this did not comprise an application to the group for funding.

Action: Liz Dowson

(9) Any Other Business

9.1 No other business was reported. DSR summarised the items for next meeting's agenda as:

- Election of Chair and Vice Chair;
- Terms of Reference;
- Proposal regarding the options for co-opting members for the parishes of Southern Scarborough;
- Feedback from Agriculture Task & Finish Group;
- Feedback from Tourism Task & Finish Group;
- Detailed output guidance;
- Key messages for the first year (e.g. eligibility);
- Communications plan;
- 'practice' projects to start to understand appraisal and approval; and
- Consideration of paper on broadband / business support for broadband.

(10) Date and time of next meeting

Wednesday 8th April 2015, 10.00 a.m., NPA Offices, Helmsley

Summary of Action Points

	Action	To be completed by
1	To present a Terms of Reference for approval by the executive on 8 th April 2015, including detailed guidance on Declarations of Interest	Helen Patchett
2	To create a Register of Interests, to be completed at meeting of 8 th April 2015 and annually thereafter	Amy Thomas
3	To present a proposal regarding options for co-opting, as discussed, to meeting of 8 th April 2015	David Renwick / Amy Thomas
4	To provide example project applications and appraisals for 'practice' for meeting of 8 th April 2015	Helen Patchett / Amy Thomas
5	To provide detailed output guidance at meeting of 8 th April 2015	Helen Patchett
6	To re-present the Communications Plans to meeting of 8 th April 2015	Amy Thomas
7	To further research and discuss possible specification for strategic project, to be presented to meeting of 8 th April 2015	Agriculture Task & Finish Group

8	To further research and discuss possible specification for strategic project, to be presented to meeting of 8 th April 2015	Tourism Task & Finish Group
9	To invite company to give written report to Group regarding business support around broadband	Liz Dowson

Helen Patchett,
NYCC