

Greensand Ridge Local Action Group Steering Group

Minutes of Meeting 23rd January 2009

Present

Leanne Bacon	Gamlingay PC
Bridget Smith	Forward Gamlingay
Sarah Hughes	Beds CC
Diane Budd	Business Link
Gill Welham	Greensand Trust
Mark Smith	North & Mid Beds CVS
David Morgan	Beds & Cambs Rural Support Group
Joel Carre	BRCC (Programme Director)
Cliff Andrews	BRCC (Programme Manager)
Jon Boswell	BRCC (Accountable Body)
Richard James	Haynes PC
Sara Hind	EEDA

Ref	Notes	Action Lead
1. Apologies		
1.1	Fiona Bryant	JC
2. Register conflicts of interest		
2.1	Members of the Steering Group were asked to register interests for the meeting: -Bridget Smith and Leanne Bacon had submitted a Project Idea on behalf of Gamlingay Parish Council -Jon Balaam had submitted a Project Idea on behalf of the Greensand Trust. -Sarah Hughes represents BCC who had submitted a Project Idea; although SH not involved in the project. -Mark Smith represents BCC who had submitted a Project Idea; although SH not involved in the project.	
2.2	Members of the Steering Group were asked to send information for the Conflicts of Interest Register and the LAG Steering Group Membership Register to Joel Carre by 28 th January for inclusion in LDS submission.	ALL
3. Minutes of last meeting		
3.1	The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting	
3.2	Clarification of the time of Steering Group meetings was sought: All future meeting to start at 09.45.	
3.3	5.2 Access to the RDPE Extranet is primarily for Delivery Team staff, but Steering Group members can request access and a password individually from Sara Hind if desired.	

3.4	Internal training on BRCC's Equal Opportunities policy will be given at the March LAG meeting.	
4. Accountable Body update		
4.1	JC presented the previously circulated update highlighting that all areas of work are progressing to timetable except the production of a Communications Plan.	
4.2	A draft communication plan will be circulated by 13/02 for agreement at the Steering Group meeting on 27/02	JC
4.3	SH to arrange for training for the Delivery Team ahead of the regional training. Initial training to be targeted particularly at Facilitators on the measures, funding allocations and match funding eligibility. Training will also be available to the Steering Group	SH
4.4	Steering group members to identify gaps in information/ training needs and forward to JC for discussion with EEDA	ALL JC
4.5	On 12/02 JC will present the Delivery Plan and Project Ideas to EEDA for their initial feedback	JC
4.6	SH commented that the LAG and Steering Group members do not need to know all the details of measures etc, as that is the role of the Delivery Team. Key points for LAG and Steering Group members to remember are the main aims of the programme: -to increase competitiveness in the farming and forestry economy -to increase diversification in the rural economy -to increase quality of life	
5. Project Idea submission		
5	General discussion prior to consideration of submissions:	
5.1	Clarification of the relationship between the LAG and EEDA was sought: The LAG is not entirely autonomous as it is delivering the programme on behalf of EEDA, in turn on behalf of DEFRA, in turn on behalf of the EU.	
5.2	EEDA has representation on the Steering Group to fulfil EEDA and RDA legislation and enable funding decisions to be made and signed at Steering Group meetings.	
5.3	Concern was expressed as to whether the LDS could be delivered with the existing budget allocations to various measure. It was confirmed that the LAG / Accountable Body has a contract with EEDA which includes the funding split allocations as submitted in the LDS, although there is a degree of flexibility with revisions to these allocations possible at an annual appraisal of the LDS and at quarterly meetings between JC and SH. Priorities within the LDS can be changed and budget	

	figures revised accordingly as long as the changes are justified and the decision making process is clear and recorded	
5.5	SH explained that a LA can apply for funding as a lead partner if they are not the final beneficiaries of the investment (example: not eligible for capital funding to enhance a built facility, but eligible for providing a subsidised training programme to eligible beneficiaries)	
5.6	State Aid issues differ according to different measures; as laid out in the RDPE Prospectus 2007-13	
5.7	EEDA have not dictated a capital: revenue split for funding allocations	
5.8	Signposting applicants to other sources of funding is a role for the facilitators. SH to ask Gill Eden to compile a list of alternative funding sources for JC to circulate to the Steering Group for additions to be made ahead of providing list to facilitators.	
5.9	It was agreed that there is a need to ensure funding is allocated evenly throughout the LAG area	
5.10	Planning permission must be in place before approval of the Project Concept stage is given	
5.11	Project development costs (eg submission of planning application) are incurred at the applicants own risk. Projects gaining planning permission and funding approval may be able to recover a portion of these costs, and count them as match funding	
5.12	It should be noted that the Project Ideas submitted to date have had no facilitator input and therefore may be stronger projects than currently seem on paper.	
5a	Determine submitted application	
5.13	Equine Tranquility Ltd – Considered to have too few beneficiaries. Facilitator to visit to explain lack of fit of current submission and to signpost to Dianne Budd.	
5.14	Redborne Upper School & Community College – Facilitator to visit to establish a) lead applicant and their status, b) landowner (as if school may be ineligible as may not fit measure)	
5.15	MBDC Greensand Cycleway – Facilitator to visit to identify a) Project lead, b) whether funding is requested for capital or revenue/ marketing. Project could be linked to transport, not just leisure/ GI. Links with Project ideas from FB Parrish & Sons and Beds Fatrax should be explored.	
5.16	Greensand Trust – Project is in LDS. Facilitator to visit to gain clarity of how IIC funded works are separate from submitted Project Idea. SH to liase with IIC staff to discuss funding issues and explore links/ competition with Wood Fuel East. As Managing Director of Greensand Trust Gill Welham left the meeting room	SH

	while this project was discussed.	
5.17	FB Parrish & Sons – Facilitator to visit and encourage collaboration with Beds Fattrax application. Demand for business units to be proven and planning permission feasibility to be explored	
5.18	BCC, Swiss Garden – Facilitator to visit to explore whether proposed enhancements will increase visitor numbers ; and whether income may be displaced from elsewhere. Project may be heritage rather than tourism	
5.19	Clophill House B&B – Facilitator to visit to discuss fit with Mid Beds Tourism Strategy. Eligible to apply as a sole trader under the micro-business measure.	
5.20	Clophill Listed Wall – Facilitator to visit to establish ownership of the wall and how private match funding will be secured. Considered that the project has limited benefits	
5.21	Clophill Green and Old Bridge Parish Implementation Group – Facilitator to visit to encourage collaboration with other Clophill projects	
5.22	Clophill Old Church Group - Facilitator to visit to encourage collaboration with other Clophill projects	
5.23	Clophill Village Hall - Facilitator to visit to encourage collaboration with other Clophill projects	
5.24	Gamlingay PC – Facilitator to visit to establish what community centre currently does and exactly what the proposed project do. Fits LDS as a ‘swiss army knife’ multi-use centre. As representatives of Gamlingay Parish Council, Leanne Bacon and Bridget Smith left the meeting room while this project was discussed.	
5.25	Bedford & MK Waterway Trust – Facilitator to visit to establish whether project links with Hidden Britain Centre station - station walks and explore whether project can be strengthened as currently considered to be low priority/ have low additionality	
5.26	Beds Fattrax bike park – Facilitator to visit to establish a) status of the club, b) landowner/ lease details, c) exactly what funding is sought for	
5.27	The LDS to be submitted by the end of January should include details of priority projects which are expected to be funded in Year 1; and summaries of other projects anticipated to come forward in years 2 and 3.	
5b	Agree amendments to Project Idea form	
5.28	It was agreed to amend the Project Idea form to allow: 100 word submission on describing the project (Q6) and 100 word submission on describing the benefits (Q7) Amount of RDPE funding sought to be identified	JC
5.29	Facilitators should assist applicants in completing the Project Idea form, ensuring the 100 word limits are adhered to.	

6. LDS Delivery Plan 2009-11		
6.1	The Draft Delivery Plan had been circulated for consideration. Any further comments to JC by 28/01, ahead of submission to EEDA by 31/01.	ALL JC
7. RDPE programme management/ delivery issues		
7.1	Confirmation was given that projects should seek to be collaborative. Projects should demonstrate that they have sought to make links with other local enterprises/ programme applicants, maximising benefits against funding invested.	
8.0 Any Other Business		
	None	
9. Date of Next Meeting		
	27 th February, 2009, 9.45am at BRCC Community Room, Cardington.	

Cliff Andrews
Greensand Leader Programme Manager
January 23rd, 2009