

## Mendip Hills AONB SDF Panel Meeting

Wednesday 3<sup>1st</sup> March 2010 10.30am, Charterhouse Centre

### Panel members

Present: Nicola Epps(MDC)- Chairman, Sheila Petherbridge (MDC), Rachael Clarke, Dr Simon Gardner

Apologies: Martin Grass, Chris Head (Community Action)

### Mendip Hills AONB Officers present

Sarah Jackson Manager

Item		Actions
1.0	<b>Declarations of interest</b> – Chris Head had emailed to say his daughter plays cricket with Blagdon Cricket club	
2.0	<b>Notes of last meeting – Skills audit</b> – Sarah had produced table for todays meeting and asked Panel members to update. All asked to send changes back to Sarah. Sheila and Simon completed at meeting. <i>See attached</i> It was agreed that it would be good to recruit someone with ecology knowledge and or someone from West of M5 area– Hutton, Loxton, Christon, Bleadon. Sarah to do press release. It was also noted that once new Partnership Committee in place the Vice Chair should be invited to be on Panel.	ALL SJ SJ
3.0	<b>Current SDF Fund position – 2010/11 allocation is £58500</b> Sarah reported that £52900 remained to be allocated as: £1600 had already been awarded to Wells Museum for Festival of Archaeology Coordinator £4000 Compton Martin pond	
4.0	<b>SDF 2009/10 Projects</b>	
4.1	Priddy Village Hall – Sarah reported that the press launch will be Tuesday 20 <sup>th</sup> April 9.15am and asked if anyone else on panel could attend with her. Nicola volunteered.	SJ/NE
4.2	‘Seriously not boring walks book’ – Sarah reported that 3 articles had appeared without mention of the SDF support. These included the Mendip Society article, 2 articles in Cheddar valley Gazette one showing photo of book signing in Waterstones with the publisher.	
4.3	Rachael who had been the contact for the applicants of the	

<p>4.4</p>	<p>grant- Sue Gearing and Les Davies had received no response to her requests to assist with school sessions or events to know when they were and also had not been told of book signing. Sarah and Rachael had both been told that there was not going to be a book launch due to difficulty in getting people together.</p> <p>Panel agreed that letter should be sent to Sue Gearing expressing disappointment that the SDF had not been recognised in the publicity and the SDF had not been informed of the book signing date in Waterstones. Reference to the guidance notes sent to recipients of SDF grants would be mentioned with specific reference to acknowledgments of SDF support. <i>Note: Mendip Times April edition does acknowledge SDF support.</i></p>	<p>NE</p>
<p>4.5</p>	<p>The Panel were also concerned that there may not have been the community involvement – work with schools that had been outlined in the application.</p>	
<p>4.6</p>	<p>It was agreed that this project had highlighted a number of issues to be aware of with future applications i.e commercial aspects of project, ensuring that community links are made and are a key part of the project, that SDF is given due credit in order to raise awareness of the fund to others.</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p>4.7</p>	<p>Sarah to inform other AONB SDF managers should applicants apply to other AONBs.</p>	<p>SJ</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p><b>New Applications</b></p>	
<p>5.1</p>	<p><b>01011-02 Dew pond restoration</b></p>	
<p>5.1.1</p>	<p>Sarah reported that applicant has emailed supportive letter from Parish Council who will consider a financial contribution in new finance year.</p>	
<p>5.1.2</p>	<p>Martin and Chris who were not able to attend the meeting had sent in comments to say they agreed with concerns and recommendation.</p>	
<p>5.1.3</p>	<p>Although a nice to do project it appears costly as so many volunteer hours (56 days)+ expert for 7 days plus supervisor 7 days involved in what is a small project that should be achievable over two weekends.</p>	
<p>5.1.4</p>	<p>Sarah commented that she was concerned about vol figures as St Hughs may have over estimated their volunteer contribution (<i>this proved to be the case when their claim came in later that day – 85 days submitted in application but only 31 days required/delivered</i>).</p>	<p>Email sent to St Hughs making this known</p>

<p>5.1.5</p> <p>5.1.6</p>	<p>Need to be aware that some projects calculating vol days to provide match funding when actually the volunteer time required/deliverable is significantly less)</p> <p><b>Agreed to offer £500 towards materials</b> as 50% of costs (840+ 160 health and safety equip) of materials as it was also felt that tools could be borrowed as had been done by other SDF applicants.</p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>SJ to email</b></p>
<p>5.2</p> <p>5.2.1</p> <p>5.2.1</p> <p>5.2.2</p>	<p><b>01011–04 Promotion of new Local Nature reserve –SCC</b></p> <p>Martin and Chris had agreed with recommendation to refuse. SDF Guidance had not been followed – max grant for local authority projects was 50%, figures did not add up with inclusion of £5000 from Somerset Strategic Partnership when project costs were £4250.</p> <p>Panel did express concern that SCC were proposing interpretation boards and further benches at Deer Leap as such a remote site enjoyed for its natural unspoilt character. Sarah to feed these views back to SCC</p> <p><b>Panel refused to grant</b></p>	<p>SJ</p> <p>SJ to email</p>
<p>5.3</p> <p>5.3.1</p> <p>5.3.2</p> <p>5.3.3</p> <p>5.3.4</p>	<p><b>01011–05 Exploring churchyards in the Mendips–Caring for Gods Acre</b></p> <p>Martin had been ok with recommendation to support but Chris had raised issues with number of churches and parishes and that not all the churches would be in the AONB. Sarah said that although some of the 28 parishes extend beyond the AONB boundary there would be enough churches in the AONB to make a project as outlined by CFGA.</p> <p>Chris’s concern that this was effectively a research project that could happen without community support. All agreed and Sheila said that there was no evidence with this application that the churches or community would want to get involved. All agreed that SDF should not be supporting a project that is imposed.</p> <p>Sarah reported that from the AONB Heritage day six people had left contact details for further information about the project but it is not known if they have any links with the churches.</p> <p>Chris also raised point that the application did not make clear link or suggest that leaflet would build on local history work in area and EH four year research project that had included survey of churches in the AONB. The project needs to be more creative and consider other communication</p>	

<p>5.3.5</p> <p>5.3.6</p>	<p>tools (walks, talks, school activities) as have concerns regarding funding a leaflet.</p> <p>85% funding request also was seen as too high for a project that was not being driven by community.</p> <p><b>Agreed to refuse</b> but would consider a revised application if showed clear evidence of church and community support. Suggest to CFGA that they organise an event at a church during Festival of Archaeology that will provide taster day/involve local societies etc. Suggest consider other means other than leaflet for getting information over. Needs to have balance with history of the churches.</p>	<p><b>SJ to contact</b></p>
<p>5.4</p> <p>5.4.1</p> <p>5.4.2</p> <p>5.4.3</p> <p>5.3.4</p> <p>5.4.4</p>	<p><b>01011-06 Music on Mendip -local journeys community interest company</b></p> <p>Chris and Martin agreed with recommendation. Chris has seen other work and felt application very innovative, makes all the right links etc. All agreed very ambitious and may struggle to deliver in short period April - Sept.</p> <p>Some concern that application very wordy and hard to grasp all the detail. Nicola said that is generally how creative thinkers write - enthusiastic and brimming with ideas!</p> <p>Concerns regarding hiring out equipment from pubs and shops - suggest don't do, paper publication probably not necessary - suggest applicant provides 2 side of A4 project proposal setting out programme for the project that should perhaps be in 3 phases: work on site/composing music Launch /performance, and production of web site with downloadable video/music.</p> <p>Had discussion about evaluation as there is cost of £800 built in that may be condition of other funders. Sarah to check that this will include evaluation of learning that has taken place. As the Watershed are involved Nicola is confident that evaluation will be professional.</p> <p><b>Agreed to offer grant requested £6820 with condition that project proposal submitted with acceptance of grant</b></p>	<p><b>SJ</b></p>
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Total allocation today £7320 leaving £45580 to be allocated</p>	
<p>7.0</p>	<p><b>Date of next meeting 26<sup>th</sup> May 2010 10.30 Charterhouse Centre</b></p>	<p>All</p>