

# Ide Parish Council

## **Weir Meadow & Northern Fields with Pynes Orchard Joint Projects Fundraising Group**

### **Minutes of meeting on Zoom, Monday 21 June 2021 at 7.30pm**

#### **1. Welcome and introductions.**

In attendance:

1. Nick Bradley (NB) - chair
2. Imelda Liversage (IL)
3. Charlotte McGregor (CLM) - secretary
4. David Howe (DH)
5. Maresa Bossano (MB)
6. Richard Reardon (RR)
7. Doug Bell (DB) - by mobile phone
8. Philip Willcock (PW)
9. Trevor Gardner (TG)
10. Peter Cloke (PC)

#### **2. Apologies**

Apologies received from:

1. Stuart Brooking
2. Cheryl Haddy

#### **3. Draft minutes of last meeting on 24 May 2021 for approval (previously circulated)**

Approved subject to deletion of paragraph dealing with Heritage Lottery Funding application by Organic Arts.

#### **4. Chair's update:**

**4.1 Option Agreement for Victorian Orchard** – Church Commissioners (CC) have now signed the document but they are not minded to exchange documents until such time as the water is connected. Still waiting for South West Water.

**Action: NB liaise with CCs**

**4.2 Ground works estimate for Weir Meadow** – DB advised that a Bill of Quantities has been produced and tender invitations have now gone out to four companies: (Kennford Tarmacadam, Civil Solutions, N T Wells and Bob Lowton of 4Mation). They have been asked to reply within 3 weeks. NB asked that our thanks were passed on to Jerry Stott as he provided services for Bill of Quantities pro bono. DB suggested a small “thank you” might be in order. The committee agreed. NB will arrange.

**Action: NB thank Jerry Stott**

Action: DB liaise with contractors

#### **4.3 Water Drainage and Landscape & Ecology Management Plans Weir Meadow –**

Teignbridge has now given formal approval of our plans for the change of use permission. As such, our conditions have now been discharged in that respect, but not for the carpark and pavilion move. The latter are not as time critical as they are for the change of use: fundraising for land purchase can go ahead.

#### **5. Progress with draft application for Initial Enquiry to National Heritage Lottery Fund, with input from Pynes Orchard Working Group (DH, MB, PC)**

Items to be covered:

- (a) Discussion of pros and cons of the criteria.
- (b) Partners.
- (c) Extent of application.

PC – explained that the original vision was that they wanted to restore a fabulous piece of heritage to its former glory and to provide a much needed open space for the village to enable people to find space and also to gather. Above all though, it was to save the Orchard from perishing. The integrity of this vision needs to be maintained whilst funding options are explored. PC realises this may limit our choice of funding sources and the working group accept this.

DH – had prepared a detailed draft with MB for the group before the meeting. Working group guidance has been very helpful. Perhaps we need to understand the hierarchy of the decision making. He proposed that the fundraising group was in place to try to deliver the aims and objectives of the working group. We must work together but it is felt this group is subordinate to the working group.

Question remains as to how far the aims and vision of the orchard group might need to be bent to fit the requirements of funding sources like the National Heritage Lottery Fund, Exeter Foundation, or waste company offerings. Some require the capital spend to match the value of the land acquisition and therefore we need to establish whether this is something we want to commit to.

MB - Advised that we need to shape the funding bid to what the funder wants to hear about. For example, we don't need to mention picnics because the funder isn't interested in this. She feels that this initial enquiry is drafted in an appropriate manner to meet the objectives as set out by the Working Group. She considers NHL funding to be a good option but thinks it unlikely that money will be granted to buy land only. Grants usually need a package of activities to attract funding. She understands that Viridor will fund land purchase if we can show that the amenity will be lost to the community; and we can reasonably argue this.

NB:

- (i) Is there a written criterion which states that the HLF will fund 50:50 capital and process? MB said this was personal knowledge as she used to work for the lottery assessing bids and advising on how to make applications. MB says it is not in the written rules but it is well known that the land purchase must not be the major feature of the application – it needs to be an enabler to make a community project viable.

- (ii) TG feeding back from the working group that they felt uncomfortable making an application for more than we needed when in fact we don't need more than the amount to purchase the land on its own.

MB: Heritage Lottery Funding would need to show benefit to those beyond the village. This is likely to cost more than we have anticipated.

2 year activity plan sensible. Most applications 2-5 years.

- (iii) Can we cut the cost? MB suggested that if we can fund the land purchase elsewhere, then the HL funding could be for the activities. MB cautioning that a properly costed project, including the costs of employing a project co-ordinator for two years, would in her view be preferable, even if more expensive.

CLM – personal view that if grant funding is available and we can fit the project within the parameters of the funding application, then even if it means seeking more, we should apply. Applying for more than we initially envisaged should not put us off if this is what will enable the project to go ahead.

PC – responding to CLM saying that grant funding is not the only way the project will work. Other avenues of funding have already been identified.

RR – Nothing further to add.

Philip Wilcock – fears that HLF will cause us to jump through hoops and force us to move away from our initial vision.

CLM – If we don't make the initial enquiry we won't know if we would be successful. We can always decide later not to proceed with the funding if we don't want to bend to their wishes. Also, if we do pass the initial phases, we can begin to negotiate on terms too. Ultimately may as well put in the enquiry and see what happens.

MB agreeing with CLM. MB feels that we should apply to everyone and then choose which funding to proceed with.

NB – vision of working group and bid enquiry are very similar with no major gaps. As such, this is surely a good starting point.

PC – He is concerned by some of the comments that have been made. If we decide that we need a project coordinator in order to satisfy the HLF then this is wrong. Concept of opening up beyond the village is fine but the whole point was to meet the need in the community.

MB – Believes a project coordinator role is an onerous one and so she felt it would be better to add it to the funding bid. Added that lottery funding is for disadvantaged groups; and in her opinion Ide is not disadvantaged. Also feels that opening it to the wider community is a nice thing to do.

PC – The vision has always been for a public, free amenity, open to all; and others from outside the village can come and take part in the activities. But doesn't feel that the orchard should be forced to depart from its main objective and initial vision.

NB – HLF requires us to apply with a partner and so we can't choose to go it alone but we can choose who we partner with. Working group felt that they have not envisaged that someone should be employed and didn't feel they wanted to be burdened with that. Working group does want it to be a public space.

TG – Employing someone was a shock to the group because the project had never envisaged this. It was felt that this started as a small scale project which has perhaps grown beyond the original scope. Working group do not want to employ someone, manufacture partners or apply for funding which we don't need. TG suggesting that we raise £30-40k, ask HLF for £20k and then a further £20k for project costs. Is this possible?

PW – he would prefer to keep it simple. Understands the view of CLM and MB but wants to scale it back and keep it manageable for the future – concern about ongoing future costs.

NB – does HLF fund whole of project cost or some of it?

MB – likely to fund most of it. Match funding is looked upon favourably. Can scale down the application but it still needs to be heritage focused and the main focus needs to be on wider community and then skills training.

NB – skills training has already been identified.

DH – Three contentions have been well set out by TG. In terms of the partnership point we need to know in advance who that is and what partnership means. How is the site run thereafter and who has control over day to day activities etc. Cautioned not to underestimate the amount of coordination required. At present, we are only at an expression of interest level with an initial enquiry, and are teasing out whether this is a proposal which might have a chance.

MB – first stage application, very limited word count and so just need to name potential partners. If we get to the second stage, if we feel we don't want to proceed with partnering with X & Y, we can then inform them and change the application accordingly.

NB – Reminded the meeting that we must not shy away from debate and disagreement. Both are important. Agendas and minutes are important so that we can have disagreements within the structure. Meetings with disagreement are not dysfunctional.

MB – she has been brought in to write the bid and she has written it in a way which is most likely to be successful. If the bid is then changed, she cannot give any guarantees that it will be successful.

NB – we are aligned in that HLF and the working group require the land to be bought and for things to happen on it. We need to agree who is going to do what in terms of coordinating the use of the land as this is required for the application.

NB – clarifying that the application should not be for the whole cost of the project. For example £40k land purchase and £20k activities with the rest fundraised.

NB – proposing that we ask DH and MB to prepare a revised application taking account of the five headings previously discussed and also with the suggested figures.

TG – let's not dictate the actual sums. Let DB and MB propose something.

PC – we need to be a bit careful about who we have initial discussions with as regards potential partners so that we don't inadvertently cause disappointment.

NB – asking what a partner organisation might reasonably expect from being named? Will they want some of the money?

MB – yes because they will want to be funded to deliver the activities.

NB – we need to be clear on what the role of all “partners” might be and the costs which they may incur. Communities in Rural England, Devon Wildlife Trust and Ide Primary school are potential “partners”.

TG – we just need to identify a list of potential partners in order to re-draft the enquiry. We can then tweak it.

MB – flagging that biodiversity is not relevant to the HLF application. This is relevant for the landfill companies.

Action: DH and MB write next draft of Initial Enquiry to NHLF after discussion w NB.

Action: NB liaise with PC, TG and DH.

Action: NB and PC receive the re-drafted Initial Enquiry, edit further in light of debate at JPFRG meeting, produce further draft for next PCOWG and JPFRG meetings.

## **6. Publicity. Reports on progress:**

6.1 CH - drone footage; and interviews with locals – not available to speak to this item.

Action: CH report to next meeting.

6.2 Mark Thomas (MT) - editing and cameraman – RR reports that CH is working on this with MT.

Action: RR and MT liaise and report to next meeting

6.3 RR - Instagram account (MB has set this up) ; and uploading to Google Drive; Website is almost finished.. £400 cash raised – IL will collect cash and pay it in to the bank. £1,100 raised at the bike ride. Cash raised for both projects. promotional film on Film night – fete has now been postponed. RR waiting for the lockdown to be released fully before committing to a date.

7. Review of Monthly fund raising calendar of events – RR reporting that cricket team doing something during the August bank holiday weekend.

NB and PC have put pieces in Ide times – edited version of the executive summary for the prospectuses.

8. Progress with final draft of prospectuses -NB has been concentrating on the Orchard prospectus and it is almost complete. Weir Field Meadow prospectus progressing well.

Action: NB complete Orchard prospectus.

Action: NB next draft WM prospectus to WMWG

9. Leaflet for distribution round the village – RR and NB will draft and circulate leaflet before next meeting. Will liaise with the distributors of the Ide Times.

Action: NB & RR liaise to draft leaflet with input from Working Group and JPFRG members

Action: NB ask Ide Times editors about inserting leaflet into magazine.

PC – re Facebook for Orchard. The Orchard page is dormant at present but will become active again when group projects can get underway again. MB clarifying that the two pages are supposed to coexist.

10. Exeter Foundation - David has looked at the website and the application process. He feels it is very traditional in its way of distributing funds. Wasn't sure if the fund was specifically about sports. CLM advising not. MB suggesting that we need to use it once we know the total cost of the project.

11. Date of next meeting - 19<sup>th</sup> July 2021.

Minutes approved 19 7 21.