

Local Assessment Panel – 25th May, Parke and via MS

Teams

Minutes and Notes

Attending:

- Russell Ashford (Chair)
- Peter Harper
- Martin Perryman,
- John Howell
- Helen Booker (TEAMS)
- James Sharpe (DNPA – voting member)
- Sam Taylor (DNPA)
- Simon Pryor (DNPA)

Apologies

- Paul Dean
- Kerry Smith (DNPA)
- Mark Walker

Welcome and introductions

- Declaration: Pete Harper declared for Sanduck Cross Farm as business' would be in direct competition (abstained from voting)

Update on forthcoming applications

- Due to GDPR rules FiPL is unable to share the location and name of the applicant until a formal application has been submitted to the panel
- Discussion on suitability of potential applications
- Are there other schemes available for some of these activities.
- Using other grants as a price point for some items and activities.
- Discussion on funding %. Should FiPL evaluation % we fund on projects.
- If funding building restoration, applicants must declare they won't use the new building for development

Applications over £5,000

Blackslade Manor

- Objectives of Project: Applicant seeks funding to plant 220 trees including an orchard and 192 metres of new hedgerow, including stone wall restorations and fencing.
- Total Grant Request: £21,956.00

- Weighted Score: 4.4 (*JS note: this is a typo on score sheet, should be 7.6 and all applicant paperwork corrected now*)
- Discussion
 - Presentation by James
 - Discussion on applicants CS agreement
 - Is FiPL being used to fund CS when applicants are late to CS
 - Need to ensure FiPL is not double funding CS activities
 - Applicant provided CS agreement prior to application being submitted to the LAP panel – no double funding
 - Is there a cheaper option of tree guards
 - Discussion on quality of tree guards
 - Discussion on VAT
 - Discussed at other LAP meetings
 - Should no VAT applicants fund VAT themselves
- Vote
 - FiPL Recommendation: That the Panel approve the application
 - Vote: All in favour
 - Conditions: the applicant provide a survey / report before and after the project is completed
 -

Kirkside 2

- Objectives of Project: This application deals with restoration of water meadows over 2.5ha
- Total Grant Request: £7920.00
- Weighted Score: 7.2
- Discussion
 - Presentation by James
 - Nature potential of the meadows – not clear in the application what nature outcomes would be
 - Why massive adds for CS
 - is FiPL being used because applicant late
 - Habitat survey to see what we are going from – to
 - Potential economic value with grazing
 - Are these the write type of cattle for grazing this area
 - Do they have adequate grazing areas
 - What will application pay for? – more detailed explanation of cost breakdown
 - What are their ultimate goals for the area?
- Vote
 - FiPL Recommendation: The application be approved in principle but we will check with Historic Environment and Ecology staff at DNPA whether further survey work is required. The applicant should have three quotes for work as it is only just under threshold for this.
 - Motion raised to Defer application based on comments and questions raised

- For = 5 Votes
- Against = 1 Vote

Sanduck Cross Farm

- Objectives of Project: The applicant seeks funding for 330m hedgerow creation, wetland habitat creation and a deer larder to help establish a venison business alongside a EWCO funded woodland creation project.
- Total Grant Request: £21,377.00
- Weighted Score: 6.4
- Discussion
 - Presentation by Simon
 - Deer larder fits into Added Value Grant
 - Suggestion that applicant seeks this grant first
 - Lack of business case made for the Deer Larder
 - What will the scrapes be used for – what is the objective with these
 - Can we ask what the purpose of the scrapes are for. Waders may not be successful in this area?
 - Concern over value for money
 - Using CS rates, but not doing to CS
 - Make sure all future applicants follow CS specification and standard as well CS payment rates
 - Any CS rate / option needs to be to CS standard
- Vote:
 - FiPL Recommendation: The application be approved in principle but the applicant should provide further detail on potential venison buyers and projected sales.
 - Motion to Decline Deer Larder (suggestion to seek Added Value Funding)
 - For: 5 Votes
 - Abstained: 1 Vote
 - Motion to approve remaining application
 - For: 6 Votes (all in favour)

Teign Marsh

- Objectives of Project: Applicant seeks funding for flood retention/wetland habitat, woodland, Devon stone hedge bank (40m) and orchard enhancement/creation over 6.3ha.
- Total Grant Request: £10,376.00
- Weighted Score: 6.8
- Discussion
 - Presentation by James
 - Not VAT registered – most is CS rates

- Looking to possible public access in future – but not aspect of application
- Tried to get CS rates – site too small and isn't eligible
 - Land not in focus area so cant get funding elsewhere
 - As long as CS activities are done to CS standard – make this a standard response to all CS items
- Clarification what people outcome is about and not conflicting with habitat outcome
 - People outcome must be inline with ecological outcomes
- Vote
 - FiPL Recommendation: Application is approved
 - For – 6 votes (all in favour)

Drywell application

- Objectives of Project:
- Total Grant Request:
- Weighted Score:
- Discussion
 - Presentation by Simon
 - Public road – so duty of highways agency
 - Will highways say needs to be done to specific standard
 - Subject to highways approval – to stop work being removed
 - How does this fit with FiPL outcome: heritage, flood, people's enjoyment?
- Vote
 - FiPL Recommendation: Approve application with the condition that relevant permission is secured
 - For: 6 votes (all in favour)

Any other business

- Approval of minutes from last meeting
- LAP panel wish to have site visit of approved / completed projects

Date of Next Meeting: 6th July