

FiPL Local Assessment Panel – 28th February, Parke

Attending

- Russell Ashford (Chair)
- Will Dracup (Vice Chair)
- Peter Harper
- Martin Perryman
- Paul Dean
- Mark Walker
- Hannah Gibbons (DNPA)
- James Sharpe (DNPA)

Apologies

- Layland Branfield
- Helen Booker
- Eamon Crowe
- John Howell
- Dan Alford

Applications over £5k

Application: DNP-FPL-113

- Objectives: Create a more regenerative, sustainable and resilient approach to cultivations and crop establishment leading to big improvements in soil health, carbon capture and wider biodiversity. Protection of the River Taw is also hugely important, particularly as a spawning ground for salmon which require low nutrient levels and sediment-free water.
- Grant Request: £25,300
- Weighted Score: 6.8
- Discussion
 - Presentation by Hannah Gibbons
 - This should be accompanied by a soil management plan.
 - Would like to see a more holistic application – others know that applicant has already established some of these additional elements.
 - Concern only 12% in the NP – but a larger farm so this is still more land than many applicants have when 100% in NP – also spawning on R. Taw therefore river health significant throughout length including upstream into NP.
 - Applicant must retain capital item for 5+yrs. Item not available through other Defra grant schemes.
 - There is limited availability of contractors to undertake this work, applicant has been using contractors for a few years and now wants to commit to this approach.

- In response to Rothamsted research project applicant wants to change to more sustainable practice.
- Vote
 - Recommendation: That the Panel consider the cost benefit of this request, particularly with regard to river quality, and provide a view to the level of grant offered.
 - Motion: Offer funding at 50% for the capital item £20,250, add condition applicant must run at least 1 demonstration day per year (FiPL yrs 2&3) £620, NPK & pH parts of soil tests should not be funded, only additional aspects of soil testing £1,000. Total £21,870
 -

Application: DNP-FPL-114

- Objectives: to improve soil health, reduce run-off and sequester more carbon.
- Grant Request: £23,000
- Weighted Score: 7.2
- Discussion:
 - Presentation of outline and score by JS
 - Slight concern over 3m wide but a good machine for the purpose/setting.
 - 50% intervention rate is consistent with other Dartmoor FiPL grants.
 - Lots of scope for demonstration and local knowledge sharing.
 - If a collaborative bid we could offer a higher intervention rate – discussion around sharing of machinery.
 - If we are going to offer higher rate for shared use then should have written confirmation from other beneficiaries and applicant confirmation will provide ‘at cost’ or below (i.e. not contracting for profit).
 - This machine has a lot of opportunity for contracting work and the applicant has not provided explicit evidence (or mention of) using the item for the benefit of others.
- Vote
 - Recommendation: That the Panel take a view regarding the intervention rate and approve this application.#
 - Motion: This machine would be eligible for funding under FETF44 at a fixed rate of £12,054, FiPL must stay in line with other schemes so can only offer this rate, Panel request a demonstration day per year (FiPL yrs 2&3) and baseline soil testing. Offer £12,674 plus cost of appropriate soil testing tba.

Application: DNP-FPL-123

- Objectives: The applicant seeks £7730 during 2021/22 fy towards mobile electric fencing and water supply, with a small request for training in livestock

nutrition observation techniques. The aim of the project is to establish regenerative techniques on the farm which is already 100% pasture based

- Grant Request: £7,730
- Weighted Score: 6.8
- Discussion
 - Presentation by HG
 - Need to clarify split between permanent boundary fencing and the temporary fencing.
 - Some concern over frequency of livestock movement/workload for applicant, is this viable? Understand quite small herd.
 - Damage to grazing/soil from outwintering could undo benefit of regenerative grazing if not careful.
 - Interested to know what other activities for soil health, e.g. lime?
 - Caution over electric fencing if PRow.
 - Temporary fencing supported as FETF106&7.
 - Panel recommended Gallagher fencing (also mentioned Hotline) as alternative suppliers.
- Vote:
 - Recommendation: That the FiPL team approve funding for this project
 - Motion: Offer funding for chiller at 50% £2490, animal health course at 100% £600, mobile drinking equipment at 80% £1287, soil sampling £885 (will fund testing elements above NPK & pH at 100%) and temporary fencing tbc when costed to include FETF107.

Application: DNP-FPL-177

- Objectives: the applicant seeks £17,510 towards a total project cost of £32,837 across two years. This is a revised submission which addresses points raised by the Panel at the last meeting. Parts 1&2, we asked the applicant to clarify justification for the fencing
- Grant Request: £17,509
- Weighted Score: 7.2
- Discussion
 - Presentation by HG
 - Debate over value for money for wildlife tower.
 - ED1 type activities must be properly risk assessed, planned, appropriate insurance etc. Although Defra have confirmed that a broad definition of educational activity can be provided for using this cost basis under FiPL, including farmer to farmer. Panel Members with direct experience of events run by applicant state these were well run. Number of participants on an event can vary, for e.g. Care Farming visits could be small group but still need careful planning and support.
 - People attending events may feel greater commitment if pay a small fee.
 - If any year 2 elements (fencing) could be brought forward this would be ideal.

- Good site for permissive access as adjacent to Dartmoor Way. Asked to pass comment to applicant.
- **Vote:**
 - Recommendation: That the Panel approve funding for parts 1&2. The Panel decline funding for the wildlife tower. The Panel approve part 5, fencing to allow conservation grazing ~£4900. The Panel approve support for 4 educational visits, £1236.
 - Motion: Approve request for funding except for wildlife tower which should be declined on vfm. Offer £8510.

Application: DNP-FPL-111

- Objectives: The applicant seeks a grant towards cost of a new barn to house livestock in winter and for lambing
- Grant Request: £21,564
- Weighted Score: 5.6
- Discussion
 - Presentation of outline and score by JS
 - Panel supportive of applicant's needs but does not score against NPPP and FiPL aims, application submitted direct without FiPL Team advice.
 - Panel believe applicant may justify support as already undertakes activities in line with FiPL.
- **Vote:**
 - Recommendation: Decline the application for funding
 - Motion: Defer but offer applicant advice on application, may also be able to provide some support for CS application if pursued.

Application: DNP-FPL-101

- Objectives: Applicant has submitted an amended application, the natural flood management has been removed from the request and this funding is being sought elsewhere. The remaining parts of the project include scrub and grazing management on this high value wet grassland habitat as well as reduced events for people (including volunteering) and biological survey.
- Grant Request: £11,718
- Weighted Score: n/a
- Discussion
 - Presentation of outline and score by JS
 - Concern that applicant is not landowner or tenant, how can they enter into a legal agreement for grant if no legal basis for control of land to deliver project. This must be clarified before any grant is awarded, suggest agreement made with landowner if no legal basis for land management exists.
 - Concern over autumn grazing, Panel do not consider this good practice and any grazier should be compensated. Also would not comply with GS6 (which generally stipulates that grazing should be carried out

- between May-Sept) which is basis for cost calculation. Applicant understands this and planning to graze late summer.
 - Concern over impact on wildlife by so many events for people in a sensitive area, especially nesting birds. Applicant notes Willow tit as possible, also believe Cuckoo on Meadow Pipit and Snipe.
 - Panel do not believe area on Marden Down is a car park, although hard standing.
- Vote:
 - Recommendation: That the Panel approve the resubmitted elements of this application as the applicant has addressed all concerns previously raised.
 - Motions
 - If agreement with landowner, can go ahead with Yr1 elements.
 - Projects 2&3, 4 approved subject to agreement with legal land manager.
 - Project 5 confirm late summer grazing, not autumn / winter.
 - Projects 6,7,8, and 9 can be supported in principle if disturbance can be avoided through running events at appropriate times (outside sensitive breeding period for priority spp)
 - Offer £11,718 in principle, subject to conditions being satisfied. Yr1 elements at £1135 can go ahead now.

Application: DNP-FPL-119

- Objectives: The applicant seeks support to restore 205m of earth hedge bank, create 100m of the same (including 10 hedgerow trees), repair 48m of stone wall including replacement of two access gates.
- Grant Request: £9,467
- Weighted Score: 7.2
- Discussion
 - Presentation of outline and score by JS
 - A straightforward but valuable application meeting a number of outcomes.
 - In an area well used by public.
 - Has fencing ever received public funding?
- Vote
 - Recommendation: That the Panel approve this grant.
 - Motion: Approve offer of £9467 with fencing requiring confirmation not previously funded.