

# REGENERATE NPT (LAG)

**Meeting: 10am, Tuesday 23 June 2015**  
**Venue: Neath Civic Centre, Rooms A/B**

## **PRESENT:**

Cllr Anthony Taylor, Chair  
Richard Walters, Groundwork, Vice Chair  
Julia Jenkins, RDP Team Leader  
Ben Riseborough, RDP Project Development Officer  
Suzette Phillips, RDP Project Development Officer  
Julie Bibby, DOVE Workshops  
Rhysian Pengilly, Glynneath Training Centre  
Carl Richards, Awel Aman Twaw/Egni  
Ian Isaac, NSA Afan  
Len Preece, Canolfan Maerdy  
Greg Kaminaris, Centre for Business  
Tony Potts, NPTCVS  
John Davies, Baytrans  
Cllr Lynda G Williams, GCG Community Council  
Alison Owen, DANSA  
Ian Whitehead-Ross, Whitehead-Ross Education & Consulting  
Elen Richards, Countryside & Wildlife Team NPTCBC  
Susan Chilcott, Cognation Project Officer NPTCBC  
Peter Hunter, Blaenhonddan Community Council  
Emma Wilcox, Project Development Officer NPTCBC  
Angeline Spooner-Cleverly, Communities First NPTCBC

## **APOLOGIES:**

Clive Ball, NPT College  
Dan McCallum, Awel Aman Tawe  
Sue Reed, Transport Development Officer NPTCBC  
Tony McGetric, Tourism Swansea Bay  
Cllr David Lewis, NPTCBC

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Action</b>
1	<b>Welcome and Apologies:</b> AT welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that it was likely difficult decisions would need to be made today. Apologies were recorded.	
2	<b>Minutes of last meeting (18 February 2015):</b> Minutes were approved.	
3	<b>Matters Arising Not On The Agenda:</b> There were no matters arising.	

4	<p><b>Administrative Body Update:</b>  JJ referred LAG members to Appendix 2 of their papers which explained that LEADER is fully funding administrative staff for each LAG under 2 strands: Strand 1 - <i>Running Costs</i> which amount to 9% of the budget and covers the Finance &amp; Monitoring Officer post and Strand 2 - <i>Animation Costs</i> which amount to 12% of the budget and covers the LAG Manager post. Strands 1 &amp; 2 do not provide enough funding for all the Administrative Body therefore NPTCBC is match funding, under Strand 3 - <i>Implementation</i>, two Rural Community Facilitators and one Rural Research Officer. These posts have been previously identified within the LDS Action Plan and approved by the LAG. Strand 4 has been identified for <i>Cooperation</i> projects which can be run in partnership with other LAGs. The current programme comes to a close at the end of June 2015 and as of 1 July 2015 Ben Riseborough and Suzette Phillips, who are both based at the Quays, will be our Rural Community Facilitators. The Rural Research Officer will be recruited in January 2016. The Rural Research Officer post will be ring fenced for NPTCBC staff that will be, at that time, at risk of losing their current posts within the Local Authority. Each of the four Strands has been allocated a flat rate of 15% to cover related running costs such as training, overheads and equipment.</p>	
5	<p><b>Members Attendance:</b>  AT referred LAG members to Appendix 3 of their papers. Terms of Reference state that if a member misses more than 3 consecutive meetings then their place on the LAG is at risk and it is at the discretion of the Chair. Some members have now missed 4 or 5 meetings and AT intends to write to each of these members asking them to improve their attendance record in order to push active attendance within the LAG. Members Attendance will therefore be reviewed at the meeting after next (possibly December 2015).</p>	SP
6	<p><b>LEADER Budget:</b>  AT referred LAG members to Appendix 4 of their papers.  LW asked if a spreadsheet could be produced explaining the LEADER budget expenditure.  BR explained that all the EOIs had been split into the 5 LEADER Themes. Totalled up, they should contribute to 80% of the overall costs to RDP. As it stands currently, there is a deficit under each theme, which outlines that not every project will be able to get funding under this programme. BR went through each theme and explained the deficits. Decisions would need to be made based on the number of activities and objectives being met, duplication with other proposed projects, priority ranking, most cost effective and value for money. A lot of the projects did meet most of the actions and all scored over the threshold. Those that scored over 40 were deemed passable and any scoring between 30 and 40 would have to come back and answer any questions that the LAG may have.  II asked if the 80% was flexible? JJ explained that the 80% maximum grant rate was not flexible but if the LAG were keen on a project, there is always the option that the sponsor could be asked to source money elsewhere or scale down the project to reduce the LEADER grant. LW asked if similar projects could be combined to work on a joint venture. JJ explained that this is a definite possibility. AT/JJ explained that the LAG will make recommendations to combine projects/look at reducing project costs/sourcing other funding streams through working with the European Team etc. at Stage 3 of the application process. JD felt that the LAG should go for best value rather</p>	BR

	than the cheapest option.	
7	<p><b>Result of Project Appraisal and Prioritisation Exercise:</b>  JJ explained that projects would be discussed in relation to the Theme it came under rather than discussing each individual project. Therefore if anyone had an interested in any project in a particular Theme then that member would need to leave the room whilst that project/theme was being discussed. In order to maximize the budget the LAG would have to come to an agreement about each project bearing in mind the funds available in each Theme and whether further discussions were needed to clarify any questions and/or whether the project needed to be reconsidered at a later date or scaled down and agree any actions that needed to be addressed to take projects forward.</p> <p><b><u>Theme 3 Discussion: The Engagement Retreat, DANSA and NPTCU.</u></b>  AO and IWR left the room.  <u>DANSA Wheels to Wellbeing:</u> Scored low. Only addressed one action from the Intervention Logic. Not deemed innovative. Has been in place for a while as Ring and Ride project previously funded by RDP. However it could be classed as needed. Not a considerable amount asked for.</p> <p><u>DANSA Wheels to Work:</u> Reasonable score from LAG. Would cover all rural wards. For it to be sustainable DANSA to work with NPTCU so those taking part in the scheme could be encouraged to save for their own transport. Getting people in rural communities in to work has to be encouraged. Potential to collaborate with other LAGs to widen the scope of the project. Concerns raised regarding health and safety risks. AT commented that it would be down to DANSA to arrange insurance and risk assessments – the project would be fully licensed and legal before given the go ahead and all users would be fully trained. RP wanted clarification on what the 30k covered. JJ stated this would be developed in the full application.  <b>WHEELS TO WELLBEING – NOT APPROVED</b>  <b>WHEELS TO WORK - APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE.</b></p> <p><u>NPTCU: Schools Savings Points:</u> Scored highest. In order for any of the others to go ahead this project has to be scaled down. Back to their original request for 90k would be more favourable. Encouraging volunteers may help reduce their costs. Like project, like aims but not cost – this needs to be reduced.  <b>NPTCU – PROJECT APPROVED WITH REDUCED COSTS.</b></p> <p><u>Whitehead-Ross Education and Consulting: The Engagement Retreat:</u> Project addressed two actions in IL. Scored reasonably well. Duplicated other services (YMCA in Swansea and Port Talbot already running the same scheme with EU money). Most trips are out of County – more trips need to be within the County Borough. Similar project will be covered through a £15M EU bid so the individuals would not be able to be included in both projects. Competition of effort. LAG requested duplication issues be clarified before decision is taken  <b>ENGAGEMENT RETREAT: PROJECT NEEDS CLARIFICATION BEFORE PROGRESSING TO STAGE 3</b></p> <p>IWR came back into the room.</p>	

**Theme 4 Discussions: NSA Afan, DANSA and Awel Aman Tawe.**

II, CR left the room.

BR had met with NSA Afan and AAT to explain that it would not be possible to fund both projects as they were similar and that there was an opportunity to merge the projects but neither Lead wanted to go further with this suggestion.

*NSA Afan:* Score and priority low. Could qualify for Wind Farm money? Similar schemes already exist for free. What would be the discounted rate?

**NSA AFAN: PROJECT NOT APPROVED, RECOMMENDED THAT SPONSOR RESEARCH WIND FARM FUNDING.**

*DANSA BioFuture:* JJ explained that the system was all in place so that DANSA could collect oil from local businesses and their equipment would convert oil for use in DANSA vehicles. Benefits for local businesses as they would no longer have to pay for oil to be collected. Not a new idea but should be supported. Scored well. Needs more information on the technical issues of conversion to fuel.

**DANSA BIOFUTURE: APPROVED PENDING MORE INFORMATION ON THE TECHNICAL ISSUES.**

*Awel Aman Tawe:* Scored well. Clarification on issues of securing match funding. What would be the impact if they couldn't raise the shares?

**AWEL AMAN Tawe: PROJECT APPROVED PENDING OUTCOME OF ISSUES RAISED.**

**Theme 5 Discussions: Seven Sisters Community Council and Margam/Taibach Community Hub:**

*Seven Sisters Community Council:* small project for 12 months. Not innovative. Lots of computer classes available through other providers. Looking for more innovative ways of using digital tech. ie. PH heart monitors, ER getting farms on line.

**PROJECT NOT APPROVED.**

*Margam/Taibach Community Hub:* Unsure what it fully entails. Not innovative. Scored low.

**PROJECT NOT APPROVED**

Recommended to issue fresh call for projects under Theme 5.

RDP

**Theme 1 Discussions: NPTCBC, Swansea Canal Society, South Wales Miners Museum, BayTrans, Cwmllynfell CC, Cognation:**

AT, SC, JC and ER left the room.

*South Wales Miners Museum:* fits more with Theme 5. Possible link with Theme 3 – partnership working. Scored well. Two officers for two walks seems excessive. Could the walks be extended?

**PROJECT APPROVED UNDER THEME 5 PENDING ISSUES RAISED.**

*Working with Nature, Reconnecting with Nature and CARES projects:* There is crossover with these projects. Could they work in partnership? PH mentioned that there were 10 nature reserves in NPT and we should be finding a way of getting them to work together with the Wildlife Trust. Can we recommend a little more work to

join up these 3 projects? This is where the two Rural Community Facilitators could come in and develop an overarching project to link with volunteering and identifying sites within NPT.

**PROJECTS NOT APPROVED BUT MORE WORK NEEDED TO IDENTIFY A BROADER APPROACH TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS UNDER ONE PROJECT.**

Cognition: Scored high. Good project. Helped local businesses (although there was some opposition and argument against that). EW stated that if the footpaths fail to generate income they will eventually decline therefore negatively impacting on tourism within NPT. 30% increase in visitor numbers since Cognition started. LW mounting biking is developing in other areas within NPT – smaller communities are linking in to the benefits of the biking tourism industry. Link to BayTrans.

**PROJECT APPROVED**

Swansea Canal Society: Not yet secured capital. Good project. Scored well – priority low. Project outcomes need explaining. How will the boards be maintained?

**PROJECT APPROVED PENDING CAPITAL BEING SECURED.**

BayTrans: Promoting Public Transport to Countryside and Afan Forest park. Company has good track record. Possible link in with Ambassador project.

**BOTH PROJECTS APPROVED**

**Theme 2 Discussions: DOVE Workshop, NPTCBC, Glynneath TC, NPTCVS, AVTC, Ambassador Training**

II, JB, TP, GK and RP left the room.

DOVE: is there work in developing 2 small micro businesses to warrant one member of staff? Who are the entrepreneurs – how will they find time to mentor and run their own businesses? Score reasonable.

**PROJECT NOT APPROVED (BUT OPTION TO DEVELOP WITH GLYNNEATH TC AND NPTCVS) UNDER ONE LOCAL PRODUCE PROJECT**

NPTCBC Green Business: Innovative. Could link with 5 Valleys. Nice project. Score reasonable. Joins up with everything we are funding?

**PROJECT APPROVED.**

AVTC: Scored low. Not innovative. Linking with the Tourism Business to develop the support they need.

**PROJECT NOT APPROVED.**

Glynneath TC: Good project. Cost is excessive. Need to scale this down.

**PROJECT NOT APPROVED (BUT OPTION TO DEVELOP WITH DOVE AND NPTCVS) UNDER ONE LOCAL PRODUCE PROJECT.**

NPTCVS 5 Valleys: Overlaps with Glynneath TC project. Discussion about creating jobs. Is it best placed to run this – they are there to support others to run projects. Could join up with DOVE and Glynneath. Creating a brand. Federation of small

	<p>businesses might be best placed to take it forward or chamber of trade rather than starting from scratch? Combine with Tourism (food tourism). Suggest linkages. Facilitators could take this forward.</p> <p><b>PROJECT NOT APPROVED (BUT OPTION TO DEVELOP WITH GLYNNEATH TC AND DOVE) UNDER ONE LOCAL PRODUCE PROJECT.</b></p> <p><i>NPTCBC:</i> Tourism: Assistance for tourism businesses. Very high cost. Not specific to food. Duplication with Visit Wales.</p> <p><b>PROJECT APPROVED PENDING REDUCED COSTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION.</b></p> <p><i>Ambassador Training:</i> High cost. Could be covered with NPTCBC Tourism Development project.</p> <p><b>PROJECT NOT APPROVED.</b></p> <p>JJ confirmed that if there was money left in the budget then RDP would publicise another call for projects.</p>	
8	<p><b>AOB:</b></p> <p>AT announced that this meeting was JJs last meeting as she was leaving the RDP team for a new job. AT thanked JJ for all her efforts in helping him and the LAG in taking this scheme forward. The LAG will be informed of JJ's replacement in due course.</p> <p>AT also thanked RW, who is resigning from the LAG, for his commitment as a member and Vice Chair. Any member wishing to replace RW as Vice Chair should contact the RDP team. LP indicated his interest. LP's name, as well as any other interested member, will now be subject to a vote by LAG members and results will be announced in due course.</p> <p>JJ mentioned that WG has requested some minor changes to the LA's Terms of Reference.</p> <p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING:</b></p> <p>The next meeting is currently scheduled for 19 august but this is likely to change, possible to the end of September. A new date will be forwarded to the LAG in due course.</p>	<p>RDP</p> <p>SP</p> <p>RDP</p>