

MOOR THAN MEETS THE EYE LANDSCAPE PARTNERSHIP BOARD

24 January 2018, Meeting Room, Parke, 10.30am

Present:	Ally Kohler (Chair)	DNPA	AK
	Andy Crabb	Historic England	AC
	David Rickwood	Woodland Trust	DR
	John Clark	CSG Representative	JC
	Mark Allott	<i>MTMTE</i> Scheme Manager	MA
	Pamela Woods	DNPA Member	PW
	Sue Viccars	CSG Representative	SV
	Tony Clark	CSG Representative	TC

Attending:	Adrian Wade	Finance and Admin Officer, <i>MTMTE</i>	AW
	Andrew Bailey	Community & Events Officer, <i>MTMTE</i>	ABY
	Emma Stockley	Community Heritage Officer, <i>MTMTE</i>	ES
	Ian Durrant	Access and Recreation Officer	ID
	Richard Drysdale	Visitor Services Manager	RD

1 Welcome

The Chairman welcomed Members to the meeting and welcomed AW as the new *MTMTE* Finance and Admin Office.

2 Apologies

Apologies were noted from Andy Bradford (Dartmoor Farmers Association), Helen Booker (RSPB), Ian James (DCC), James Platt (SWLT), Jenny How (Visit Dartmoor), Layland Branfield (Dartmoor Commoners' Council), Nik Ward (Natural England), Tom Stratton (Duchy of Cornwall), Phil Hutt (DPA), Chrissy Mason (*MTMTE* Community Ecologist) and Kevin Bishop (DNPA).

There was some discussion as to whether the meeting had a quorum, and consideration given to how any decisions made at this meeting might subsequently be ratified, as it was unclear whether CSG representatives were included in a count for quorum. However, reference to the Constitution after the meeting clarified that CSG representatives count towards the quorum, as they are members of the Board (paragraph 4.1 of the constitution). The meeting was therefore quorate.

3 Minutes and Actions of the last Landscape Partnership Board meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2017 were agreed as a true record and were approved.

The actions detailed in the minutes were considered in turn, with two carried forward, slightly amended:

ACTION: MA to arrange another visit to Higher Uppacott for LP Board Members – invite members to visit on 8 February 2018 (1pm to 2.30pm) to coincide with HLF site visit.

ACTION: PA3 Natural Connections: MA to confirm with Chrissy Mason whether there are agreements to sign.

Other outstanding actions are dealt with as part of this meeting's agenda.

4 Highlight Report Review for Year 4, Quarter 1

MA presented the Y4Q1 Highlight Report. The main points are summarised as follows:

- The Scheme is roughly where it should be. The RAG ratings at Appendix A to the report show movement in the right direction, with many of the ambers converted to green.
- There were no queries from HLF in relation to last quarter's claim, and payment was made very promptly, in October.
- The current quarter's claim has been submitted, and is approximately 14% lower than target.

The Wray Valley Trail element of the Scheme has completed, which is very positive, as the full amount (which was on a £ for £ basis) has been claimed. The trail itself is not fully complete, as there are elements outside of the *MTMTE* Scheme still to complete, and it is hoped that the Trail will be ready for an official opening before the Scheme closes.

Many of the other projects are showing a variance within their quarters' forecast, which has the potential for significant impact now that the Wray Valley project is complete. PB1 (Bellever and Postbridge Trails) and PC8 (Postbridge Visitor Centre) will be key projects in financial terms for the Scheme going forward.

Two projects have been withdrawn, but substitute proposals are considered below at item 6.

Fifteen events/activities took place over the last Quarter. A *MTMTE* exhibition is running at Princetown Visitor Centre and the Wild and Wondrous Region exhibition at RAMM, Exeter, as part of PB7 (In the footsteps of the Victorians).

Around £83,000 volunteer time has been claimed to date, well on the way to the Scheme's £114k target. Two projects (PA1 – Moorland Birds and PB4 – Engaging with the nature of the Bovey Valley) have £10k each to deliver towards this outstanding target. DR queried PB4's outstanding contribution as she was under the impression that the target had been exceeded. It may be appropriate to discuss with HLF the possibility of adjusting targets across projects.

ACTION: MA to re-confirm PB4's outstanding volunteer contribution with DR and Chloe Pitts, WT.

In relation to social media, Twitter following is down slightly in the quarter, but Facebook following continues to grow, though could be developed further, subject to resources.

SV was thanked for the exposure given to *MTMTE* and the RAMM exhibition in Dartmoor Magazine, amounting to around seven pages.

AW has joined the *MTMTE* team, so the team is again at full strength.

JC expressed a concern that members of the community remained generally unaware of the *MTMTE* Scheme, and there was little or no information in Tourist Information Centres. This issue is discussed in more detail in item 8(c) below.

The main success of this Quarter is the completion of the Wray Valley Trail, and it was noted that there was a risk attached in not capitalising on this success before the *MTMTE* Scheme comes to an end.

ACTION: IJ to actively promote PC5 Wray Valley Trail once the project is complete and planning conditions discharged.

<ID and RD arrived>

5 Financial Review

a) Project Budgets

Generally the position is positive. There is some work to do on some of the projects (eg PA4/PB4/PC1) but the expectation is that the full amount of the grant will be claimed.

Programme E (Overheads) costs are being monitored. Where projects underspend, it may be possible to redistribute funds towards staff costs in relation to running the Scheme, subject to HLF approval.

There are no areas of concern in relation to the projects as overspends had been underwritten in response to the previous quarter's review. DR noted that PA4 (Bovey Valley) had overspent, but this was planned, and the project had over-delivered on some outputs/outcomes through an extension of elements of the project. It was agreed that there were no significant risks attached, and it was appropriate for the over-delivery to continue. AK noted that there were similar issues with PA6 (Higher Uppacott), which showed an overspend, but in that case due to unforeseen issues naturally arising from the renovation of an ancient building. In neither case was the overspend due to mismanagement.

ACTION: MA to add commentary against relevant projects in the Appendix A summary to explain the nature of the overspends on PA4 (subject to ongoing budget calculations by Chloe Pitts, WT) and PA6.

In relation to PB1 (Believer and Postbridge Trails) and PC8 (Postbridge Visitor Centre), the overspend showing on the report is not expected to happen in

reality, and these projects are expected to come in on budget. PB1 requires re-profiling to account for the £23k underspend in the quarter and its delivery schedule re-alignment with PC8 (see 6b).

ACTION: ID to re-profile PB1 spend as part of Y4Q2 reporting in response to his paper presented to Board.

ACTION: RD to re-profile PC8 spend as part of Y4Q2 reporting in response to his paper presented to Board.

b) Scheme Finance Overview

There was a discussion in relation to staff related costs, and lessons learned; some costs were planned at the outset, but others were unforeseen (though incurred with the approval of the Board). It was agreed that the nature of these projects required allocation of sufficient resource for travel and subsistence, which was a point to note for any future Scheme of this nature.

6 Scheme and Project Queries

a) **PA5 – Unveiling the heritage of the High Moor**

AC informed the Board that the PA5 budget was currently showing an underspend, and proposed that the bulk of the £15k underspend be allocated to archeological work on the Holwell hut circle and adjacent reave: £2,500 of this budget was to be allocated to an archeological survey, although Winchester University may do this free of charge subject to ongoing negotiations; £9,000 allocated to post-excavation works; £1,000 for publication costs; and £300 for archiving. Total estimate a little over £13k, though the actual cost of the post-excavation works will not be known until Summer 2019, and there is therefore an element of risk in relation to that sum.

RESOLVED: Board approved the proposal.

ACTION: Lee Bray to update the Project Proforma and forward to MA to seek formal HLF approval.

b) **PC8 and PB1 - Postbridge Visitor Centre and Bellever and Postbridge Trails**

RD reported that in practice these two projects are now integrated. The welcome to visitors to Postbridge generally starts at the Warren House Inn in one direction, and Powdermills in the other, with clear signage and indications of where visitors can explore. RD is confident that the Visitor Centre will be fit for purpose in relation to both its interpretation and its retail functions. RD is working with local architects, including a Duchy architect, and interpretation experts, and the outcome will be an effective learning and engagement resource fit for modern visitors, and including the story of the Whitehorse Hill cist. Following discussion with the architects, RD is confident that this can be delivered within the original £185k budget (£130k for the works on the Visitor Centre, and £55k for interpretation). MA noted that approximately £8k had been spent of the original budget due to abortive costs. Drawings are not yet available, but should be available by the end of March, subject to HLF approval of the revised proposal.

The overspend showing on the report relates to the worst-case scenario for the range of costs presented in the paper to Board. The additional roundhouse replica proposal will be a managed volunteer project seeking external funding. This will tie in with learning from the Holwell Hut Circle excavations (the PA5 proposal referred to in 6a) to ensure the roundhouse is as authentic as possible. There are some ideas for location, but this has not yet been determined. DR noted that Woodland Trust may be able to assist with provision of timber for the project. It was noted that the £40k estimate included volunteer time.

ACTION: RD to calculate the volunteer element included within the roundhouse estimate of costs and update the Project Proforma for MA to seek formal HLF approval.

The Visitor Centre project should be delivered within 14 months (open by Easter 2019), with the roundhouse project to be delivered after that (possibly August 2019). It is anticipated that the centre will be closed between October 2018 and March 2019, during the usual off-peak season closure.

It was noted that these timescales put completion of the project very close to the end date of the Scheme.

ACTION: MA to establish with HLF what their position would be in the event of delay in completing the project.

The potential relocation of the Whitehorse Hill cist will be considered in more detail at a later stage, and will need Duchy cooperation and an effective communication plan. Plymouth Museum is keen to cooperate on the interpretation elements.

In summary, the original outcomes can be delivered within the original budget; the roundhouse element is a separate issue.

RESOLVED: Board approved the proposals in relation to the Visitor Centre and interpretation works at £185k (less spend to date on the project), but made no decision in relation to the roundhouse proposal at this stage.

ACTION: RD to update the Project Proforma and forward to MA to seek formal HLF approval.

ID reported on progress with the Bellever and Postbridge Trails project (PB1). This links closely with PC8 as visitors to the Visitor Centre will be encouraged to explore the landscape as part of their visit. Following discussions with the Forestry Commission, completion is anticipated in Year 5/Quarter 3.

ACTION: ID to forward the Forestry Commission timeline to AW to be attached to the minutes.

There will be three different walks in three categories: short, long and outlier walks. Some of these have been completed, and others are facilitated by a self-guide leaflet.

Interpretation panels will be placed at Bellever and Postbridge car parks, the first in April 2018 to coincide with the introduction of parking charges.

This quarter will involve significant expenditure on the improved access to Powdermills and back. There is no provision being made at this time for a car park at Powdermills, and visitors will be guided to walk from the Postbridge end of the trail.

ACTION: ID to re-profile PB1 spend as part of Y4Q2 reporting in response to his paper presented to Board.

c) PB6 – Managing Volunteers

AB confirmed that the general aims of the project have been met, but there is an unforeseen underspend as the costs of recruitment and training have been lower than originally planned. AB proposed that part of the budget allowed for recruitment and training is re-allocated to provide support/grants for volunteer groups, and part of the budget is allocated to commissioning a bespoke trailer which will operate as a mobile tool store for volunteer groups. DNPA's Rangers have identified a need for such a resource, which would include hand tools and tea-making facilities in a bespoke sign-written trailer capable of accessing remote areas. The Rangers, who have costed the trailer, would manage and maintain this resource, and after the *MTMTE* scheme ends, DNPA would be responsible for servicing and other associated costs. It would also be made available to other volunteer groups across Dartmoor. The need for an effective booking system was noted.

A paper was tabled with proposed reallocation of costs detailed. There is no change to the bottom line of this budget.

RESOLVED: Board approved the proposal.

ACTION: MA to seek formal HLF approval.

d) PD6 – Dart Valley in Focus

AK informed the Board that a proposal had been prepared to make use of the East Shallowford Trust budget. There are two main elements to the proposal: working with young people, and promoting family events in the Dart Valley. Some behavioural issues have been identified in the area, and it is hoped that this project will indirectly and positively impact on these issues, and enhance the reputation of the area.

The proposal is to recruit young people to produce a 60 second film aimed at promoting positive use and appreciation of the area and to aid the understanding of the area among families who visit.

The budget is £30k, with £10k from HLF and £20k from DNPA. The landowner has been approached, and is interested in principle.

This is an ambitious project, and therefore carries some risk, but the Board's view was that the potential outcomes were worth the risk.

RESOLVED: Board approved the proposal.

e) PB5b – Welcome to Widecombe

The interpretation element of the Welcome to Widecombe project has gone well, with aims achieved, and an underspend on budget. However, the farm machinery restoration element has not proceeded as planned. The Board was asked to consider (a) approving further expenditure on interpretation and (b) abort the farm machinery project and approve a revised proposal: “the Lost Medieval Manor”. A paper was tabled detailing the latter.

The project involves three elements: (1) investigation of the manor, involving an archaeological excavation with community volunteers (2) a community celebration, involving a family friendly open day with re-enactments and (3) interpretation of the findings, including an archaeological report, interpretation panel, booklet, video of the excavation, consolidation and archiving of data and research, including the work carried out by Peter Rennells.

In terms of output, this will include the above plus 150 volunteer days, school days involving four schools, five ‘walk and talks’, a medieval arts project at Widecombe Primary School and a drawing of the manor.

The excavation would take place in July, and will be delivered by AB, AC and ES, together with volunteers, including the local history society. There would be no change to the overall budget.

RESOLVED: Board approved the proposal.

e) PC1 – The Dartmoor Story

Discussion postponed due to shortage of time.

ACTION: AB to update Board on the PC1 - Dartmoor Story project at the next meeting.

7 CSG Feedback

CSG feedback in relation to legacy and communications was given in the relevant discussions detailed below.

8 Decisions

a. PB2: Parishscapes: extend ES support to 31 August 2018

<ES left the room>

MA explained that ES’s contract had been extended a year ago from three days a week to four days until 28 February due to the demands of the role.

Parishscapes remains a challenging project, and in addition, ES is working on legacy elements of the project. MA proposed that the arrangement continue until

31 August 2018. The project has an underspend, so the cost can be managed. The cost will be in the region of £4,000.

RESOLVED: The Board approved the proposal to extend the extra day on ES's contract to 31 August 2018

<ES rejoined the meeting>

b. Accept the Interim Evaluation Report

The report includes eight recommendations. JC was thanked for his contribution to the draft document, and his and MA's comments had been incorporated into the final version.

RESOLVED: The Interim Evaluation Report was accepted by the Board.

The recommendations were discussed in turn, with the following comments noted about priorities:

1. **A collaborative approach to legacy.** CSG discussions have already commenced, and Orlando Rutter is to run workshops which will include representation at all levels. TC noted that CSG were concerned that with only two years to go this must be seen as a high priority. Project Leads need to be engaged in the process while they are still active on the projects. CSG had 'brainstormed' this issue, and had been pleased to see that what is likely to be available at the end of the Scheme closely matches what will be needed. AK noted that a legacy plan has to be prepared by the end of Year 4 (ie August this year), which will be part of MA's role as Scheme Manager.

RESOLVED: legacy is to be high priority and workshops are approved

2. **Inter-project relationships.** It was noted that Project Leads meet regularly already, and new links are also being formed outside of formal meetings.
3. **Improve Reporting Systems:** it was noted that Project Leads already meet frequently and the quarterly reporting forms and process was discussed in the last meeting. MA is happy to meet with individuals where necessary. Generally, the Board felt that suitable reporting systems were in place, but it may be appropriate to train individual Project Leads on the reporting requirements.
4. **Communications:** this is discussed in a separate agenda item below.
5. **Scrutiny and Risk:** It was noted that the spreadsheet updated by the Scheme Manager and contributed to by Project Leads each quarter covers these items.
6. **CSG Recruitment and Role:** It was agreed that recruitment to the CSG was a priority and had been raised at the last CSG meeting as such. Both CSG and the Scheme Manager have been pursuing this with limited success. It was noted that CSG's focus now relates to legacy planning and communications.

7. **Monitoring Toolkit:** This is a priority. A revised toolkit has already been sent, and ties in with monitoring and evaluation. This needs to be a theme at the next Project Leads meeting.

ACTION: MA to review and redistribute the toolkit from Resources4Change and discuss in the next Project Leads' meeting.

8. **Celebrate Volunteering:** Parishscapes is already dealing with this. There was discussion as to whether a series of celebrations would be more effective than a large event.

ACTION: CSG to add Celebrating Volunteers as an item on its next meeting agenda

<ES left the meeting>

c. Communications Plan

This had been circulated in advance. AB was thanked for his work on this. The next step is for Project Leads to identify their individual project communications for incorporation by MA into the Scheme Communications Plan. AB noted that *MTMTE's* voice was relatively small, and it would be helpful if this were amplified by the other groups involved in the projects.

The Woodland Trust's plan was discussed as an example; it should be possible to use each group's existing systems to communicate the successes of the projects.

ACTION: MA/AW to create a spreadsheet to manage the Scheme's Plan and circulate a template to capture planned project communications through the quarterly reporting process

The potential value of using parish magazines was discussed, and it was acknowledged that the challenge would be to ensure that the message is made relevant to each parish.

The importance of distributing leaflets was discussed, and JC was keen for a new leaflet to be produced in a 'pocket friendly' format. Work is planned on a new leaflet, but the DNPA comms team have a very full workload until March. AB has produced an interim leaflet, with a small print run of around 1000. JC and PW in particular were interested in distributing leaflet more widely.

ACTION: AB to arrange a further print-run of the interim leaflet

It was noted that *MTMTE* had enjoyed exposure in Dartmoor Magazine and BBC Spotlight recently. The RAMM exhibition presents a lot of opportunity for positive publicity.

RESOLVED: the Communications Strategy was agreed and is to be implemented

<NB: Other decisions listed in this agenda item had been dealt with in earlier items>

10 AOB

- a) The following projects to be discussed at the April meeting: Discovering the Dartmoor Story (PC1); Discovering/Engaging with the Nature of the Bovey Valley (PA4/PB4);. At the September meeting, Heritage Skills Training (PC6) and Moorland Birds (PA1) will be a focus.

- b) AB informed the Board that Chrissy Mason had been unable to attend the meeting today, and is due to leave next week, but would like to attend a future meeting.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 13.45