

## **MOOR THAN MEETS THE EYE LANDSCAPE PARTNERSHIP BOARD**

12 July 2018, Meeting Room, Parke, 2.00pm

<b>Present:</b>	David Rickwood	Woodland Trust	DR
	Helen Booker	RSPB	HB
	John Clark	CSG Representative	JC
	Mark Allott	<i>MTMTE</i> Scheme Manager	MA
	Nik Ward	Natural England	NW
	Pamela Woods (Chair)	DNPA Member	PW
	Susan Morris	CSG Representative	SM
	Tony Clark	CSG Representative	TC
<b>Attending:</b>	Adrian Wade	Finance and Admin Officer, <i>MTMTE</i>	AW
	Andrew Bailey	Community & Events Officer, <i>MTMTE</i>	ABY
	David Attwell	Project Lead: PD4 (Heritage Skills)	DA
	Donny Healy	DNPA Leadership Team Representative	DH
	Richard Drysdale	Project Lead: PC8 (Postbridge V.C.)	RD
	Ross Kennerley	Observer/Guest	RK

### **1 Welcome**

PW welcomed attendees, including RK, who had been nominated as a candidate to chair the LP Board (item 9). Introductions were made around the table.

### **2 Apologies**

Apologies had been received from Ally Kohler, Andy Crabb, James Platts, Kevin Bishop, Jenny How, Kevin Bishop, Layland Branfield, Phil Hutt and Tom Stratton.

Andy Bradford and Ian James (IJ) were noted absent.

### **3 Minutes and Actions of the last Landscape Partnership Board meeting**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 April 2018 were agreed to be a true record and were approved.

The actions detailed in the minutes not marked as 'complete' were considered in turn (actions in bold are to be carried forward):

**ACTION: (carried forward) IJ Promote Wray Valley Trail once the project is complete and planning conditions are discharged.**

**ACTION: (carried forward) NW to assess the value of the Conservation Assistants' work in monetary terms.**

**ACTION: (carried forward) MA to consider the risks to the Scheme if we cannot deliver the reservoir element of the [PA4 – Discovering the nature of**

**the Bovey Valley] project. A rescoping is needed to bring the project to an affordable level, which may require HLF approval**

ACTION: HB to send a copy of the design [PA1 – Dartmoor Moorland Birds: site information sheet] to the Board members – *complete* - this was shown on screen to the meeting and explained by HB.

ACTION: HB to consider how volunteers could be utilised [in PA1 – Dartmoor Moorland Birds] and communicate this with MA – *complete*. Fiona Freshney is utilising volunteers for a number of purposes, and additional volunteers are being sought for data entry.

ACTION: ABy to provide examples of the type of video [for PC1 – Dartmoor Story] which he has in mind – *complete*. Links have been sent to the Board members with the meeting papers.

ACTION: ABy to submit an End of Scheme Celebration proposal to Board at the next meeting on 12 July 2018 – see item 13C.

All other actions have been completed.

#### **4 Project Spotlights**

##### **a) PD4 – Heritage Skills Training**

DA produced photographs of various items of training being delivered, and summarised the aim of the project. The project had been delayed at the beginning, so there had been some work to do to ensure the project's outputs are delivered. The first step had been to establish what training was required in the area. The project had aimed to deliver 36 courses, with attendance by 180 people. 25 courses have been arranged to date, attended by 213 people, meaning that the attendance output has already been exceeded.

A budget summary was distributed to the Board. The budget is in a reasonable position.

Legacy is a focus at present, and in particular the enhancement of traditional skills in the area, and the formation of a heritage skills 'club' is being considered. The bee-keeping courses are very popular, though it is a challenge keeping bees on Dartmoor.

DA noted that non-farmers working with farmers is having a positive impact. Awareness is being raised, and communications are improved. Workshops have been run on bracken control, Molinia, traditional and modern farm buildings etc.

DA has found the communications side of the project challenging. Ages involved in the training range from 9 years old to 80+ years old. Social media support from the *MTMTE* Team is being utilised, and there has been an article on Radio 4, but DA would appreciate any input from the Board members on this issue.

There are 11 courses still to arrange, and DA is keen to work in partnership with other organisations. HB noted that links with RSPB may be possible, and JC

suggested that conservation groups around Dartmoor would certainly be keen. DNPA's Orlando Rutter (OR) may be able to assist with this.

**ACTION: DA to speak to OR with a view to forming links with outside groups.**

PW asked how the courses were being documented. DA informed the Board that feedback forms are obtained, and actions arising from feedback were followed up.

There was a discussion on the issue and challenge of addressing and measuring matters of diversity. ABy noted that an audience engagement exercise was conducted at the start of the project, but in reality, Dartmoor has less diversity than many areas. PB9 - Moor Boots is the only project specifically targeted at a particular group.

DA was thanked for his time, and he left the meeting.

#### **b) PC8 – Postbridge Visitor Centre (Interpretation)**

RD informed the Board that he would be leaving DNPA on 10 August 2018, when a new project lead would take over the running of PC8 (Sam Hill, DNPA Head of Communications, Economy & Fundraising in the interim). The project's focus will be on interpretation, with a focus on Whitehorse Hill, and the materials will be designed to be used in the current centre but will be transferrable if a new centre is built as planned (outside of the *MTMTE* Scheme).

The proposed Roundhouse is proving problematic. Specialists have advised that the Dartmoor roundhouses, with their granite walls, are more difficult to reconstruct, and there are health and safety concerns in relation to a public building with a thatched roof. The building would need planning permission and building regulations approval. It is also not clear whether the relevant skills are available to construct it.

In total, the project's fund is £184,920 with £7,222.50 spent to date. £50,000 of the remaining budget had been allocated to the roundhouse element.

Options will be discussed with HLF in the meeting on 24 July, and there will be more clarity at the next Board meeting in October.

**ACTION – PC8 Project Lead to update Board at the next meeting.**

RD was thanked for his time, and he left the meeting.

### **5 Highlight Report Review for Year 4, Quarter 3**

#### **a) General Overview**

The report had been distributed in advance. MA informed the Board that most of the projects had a 'green status', with a full breakdown in Appendix A of the report.

Y4Q2 and Y4Q3's claims had both been paid in full, the latter in record time.

MA noted that the last three quarters' claims were significantly below the project leads' forecasts for each of those quarters, with claims being approximately 50% below the amounts forecast. Page 5 of the report includes more detail. Project Leads need to be realistic about when costs will be incurred, as inaccuracy of forecasts will increasingly impact upon confidence as we approach the end of the Scheme – there are now only five quarters remaining and divergence between forecast and expenditure has grown.

DH noted that the Leadership Team have asked MA to meet every Project Lead face-to-face to discuss this and other issues, and this is being included in MA's workplan. TC noted that CSG had also expressed concern about the accuracy of Project Lead reporting, which seems to have deteriorated since steps were taken to address this issue a year ago.

MA informed the Board that HLF had missed a few financial adjustments we had requested in both of the last two quarters, and this has been raised with them. He is awaiting instructions from HLF on how they would like to rectify this.

## **(b) Issues**

Overall, the Scheme is where it should be, though there are three main projects with potential issues: PA4 (Discovering the Nature of the Bovey Valley), PB1 (Believer and Postbridge Trails), and PC8 (Postbridge Visitor Centre).

Six projects have forecast expenditure in the final quarter of the Scheme, and in theory all expenditure should be complete by the end of the penultimate quarter. These are believed to be forecasting errors, with the exception of PD5 (Conservation Apprentices), as this is a legitimate forecast relating to apprentice salaries. There will be face to face discussions with every project lead in the near future to discuss forecasts line by line to ensure that these are as accurate as possible.

Events and activities are going well, with around 20 having taken place in the last quarter, including the RAMM exhibition, nature walks and Parishscapes events. Islington and Bickington's Parishscapes projects are now underway.

Volunteering continues to go well, with a total value equivalent to around £370,000.

PD6 (Dart Valley in Focus) is now underway, and Jasmine Atkinson started her role in June.

Project outputs are being monitored, and the 'top ten' concerns are listed in the appendices to the report. Overall, the position is slightly better this quarter than last.

MA noted that the Communications Strategy was approved in January, but around half of the projects have not yet identified any communication opportunities.

Centrally, social media communications continue to go well, with increased viewing each quarter. There has been a lot of activity this quarter (e.g. the North Hall Manor excavation) which has assisted with this. There has been less printed material this

quarter, but some examples have been added to the folder kept in the meeting room.

JC expressed strong dissatisfaction about the failure to produce a replacement leaflet for the Scheme, with his view being that the 'interim leaflet' is inadequate due to its A5 format; he is disappointed that no progress has been made on this. ABy suggested that the focus, given that the Scheme is nearing an end, should be on a Dartmoor Story leaflet. PW suggested that this was a topic that merited more discussion, and it was agreed that this would be discussed at the next meeting.

**ACTION: AW to include the leaflet as an item on the agenda of the October meeting.**

MA concluded his summary and informed the Board that overall the Scheme was in a slightly worse position this quarter than last due to the issues around PC8 (Postbridge Visitor Centre - Interpretation) and the reduction in confidence as a result of divergence between forecasts and expenditure .

PW suggested that the agenda be prioritised next meeting to include:

1. Legacy
2. Communications
3. Outputs
4. Leaflet

**ACTION: AW to include the above items on the next agenda.**

## **6 Financial Review**

Appendix A of the report shows that most projects are on track, but it is essential that the variance is monitored carefully by Project Leads. The Costs section of the report covers the main issues.

It was noted that PC8 (Postbridge Visitor Centre), if not delivered, would have a net impact of £25,000 on the common fund.

NW gave an overview of projects PA4 (Discovering the Nature of the Bovey Valley) and PD2 (EcoSkills). In terms of the reservoir funding, there is approximately £60,000 left in the budget and NE has secured the funding for this. Fergus Mitchell is reworking the reservoir tenders to attempt to bring the quotes in line with the budget available.

PD2 (EcoSkills) has worked very well, though the trainees' expenses have been more costly than forecast. The project is now looking at delivering 15 trainees rather than the originally planned 20.

## **7 Scheme and Project Queries**

Item removed - issues have been discussed elsewhere.

## 8 **CSG Feedback**

TC provided a summary of the CSG feedback. CSG had noted that Project Leads' communications were essential, and the Project Leads need to be aware of the impact of not providing the information sought. There was also some concern over the frequent absence from this meeting of some of the partner organisations, and the lack of communication and feedback from some partners. Legacy was also discussed at CSG, and will be covered below in item 11.

## 9 **Decisions**

### **Election of new Chair**

All Board members had received notice of RK's nomination and personal information. NW formally proposed that RK be appointed, and HB seconded.

### **DECISION: all in favour of RK's appointment as Chair**

RK said that he would be happy to refrain from voting, to ensure that WT only had one vote at these meetings, as DR would continue to be WT's lead representative. No formal decision was made on this point.

It was agreed that PW would continue to chair for the remainder of this meeting.

## 10 **Outputs**

Information had been distributed in advance. MA requested that if any of the outputs were likely to change, he should be informed as soon as possible as this will need to be raised with HLF at the earliest opportunity.

## 11 **Legacy**

MA has looked at a wide range of sources and former examples of legacy documents from Landscape Partnership Schemes and had sent a summary paper to the Board in advance. His view is that there are two key elements: a strategic overview/statement of intent (which would be a public facing document) and a detailed plan (which would contain details of how the legacy will be achieved), similar to the 'Your Dartmoor' document which includes delivery plans, actions and identifies the lead person/partner who will be responsible.

Project Leads have been asked to update their legacy against the legacy detailed in the pro-forma to enable the Scheme to form a baseline and gather further ideas.

MA considers that there are tangible legacies (e.g. the Dartmoor Story website/ interpretation boards etc) and intangible (e.g. the Moor Medieval study group).

An example of a public facing legacy document from the 'Up on the Downs' LPS had been distributed to the Board in advance.

TC informed the Board that CSG had discussed legacy at length in the last two meetings. He was disappointed that the legacy working group did not materialise, and considers that there is a lot of work to do by October, and this will be a busy

time for the *MTMTE* team. He feels that the legacy document should be celebratory, and facilitate the expansion of the legacy into the rest of Dartmoor. While it is unlikely that HLF will further fund the same area, he feels that there is scope for bids benefitting Dartmoor outside of the current *MTMTE* area. He considers the Excel spreadsheet (labelled 'Legacy Plan') to be an end of project report.

TC considers that proactive support and commitment from partners and others will be essential. Parishscapes has been a great success, and TC recommends that further HLF bids are submitted for this type of project.

PW noted that the drafting of the legacy plan by October will be a challenge and asked who would have input. She wondered if a working group was needed. MA said that this had been planned, but only TC and AK had volunteered. PW asked the Board for additional volunteers. RK said that he would be happy to attend a meeting or workshop.

RK wondered if HLF would agree to aligning the legacy with the Dartmoor Management Plan. TC repeated his view that the legacy should be Dartmoor-wide in scope and queried who would be supporting and funding this project.

MA said that he would be discussing this with HLF in the meeting of 24 July and will arrange a meeting of those interested in forming a working group after that.

**ACTION: MA to arrange a meeting of a Legacy Working Group**

JC said that he was concerned about the lack of attendance and input from some of the partners, and PW noted as above that this is in MA's workplan to address. MA made the point that it would be appropriate for partners to ensure their individual project leads report accordingly as there is a limit to his authority in relation to the project leads employed by the various partners. RK noted that their input is important and essential if they are to have future involvement and ownership.

**12 Communications**

This item has been covered in discussions above.

**13 AOB**

(a) Project Spotlight

Project Leads will be invited to the next meeting in accordance with the priorities identified above and those with significant slippage in their costs, as detailed in the Scheme's Highlight Report, 'Cost' section.

(b) Board Rep for CSG

**ACTION: AW to issue with the distribution of these minutes an invitation for a representative to attend CSG due to take place on 3 October at 6pm.**

(c) End of Scheme Celebration

**ACTION: ALL to consider suggestions and submit ideas to ABy**

**11 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for the 10.30am 9 October 2018. HB and NW proffered their apologies in advance.

PW noted that discussions had been rigorous but acknowledged the complexity of the Scheme and the difficulties this creates. The Board support the team and appreciate the work being done.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 4.30pm