

MOOR THAN MEETS THE EYE LANDSCAPE PARTNERSHIP BOARD

9 October 2018, Meeting Room, Parke, 10.30am

Present:	Ally Kohler	DNPA	AK
	Andy Crabb	DNPA	AC
	David Rickwood	Woodland Trust	DR
	Helen Booker	RSPB	HB
	John Clark	CSG Representative	JC
	Nik Ward	Natural England	NW
	Pamela Woods	DNPA Member	PW
	Ross Kennerley (Chair)	Woodland Trust	RK
	Susan Morris	CSG Representative	SM
	Tony Clark	CSG Representative (Chair)	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

1 Welcome

This was RK's first meeting in the role of Chair; he welcomed the attendees and introduced himself. The other attendees confirmed their names and roles.

2 Apologies

Apologies had been received from Mark Allott, James Platts, Helen Booker and Nik Ward. The other members of the Board were noted absent.

It was confirmed that the meeting was quorate (and noted that CSG members count towards the quorum).

3 Minutes and Actions of the last Landscape Partnership Board meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 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) PC8 - Postbridge Visitor Centre: Project Lead to update Board at the next meeting.

ACTION: 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* - **COMPLETE** Contractors have been appointed and Natural England is confident that the project will be completed and outcomes achieved.

All other actions have been completed.

4 Highlight Report Review

AK led this item in MA's absence.

It was noted that a huge amount of excellent work had been carried out over the summer months, including but not limited to the digs at Holwell and North Hall Manor, open days etc. A very large number of people have been engaged over the last few months.

She noted that the variance against former projections (where forecasts have been made but costs have not been incurred when expected) is being addressed in relation to many of the projects, as the relevant work for a large number of these items has been contracted or tenders are out. There has been a delay, but there is a high level of confidence that the work will happen. The reservoir delay, for example, had been a procurement problem which has now been addressed.

The main concern now is where expenditure is forecast at the very end of the Scheme (or even beyond). Some have already been identified as errors; other items relate to salaries (e.g. the *PA5 - Conservation Apprentices*). MA is picking up this issue to ensure that Project Leads are aware that expenditure needs to be incurred before the cut-off point. There will be no claim after December 2019 (anything after 31 August 2019 only by written agreement): anything left unspent at that point would be an underspend in relation to the Scheme.

AK noted that MA had met most project leads and queried any projected underspends. The vast majority have expressed confidence that they will finish their projects without an underspend (the key exceptions being PC8 and PB1).

RK asked if we had updated figures in relation to the forecasting errors that have been identified, and AK confirmed that these are not expected until the next quarterly reports are due, at the end of Y5Q1 (i.e. 7 December 2018).

The Board felt it was important that the highlight report is as up to date as possible for the meetings and asked that MA provide a late update in relation to key data which changes between the preparation of the report and the Board meeting where practicable.

ACTION: MA to verbally update Board whenever applicable

TC noted that it was essential that MA is confident in the quality of the information being provided to him by the Project Leads, and expressed his view that further approaches should be made to Project Leads, proactively, in order to establish this if there is any doubt.

Three specific projects were discussed:

PC5 – Wray Valley Trail

DCC has spent all of the £845k commitment, with the benefit that brings to the Common Fund, but the risk now relates to the opening of the route before the end of the Scheme. DCC has now secured additional funding to continue with the project, and there is high confidence that the trail will open in time, but the surface may not be of the quality originally anticipated. This has been shared with HLF, whose main concern is to see the route opened. AK is confident that DCC are doing everything they can to ensure the success of the project. The Board noted that this had been a concern for some time, and they were pleased that progress is now being made again.

ABy added that the delay has impacted his PC1 project in relation to the associated Wray Valley Trail interpretation. It will be important to be mindful of the risk of leaving the interpretation too late, and if time runs short, it may be necessary to produce off-trail interpretation (e.g. leaflets etc.).

PC8 – Postbridge Visitor Centre

The original brief had been to extend the visitor centre and the interpretation at the centre. After various iterations, the aim now is that the centre will be extended but through a different funding source, with the interpretation paid for by *MTMTE*. The interpretation work is expected to be completed by May 2019, using a contractor. The new works will be moved into the extended centre when complete, and during the building works there is scope for these to be displayed at Princetown Visitor Centre.

It has been agreed by the Leadership Team at DNPA that they do not have the capacity to complete the roundhouse element within the scope of the Scheme, though its construction at some point in the future remains an ambition, though AK made it clear that DNPA could make no definitive promises. In terms of *MTMTE*, this was always an additional outcome, and HLF has accepted the removal of this element.

PB1 – Bellever and Postbridge Trails (external interpretation)

The tender is out for this and there is a high level of confidence that it will be delivered by the end of May 2019. The only concern in relation to this project is that the costs are likely to be less than anticipated, leaving an underspend.

The Forestry Commission (FC) also have elements to deliver in this project, and AK has asked FC for a meeting. The Project Lead has had assurances from FC that they will deliver, but AK believes a meeting will be helpful.

ACTION: AK to update Board on the result of the update/meeting

5 Financial Review

RK noted that good progress has been made but work still needs to be done. Discussions with HLF are necessary, along with their approval for certain changes in relation to the final 12 months of the Scheme.

It was noted that HLF will retain 10% towards the end of the Scheme. DNPA will be looking very closely at claims to ensure that outcomes are delivered by partners, as DNPA carries the financial risk in relation to the non-payment of any elements by HLF. Payments may be withheld by DNPA if issues are identified.

The Board agreed that all partners need to be accurate and supportive as the Scheme draws to a close.

TC noted that the CSG's view was that partners had contractual obligations and a legal duty to work together to ensure the Scheme's success; his view was there are opportunities at this stage for the Scheme Manager to incentivise the partners to provide accurate data. He added that lack of clarity at this stage represents a threat to the legacy of the Scheme, and it is essential that the *MTMTE* team does all within its power to obtain the relevant and accurate data, and that the partners use their influence within their organisations to ensure this happens.

It was agreed that the following statement should be emphasised in these minutes:

Partners who are failing to comply with their obligations under the Scheme need to take action to address these issues without delay

ACTION: MA to remind partners of their contractual obligations

ACTION: all present to ensure the Project Leads within their organisations provide timely and accurate reporting

Some specific projects were discussed: PA2 and PA3 have reporting issues as the Project Lead has left; PA5 was delayed this quarter as the Project Lead was at excavations and in the field during the reporting period; PC1 and PD6 were filed late due to the Project Lead's busy schedule during the reporting period, but were in time for claims to be made; PC4 was delayed, reason unknown.

AK also felt that there was still some uncertainty among some Project Leads, and the view was expressed that project leads need both support and pressure from the *MTMTE* team. AK noted that establishing increased certainty had been one of the aims of the recent Project Lead meetings conducted by MA. The Board were still not sure that sufficient certainty existed in relation to the position of some of the projects and felt that additional work needed to be done, with prioritisation by the Scheme Manager where appropriate.

ACTION: MA to obtain greater certainty in relation to projects which appear to have queries in relation to expenditure or delivery of outputs.

AK noted that the Project Leads should be aware that the primary purpose of the quarterly report is to look forward, not report on what has happened.

6 CSG Feedback

TC led this item. He noted that CSG had given feedback at their meeting last week: the Holwell Hut Circle excavation was excellent, the North Hall Manor dig was also very good, especially the Open Day, which was a great success. The 40th Anniversary of the Lustleigh Society was also a success, with a large turnout, not just from the immediate area. A day spent searching for North Bovey Manor was entertaining, even though the manor was not found.

TC had commented on the use of Facebook by *MTMTE* and said that the videos really shine through, giving a human touch to the Scheme (particularly ABy and ES).

It was useful that CSG now includes two parish councillors.

CSG were more critical about the lack of detail and the existence of uncertainty in relation to some elements of the Scheme.

ABy took this opportunity to note thanks to John Clark and Susan Morris for their support at his Lantern Walk event over the weekend.

7 Decisions

RK proposed that the Legacy element be dealt with in this item as decisions are required.

(a) Project underspend reallocation

AK noted that there were two confirmed underspends (PC8 and PB1) totalling £73k. Both of these projects contribute to the common fund, so are important for the funding of other projects.

AK noted that if DNPA allocate the £58k from PC8, it will be necessary to obtain match funding from the benefiting partner.

Staff overheads are anticipated to be overspent by £32k at present. DNPA propose that the Scheme asks HLF to agree to allocate some of the underspend to deal with this. It was also noted that ABy's contract is due to end in June, and there is scope for him to add value to the Scheme beyond that date if he is retained.

<ABy was asked to leave the room>

PW proposed that the staffing overspend be dealt with as a priority, together with the extension of ABy's contract. It was noted that some other team members may leave, but it was agreed that the Board had to deal with the known factors.

It was agreed by the Board that their preference in relation to the underspend was:

1. Staffing overspend and ABy's extension to be proposed to HLF

2. Other projects need to be prioritised into a second tier.

ACTION: AK/MA/RK delegated to prioritise second tier of underspend allocation

3. AK/MA/RK to report back to the Board at the next meeting on progress of underspend allocation

ACTION: AK/MA/RK to report back to the Board at the next meeting on progress of underspend allocation

<ABBy returned to the room>

(b) Legacy

A Legacy Development Strategy was tabled. AW explained that this had been emailed to the group on Friday, but he had discovered immediately before the meeting that DNPA had encountered email problems on Friday and the email had not been delivered. Reading time was therefore given.

TC expressed disappointment that the document had been produced late and noted that even if it had been delivered on Friday, it would have been a very short period for the Board to consider the paper. AW was thanked for preparing the document.

This document is intended as a framework for preparing the legacy, with the main points to be covered included. AW was asked to distribute the document for comment (including to CSG), with comments to be returned to MA.

TC noted that there are two elements which should be included:

1. The extent to which the rest of Dartmoor and the surrounding towns will be included in the legacy
2. How *MTMTE* will be supported for the five years beyond the Scheme, and how areas beyond the *MTMTE* area will be funded, with possible scope for more funding applications beyond the *MTMTE* area.

?RP? noted that he was keen to see a well-developed action plan.

The deadline for submission to HLF of 11 November was discussed. It was noted that this was a self-imposed deadline, not HLF imposed, but it was agreed that it would be a good target date.

Other legacy assets were noted to be the Dartmoor Story website and a potential *MTMTE* visitor centre display.

It was agreed:

1. Any comments on the document in the next few days are to be sent to MA
2. It will be discussed with HLF next week
3. The aim is to have a full legacy plan to submit to HLF by 11 November 2018

4. AK/DR/RP/RK/TC and the *MTMTE* team are delegated to develop the plan

ACTION: any comments on the legacy to be submitted by 2 November 2018

TC noted that CSG had been confused by the terminology being used to describe the documents to be produced, and he noted that the document under discussion was helpful in clarifying that.

8 Outputs

It was agreed that this would be discussed at the next meeting.

9 Legacy

This was discussed in item 7

10 Communications

ABy led this item which covered three items:

(a) Events:

A large number of events have taken place over the last few months, including schools involved in a new way of delivering the John Muir Award, the North Hall Manor dig/walks/talks/open day involving around 620 people, the Holwell dig, Lustleigh heritage weekend, wildlife events, the Lantern Walk and a Parishscape event in Ashburton.

(b) Communications Plan

This has been added to further by some partners, but not by all partners. The Scheme has received some good press coverage, and the Scheme's Twitter and Facebook presence continues to grow. BBC Spotlight covered both the North Hall Manor and Holwell hut circle digs.

ABy noted that it can be difficult persuading media to mention *MTMTE* and/or HLF in their broadcasts, but attempts are made wherever possible.

The Scheme made the national press with Woodland Trust's national magazine, with *MTMTE* receiving several mentions.

(c) Celebration Event

ABy noted that this is summarised in the draft legacy document. The current plan is to run Day 1 from 1pm, with a wide range of invitees, including volunteers, schools and various dignitaries. Day 2 will be a public day with activities, music etc. and will present an opportunity to showcase many elements of the Scheme.

ABy proposed that a working group be formed to organise the event.

ACTION: ABy to consider what skills and assets will be required for the celebratory event and bring to the next Board meeting

ACTION: ALL to let ABy know if they wish to be involved

RK asked if the *MTMTE* 'brand' was in the draft management plan. ABy noted that the Dartmoor Story was now up and running and was intended to be the brand for the longer term legacy. ABy was meeting a film company to discuss the main website video immediately after this meeting, and four 'character' films are also to be produced.

11 **AOB**

(a) Scheme leaflet

TC noted that issues with shortage of the scheme leaflet in visitor centres had been identified. MA is dealing with this.

It was also noted that the next version of the leaflet would focus on the legacy.

(b) Project Spotlight

Projects which may be appropriate for the 'spotlight' in the next meeting were discussed, and suggestions included Parishscapes, Natural England's reservoir sub-project, and FC's outstanding work on PB1. It was also suggested that Lee Bray be invited to discuss Holwell and the finds of that excavation.

ACTION: MA to select projects to highlight at the next meeting, and invite the relevant individuals

(c) Board representative at CSG meeting 6pm 16 January 2019

AC volunteered to attend this meeting on behalf of the Board.

(d) Other items

- i) TC encouraged the Board members to attend the WW1 exhibition at Princetown Visitor Centre.
- ii) It was noted that AW was leaving *MTMTE*, and he was thanked for his input over the last few months. AK informed the Board that the intention was to recruit internally if at all possible.

11 **Date of next meeting**

Thursday 24 January 2019 at Parke, 10.30am