

**Developing Enterprising Communities** 

### SCOTTISH BORDERS LEADER PROGRAMME 2014-2020

Local Action Group meeting

18<sup>th</sup> April 2017 10.00am – 3.00pm at Tweed Horizons, St Boswells **MINUTES** 

### Present:

Heather Batsch, The Bridge (HB) - Voluntary Frank Beattie, Scottish Enterprise (FB) - Public Gordon Harrison, Scottish Borders Community Council Network (GH) - Voluntary Jules Horne, Creative Arts Business Network (JH) - Private Bryan McGrath, Scottish Borders Council (BMcG) - Public Jane Rosegrant, Borders Forest Trust (JR) – Voluntary Bosco Santimano, You Can Cook (BS) - Private Gary White, Peebles CAN (GW) - Voluntary Douglas Wilson, VisitScotland (DW) - Public

### Secretariat:

Fiona McDougall, Scottish Borders Council (LEADER Co-ordinator) (FM) Simon Lynch, Scottish Borders Council (LEADER Facilitator) (SL) Bartje Magee, Scottish Borders Council (European Programme Support Officer) (BM) Nesta Todd, Scottish Borders Council (European Programme Support Officer) (NT)

		Action
1.0	Apologies	
	Clare de Bolle, YouthBorders (CdB) - Voluntary	
	Luke Comins, Tweed Forum (LC) - Voluntary	
	Ian MacDonald, NFU Scotland (IMacD) - Private	
	Andrew Mitchell, Berwickshire Community Councils' Forum (AM) - Voluntary	
	Annabelle Scott, Mssrs A A Scott (AS) - Private	
	Ian Tod, The Hippodrome Arts Centre CIC Ltd (IT) – Voluntary	
	Hans Waltl, Federation of Small Businesses (HW) – Private - Joined the	
	meeting for the business projects (apologies for morning meeting)	
	Conflict of Interest	
	GH declared interest in SBO/018/192C/014.	
	HB and SL declared interest in SBO/030/192C/032	
2.0	Minutes of last meeting and matters arising:	
	The minutes were adopted as being a true record of the meeting on 24	
	January, 2017.	
	Actions taken: Project outlines were now numbered and timescales clearer.	



	DECIDED THE APPLICATION COULD COME FORWARD AT THE NEXT MEETING,	
	THEREFORE EXCLUDED FROM THE CONVERSATION. IN LIGHT OF THIS THE LAG	
	INFORMATION SENT IN BY APPLICANT HAD NOT BEEN RECEIVED AND WAS	
	THIS PROJECT WAS REJECTED BY THE LAG AT THIS MEETING. HOWEVER,	
	NOTE:	
	Decision: Unanimous rejection.	
	Decision: REJECT see note below	
	Average Score: 46.54%	
	LEADER grant requested: £149,685.44 (60%)	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £251,381.65	
	(SBO/031/192C/035)	
5.5	[Froject details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
3.3	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
	Decision: Project approved unanimously.	
	Decision: APPROVE	
	Average Score: 63.54%	
	LEADER grant requested: £107,920.00 (53.98159264%)	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £199,920.00	
	(SBO/029/192C/030)	
3.2		
3.2	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
	<b>Decision:</b> Project approved unanimously.	
	Background:	
	Decision: APPROVE	
	Average Score: 67.44%	
	LEADER grant requested: £48,362.62 (59.99876930%)	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £80,604.37	
J.1	(SBO/018/192C/014)	
3.1	[Froject details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
 	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
	represented the public sector (<51%)	
	It was noted that 9 members were present (quorate), 3 members	
3.0	Project Applications Round	



	Average Score: 61.28% Decision: APPROVE Decision: Unanimously approved in principle, subject to clarifying the budget by checking the salary scale and making sure all costs are realistically covered. If LAG is satisfied with this information, applicants will receive confirmed final approval of project by e-mail.	
4.0	<b>Co-operation projects guidance - ratification</b> Guidelines for the LAG were previously circulated and the LAG approved them.	
5.0	<ul> <li>Staffing Review</li> <li>The LDS provided for a review of staffing levels where appropriate, to cover increased workload as the programme progresses. It was acknowledged that LARCs was not easing the workload as expected at present. HW had made recommendation of an extra 0.4FTE Project Support Officer.</li> <li>In practice this looks as follows:</li> <li>[Staff member A] 2 days LEADER (+0.5 SBC)</li> <li>[Staff member B] 2.5 days LEADER (+2 SBC)</li> <li>[Staff member C] 3 days LEADER (+2 SBC)</li> <li>LAG discussed if this was enough, approved and decided to look at it again in 2018.</li> </ul>	
6.0	<b>Budget Update</b> FM discussed the budget update setting out revised figures compared to the last LAG meeting. LAG expressed a wish to see a more detailed budget update so that they could more clearly monitor financial progress with the programme. The details should include funds committed and importantly funds spent (on admin as well as projects). Staff to devise an ongoing reporting structure for the next meeting.	FM/BM
7.0	<ul> <li>LEADER Programme Progress Report</li> <li>FM and SL presented the progress report which had been circulated to the LAG. Some items highlighted were: <ul> <li>Survey sent round all applicants (including those not going forward) gave an 80% approval rate. This survey was done pre-LARCs.</li> <li>SL sent round a survey to the LAG to get an idea of what kind of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	LAG



<ul> <li>improve the lay-out of the pipeline document to make it easier to use.</li> <li>Co-operation projects coming forward. Dumfries &amp; Galloway LAG to lead.</li> <li><b>AOB</b> <ul> <li>Query relating to length of lease requirements for a capital project. SL advised that at least a 5 year lease should be in place.</li> <li>LAG would consider future skate park applications on their individual merits.</li> <li>[LAG Member] asked for clarification of protocol item 7.3 In order to avoid conflicts of interest, Local Action Group members will not score applications where their organisation is the project sponsor or lead partner. However, in recognition of the number of partnership projects likely to come forward, members may score applications that they have funded or assisted as 'non-lead' partners. Lead partners will leave the LAG meeting when their project is being assessed. Discussed and understood.</li> <li>[LAG Member] advised that he would prefer to be 'private', rather than a voluntary LAG member. This will be changed on the paperwork.</li> <li>[LAG Member] advised that her organisation was Creative Arts Business Network.</li> <li>FM discussed the Questions and Answers sheet. It is hard sometimes to distinguish between comments and questions. It was decided that future scoring sheets would include separate boxes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	9.0 10.0 8.1	Dates and times of future meetings LAG meeting 18 July, 2017 at Tweed Horizons, 10am – 3pm.  Business Sub-Group Present: It was noted that 5 members were present (quorate) and two members represented the public sector (<51%). LAG members confirmed that there was no conflict of interest in relation to the applications presented.  [Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.] SBO/026/192B/022	
<ul><li>return by 8 May.</li><li>Pipeline is ever increasing, 100+ projects totalling £2.2M. SL would</li></ul>	8.0	<ul> <li>Pipeline is ever increasing, 100+ projects totalling £2.2M. SL would improve the lay-out of the pipeline document to make it easier to use.</li> <li>Co-operation projects coming forward. Dumfries &amp; Galloway LAG to lead.</li> <li>AOB <ul> <li>Query relating to length of lease requirements for a capital project. SL advised that at least a 5 year lease should be in place.</li> <li>LAG would consider future skate park applications on their individual merits.</li> <li>[LAG Member] asked for clarification of protocol item 7.3 In order to avoid conflicts of interest, Local Action Group members will not score applications where their organisation is the project sponsor or lead partner. However, in recognition of the number of partnership projects likely to come forward, members may score applications that they have funded or assisted as 'non-lead' partners. Lead partners will leave the LAG meeting when their project is being assessed. Discussed and understood.</li> <li>[LAG Member] advised that he would prefer to be 'private', rather than a voluntary LAG member. This will be changed on the paperwork.</li> <li>[LAG Member] advised that her organisation was Creative Arts Business Network.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	BM/NT



LEADER grant requested: £49,999 (42.62573743%) Average Score: 58.97%	
Decision: APPROVE	
Decision: Project approved by majority vote.	
[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
SBO/027/192B/028	
Total Eligible Project costs: £22,437.62	
LEADER grant requested: £11,218.81 (50%)	
Average Score: 57.05%	
Decision: APPROVE	
<b>Decision:</b> Approve subject to successful planning application, 4 in favour.	
In addition the LAG request feedback after a year showing the change in	
turnover and head count.	
[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
SBO/028/192B/029	
Total Eligible Project costs: £26,255	
LEADER grant requested: £13127.50 (50%)	SL
Average Score: 60.77%	
Decision: APPROVE	
Decision: Project approved by a unanimous vote.	