



Minutes of Joint Meeting – LCT and TG&DDC

Tuesday, 25 June 2019, 6pm – 7pm, Garve Village Hall

Present: Ed Tarr (Chair), Tina Hartley (Minutes), Jean Bailey, Lucy Beattie, John Bedwell, Chris Hamilton, Jennifer Haslam, Uisdean Menzies, Carol Smith, Sue Tarr, Sharon Wright

Apologies: Jeanette Fenwick, John Fenwick, Alan Illingworth, Sheila Mitchell, David Raeburn

1. **Welcome** - Ed welcomed everyone to the meeting with the recognition of a large agenda and limited time asking all to be as concise as possible.
2. **Community Energy Strategic Theme Launch** – for the benefit of LCT, John updated the meeting on plans for the for a community event. Members of the Energy Group have recently attended the SHREC (renewable energy) conference which, amongst other things, looked at opportunities and resources to move forward the renewable energy agenda. TG&DDC has decided to run a similar event on a smaller scale to launch this Community Development Plan strategic theme. On another note, John mentioned that that other funding was available to support this theme.
3. **The Garve Agreement** – Sharon informed the meeting that the final document was in for signature but on closer inspection there were several discrepancies which, if the document had been signed, would have had major financial implications. LCT therefore returned the document for amendment. It was expected that the fully amended, final agreement, would be back with LCT for signature very soon and monies released.
4. **Garve Village/Public Hall – Emergency Remedial Work** - Sue had prepared a note to read out to the meeting outlining the recent funding application made to LCT from Garve Public Hall Trustees (attached). 3 questions were raised:-
 - I. LCT guidance for applications that relate to improvement of property is not clear enough, e.g. the supporting evidence that was requested from the hall (proof of ownership, provision of constitution with limited liability of members), Has it been established that this is a requirement?

- II. LCT should hold the same detail for every application relating to property improvements for audit purposes.
- III. For transparency, the scoring and voting process for each application needs to be clearer. From the LCT minutes dated 10 May 2019, 1 Director abstained from approving/rejecting the hall remedial work, and 2 Directors abstained from approving/rejecting the Community Assets Feasibility work. It is not clear to the community and LCT Members why a Director would abstain from voting.

In response the following was discussed:-

LCT confirmed that anyone who applies for this type of (property related) funding received the same level of scrutiny and a clear scoring mechanism is in place and therefore the process was the same for all. For this particular application LCT Board Members needed to find out some further information.

Sue asked if the guidance was clear about exactly what documents needed to be put forward in support of these type of applications. When asked, Tina felt the guidance could be more specific and that she believed she had put forward a full and comprehensive application with all the required documents.

Carol explained that it would be impossible to have a guidance that covered every type of application/scenario e.g. obviously LCT would look into ownership for an application relating to work on a building and if an application came from a children's group they would obviously look at disclosure etc. every application is different and has to be dealt with on a case by case basis.

In terms of Item iii., LCT confirmed that they follow Foundation Scotland's guidance with regard to making information public. Foundation Scotland recommended that scoring details for applications and reasons for abstention need only to be recorded internally and are not for public review.

Carol told the meeting that the Board are currently looking at revamping the scoring procedure especially as the Community Plan is now in place and subsequent new guidance may be issued.

To conclude, Sue asked if the questions posed could be taken back to the whole LCT Board for consideration and response. LCT said that a new Board

would be in place soon, some of whom, will have not been involved with this application and that question iii. had been fully answered. Sue asked again that questions i. and ii. are taken to the new LCT Board for full consideration and response and this was agreed.

5. **Micro-grant Scheme** – Carol handed out a poster, application guidance and form for the new LCT Micro Grant Scheme to be launched soon and asked if this could be publicised on the on-line community hub. She explained that this would be a simple and quick process for applicants. Ed asked about the £200 limit which had been identified and Tina confirmed this was based on TG&DDC original Seedcorn idea.
6. **Strathgarve Primary PTA Support** - Lucy reported that she had met with the Strathgarve PTA who were seeking support in their application to LCT for longer term funding for Strathgarve Primary School. LCT has assisted with previous applications and Carol mentioned that within her own community a scheme was in place that supported applications on a “£ amount per pupil” and kindly agreed to share information with the CEDO’s. Lucy asked if costings for events etc had to be actual and LCT said that indicative costings would be acceptable and that any application should give consideration the longer term impact of funds provided.
7. **Kirkan Windfarm Community Ownership Scheme** - Sharon referred to recent correspondence regarding Kirkan Windfarm and TG&DDC said they had also been contacted regarding a community ownership scheme. LCT had agreed it would not be appropriate for them to enter into any agreements to use monies from one windfarm to support a community ownership scheme with another windfarm. John said that at the moment there is no expertise or capacity within TG&DDC to take this forward. Lucy would therefore respond on TG&DDC’s behalf to correspondence received.
8. **Update - LCT Board Structure following AGM** - Following discussion, the date of the AGM is Wednesday, 21 August 2019. LCT has received one application from a community member to join the Board and Carol mentioned that LCT articles were currently being looked at but Sharon felt this was not relevant in terms of this item.
12. **Meeting closed promptly at 7pm.**

TH/TG&DDC/10.7.19

Joint LCT – TG&DDC Meeting 25th June 2019

Agenda Item: Garve Public Hall Emergency Remedial Work - Sue Tarr

Note read out to the meeting.

Representation to LCT on the application process: it is part of the role of the Development Company to have a clear understanding of the process which LCT go through when dealing with applications for funding; this is important so that we can try and organise our time and resources as efficiently as possible, both from a financial point of view and also from the point of view of community engagement, confidence and motivation.

- TG&DDC recognise that the need for emergency remedial work on the hall was unfortunate. The hall had to close to the public and it also was bad timing in terms of the plans for feasibility work to be undertaken looking at other options which would most likely involve various constructional works being carried out. However, it is essential for various community projects and activities that the Hall is available and indeed the closure period may have highlighted to us just how much we take it for granted that the Hall is always there for us. The TG&DDC priority was to give support to Garve Public Hall to secure the most effective way forward in getting the Hall up and running again.
- TG&DDC is also appreciative that LCT recognised this as an emergency and assisted by accepting the application for funding outwith their normal schedule.
- Brief summary of the application process: on Apr 15th, CEDO, Tina Hartley, submitted an application to LCT on behalf of Garve Public Hall. This was a detailed application with full supporting evidence, including items prepared by professionals where appropriate (Electrical Condition Report, Audited Accounts, application prepared by CEDO).
- The response from LCT disputed the electrician's recommended remedial work; some back and forth resolved this. Then ownership of the Hall was queried, to which the Hall supplied a copy of the Deeds. It should be noted here that the Hall was unaware that LCT intended to send this to their solicitor. LCT then wished to grant funding subject to a condition which appeared ambiguous, then finally approved the funding with a condition acceptable to both parties.
- There were big sighs of relief all round when funds were granted on May 11th and work started on the electricals on the next working day.

For community groups going through this type of process it is frustrating, stressful and demoralising. Projects are more at risk of stalling or even failing as a result.