

Planning Obligations Board (POB)
Meeting Minutes



Date:	5 October 2017
Time:	14:00 – 16:45 pm
Location:	Dunkery Room, West Somerset House
Chairperson:	Cllr Mandy Chilcott
Minute Taker:	Sara Penn

	Name	Organisation
Attendees:	Cllr Mandy Chilcott (MC) Andrew Goodchild (AG) Cllr Peter Downing (PD) Doug Bamsey (DB) Ross Edwards (RE) Mark Lewis (ML) Andy Coupe (AC) Cllr Clare Aparicio (DH)	WSC Board Member (Chair) WSC Board Member (Reserve) SDC Board Member SDC Board Member EDF Energy Board Member (Reserve) EDF Energy Board Member SCC Board Member SCC Board Member (Reserve)
	Lisa Redston (LR) Andrew Goodchild (AG) Justin Sargent (JS)	CIM Fund Manager (Presenting) WSC Presenter/Observer Somerset Community Foundation (Observer)
Apologies:	David Eccles David Hall Brendan Cleere	

1. Welcome, Agree Previous Minutes, Declarations of Interest

MC welcomed everyone to the Meeting.

No declarations of interest were stated. AC advised the meeting that in respect of the EBP application, he had no knowledge or information relating to the application prior to receipt of the Board papers.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 August 2017 were tabled and were accepted as an accurate record.

Actions Arising from the Last Meeting

Action: AG/LR to prepare a paper setting out a suggested approach to match funding between the CIM Fund and the Community Fund

LR confirmed that it had been agreed between the two funds that match funding bids from the HPC Community Fund would not be accepted by the CIM Fund and vice versa.

Action: JS to circulate a copy of the Research Tender to the Board

It was noted that this had yet to be received by the Board.

JS confirmed that a meeting had taken place between officers from each of the Councils, EDF and the Somerset Community Foundation and the outputs from this consultation had informed their research brief. He confirmed that the survey had been sent out and responses would be collated and reported to the Board.

Action: LR to provide the Board with a report outlining the KPIs for each of the projects in receipt of CIM funding and the results of monitoring reports on a 6 monthly basis.

LR acknowledged that this was still outstanding but advised the Board that work is being undertaken to compile this information.

LR will provide the Board with an update and monitoring report in time for the HPC Community Funds workshop in January 2018. MC felt this would also be a good opportunity for a press release to be prepared outlining achievements.

Action: LR to update the website to reflect that Expressions of Interest will expire after 12 months

LR confirmed that the website has been updated as agreed.

2. Update on West Somerset Council decisions, expressions of interest, project monitoring and financial position

West Somerset Council Cabinet and Full Council Decisions

LR advised the Board that, subject to the conditions recommended by the Board, WSC Council had agreed to release £79,289 from the 1st Annual payment to the Bridgwater Chamber of Commerce for the Supply the Supplier Business Engagement Project. LR will be meeting with them to finalise the Terms & Conditions of the grant.

LR updated the Board on the current position relating to EOI applications.

AG highlighted the need for a clearer understanding of where funds have been allocated and what would be available for the future to ensure best allocation of the remaining funds. MC agreed that a 'map' as previously prepared would be extremely informative. AC stated that a thematic explanation would also be of benefit.

DB agreed and highlighted the need for a rationalised approach. He expressed concern that some of the most impacted areas were not coming forward with projects for funding and suggested that some proactive activity might be needed in these areas, ie Highbridge and Burnham-on-Sea, to ensure they benefit.

DB stated that an understanding of lessons learnt and the number of projects which have 'struggled' and what happens on the ground to resolve these issues would be of huge benefit. What is needed is an understanding of which organisations are actually able to complete their projects once they have been allocated funds. He cited Wembdon Village Hall as an example.

JS stated learning from the CIM Fund will inform how the HPC Community Fund operates going forward and that being able to identify areas of need which could be targeted would be really helpful. He confirmed that the Portal will be online by the end of October and felt that this could help to identify projects both from a social cohesion and geographical aspect.

All were in agreement that a meeting to discuss these issues should be organised.

Action: AG/LR were asked to arrange a meeting to discuss these issues.

The following was agreed by the Board:

Somerset Rural Youth Project

Will be submitting an application by 1 December 2017.

YMCA Somerset Coast

It was agreed that the EOI would be rejected with the advice to prepare a more comprehensive business plan to support any future application.

Accessible Transport West Somerset Ltd (ATWEST)

This EOI has been withdrawn and the applicants are working with HTAP to develop a growth programme.

Home Start West Somerset

This has been redirected to the Somerset Community Fund as this falls within their criteria.

Bridgwater Foodbank

This has been turned down as it does not identify impact relating to HPC development.

Sunshine Pre-school

This has been turned down as they did not provide evidence of HPC families moving into the area who would benefit from this service.

Williton RBL Target Shooting Club

This was turned down as there was no clear evidence of need for the project proposed in relation to impacts of HPC.

Taunton Festival of the Arts

This was directed to the SCF Small Grants fund.

Westfield Reformed Church

This was turned down as it did not show mitigation of impacts. Have also been in receipt of substantial CIM funding.

Cannington Parish Council

MC stated that if the traffic calming measures were to be funded from ring-fenced funds and had the support of the local community, then the Board should consider the application.

3. Consideration of CIM Fund applications

Somerset Education Business Partnership (EBP)

While this bid has been written by SCC, the EBP will be an entity in its own right.

The aim of the EBP is to retain and attract new staff to backfill those areas experiencing displacement of staff due to HPC. They will work to maximise opportunities for young people seeking employment and careers in Somerset.

MC felt that this bid was a more comprehensive application than the previous EBP bid.

MC stated a concern about funding beyond Year 3 and the comment that funding would be sought from the HPC Community Fund. JS confirmed that this was not something that had been discussed at this point in time, but any funding beyond Year 3 would be considered in the light of the delivery of the first 3 years of the project.

AC stated that the HPC Community Fund was only one funding opportunity that would be open to them and it would be considered in the light of the 'landscape' in the future. JS confirmed that it was always recognised that such funding would depend on identification of previous success.

MC expressed concern about the 'business' based ethos of the project. The monitoring criteria identified were business focused, rather than being focused on young people. What was required was a measurement of how many young people would be engaged by the project.

CA advised that the EBP would be using demographic information relating to young people to inform the process going forward.

DB expressed how important it was to 'get this right' and to ensure that this project would make a difference. The monitoring of this project would be of utmost importance.

RE felt that there should be fewer and clearer objectives.

MC stated that, above all, the most important part of the project were the young people.

In response to MC's question, JS confirmed that Councils can apply to the HPC Community Fund as long as the project has charitable objectives.

A vote was taken and all were unanimously in favour of recommending approval of the application from Somerset County Council for the Somerset EBP.

North Petherton RFC

DB acknowledged the challenge presented by this application. The community is clearly experiencing impacts from the HPC development and Junction 24. There are a significant number of people moving into the Parish. The challenge was understanding how this particular bid will mitigate impact.

PD expressed concern at the amount of funding applied for. While he was inclined to support an application from this organisation, he was not convinced that this was the right project.

AC also felt that this application was requesting a considerable amount of funding and he agreed with LR's analysis of the application. He would like to have seen more detail about the impact the project was attempting to mitigate and this lack of information made it difficult to judge the application and come to a decision. AP agreed with these comments.

ML felt that the amount requested felt disproportionate to the impacts being mitigated.

LR highlighted that the new changing rooms will be used mainly by people playing rugby, particularly the junior teams. The changing rooms alone will not mitigate the impacts on the community.

MC advised the Board that the Club were already in receipt of £50k from the Leisure Fund, which was confirmed by DB. The question that needed to be answered was – In the light of access for all, how many people would actually benefit from this project?

DB felt that this was a project looking for funding, rather than a project to mitigate impact. While he acknowledged that there were impacts to be mitigated and, in North Petherton, the rugby club was a good place to locate recreational mitigation, this was not the right project to achieve this.

LR raised the possibility of the applicants looking at an alternative project, such as a gym, which would benefit the wider community. MC expressed concern about the message this would give the rugby club.

LR undertook to work with NPRFC and Sedgemoor DC to give feedback on the application and to help the applicants consider an alternative project.

A vote was taken and it was agreed unanimously to recommend that the application from NPRFC was not approved on the basis that the project did not sufficiently meet the criteria to mitigate community impacts of the HPC development.

Holford Village Hall

RE supported this application.

LR confirmed that the Committee were awaiting Planning Permission which would then enable their Big Lottery application to proceed.

CA also supported this application, commenting that it was a much better bid than the previous one and was for a more reasonable amount of funding.

AC felt that the application had articulated the case well and had answered the Board's questions.

PD felt that while the application was persuasive, he had concerns about how robust it might be. LR confirmed that the grant of funding was dependent on all other funding being in place. MC acknowledged that to raise £10k was a significant achievement.

JS asked if there was scope within the HPC project to offer resource to help with the project management elements of the project, if this proved necessary. EDF representatives were asked to explore potential for this and confirm if this was possible.

A vote was taken and all were unanimously in favour of recommending approval of the bid with the following conditions:

- **Planning permission has been granted for the proposed project.**
- **Match funding has been secured to cover the total project costs as set out in the application.**
- **Following the tender process and selection of a preferred contractor the CIM Fund Manager is satisfied that the project remains affordable.**

Fiddington Village Hall

AP felt that this was not the right project for CIM funding.

DB pointed out that while this is the only facility in the village the application did not address how it would mitigate the impacts of HPC. Work needs to be undertaken with them to address how they can ensure that the village hall mitigates impact.

AG felt that the application should include additional activities the project would provide for the community and workers moving into the area and not just to apply for funds for a refurbishment of the village hall.

RE felt that work needed to be undertaken to encourage the applicants to develop an appropriate project, rather than just rejecting the application. AC stated that there was merit in the application and it was clearly an impacted community.

DB confirmed that there would be a significant increase in population as a result of the caravans in the area.

AG suggested responding with a gentle 'no', with a firm offer of assistance to submit a revised bid. DB confirmed that Sedgemoor would offer support with bid writing.

LR highlighted that any application would need to make clear what services and activities the hall would provide to mitigate impacts, rather than improving facilities for hire.

MC acknowledged that while the bid was for a relatively small amount of money, the Village Hall would not be able to raise these funds themselves.

A vote was taken and all were unanimously in favour of recommending that the application was not approved and that the applicants should be advised to return with a revised application.

Citizens Advice Sedgemoor

DB felt that this was the right organisation, in the right location but the application needed to be refined to ensure that the Board were confident in the applicants ability to deliver targeted mitigation. He suggested a deferral. PD supported this recommendation.

AC expressed concern that he was not clear about the interface between the organisation and its clients. CA agreed and highlighted the lack of clear, positive engagement.

RE stated that while the main impact would be to advise people regarding benefits, there should be less unemployment or need for benefits as a result of the HPC development. DB emphasised the need to highlight the links to the Welfare Unit at HPC.

MC agreed that the application did not contain sufficient information and was concerned about the cost of the training element of the bid and the organisation's capacity to handle large numbers of volunteers. She felt the organisation could be at risk of doing too much, too quickly.

A vote was taken and all were unanimously in favour of deferring a recommendation pending the submission of additional information by the applicant to support their application.

4. Update on EDF Community Fund

JS advised the meeting that the fund had been rebranded and would now be known as the 'HPC Community Fund'.

JS advised the Board that the Portal would be ready for trial w/c 16 October and launched at the end of October.

The fund will be open for small grants from mid-November. The first grants will be awarded in January 2018.

The Awards Panel has been set up.

JS advised the Board that he was in negotiation with a Third Sector organisation to provide support in bid writing for organisations in Bridgwater and West Somerset.

5. Any Other Business

MC drew the Board's attention to the new timetable for applications.

THE MEETING CLOSED AT 16.20 PM

Date of next meeting: 2.00 pm on Thursday 7 December 2017 at West Somerset House