

Links are in red

From: "Skirton, Sara" <skirtons@mendip.gov.uk>
To: "Mendip LSP" <MendipLSP@mendip.gov.uk>; "Thomson, David" <thomsond@mendip.gov.uk>; "Brown, Stuart" <browns@mendip.gov.uk>; "Roger Kershaw" <RJKershaw@somerset.gov.uk>; <jonathan.Stratford@avonandsomerset.police.uk>
Cc: "Maria Clarke" <MAClarke@somerset.gov.uk>; "Perkins, Kate" <perkinsk@mendip.gov.uk>; "Dicken, Claire" <dickenc@mendip.gov.uk>; "Harrison, Sue" <harrisons@mendip.gov.uk>; <Linda.sayers@avonandsomerset.police.uk>; <netta@eliminwells.org.uk>; "Hannah Norman" <HNorman@somerset.gov.uk>; "Community Strategy Project Group" <CommunityStrategyProjectGroup@mendip.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 September, 2004 11:03
Attach: 9 MSP Funding Programme 2004-05.doc; 11 Budget report.doc; 3 MSP minutes 130704.doc; 5 Election of Vice Chair and Membership Changes.doc; 8 Action Planning - identifying priorities.doc; 1 Agenda 28.09.04.doc
Subject: MSP Board meeting 28th September 2004 - Agenda

Dear MSP Board member, please find attached the agenda and papers for the meeting of the Mendip Strategic Partnership Board on Tuesday 28th September 2004 at Wells Town Hall, commencing at 3pm.

The following documents should accompany this message:

1. [Agenda](#)
3. [Minutes of the meeting of 13th July 2004](#)
5. [Election of Vice Chair and Membership Changes](#)
8. [Action Planning –Identifying priorities](#)
9. [MSP Funding Programme 2004-05](#)
11. [Budget Report](#)

With regard to the MSP Funding programme, I'm aware that Board members and colleagues may get queries from people who have submitted projects about when they will know if their bid has been successful. If this happens I would be grateful if you could tell them that I will contact them about the outcome as soon as is practicable after this MSP Board meeting.

Many thanks

Sara Skirton
Community Planning and Consultation Officer
01749 341340

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses by MCI's Internet Managed Scanning Services - powered by MessageLabs.
For further information visit <http://www.mci.com>



Mendip Strategic Partnership
Board Meeting 28th September 2004
3pm at Wells Town Hall

Agenda

- 1. Apologies**
- 2. Public Participation**
- 3. Minutes of the meeting of 13th July 2004**
- 4. Children's Centre Developments and the role of the Children's Services Planning Group**
Presentation from Elaine Pugsley, NCH
- 5. Election of Vice Chair and Changes to Board Membership**
To elect a Vice Chair of the MSP Board and to note changes to membership
- 6. Mendip District Council's Comprehensive Performance Assessment**
Verbal report from Stuart Brown, Business Manager, Corporate Finance and Resources
- 7. Somerset Strategic Partnership – Vision and Community Strategy**
Copies previously circulated. Verbal report to be presented by a representative of Somerset County Council
- 8. Action Planning – Identifying Priorities**
The Board is asked to agree priorities for action and a framework for developing action plans to achieve them, leading to the completion of the Community Strategy and Action Plan for Mendip
- 9. MSP Funding Programme 2004/05**
The Board is asked to approve the programme of funding proposed by the Budget and Finance Sub Group, as detailed in the report
- 10. Shepton 21**
Verbal update for information
- 11. Budget Report**
Report for information
- 12. Any Other Business**
- 13. Dates of future meetings**
The next scheduled Board meeting is on 30th November, commencing at 3pm, venue to be arranged. To consider dates for meetings in 2005.



Mendip Strategic Partnership

Minutes of the meeting of the Mendip Strategic Partnership held on Tuesday, 13th July 2004 at 3 p.m. in the Assembly Rooms, Christchurch Street West, Frome

PRESENT: Penny Church Frome Citizens Advice Bureau
 Cllr. Elizabeth John Councillor, Mendip DC
 Penny Baker MACOC
 Chief Insp. John Stratford Avon and Somerset Constabulary
 Roger Martin CPRE
 Nick Cottle SALC
 Zena Pollard Barclays Bank

MENDIP DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICERS PRESENT:

Simon Eames	Senior Policy Officer
Sara Skirton	Community Planning and Consultation Officer
David Thomson	Chief Executive
Peter McKenzie	Corporate Financial Adviser
Ros Wilkins	Community Grants Officer
Kate Perkins	Committee Clerk

ALSO PRESENT:

Jon Roberts	RSM Robson Rhodes
Peter Grainger	Somerset County Council
Michelle Hawkes	PCT (observer)

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:

Elaine Pugsley, Ron Ballantine, Karen Deverell, Ian Bennett, Sue West, Ian Wallace, Pat Champion, Cllr. Harvey Siggs, Cllr. Cathy Bakewell and Pastor Stephen Fowler.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Minute 9 would be checked with Zena Pollard. Otherwise the minutes were accepted as a correct record.

4. MDC – REVIEW OF STRATEGIC AND OTHER PARTNERSHIPS

Jon Roberts referred to the External Audit report and Summary Findings Matrix circulated to the meeting. He reported that a high priority for the CPA regime was partnership working, and the MSP had been selected for audit. There was still a need for effective monitoring and skills knowledge to deliver the Community Strategy. Assessment by ODPM found:

- Strategic perspective - there is ownership amongst partner organisations and feeling for the Strategy
- Strategic direction - improved clarity of vision – action planning is a priority
- Inclusivity - has improved and the Council's role has been effective, with meetings well conducted. There should be representation from other groups, particular youth groups, in partnership activities. There are no community development workers in the Council.
- Action focus – there is a need to look at service gaps and actions.
- Performance management – this is the next priority after the action plan is in place
- Efficiency of partnership – links with other regional partners. Effective IT is in place. Information sharing across the region would be useful, and action plans need to be properly costed.
- Learning and development – future training arrangements will need to be formalised.

The Council's management comments to the recommendations were as follows:

- R1 It was agreed at the meeting that all partners should take responsibility for communicating the Strategy
- R2 Will be delivered within the current resources by MDC – December 2004
- R3 Agreed in principle. Reference was made to the role of SALC and Parish Forum
- R4 MDC acknowledge that the next stage is identifying the gaps and build into partners' delivery plans. The Task Group will progress.
- R5 Representation through Ron Ballantine. MSP will take formal stock of duplications and gaps.
- R6 The difficulty of getting the public to meetings is an ongoing issue
- R7 Work will commence July 2004, together with the MSP Action Plan
- R8 Low priority, longer term – already links with Shepton 21
- R9 Progress is being made, and the Task Group are working on this
- R10 Web site has been developed and further development around IT will depend on resources

R11 A longer term investment after the production of the action plan. Stock should be taken at this stage of future needs.

It was agreed that the Partnership would work with the Council in taking forward the recommendations via the Task Group. Nick Cottle would also progress SALC involvement.

5. MENDIP LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

The report from Simon Eames was noted. Simon explained that although the Local Plan will automatically be saved for three years, by that time the Council will have to have the Local Development Framework in place. Although the LDF is about planning and control decisions, it is also about shaping decisions around the wider community. The Council is required to prepare a programme, called a Local Development Scheme, for preparing its LDF. Richard Dixon is currently working with a small group of MDC Councillors supporting the Portfolio Holder in drawing up the first LDS for recommendation to Cabinet. The Government is keen for Local Authorities to move quickly to the new scheme and enlist LSPs in sounding out key partners. Key aspects of the new system are:

- Setting out in a Statement of Community Involvement the ways that the Council will engage communities in preparing the policy documents
- Setting out standards in a Statement of Community Involvement which prospective applicants will need to meet in consulting with people before they submit applications for major development
- Setting out in the LDS the priority documents to be produced and ensuring that what is in the Scheme is realistic and can be delivered. One optional extra is proposed to be included, and this will take in the area action plan for Shepton Mallet.

Simon explained that the small group of councillors was keen to include a policy document to support the social and economic regeneration of rural areas but that it had not been possible to include this in the first LDS, as the resource did not currently exist. If an additional resource could not be found it will be considered for year 4 as the programme is rolled forward. The Board was being asked to endorse the priorities and the inclusion of the Shepton Mallet document.

The Partnership agreed to support the content of the draft LDS and the priority documents for the first three years. The inclusion of an Area Action Plan for Shepton Mallet was especially welcomed. It was also agreed that a resource contribution would be considered in the context of the Second Homes funding.

6. VOLUNTARY SECTOR SUPPORT

Ros Wilkins introduced her report on ways in which the Council supports the voluntary sector in Mendip and in particular the formation and work of Mendip Community Support.

Ros also circulated documents relating to the draft Somerset Compact “Rules of Engagement”, and asked for input from the MSP on the five policy statements. There will be consultation on the Code of Practice and each partner organisation was asked to ensure that the consultation response forms are completed and returned.

It was agreed that:

- **MSP support the draft Compact**
- **MSP agreed the proposed Codes of Practice**
- **Comments would be passed to Penny Church to feed back to Ros Wilkins**
- **MSP representation on the steering group would be checked and confirmed at the next meeting.**

7. CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO DRAFT COMMUNITY STRATEGY

Sara Skirton reported that the draft Strategy had been made available for stakeholder consultation during May and June and responses received were summarised on the table attached to the report. Response letters had also been received from Mendip District Council and Mendip Primary Care Trust.

Main concerns were around the lack of focus on young people, which will be looked at through the Task Group; the need for “plain English” and the ability to deliver, particularly in the light of changes at MDC, which will be addressed through the action planning process. Sara Skirton and Nick Cottle will discuss the Parish and Town Council responses.

In response to a query from Roger Martin, Simon Eames said that the Government saw Building Control as the primary means by which energy resource conservation could be built into the housing stock, although there was scope through the use of policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance to influence development.

The Partnership agreed to delegate the task of amending the Community Strategy to reflect the responses and preparing a final version for approval by the MSP Board to the MSP Task Group, in conjunction with key Board members where appropriate.

8. AUDIT OF PARTNER ACTION PLANS – GAP ANALYSIS

The report and tables were noted and discussed. Areas where there were no “status 1” actions had been identified and the following areas were highlighted:

- ADJD4 – an important aim for the Strategy. The MSP will contact the Glastonbury Development Trust

- Energy and Waste – there is a lack of lead agency on some aims. Shepton 21 will be highlighting aims 3, 4, and 5 and there should be promotion of the Green Business Club
- Food – there is no direct link with the Mendip Food Network. Roger Martin's suggestion that aims 1e, 1f, and 1g be deleted was noted.

It was suggested that the MSP should concentrate on the areas where there are specific actions, and work towards those where there are gaps.

It was agreed that the document would be reviewed on a regular basis. Members of the Board were asked to let Sara Skirton know of any activities which had not been captured in the table.

9. REVISED FINANCIAL PROTOCOL FOR THE MSP

The report was noted and **the Board agreed the proposed financial protocol as outlined in the report.**

10. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FROM SECOND HOMES COUNCIL TAX

The report was noted and the meeting agreed that more time was needed to consider the individual bids for funding. It was also agreed that the availability of this funding should be given wider publicity on the website and through the local Press. Each member of the Board would also use their network to invite bids. Peter McKenzie confirmed that the available funds this year amounted to £123,000, and that it could be assumed that this would be available for future years.

It was agreed that:

- **The availability of funds would be publicised – Zena Pollard to work with Grenville Jones on press releases.**
- **A Sub Group would be set up as outlined in (11) of the financial protocol. Sara Skirton will approach the appropriate individuals.**
- **The deadline for receipt of applications will be the end of August. The Business and Finance group will meet mid September, with recommendations for allocation of funds by October.**

11. MEMBERSHIP ISSUES

The report was noted and Ros Wilkins explained that voluntary sector representation was for an elected individual rather than an organisation.

It was agreed that:

- **Kate Jefferies of English Nature would join the Board as an environment sector representative, on the understanding that she would only be able to attend three meetings per annum**
- **The Chairmanship and Vice-Chairmanship would be reviewed in September**
- **A representative would be co-opted from Mendip Community Support.**

12. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DEPRIVATION IN MENDIP – INDEX OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION

The report was noted. It was agreed that members of the Board would submit any views to Sara Skirton on how this issue should be addressed in the future.

13. RURAL PROOFING – MSP AND THE DRAFT COMMUNITY STRATEGY

The report and checklist were noted. Nick Cottle will discuss Parish Council liaison with South Somerset.

14. SHEPTON 21

Zena Pollard reported that there had been no response to the letter which had been sent out. Although there are still some areas of frustration, progress was being made with specific parts of the project, and there had been a good response from some Parish Councils and MDC. Talks were taking place with developers on one issue. Good work is being carried out around transport and roundabouts.

Zena confirmed that the wording of item 9 in the minutes of the last meeting did not need amendment.

15. BUDGET REPORT

In Stuart Merritt's absence, Sara Skirton reported that there had been little expenditure against the MSP budget.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

a) **Down to Earth** – A leaflet publicising this conference aimed to promote sustainability issues, particularly within church communities, was circulated.

17. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Tuesday, 28th September 2004 at 3 p.m.
Tuesday, 30th November 2004 at 3 p.m.
Venues to be arranged.

The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item: 5

FROM: Community Planning and Consultation Officer
- MDC Date: 28th September 2004

SUBJECT: Election of Vice Chair and Membership Changes

1. SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report highlights the changes in recent months to Board membership and any implications these may have for the Board.

1.2 Following the resignation of Cate le Grice Mack from the Board, Tony Shepherd of Mendip Community Support has agreed to be co-opted to the Board as a voluntary sector representative, pending the outcome of the Voluntary Sector Elections to be held later this year.

1.3 Due to a job change, Penny Church has had to stand down from the Board. This resignation means that the Board needs to elect a Vice Chair and also leads to the loss of an additional voluntary sector representative, which will also need to be addressed via the Voluntary Sector Elections.

1.4 Kate Jeffreys of English Nature has agreed to join the MSP Board.

1.5 Councillor Elizabeth John will be assisting Cllr Harvey Siggs in representing Mendip District Council on the MSP Board.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 MSP Board members are asked to note the Board membership changes and elect a Vice Chair for the MSP Board.

Contact Officer: Sara Skirton 01749 341340
skirtons@mendip.gov.uk

The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item: 8

FROM: Community Planning and Consultation Officer
-MDC

Date: 28th September 2004

SUBJECT: Action Planning – Identifying Priorities

1. SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

1.1 The draft Community Strategy for Mendip went out to stakeholder consultation during May and June 2004. The redrafting of this document is underway, taking into account the consultation responses where appropriate. The final Community Strategy will need to be supported by a medium term action plan that sets out exactly what work will be undertaken to achieve the Strategy aims, which partners will be involved and where the resource commitment is coming from.

1.2 Whilst the majority of consultation responses expressed support for the draft Strategy, some comments indicated that that further work was need to:

- demonstrate how the long term aims would actually be achieved
- ensure that the Strategy was relevant to all groups including young people, children and people with disabilities

1.3 During the draft Strategy consultation period, the Task Group undertook an audit of existing partner action plans to map out current and planned activity against the long term aims and themes of the Strategy and to produce from this a gap analysis which was considered by this Board at its meeting on 13th July 2004.

1.4. It was agreed that the MSP Task Group would use the consultation responses and the audit/gap analysis to help develop an action plan which would set out exactly how the themes and aims of the Strategy will be achieved. Officers and Task Group members acknowledged that although all of the aims under all eleven themes in the draft Strategy were important, it was necessary to focus in and identify some priorities for action in the short to medium term.

1.5 The Task Group met on 20th August 2004 and identified the following as potential priorities for action that could be adopted by the Board and reflected in the work of each partner agency:

- Secure ownership of environmental and climate change issues by the relevant agencies and organisations
- Secure ownership of Energy and Waste aims 3 to 5:

3. To ensure that systems and strategies are in place to reduce transport energy demand and impact through influencing peoples' travel choices, including making walking and cycling easier, safer and more attractive

4. To ensure that systems and strategies are in place to reduce energy demand as much as possible and carefully match the type of supply to needs and wider environmental impacts

5. To ensure that businesses are aware and able to take advantage of opportunities in the developing energy efficiency, waste reduction and recycling, sustainable production and renewable energy markets

by the relevant agencies and organisations, which includes District and County Councils, the Business Community, the Environmental Voluntary Sector and Education.

- Ensure access to locally produced healthy food
- Ensure that Mendip continues to be a working district providing diverse job opportunities for local people
- Ensure adoption of the Ways to Learn Aims by other key education providers in Mendip
- Ensure all key agencies linked to the MSP have a Green Travel Plan
- Develop links with the Safety Camera Partnership to address issues around road safety in Mendip
- Improve health and reduce health inequalities
- Build capacity in the voluntary sector

Plus:

- Ensure the needs and aspirations of young people are included across all themes

1.6 This list of potential priorities still represents a very broad agenda and presents the challenge of how the actions necessary to deliver them will be identified, implemented and monitored. One possible course of action which has been adopted by some LSPs is to set more than one task group, with each one being given responsibility for a particular theme or group of themes. These task groups would be accountable to the main LSP Board.

1.7 The MSP has made use of themed working groups in the past but these tended to be 'task and finish' groups. Task groups set up to develop, deliver and monitor actions for the Community Strategy would need to have a longer life and for this model to work, resources would need to be identified at the outset to co-ordinate and support these groups.

1.8 It has been suggested that the MSP Board might consider setting up four MSP Task Groups – Environment, Economy and Social, plus a cross-cutting Young People group. Each group could take forward the appropriate priorities for action, including those identified by the existing Task Group, and develop an appropriate and resourced action plan for approval by the MSP Board.

2. TIMESCALES

2.1 The target of finalising the draft Community Strategy and produce the supporting action plan by September 2004 has not to been achieved. The reasons for this include limited capacity to progress the work over the summer period, due in part to the need to redirect resources to administer the second homes Council Tax funding programme.

2.2 Whilst being aware of the pressing need to make progress, there may be some practical merit in delaying the action planning process by a few months. Many of the larger agencies represented on the MSP will be going through their own business and budget planning cycles during the autumn and winter. By taking into account any priorities for action agreed by the MSP Board at this meeting, these agencies will be better placed to ensure the integration of MSP priorities with their own organisation's priorities (to the appropriate extent) and can therefore ensure capacity exists to deliver of both sets of priorities. This should help the MSP arrive at an action plan that is realistic, achievable and owned by all partners.

2.3 The timescale for delivering a final Community Strategy and action plan will depend on the method chosen to develop the action plan and the resources made available to do so. There is however considerable pressure for Mendip District Council (the partner with the statutory duty to ensure preparation of a community strategy) to ensure that the Community Strategy is finalised and adopted as soon as possible. Taking these factors into account the following timetable is suggested:

End Sept 2004	-	MSP agree priorities for action and preferred model for addressing them, e.g. themed task groups
Oct – end Nov	-	All partners incorporate agreed priorities into their business and budget planning process
		Task Group(s) develop themed action plans
		Task Group(s) finalise draft Community Strategy document
Nov 04 or Jan 05	-	MSP Board approve draft Action Plans
Feb / March 05	-	Action plans finalised subject to budget-setting outcomes
		Community Strategy and Action Plan adopted and published

ID	Task Name	October	Novemb	Decemb	January	Februa	March	April	May
		Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May
1	MSP Agree priorities for action	28/09							
2	Community Strategy document revised								
3	Community Strategy document approved			30/11					
4	Action plan								
5	Priorities reflected in Business Plans and budget setting								
6	Task Group(s) develop SMART actions								
7	Draft action plan			23/11					
8	MSP approves action plan			30/11					
9	BP and Budget process								
10	Action plan finalised								
11	Final CS and AP								

3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 MSP Board members are asked to:

- agree priorities for action and incorporate them as appropriate into their organisations' business planning cycle
- agree a mechanism for developing priorities into actions and how this will be resourced
- agree the proposed timescale for finalising the Community Strategy and Action Plan

Contact Officer: Sara Skirton 01749 341340 skirtons@mendip.gov.uk

The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item: 9

FROM: Budget and Finance Sub Group Date: 28th September 2004

SUBJECT: MSP Funding Programme 2004/05

1. SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

1.1 At its meeting on 13th July 2004 the MSP Board discussed how it wished to allocate the second homes Council Tax funds that had been made available to it. The Board decided to invite groups and organisations to bid for funding for projects that would help deliver the long terms aims of the draft Community Strategy. A press release was issued to raise awareness of the availability of the funding.

1.2 35 applications were received by the closing date of noon on 31st August 2004. The amounts requested meant that the funds were vastly oversubscribed.

1.3 The External Funding Officer, Community Grants Officer, and Community Planning Officer of Mendip District Council undertook an initial scoring of the applications to provide the Budget and Finance Sub Group (BFSG) with a framework for evaluation. The proforma used for scoring is attached as appendix 1 (it should be noted that the proforma is designed so that a low score means that the project has a better fit with the criteria than a high score). Comments from members of the MSP Task Group were also passed to the BFSG for consideration.

1.4 The BFSG met on 16th September 2004 to make recommendations to the MSP Board on which projects should be funded and at what level. The notes from this meeting, which include recommendations for funding, are attached as appendix 2 to this report.

1.5 The total value of the proposed funding programme is £73,860. If approved, this leaves the Board with funds of up to £36,000 to commit in 2004/05.

1.6 The BFSG did not allocate any funds to playgrounds and village halls at its meeting on 16th September as it wished to consider how the MSP should best respond to such applications. Following the meeting the Chair of the MSP has prepared the following statement:

Taking into account the total level of funds available to the MSP and the wide range of funding bids received for projects appropriate to its objectives and plans, the MSP normally cannot consider bids for funding the major building or redevelopment of halls and playgrounds.

The MSP, however, wishes to support community activities as far as possible and will therefore consider bids on the following conditions:

- 1 *Bids should relate to facilities open to the community and not to 'member clubs'*
- 2 *Bids should be for funding towards improvements to halls and playgrounds that*
 - *improve access, especially for disadvantaged groups*
 - *protect existing facilities against crime, vandalism, etc*
 - *create new required amenities to the benefit of local people*
- 3 *It should be shown that other funding has been/is being sought - including through local fundraising*

The MSP will reserve a proportion of the total funding available for such community bids and will have to allocate to individual projects within this proportion. Accordingly, some bids may have to be rejected or held over for future consideration.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 MSP Board members are asked to approve:

- the statement put forward by the Chair regarding funding for village halls and playgrounds
- the funding programme proposed by the BFSG

Contact Officer: Sara Skirton 01749 341340
skirtons@mendip.gov.uk

MSP Funding Proposal Project Assessment Sheet

Ref	Organisation	Project Name

Criteria	Score 1 – 5 where 1 is highest and 5 is lowest					Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	
To what extent does the project meet community strategy and MSP aims and priorities						
Is there strong evidence of need for the project						
Are the outcomes and impacts significant						
Is match funding being sought, appropriate to the project						
Does the project represent value for money						
Is the project sustainable and viable once the grant ends						
Does the lead organisation have the capability to deliver the project						
Is the project replacing or substituting for other Council funding						

Total score	General observations

**Notes of the Meeting of the Budget and Finance Group
6pm 16th September 2004**

Present: Ron Ballantine (Chair), Ian Bennett, Maria Clarke, Nick Cottle (until 7.05pm), Karen Deverell, Richard Dixon, Peter McKenzie, Stuart Merritt, Sara Skirton, Jon Stratford

Apologies: Roger Kershaw, Andy Marsh

1. Purpose of the Meeting

Introductions were made and the Chair outlined the purpose of the meeting, which was to evaluate the proposals received for funding for 2004/05 from the second homes Council Tax monies. Pete McKenzie informed the group that the monies totalled £110,000 for 2004/05.

The Chair thanked the Task Group and MDC Officers for the comments and initial evaluations that they had provided for the BFSG to consider.

2. Evaluation Criteria

It was noted that the application form provided a framework for evaluating the bids and that this had been used to develop the proforma used by the MDC Officers for their initial 'sift' and scoring of the bids. The way the proforma was designed meant that the lower the score the more support the proposal was given by the Officers. Peter McKenzie presented the group with a table showing the level of support given to each project by Task Group members.

Discussion took place about other factors should be considered when evaluating the bids and offering funding. It was agreed that:

- the proposed funding programme should show both a geographical balance and a balance between economic, social and environmental projects
- no overall maximum amount per project would be imposed as each project needed to be considered in terms of the impact it would make
- in some cases the MSP may wish to offer funding for a project but at less than the minimum amount requested. In such a case the applicant would need to consider whether the amount offered would be useful to the project
- projects should not be financially supported where the main benefit was to a limited number of individuals rather than the wider community
- given the number of potential applicants across the district, the BFSG would recommend that proposals for small play areas, sports grounds and village halls should not be allocated funds in this current round, as the MSP Board needed to consider whether it was in a position to help such projects and if so how best to do it

- advice would be given about possible alternative sources of funding to those who has submitted projects that the MSP Board was unable to support financially in 2004/05

3. Assessing the bids

The Group assessed each proposal individually, taking into account the agreed criteria and the views of the Task Group and Officers. Recommendations were made for each proposal on the level of funding it should receive. These are shown in the right hand column of the table overleaf. The total amount that the BFSG proposed should be allocated in this round of funding was *£74,035.

The meeting closed at approximately 8pm.

** N.B. the BFSG had recommended that application 34 from Keyford Community Garden Association received funding of £175. The Association has since withdrawn its application as it has received funding from another source. This brings the total value of the recommendations to £73,860*

Budget and Finance Sub Group – Proposed Funding Allocation

Ref	Organisation	Project	Amount Req.	Min Amount	Officer score	BFSG Rec.
0	SCC /SSP	Vision	10,000	10,000	N/A	10,000
1	South Som CAB (for all Som CABx and Shelter)	Multi Agency County Court Project to tackle homelessness and debt	3,000	any	15	3,000
2	Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Police Community Support Officer for Glastonbury	5,000	5,000	15	5,000
3	Mendip Primary Care Trust	Engaging with people in isolated rural communities to address unmet health, social and welfare needs	4,000	2,500	20	3,000
4	Shepton Mallet Deanery (Church of England)	To employ a youth development worker part-time for a four year period	6,000	1,000	19	0
5	Somerset Child-Safe Partnership	To provide everyone involved in children and young peoples' sport and group activities with simple, practical child protection information	3,000	1,500	23	1,500
6	Mendip Care and Repair	To recycle stair lifts and make them available to those on low incomes (part of lottery bid)	10,000	any	16	1,000
7	5 A DAY Team Health Improvement Service	To build on the community food mapping work completed in Shepton Mallet	10,000	7,000	18	0
8	Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Police Community Support Officers for Frome	10,000	10,000	19	10,000
9	Inaura the Inclusion Charity	Develop a Family Learning and Restorative Justice service into a full Social Inclusion Network	35,200	15,300	23	5,000
10	Life Education Centres (Somerset)	To raise £120,000 initial capital to purchase a second mobile classroom, hire and train a specialist Educator in order to extend availability of Life Education Centres to schools in Mendip	10,000	any	22	2,000
11	Wells and District Opportunity Playgroup	Provision of pre-school sessions of education and therapy for children with special needs where no other provision exists	8,000	5,000	22	0
12	Somerset County Council	To increase the rate of take up of broadband and movement up the ICT and e-adoption ladder by SMEs, build capacity in local communities in accessing broadband and utilising ICT, help develop skills of learners and the workforce	20,000	20,000	20	0
13	Whitstone School and NCH	To continue to employ through NCH a Counsellor for school students (11-16)	20,000	10,000	23	2,000
14	Mendip Community Support	Proposed Volunteer Recruitment Agency for Mendip	9,960	9,960	16	9,960
15	West Mendip Credit Union	To make broadcast quality DVD of testimony of borrowers	5,000	5,000	26	0

16	Victim Support Somerset	To instigate and improve the quality of VS's volunteer infrastructure and improve speed and quality of response in Mendip	12,654	9,296	18	3,000
17	Meare and Westhay Parish Council	To develop an area of land gifted to the Parish Council as a pre teen children's play area	40,000	5,000	22	0
18	T2000 Somerset and Croscombe Village Bus Action Group	To regenerate community bus links between Wells and Shepton Mallet with Connection to and from Bath	15,000	10,000	27	0
19	Somerset Biodiversity Steering Group / Somerset Environmental Records Centre	A major review of Biodiversity management within the district of Mendip to appraise future Biodiversity Action Planning work	4,400	4,400	16	4,400
20	Mendip Small Wind Turbine Group	The project will introduce wind power to the area without the controversy surrounding very large turbines	8,000	1,000	20	0
21	Somerset County Council (SINE)	To have a coordinated approach to research and intelligence gathering in Somerset, Co-ordinate the HSNAG report and publication	2,000	1,000	19	**0
22	Batcombe Parish Council	Improvements to Batcombe Playing Field and Play Area.	7,500	750	17	0
23	Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group (FWAG)	Mendip Farm Plastic Recycling Project. Collection of waste plastic from farms in Mendip and delivery to reprocessor for recycling	22,400	11,200	18	5,000
24	Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group (FWAG)	Mendip Bat and Dormouse Project Phase 1. Objectives include to contribute to protection of endangered bat and dormouse species in Mendip	10,000	6,000	21	4,000
25	Centre for Sustainable Energy - Warming Mendip project	Aims to help householders in Mendip save money on fuel bills, keep their homes warm and health, decrease their impact on the environment	10,000	5,000	15	5,000
26	Mendip Power Group -	to install micro hydro systems at 10 mill sites within Mendip with a total installed capacity of 150kw, annual electricity production of 6000,000kwh and annual CO2 savings of 250 tonnes	50,000	10,000	23	0
27	Cranmore Cricket Club	To build new pavilion on site	30,000	2,000	27	0
28	The Atmospherics Trust - reaching through barriers	To offer a specialised service, i.e. educational/ therapeutic - to adults with severe learning disabilities in the Mendip Community	20,000	Any	29	0
29	Trudoxhill Village Hall Committee	Refurbish existing toilet facilities to enable disabled access as required by recent legislation	8,500	Any	21	0
30	The Robert Barton Trust	To complete a short focused homelessness prevention project and produce relevant documentation and recommendations for appropriate agencies	15,000	12,000	21	0

31	Nunney Parish Council	To convert a disused quarry into a leisure facility to provide badly needed leisure facilities for all residents of Mendip, particularly disabled people	10,798	n/a	21	0
32	Wanstrow Village Hall	To pump prime a larger project of existing the existing village hall to double its size, improve facilities and to comply with disability regulations	8,000	4,000	17	0
33	Stoke St Michael Community Playing Field	To install playing equipment and safety	1,000	any	24	0
35	Stonebridge Community Management Association	Secure doors	3,000	any	25	0
		Totals	447,412	183,906		73,860

N.B. the BFSG had recommended that application 34 from Keyford Community Garden Association received funding of £175. The Association has since withdrawn its application as it has received funding from another source.

34	Keyford Community Garden Association	To install a vandal proof standpipe at the gateway to the garden according to Bristol Water regulations	175	70	16	175
----	--------------------------------------	---	-----	----	----	------------

**Re: Application No 21 from Somerset Intelligence Network (SINE), the MSP may wish to fund this project from its other (i.e. not second homes monies) budget.

The Mendip Strategic Partnership

Agenda Item:11

FROM: Mendip District Council Date: 28th September 2004

SUBJECT: Partnership Budget

At April 1st 2004, a sum of £19,240 was available to the Partnership, the residue of initial contributions from Somerset County Council, Mendip District Council, Mendip Housing Limited and Mendip Primary Care Trust.

Expenditure so far this year is as follows:

Expenses	£	15
Web-site	£	75
Food Festival Grant	£	1,000

The total currently available to the Board, exclusive of 'Second Homes' funding, is therefore £ 18,150.

Detailed accounts may be inspected by Board Members at any time at the Council's offices.

Stuart Merritt, Service Manager Corporate Policy, Mendip District Council
Telephone No. 01749 341312