

**Minutes of Cairngorms Local Action Group meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2016,  
At the Richmond Arms Hotel, Tomintoul.  
10am-4pm**

LAG Members Present: 60/40 private/public split.

<b>PRIVATE</b>	<b>PUBLIC</b>
Ian Wilson	Dennis Malone
Drew McFarlane-Slack	David Cameron (Vice-Chair)
Roger Clegg (Chair)	Cattie Anderson
Ben Addy	Brian Wood
Jenny Milne	
Eric Baird	

Apologies: Kate Adamson, Anna Dawson

In attendance: Alice Mayne (Programme Manager), Adam Howarth (Programme Supervisor), Bridget Trussell, Sam Masson (Project Development & Support Officers), Lynn Anderson (Support Officer)

Roger welcomed all to the meeting

Minutes of 19<sup>th</sup> May were approved with no changes.

The Programme Manager asked the LAG whether they were content with the information from the LAG minutes which will be uploaded onto the LAG website and into the public domain. LAG members felt that in terms of transparency as much of the discussion at LAG meetings should be in the public domain however they have to be mindful of confidentiality and a balance has to be struck between the two.

### **Declarations of Interest**

The LAG Chairperson reminded the LAG members of their obligation under Section 5 of the LAG code of conduct and Paragraph 61 & 62 in particular.

*In considering whether to make a declaration in any proceedings, you must consider not only whether you will be influenced but whether anybody else would think that you might be influenced by the interest. You must, however, always comply with “the objective test”, which is whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard the interest as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your discussion or decision making in your role as a member of the CLAG.*

*If you feel that, in the context of the matter being considered, your involvement is neither capable of being viewed as more significant than that of an ordinary member of the public, nor likely to be perceived by the public as wrong, you may continue to attend the meeting and participate in both discussion and voting. The relevant interest must however be declared. It is your responsibility to judge whether an interest is sufficiently relevant to particular proceedings to require a declaration and you are advised to err on the side of caution.*

Brian Wood declared an in-direct interest in Projects 8 and 10, although he has no direct involvement with these projects the applicants are members of the Braemar Community and are known to him.

David Cameron has assessed an EOI as part of his temporary more operational role within the LEADER team following the Programme Manager's departure .Any feedback given is based on an overview of the expression of interest, its fit with the Local Development Strategy and potential technical compliance issues and not based on any opinion on the merits of the project. Therefore, he has not pre-judged the merits of a potential application and feels he remains free to undertake his LAG responsibilities of assessment.

The LAG accepted both these declarations of interest and responses to them.

### **Appeals Process**

The LAG Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Programme Manager had agreed a draft appeals process previously however it was realised that a more detailed appeals process needs to be drafted which gives a step by step outline of what the appeals process will be so everyone is clear.

The LAG Vice-Chairperson asked the LAG members to consider whether the appeals process should be a separate process and if so whether any appeals against conditions or terms of approval can be resolved by email or whether it has to be a face to face meeting. Would LAG members be willing to meet between normal LAG meetings to discuss appeals?

A LAG member was concerned that the appeals process is happening retrospectively and this should have been drafted before now.

The Programme Manager explained that the appeals process had not been drafted as part of the LDS and Business Plan because initially Scottish Government had advised that they would produce a policy centrally and it is still not clear whether they are planning to still do so.

In the meantime the LAG Vice-Chairperson will draft a more detailed policy by the LAG meeting in November to include the option for appeals to be dealt with virtually, between meetings.

### **Enquiries**

The Programme Manager circulated the enquiries spreadsheet covering the period 1<sup>st</sup> May-31<sup>st</sup> July for review by LAG members.

### **Expressions of Interest for review**

Three Expression of Interest forms were shared with the LAG for comment.

### **Application decision from previous round**

A decision was made on one application which had been deferred from the previous LAG meeting.

### **Application review and decision**

There were 6 projects scored by the Scoring sub-group and reviewed by LAG members at this meeting.

### **Any Other Business**

The Programme Manager asked the LAG members to consider whether we should be promoting all the themes in the local development strategy rather than focussing on themes 2 and 5. This would help generate as much interest as possible and project development will have a better fit within the themes. Applicants will still have to evidence that they fit within at least 2 themes but there does not have to be a priority theme. LAG members approved this change.

Internal Audit – a review of our processes and policies was carried out, no issues were highlighted. Three project files have been sent to Scottish Government as part of the monitoring and accreditation audit.

The LAG members were asked whether they were content to receive all the papers which they review as part of the projects for decision. They LAG members confirmed they were but that it would be useful if the more subjective comments from the development officers could be referenced in the technical checklist. The scoring sub-group was asked whether the development officers should attend that sub-group meeting. It was agreed by those LAG members that the project should be scored based on a broad overview of the project and any specific comments by the group should be answered at the LAG meeting.

A LAG member asked that for any project decision/amendment where a response is required by email and a deadline for responses has been given it should say the deadline date and also or whenever we have a decision by quorate.

Date of next meeting 23<sup>rd</sup> November, 2016 in Blair Atholl, venue to be decided.

Meeting closed 3pm.