



**TAYSIDE BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP
MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING**

**THURSDAY 3 NOVEMBER 2005, 10AM
PERTH COLLEGE**

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present:

M Price (Chair)	CMS, Perth College
P Coutts	Angus Council
D Flint	Perth & Kinross Council
B Harris	Dundee City Council
C Lloyd	Tayside Biodiversity Partnership
M Strachan	Forestry Commission (Item 4 only)
C Warwick	Scottish Natural Heritage
S Merone	Perth Quality of Life Trust (Item 4 only)

In attendance:

Angela Paterson	CMS, Perth College
Raja Sekar	visiting Forest Officer, NW India (Punjab)

Apologies:

M Smith	Dundee City Council
---------	---------------------

1	Apologies As above	
2	Minutes of Last Meeting on 27 July 2005 Agreed.	
3	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>4.16 Child Protection, CL still has in hand.</p> <p>5.2 BARS – there was a poor response rate from Lead Partners for the mid-September deadline; SNH and SEPA were the only ones to respond.</p> <p>Update from DCC: they are reviewing the 1st Tranche action by action, picking out priorities for the local authorities and then using for their own reporting purposes. They plan to complete this stage by the end of November.</p> <p>DF said that there were no implications for not submitting to BARS (it is voluntary) but we need to be clear about what we are doing. The majority of the actions relate to all local authorities and there is a need to be clear about making the actions SMART. It was agreed that before the next Steering Group meeting the three local authorities would meet and at next Steering Group meeting a timescale would be set.</p> <p>The 1st Tranche needs to be SMART before considering the 2nd Tranche. DF felt that it was necessary to be realistic, start small and then work up. Time needs to be identified for key partners (and possibly all) to review the LBAP. A workshop to discuss SMART targets might still be necessary.</p> <p>Should we set ourselves a timescale for getting information onto BARS? This would be dependent upon receiving information from the Lead Partners. Should there be any sanctions for Lead Partners not returning information? It was agreed to add the LBAP Review and BARS to the agenda for the next Steering Group meeting.</p>	<p>CL</p> <p>BH</p> <p>DF/ PC/BH</p> <p>StGp</p>

	<p>As a Partnership we need to be clear about going forward as a Partnership rather than as individual partners. CW will forward email to DF with actions she sent to CL. We need to agree which actions are relevant and then prioritise.</p> <p>All information to be collated through CL, and all contentious issues to be discussed at a workshop; to be discussed in the next Steering Group meeting.</p>	<p>CW</p> <p>StGp</p>
4	<p>SITA Tayside Biodiversity Action Fund Re. previous minutes - Application forms and Guidance Notes now agreed</p> <p>MAPS MS has maps, but these have not been put on the website yet as there are copyright issues which he is dealing with. He had hoped this would have been sorted out by the end of September, but there had been delays. Hard copies were available at the meeting. MS will see if he can get an A4 version to attach to the guidance notes sent out with applications. He reported that the majority of Tayside is covered, although some uplands areas are not. SM will check with Aberdeenshire re northern area, and speak to Stirling re the Killin/ St Fillans areas. The Rannoch area is not covered, and only half of Glen Lyon. SM will get the information and MS will add details to the map and arrange to get information onto the website. Maps will only need to be sent with applications for boundary areas.</p> <p>One application has been received which includes a project site outwith the map area (Forest Research – Carrie, by Loch Rannoch).</p> <p>LAUNCH The launch of the Fund went well; MP, CL and many Lead Partners attended. There was good press coverage, although the Perthshire Advertiser printed an erroneous press release saying that £300k was going directly to Red Squirrel projects. CL wrote a ‘letter to the editor’ (not yet published) to put the matter right.</p> <p>A good number of projects have been received and a full allocation of funds could be achieved this year. There followed a discussion regarding how best to agree criteria for ranking projects. SM suggested going through all projects, taking into account compliance issues as some projects would not fully comply or would only be eligible for X%. From this it would be straightforward to see how many applications were actually eligible. Projects could be prioritised from there.</p> <p>It was pointed out that the deadline for the next round is 20 January 2006. DF suggested that if any of the existing projects proved borderline, these could be carried forward to January as SM could request more information and then consider in January.</p> <p>CW said we needed to look at funding projects only for Year 1 as other years might not be viable if we don’t get funding for further years. SM said we can commit Y1 and Y2 funding in Y1 and then carry forward rather than waiting to Y2 to see if money still available then. He confirmed that Y2 funding is very likely; Y3 we don’t know. There was £95K available for this year. Some of the applications received have projects that start in Y2.</p> <p>It was suggested we need to add a clause that it is intended to fund projects for further years, subject to funding being confirmed.</p>	<p>MS</p> <p>SM</p> <p>SM/ MS</p>

<p><u>PROJECT ASSESSMENT PANEL</u> <u>Round 1 - 2005/06</u></p> <p>PROPOSALS (refer by application reference number)</p> <p>5383 - Scottish Crop Research Institute Living Field Study Centre (the Flora and Fauna of Scotland's Arable Farmland) Project should be linked to a site where habitat/species are identified. Location OK but educational aspects not eligible; most of this application covers training/education and is not linked to a specific site/habitat. Demonstration plots are part of the practical work on site – this could be eligible (10%).</p> <p>£1,100 eligible + 10% = £1,200 (access paths, specialist seed). Consider granting this, explaining why this is the only sum eligible, and offer further advice regarding other possible sources of funding (eg Green Spaces website).</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Priority – medium Y1 - £1,200</p>	
<p>5384 - Angus Council (Social Work and Health Department) Beech Hill House Wildlife Garden (Forfar) Site eligible It is not possible to give funds directly to Angus Council – the council would have to invoice PQLT and add VAT (which is not recoverable). Angus Council could charge £3,500 + VAT (but this is not recoverable) as this is providing a service, or we could pay the £3,500 including VAT.</p> <p>It was noted that the garden is not an area open to the general public, but this is not an issue under the Fund. It is an Angus Council/NHS project.</p> <p>DF noted that the grant would be for making the path and asked if this linked into the biodiversity/species improvements as in the Guidelines.</p> <p>The Angus Ranger Service will monitor the effectiveness of the project. Feeding stations will be provided. CL asked if the project could be made part of the Angus Ranger Service Hospitals/Sheltered Housing Biodiversity Project.</p> <p>Should we be funding nest boxes and direct biodiversity enhancement rather than the path, which is not directly contributing to biodiversity?</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Priority - medium Panel generally likes the project but needs assurance that proposed works will not be to the detriment of biodiversity and will actually enhance the area's biodiversity. Panel needs verification of the commitment from the Ranger Service.</p> <p>Ask the applicant for clarification on costs and for further consideration on funding the biodiversity element. The Panel would like to fund the biodiversity part of the project (e.g. nest boxes, feeder stations, etc., rather than the actual path.</p> <p>Request re-submission of the application by 20 January 2006 that shows how the project as a whole will benefit biodiversity.</p>	

<p>5385 - Angus Council Ranger Service Crombie Country Park Artificial Sand Martin Wall Site eligible It is not possible to give funds directly to Angus Council – the council would have to invoice PQLT and add VAT (which is not recoverable). Angus Council could charge £10,029 + VAT as this is providing a service, or we could pay the £10,029 including VAT.</p> <p>Good project and good balance of people involved; a well thought out project. It will have a direct benefit for a number of species, as well as educational benefits. Monitoring of project guaranteed.</p> <p>CW asked who is carrying out the work? Not indicated, tenders not included (if Angus Council satisfied, then we agree to funding).</p> <p>Actual cost would include VAT so to fully fund the project the requirement would be for approx £12k (more than they have asked for). Alternatively, we could give what they ask for. The Panel provisionally agreed £10k, including VAT (so they will have to charge VAT on top of this). Depending on allocation of 2005-06 monies, we could recommend an increase to £12k if sufficient monies are available. Ask if the applicant can obtain some materials in kind (by way of donation or sponsorship).</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Priority - high Y1 - £10k (see note above)</p>	
<p>5386 – Comrie in Colour Wildflower Meadow, St. Serf’s Episcopal Church, Comrie This project will not happen unless we grant 100% funds for new plants and fence repairs/ new gate. The considerable in-kind voluntary work proposed has not been costed.</p> <p>DF declared an interest (lives in Comrie). He mentioned that the area is at the start of the Comrie Millennium Footpath.</p> <p>Poor application with no inclusion of which biodiversity targets it hits. The secondary criteria mentions that the whole community will be involved in the project – is this applicable?</p> <p>There is a sustainability issue, and potentially the wrong technique being proposed to convert a field into a wildflower meadow.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION REJECT Good idea to have a wildflower meadow and potential for it to become part of the Tayside Green Graveyard Initiative. Suggest that the existing proposal is not the right way forward and give advice as to what to do next.</p> <p>A resubmission would be welcomed if the applicant tells us how the project would hit national and/or local biodiversity targets, considers alternative means of creating a wildflower meadow (e.g., seeding), and also how the meadow interacts with the Millennium footpath?</p>	

<p>5388 - <u>Angus FWAG</u> Missing Links, Natural Networks Project A substantial project developed over a long period of time; some funding has been offered (including Angus Environment Trust and SNH – this has not yet been confirmed).</p> <p>Funding requested - £90k which would generate an income stream for FWAG. CW - SNH in principle could give grant aid next year (£18k), but an application has not been received yet. MS - Forestry Commission could possibly consider grant aid (Angus FWAG has, however, not approached FC), or other SEERAD aid may be available.</p> <p>This is a multiple sites project; ENTRUST would like to identify the proposed project sites (not given at the moment) - this could become issue. Project could be split into two – a pilot stage where one or more sites could be identified and funded, and a second project stage where further sites could be identified and funded at a later date.</p> <p>DF asked why Perthshire FWAG was not involved if it was a Tay Estuary-bounded project that included Fife, Angus and Kinross-shire (i.e. Fife & Kinross FWAG and Angus FWAG).</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Priority – high.</p> <p>Funds could be granted for undertaking surveys (£1K/site) and setting up a minimum of 3 demonstration sites. The Panel will need to know the names of the sites, check that they are eligible and that farmers agree. The demonstration sites must be in either Kinross-shire or Angus.</p> <p>The Panel proposes ring-fencing up to £12k for setting up the pilot project for this financial year (£3k for surveys and an average £2k to £3k per farm). Information is required on how much FWAG would need to fund the pilot sites (and identify specific sites); ask them to consider other funding (e.g. Forestry Commission).</p> <p>Encourage resubmission at a later date when the main part of the project is ready to be launched and FWAG has identified and applied for other funding as appropriate. It should be emphasised that funding is contingent on the formal identification of sites. Feedback required from Angus FWAG that this is viable.</p> <p>Y1 – up to £12K (for a minimum of 3 demonstration sites). Sites must be identified before the grant can be made.</p>	
<p>5389 – <u>Woodland Trust</u> Geordie’s Wood ‘Tree for All’ Project The applicant does not require funds until 2006/07 - £20k application. Funds already available from the Forestry Commission. Predominately a Clackmannanshire project with a small patch in our area. However, the education opportunities are probably largely focussed outwith Tayside. Costs of this element of the project appear to be much higher than for other elements.</p> <p>Panel requires confirmation on how much of the site comes within Tayside and what species would benefit. Query also on whether the project is going to be sustainable.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION REJECT If feedback required, clarification needed as why funding is being requested</p>	

	<p>when costs already appear to be covered by a Forestry Commission grant.</p>	
	<p>5390 – <u>Forest Research</u> Juniper Natural Regeneration Management Trials Sites eligible. A well thought out project. Juniper is a UK priority species so project is of Scotland-wide importance. Overall, a 5 year project (applicant requesting 3 year funding here). Sowing seeds/testing seeds - Y1 £814. Assuming TBAF funding available for further years, will consider Y2. Queried whether SNH could provide support for this.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Priority – high Y1 - £814 Y2 - £5.5K from Y1 funds</p> <p>We will look favourably at the monitoring and data work (£6K) in Y3 but would like applicant to check other possibilities of funding (e.g. SNH). The proposal for Y3 will be reconsidered once SITA funding is confirmed.</p>	
	<p>5391 – <u>Forest Research</u> Small Cow-Wheat Species Recovery Project 5 sites identified, one not eligible, plus 2 new sites not yet identified – Panel will need that information first.</p> <p>The funds requested for this year are for the 2 new sites. This is not possible as need to identify sites before the project can be registered for Entrust.</p> <p>However, it would be possible to fund 4 out of 5 named sites. We can fund the Recovery Project, but not the scoping study to identify new sites. The Panel suggests that SWT or SNH could be considered as a funder for this part of the project.</p> <p>Query from CW - do they need an extra 2 sites to validate the results?</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Priority – medium</p> <p>We are not able to allocate for this year as the first part of the project is for a scoping study and this cannot be funded. The Panel recognises the national importance of the project and asks the applicant to resubmit an application for the second part of the project (Years 2 and 3 at the eligible sites). If the applicant can resubmit by 20 January, we will reconsider at our next meeting (plus the additional 2 sites if they can be identified).</p>	
	<p>5392 – <u>Broughty Ferry Environmental Project</u> Following the Life of Water (FLOW) SNH co-funds the officer’s post for this project and covers the revenue costs. Need to ask for clarification if funding request covers existing officer’s post to ensure there is no double funding. We also need to have the project sites identified.</p> <p>The Panel would like to recommend funding, but can only do so if the site location for Year 1 is identified and confirmed within the month.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Priority – medium</p>	

	<p>Y1 – up to £5,100</p> <p>The Panel recommends funding Y1 as long as 1) sites are identified 2) clarification is received regarding any element of double funding for project worker (i.e., is project worker element currently paid from existing funds?). The Panel would be willing to consider Y2 and Y3 funding but again needs to know specific sites and what the project officer costs mean. No commitments can be made at this time.</p> <p>If information is received by the end of November, we can update the existing application so that it can be considered at the PQLT meeting at the beginning of December.</p> <p>If other information is available by 20 January (or sooner) it may be possible to ring- fence funds for Y2 and Y3 from this year’s funding allocation.</p>	
	<p>5393 - RSPB Angus Corn Bunting Recovery Project The applicant is looking for funding for 2006/07 (starting April 2006). Sites not identified (3 sites need to be identified) It is a priority species; the project will also benefit other farmland species.</p> <p>The funding of specific Farm Biodiversity Action Plans for each of the proposed sites is not included in this.</p> <p>If sites can be identified by the end of November, the Panel will recommend funding.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Priority – not given Y1 - £10,578 Y2 - £9,298 from Y1 funds We will fully fund Y1 and Y2 from this year’s funding allocation as long as the applicant confirms the project sites. Subject to SITA funds being confirmed, Y3 (£10,578) will also be considered at a later date. An annual progress report will be required.</p>	
	<p>5394 - Auchterarder Golf Club Pond Creation Project Project has been withdrawn.</p>	
	<p>5396 – YMCA The Focused Young People Project The application does not meet Entrust guidelines. The Panel recommends that the applicants study the Green Space website for assistance with funding.</p>	
	<p>Summary of allocations from Y1 funds 5383 - Scottish Crop Research Institute: Y1 - £1.2K 5385 - Angus Council Ranger Service: Y1 - £10k 5388 - Angus FWAG: Y1 – up to £12K 5390 – Forest Research: Y1 - £814; Y2 - £5.5K = £6314 5392 – Broughty Ferry Environmental Project: Y1 – up to £5,100 5393 – RSPB: Y1 - £10,578; Y2 - £9,298 = £19876 TOTAL (maximum): £54490</p>	
	<p>It was agreed that the Application Guidelines need to be amended to indicate that</p>	

	<p>sites must be identified at the time of application. Add – “Wherever possible, you should identify the sites”.</p> <p>For next meeting, if sites are not identified at the time of application, SM or CL are to contact applicants in advance to ask for the information.</p>	SM/ CL
5	<p>LAGS (Local Action Grants Scheme) As reported at the last Steering Group by CW, SNH may, in principle, be able to contribute slightly less than £10k. SNH needs to know how such monies will be used and whether it should be used in conjunction with the SITA funds, etc. Should such a grant be added to the SITA funds? If it is, SNH’s logo would need to be added to the list of Partners contributing to the Fund. Would there be problems of double-funding if applicants applied to SNH separately? Assuming that the funds would be combined with the SITA Trust funds, it is assumed that five per cent of the SNH grant would also need to go to the PQLT as a contribution towards administration costs (i.e. £500 out of a £10k grant). Who should apply to SNH – the Partnership as a whole? CW will ask if the SNH monies could be added to the SITA fund, or if they should be kept as a separate fund.</p> <p>It was agreed that MP could apply on behalf of the Partnership (if a request for funding to SNH is for over £10k there is a twice yearly deadline, but if under £10k the situation is simpler – propose to request just under £10k). Alternatively, could PQLT apply for the funding? CL/MP could write a proposal for S Merone (if he agreed) who could then submit it to SNH. CW will advise on the issues above and on which option would be best and then send either MP or CL an application pack.</p>	CW CW
6	<p>Work Programme/Co-ordinator’s Report The report was circulated. CL will update quarterly figures from previous quarter before circulating a definitive version. Priorities are in bold. Red Squirrel newsletter - funding secured from SNH and FC; 5,000 copies published and currently being widely distributed. CL has prepared a report, based on the weekly information she is receiving, showing how much the website is being used. This can be e-mailed to those interested. The website is being updated regularly.</p> <p>2.2 Press releases and article writing - slightly behind, although these are being prepared as often as possible. The Water and Wetland Sub-group has arranged a national seminar on the subject of “River Engineering – Solutions for Roads and Fish” for 9th November, and obtained £1,000 sponsorship. Taking place at the Birnam Institute, 100 delegates have booked from all over Scotland. Many more had been turned away, so a second seminar is being mooted in 2006.</p> <p>3.4 A lot of support has been given to the Red Squirrel groups and Town Swift survey; Population Mapping – this has been undertaken. Question raised by CW: Red squirrel Groups - can the sub groups deal with this rather than CL? Should there be a Red Squirrel Interest Group set up? Is there enough contingency in the work programme for CL to take up e.g. a Red Squirrel Interest Group. CL said that at present Red Squirrel issues were routed via the Woodland sub-group, but that other Interest Groups (for Barn Owls and Swifts) had proved very useful.</p> <p>CL’s admin allocation - could part of this be used to take minutes at sub group meetings? DF said there shouldn’t be a problem here (say c. 3 times a year) but a problem would be created if every group wanted this kind of support. This item needs to be added to the agenda of the next steering group meeting: discuss sub group meetings and how they function/time allocations.</p> <p>Look at how we can bring in new people to the Partnership and sub-groups, and enthuse people, DF suggested having ‘events’ to bring people in. CL said that each</p>	CL StGp

	<p>sub-group was trying to have an annual summer visit to which potential new members could be invited. There were also the two national focus points of Scottish Biodiversity Week (May) and Backyard Biodiversity Day (June). She suggested we look at ways in which the sub groups could link into national events (e.g. the Water and Wetlands sub-group could champion World Wetlands Day in February or focus on the International Bog Day in July by raising awareness of projects/issues in Tayside?).</p> <p>It was proposed that each Sub Group leader suggests a subject their group could link into. Add as an agenda item for the Steering Group: ways to widen the Partnership membership; look at key priorities that need to be worked on.</p> <p>PKC – DF reported that 1,800 parks/open spaces are undergoing an Open Spaces Assessment throughout Perth and Kinross-shire. DF/CL are closely involved in ensuring that biodiversity is added as a criteria in the better management of estates. They are also looking at how best to train assessors in the biodiversity elements. DF to contact M Jamieson at Kindrogan to see if he can assist. DF to contact Mike Messenger as SNH can help with good practice and can put staff in touch with people who have already done audits.</p> <p>CL reported that there is a lot of good ongoing networking with other LBAP officers, including regular meetings with the Clacks and Fife LBAP Officers regarding potential joint projects. There was a significant addition to the work programme for the number of days given to the “LBAP Network” because of this, together with the additional travel to and from Lewis for the last meeting.</p> <p>Queries from the general public regarding wind farms are creating extra work, but this is being minimised as much as possible by passing specific queries on to other Partners.</p> <p>Priorities to the end of February (days estimated):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning Manual (needs input from Planners to ensure it is up to date) - 10 days; 2. Review of 1st tranche actions/BARS (aim to agree by end February 2006) - 10 days; 3. Steering Group meeting – 2 days; 4. SAPs and HAPs: get consultative drafts on website – need to be brief and SMART (lower priority) – 5 days; 5. Prepare new programme for 2006 ‘Building Better Biodiversity’ series of seminars and workshops - 2.5 days; 6. Funding Newsletter - January 2006 - 1.5 days; 7. Work with local authorities - 10 days; 8. Next round of TBAF applications - 5 days; 9. Servicing of Sub Groups - 3 days; 10. Rangers’ Networking Workshop (10 November 2005) – 2.5 days. 	<p>StGp</p> <p>DF</p> <p>DF</p>
7	<p>Finances Report dated 26 October 2005 was circulated. Micro-management of budget on Excel spreadsheets is in hand. Invoices will be sent soon to Angus and Dundee Councils. PC asked if next year’s invoices could be sent as early as possible in the new financial year.</p>	DF
8	<p>AOCB Angela Paterson will be on sick leave from 18 November; DF agreed to find someone to take minutes at 24th November Steering Group meeting in Perth and, if necessary, at the next Management Team meeting (at Perth College) on 16th February. Similarly, PC agreed to do this for the next Steering Group meeting in Forfar on 23rd February if necessary. CL agreed to pull together the minutes for this Management Team meeting.</p>	<p>DF</p> <p>DF</p> <p>PC</p> <p>CL</p>

9	<p>Next Meeting Next Management Team meeting: 16th February 2006, 10am Perth College (the closing date for the TBAF 2nd round is 20th January 2006). Add agenda item on long-term planning (regarding the next funding application for Co-ordinator's post to SNH); need to review Business Plan and outcomes of October 2004 strategic meeting.</p> <p>Steering Group meetings: 24th November 2005, changed from Forfar to Perth (DF to locate a room). Next Steering Group meeting to be held in Forfar (23rd February) in the Board Room at St. James House, Angus Council, Forfar; next meeting in Dundee (date t.b.c.).</p> <p>PQLT meetings – 6th December 2005 and 7th March 2006.</p>	<p>DF</p> <p>PC</p>