



**TAYSIDE BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP
MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING**

**THURSDAY 16 FEBRUARY 2006, 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 2 only) |
| C Warwick | Scottish Natural Heritage |
| S Merone | Perth Quality of Life Trust (Item 2 only) |

In attendance:

| | |
|------------|--------------------|
| A Paterson | CMS, Perth College |
|------------|--------------------|

Apologies:

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

1 APOLOGIES

As above

Action

2 SITA TAYSIDE BIODIVERSITY ACTION FUND – PROJECT ASSESSMENT PANEL

Comments on 1st round projects:

5383 SCRI, Living Field Study Centre: registered, £1,200
5385 Angus Council Ranger Service, Crombie Country Park: VAT issued now resolved, registered, £10,029
5390, Forest Research, Juniper Trials: registered, £6,314
5391, Forest Research, Small Cow-Wheat Species: registered, £11,200
5992 Broughty Ferry Environmental Project, FLOW: registered, £5,100
*5388 Angus FWAG, Missing Links**
*5393 RBSP, Corn Bunting: **

Total allocated £33,843.

**5388 and 5393.* Unfortunately these projects cannot be registered by Entrust as they are considered as being a subsidy to farmers, based on privately-owned agricultural land, and therefore not eligible under the Fund. SM to get a formal statement from Entrust regarding this issue and then letter will be issued to both applicants. SM to reply stating that they are both good projects and encourage them to take the issue forward nationally.

SM

5389 Woodland Trust, Georgie's Wood: this project was refused and they have now appealed. The Panel reconsidered, however, the decision still stands. SM to reply indicating that the main aim of SITA funding is to fund new activities and not to reduce deficits of existing projects and that the panel will be happy to consider any other proposals for new projects they may have.

SM

SM

If the Fund plan to set aside money for Years 2 or 3, this should be noted in the table (applies to FLOW 5992, £5,100 agreed for Year 1 only)

Guidance Notes/Entrust

Once formal statement received from Entrust, the Guidance Notes must be updated (SM). It now looks unlikely that we will be able to fund projects on privately-owned agricultural land. SM to enquire as to how these types of issues are dealt with by SITA in England. SM

Guidance notes should also be updated regarding on-site physical conservation work required. CL/ SM

We should clarify with Entrust when they would be able to fund a project, eg project feasibility/development/implementation/management or can they fund part (eg just implementation). SM

General note: We should ask SITA for details of projects that have already been accepted so that we can see the types of successful projects

Press release

As the matter of funding allocation has been ongoing, no press releases have been published as yet but when we do details of projects funded, amounts already allocated and next round deadline to be included. Also include the fact that we can only support onsite physical conservation work. CL/ SM

Next deadline for funding is 21 April 2006, followed by the end of July 2006, October 2006 and January 2007. Money can be carried forward to next year if not fully allocated this year.

Project Assessment Panel, Round 2

5451 Angus Council, Angus Woodland Enrichment Planting (Flowers for the Forest Project)

The issue was raised of multiple sites, habitats and species. Number of sites is not a problem if a particular species is focused on, ie cluster sites around species. It was noted that half the sites are suitable for bluebells. It was questioned whether there was a reasonable chance that project would be successful, ie would the bulbs and plugs survive. Panel considered this as good project with good community involvement.

Ask applicant to resubmit a scaled-down proposal with soil and adjacency criteria (ie close to other habitats, so expanding habitats rather than creating new ones). We could consider funding the sites that most focus on bluebells (28 of 56) but encourage other species that would be part of that habitat.

Recommendation: Reject, ask for resubmission

5459 Angus Council Social Work and Health, Beech Hill House Care Centre for older people (Creation of a garden – Angus)

This is a resubmission but did not show any significant changes from the original submission. Ask them to resubmit, specifically for a project about bird nest boxes, red squirrel feeder stations, bat boxes & bird feed, and identify where they will be located in the garden and how much they will cost. Ask them if they can resubmit by 27 February, otherwise we will be glad to review it at the next round. P Coutts to discuss with them. PC

Recommendation: Reject, ask for resubmission

Priority – medium

5460 Tay Ringing Group, Tay Reedbeds Management Project

Important project for biodiversity in Tayside; currently an ownership issue over the Reedbeds between David Clark and Crown Estates, however, this should not affect this Ringing Project. £1,890 to be awarded out of this year's funding. A condition of the grant is that they should

report results to SNH, BTO, RSPB and to put on the NBN (National Biodiversity Network)

Recommendation: Accepted, Y1 £1,890

Priority – High

5461 Tay Ringing Group, Save Tayside's Ring Ouzels

The original project was Perth and Angus, now all in Angus. Accepted, on the condition that they report back all results to the Partnership and NBN. Need assurance that results will be provided to the landowner and form the basis of prioritised management actions. Encourage them to also contact Cairngorms LBAP for parts of project outwith our area

Recommendation: Accepted, Y1 £1,065

Priority – High

5462 RSPB, Tay Reedbeds Biodiversity Enhancement Project

Would like to fund but with the following comments:

- what does the monitoring include? Is it complementary to the 5460 project?
- we would require them to put the results into NBN
- as a condition, they would need to comply with good practice on Control of non-native vegetation.
- need to know which reedbeds this will cover and confirm that they have an agreement with the owner(s) that the work done will have long-term benefits (copy of the agreement required).
- results to be published on the NBN (CL to give SM details to include on letter)

CL

CW to discuss this project with Denise Reid, who has been in touch with David Clark, the landowner

CW

Recommendation: Accepted pending above, Y1 - £26,000

Priority High

5463 Angus Adult Resource Centre (Angus Council)

Lilybank Biodiverse Garden Project

£6,686 has been applied for. Would like to accept the project on the condition that they get another 2 estimates for pond building. Recommend £6,000 (as the applicant is Angus Council, we cannot pay the VAT element).

Recommendation: Accepted, Y1 £6,000

Priority medium

5464 Butterfly Conservation (Scotland)

Action for Tayside's Butterflies and Moths

Project is survey-based but they do plan to do physical work once data collected. Atholl Estates is one site – MS indicated that the Forestry Commission may be able fund the survey and management plan (90% grant) for the woodland sites (3 out of 4) Separate applications would need to be made for each site; the landowner should apply on behalf of Butterfly Conservation. Ask Butterfly Conservation to get in touch with the Forestry Commission to see which sites could be funded. We cannot fund the other initial survey work (Small Blue)

Would see this as a priority project but given various issues, suggest speak to FC and indicate that we regret we are not able to fund work relating to the small blue unless it leads to onsite physical conservation work.

Recommendation: Rejected, Ask them to apply to Forestry Commission

5468 Sustain Dundee Dundee Habitat and Species Survey

We cannot fund this project as there are multiple sites involved which are not identified, no physical work identified (collecting data, hiring consultant), and no equipment is being purchased. Entrust would be unable to register this project. In principle, agreed this was an important project, linked to community planning.

Decision - not able to fund but would encourage them to resubmit with another project possibly looking at specific sites and ask them to consult biodiversity officer on this. Need to know what the habitats are on the 37 sites. Conditions apply to each site. Need evidence of physical work, not just survey work to be carried out.

Advise them that 'on-site physical conservation work' is a requirement of Entrust and they should consider how they can combine this with implementing their management plan. CL/SM to agree on reply, giving positive encouragement.

A question was raised over the difference between this and ringing projects, as this covers consultant's time and no purchase of equipment, while the ringing projects are mainly for purchase of equipment, with volunteer time.

Recommendation: Rejected, ask to resubmit if requirements can be met

5470 Perth and Kinross Countryside Trust, Veteran Tree Initiative

SM met with them, they are working on pilot sites and within these sites will identify the sites and then costs. If can identify sites before 27 February, the project could go ahead but we don't have costs at the moment. Being asked for a proportion of a large project

Decision - defer project and ask them to resubmit for next round of applications, identifying sites and physical work.

Note: SNH funds the P & K Countryside Trust to around £100K

Recommendation: Defer, ask to resubmit

3 LOCAL BIODIVERSITY FUNDING

A discussion took place regarding the possibility of SNH being able to contribute up to £10,000 to local Tayside biodiversity projects. This may be able to assist when projects do not meet the full Entrust requirements (eg funding for survey work). Various options were considered:

- Applicant could apply directly to SNH for funding i.e. for individual projects via SNH's grant application process
- The Partnership could apply for £10,000 funding from SNH to be used as a separate fund with defined criteria, eg for survey/monitoring projects. As the partnership is not a legal entity, PQLT may need to apply on its behalf. (However, P Coutts commented that the Partnership has separately applied for large sums before even though we do not yet have a constitution). The PQLT could apply for the funding which could be added to the TBAF.

CW to investigate options and advise the Partnership if this may raise concerns regarding double funding and also whether this could just be used for projects which have been considered by the fund and rejected due to surveying issue. If we are not able to apply for this fund, suggest putting note in guidelines stating that for certain aspects of projects which are not eligible for Entrust funding such as survey/feasibility studies, provide list of other funding sources which may be able to help. Applicants would need to apply via the normal SNH grant application process.

4 **MINUTES OF LAST MEETING ON 3 NOVEMBER 2005**

Agreed

5 **MATTERS ARISING**

- 4.16 Child Protection, in hand, CL following up CL
- 1st tranche, DCC, 2 meetings have been held between the 3 Local Authorities, gone through action plan
- BARS – to be discussed at Steering Group Meeting
- Maps for TBAF, more or less now completed. MS to provide CD copies to CL for MS circulation
- Open Spaces Assessment, PKC keen to get advice from Kindrogan/SNH on this, DF DF to make contact

6 **WORK PROGRAMME/CO-ORDINATOR'S REPORT**

CL reported that it had been a very busy year with many more general enquiries now coming through. One of the major issues has been dealing with a higher volume of phone calls and e-mails; CL passing on to Partners where possible.

Comments on Work Programme:

- Management group reports/meetings, full allocation of days now used up. CL has taken this into consideration for next year and has included it as a separate item CL
- Develop and produce leaflets, TBP newsletter, website updates – this also has to include the planning manual
- Building Better Biodiversity - New programme for 2006 drafted and circulated at meeting, list discussed (copy attached)
- Funding newsletter – done
- Work with Local Authorities, 10 days used, no more work with Local Authorities until end of year (except Tranche 1)
- Review of 1st tranche actions/BARS – 10 days now used, no days left. CL has met with Local Authorities and Sub Group Leaders, draft is being pulled together for circulation to steering group and if ratified can be put onto BARS. Review of 1st tranche a priority. Agree at next steering group meeting a timetable for getting 1st tranche reviewed and what comes out of today put in next work programme. Send out list of actions to steering group, get comments. For actions that we have difficulty getting agreement, put as a priority.

Priorities set at the last MG meeting to the end of February were reviewed:

1. Planning Manual – not yet completed
2. Review of 1st tranche actions/BARS (aim to agree by end February 2006). Meeting was held with the 3 local authorities.
3. Steering Group meeting – completed
4. SAPs and HAPs: get consultative drafts on website – need to be brief and SMART (lower priority) – not progressed
5. Prepare new programme for 2006 'Building Better Biodiversity' series of seminars and workshops – draft programme circulated
6. Funding Newsletter - January 2006 – completed.
7. Work with local authorities - 10 days;?
8. Next round of TBAF applications - completed
9. Servicing of Sub Groups - completed
10. Rangers' Networking Workshop (10 November 2005) completed.

Priorities for next 6 weeks (until end of March 2006) should be:

1. Planning Manual (6 days)
2. Review of 1st tranche
3. Annual report (to SNH mid-May) to include summary of achievements against work plan. We will also will need to report to SITA and can use this as a basis
4. TBAF funding applications (next deadline 21/4/06)

Need to see what the priorities are from the Steering Group and then look at work programme in detail. Circulate draft work programme to steering group after the Steering

Group Meeting and get comments back 2 weeks after that, with copies back to the Management Team

Future Funding

CW discussed possibilities for funding in the longer term. SNH have concordats with the local authorities. Met already with Dundee. Discussed merit of LBAP Officer within each Local Authority area. SNH would be prepared to fund 35% of such posts for 3 years. Considerations need to be taken into account how would this affect the partnership if there were 3 separate biodiversity officers. Another proposal was to have two Tayside biodiversity officers. To be discussed at next meeting. SNH have introduced closing dates for applications for contributions over £10,000. The deadline for the TBAP coordinator post is 1 September but SNH would prefer to receive the application as early as possible in August to allow time for any additional information required before the closing date.

7 FINANCES

Income and Expenditure report circulated

8 LONG TERM PLANNING

(NEXT FUNDING APPLICATION FOR CO-ORDINATOR'S POST TO SNH)

See section 6.

9 REVIEW OF BUSINESS PLAN/OUTCOMES OF OCTOBER 2004 STRATEGIC MEETING

Not discussed at meeting

10 AOCB

None

11 DATE OF NEXT MEETING AND FUTURE MEETING TIMEFRAMES

Next Management Team Meeting will be held on Tuesday 16 May 2006, 10am at Perth College (Room 810 Webster Building).