



Teesdale Area Action Partnership - Board Meeting Minutes

Meeting Held: 21 September 2022 – Etherley Methodist Church

Elected Members:

Cllr George Richardson
Cllr James Rowlandson
Cllr Richard Bell
Cllr Robert Potts
Cllr Wendy Greenfield (Town & Parish Council's Representative)

Public Representatives:

Elaine Laurie
Rachel Tweddle
Robin Brooks
Lynne Oxby
Christine Watters
Susan Bainbridge
Roger Peat

Partner Representatives:

Peter Locke
Craig Jewkes
Linda Bird
Sgt Angela Drasdo
Tim Viggars

Co-opted

Grace Crawford

Presenter

Jenny Wood (JW) – ERS Principal Consultancy – Community Engagement Review

Officer Attendance:

Adam White, TAP Coordinator
Annalisa Ward, TAP Community Development Project Officer
Peter Henderson, CDPO Towns and Villages Community Development Project Officer
Emma Walton, AAP Support Officer

Observers: 3 x Forum Members

Apologies:

Insp Ed Turner
Bob Danby
Alison Clark

Teesdale Action Partnership Board Meeting

1. Welcome from Chair, Introductions and Apologies

In the absence of Insp ET, **Cllr Richard Bell** will chair the meeting. **Cllr RB** welcomed everyone to the Board meeting of Teesdale Action Partnership (TAP).

Cllr RB reminded meeting observers they would be welcome to comment under items 4,8 and 9 on the agenda.

EW confirmed that apologies for absence had been received, as noted above.

AW stated that due to the resignation of Tracey Williams, a recruitment exercise has taken place and **Susan Bainbridge (SB)** has been appointed to the TAP Board. **AW** thanked Tracey Williams for her time on the TAP Board and welcomed **SB**.

AW also confirmed that Sgt Drasdo is attending in place of Insp Turner and Grace Crawford is also substituting for Bob Danby.

2. Declaration of Interest and Meeting Protocol

AW made the Board aware of the declaration of interest procedure and informed all Board members that this is a standard item on the agenda. **AW** informed the Board and Forum Members of 'house rules/etiquette' for the meeting.

Cllr Rowlandson declared an interest in Witham Hall Ltd - Enhancing the appeal of the Witham project.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

The draft minutes from the meeting held on 13 July 2022 have been circulated in advance with the meeting papers. **AW** reviewed the minutes for matters arising, actions and accuracy.

AW confirmed there were no further outstanding actions. The minutes of the last meeting were **agreed** by the Board as a true and accurate record.

AW notified the Board that there are 2 items that will be raised under AOB.

4. Community Engagement Review

4.1 Community Engagement Review

Board Members received a presentation from **Jenny Wood (JW)**, Principal Consultant – ERS Consultants on the Community Engagement Review.

JW gave an overview of the current review, its methodology, and the key stakeholders that will be involved. The review will work within the existing AAP structures to gain individuals views on community engagement and the AAP structure in supporting community engagement.

The review will take place between June – December 2022.

JW highlighted that a survey will be circulated to both past and present AAP Board and forum members to seek the views on community engagement within AAP's. Board and forum members were encouraged to submit their views through the survey.

AW highlighted a focus group for Board members will be held on the 29 September 2022 at the Witham, Barnard Castle.

A Q&A session took place, and the following points were noted:

RT asked how the survey will be promoted. **JW** stated that the consultants will be attending Board and task and finish group meetings, speaking with community champions, holding visioning events, and will be attending 1-2-1 interviews across the County. A link to the survey will also be promoted through social media. Paper copies of the survey can also be available upon request.

RB asked how the views of the wider public will be sought. **JW** stated that the views of the wider public will be captured online with the support of local groups and organisations.

LB asked how the work of the AAP's will be celebrated. **JW** stated that feedback has generally been positive, and that 'best practice' will be shared amongst AAP's. Evidence will be collected and any future changes, based on consensus, to AAP's will be explored. **Cllr GR** stated that TAP AAP could be used as a flagship AAP.

Cllr RB asked how the review will be kept consistent across AAP's. **JW** stated that individuals will be encouraged to identify the AAP they are providing feedback on. Individuals will also be provided with the opportunity to feedback anonymously.

WG asked how the review will consider in both rural and urban AAP's. **JW** explained that the survey relates to the delivery of community engagement and development and how these mechanisms contribute to the work of the AAP's. **JW** highlighted that the survey would differ depending on your role and involvement within the AAP.

A **forum member** asked will the review provide the AAP'S with the opportunity to share 'best practice' and to highlight improvements that can be made, or is the review to 'start again?' **JW** confirmed the evaluation of the review will provide improvements to the AAP's going forward.

A **forum member** reported that many organisations, groups, and local individuals aren't aware that they receive support / benefit from the work of the AAP's. **JW** stated

that views will be sought from those already engaging with AAP's and with the help of community groups and organisations from those in the community. Through the community engagement element of the review the awareness of AAP's will be raised, and contact information will be obtained from individuals that are interested in becoming further involved in the work of the AAP.

Cllr RP raised concerns with the distribution of funding amongst AAP's given the number of parish councils, the population of the AAP, the number of schools, village halls etc that differ across each AAP area and felt that this should be reflected in the funding allocated to each AAP. He also stated that the costs to deliver a project in a rural area increases drastically. In addition, each AAP has access to alternative funding opportunities, such as Section 106 Funding, that may not be so prevalent in other AAP areas. **Cllr RP** asked will the funding allocation across AAP's be considered in the review. **JW** stated that as part of the review the distribution of funding across the geographical area has been raised. The issue with regards to the delivery of a project in a rural area has been highlighted. This factor will be considered as part of the review.

Cllr RB suggested exploring how each elected member spends their funding and how easily the funding is distributed. **Cllr RB** stated that based on the points raised above, some AAP's may struggle to allocate their Neighbourhood Budget funding.

Cllr RB expressed his views on the elected member ratio on AAP Board's and highlighted concerns that have been previously flagged up regarding governance arrangements across AAP's. However, stated that this is not the case in TAP.

Cllr GR reiterated that politics has never been an issue at TAP, he also praised the work of the AAP Team over the years.

Cllr RB thanked **JW** for the presentation.

5. Area Budget

AW confirmed that a copy of the full Area Budget applications has been circulated in advance with the meeting papers. **AW** highlighted that Board members were given the opportunity to provide any comments to the TAP team in advance of tonight's meeting. No comments were received.

All applications have been considered by the Community Recovery Task and Finish Group and relevant service providers. All the applications are recommended for Board **approval**.

AWard gave a brief outline of each project:

5.1 1st Middleton in Teesdale Scout Group – Scouts COVID Kickstart

Area Budget request: £6,194

Match Funding: £520

Total Project Cost: £6,714

No comments were raised, and the Board **APPROVED** the application.

5.2 Durham County Council: Parks and Countryside – Access improvements on Tees Valley Railway Path

Amount of funding requested: £10,000

Match Funding: £10,920

Total Cost of Project: £20,920

No comments were raised, and the Board **APPROVED** the application.

5.3 Arts of the Brain – Blaize

Amount of funding requested: £5,000

Match Funding: £200

Total Cost of Project: £5,200

No comments were raised, and the Board **APPROVED** the application.

5.4 Copley Village Hall – building work, refurbishment, and upgrade to equipment

Amount of funding requested: £10,000

Match Funding: £6,317

Total Cost of Project: £16,137

No comments were raised, and the Board **APPROVED** the application.

5.5 Walking Football Club Development – Middleton Wanderers Walking Football Club

Amount of funding requested: £5,000

Match Funding: £534

Total Cost of Project: £5,534

Grace Crawford declared an interest in the project.

No comments were raised, and the Board **APPROVED** the application.

5.6 Teesdale Day Clubs – Access and Engagement

Amount of funding requested: £12,500

Match Funding: £6,027

Total Cost of Project: £18, 527

Susan Bainbridge declared an interest in this project.

No comments were raised, and the Board **APPROVED** the application.

AWard to forward the Area Budget applications to the DCC Funding Team for technical appraisal. **(ACTION 1: AW)**

6. Towns and Villages Funding

AW gave a brief overview of each project of the EOI's for Towns and Villages Funding:

6.1 Witham Hall Ltd - Enhancing the appeal of the Witham

Amount of funding requested: £20,000

Match Funding: £13,438

Total Cost of Project: £33,438

RP declared an interest in the project.

TV asked has the rising costs of electricity been considered. AWard stated that the lighting will be LED lighting.

No further comments were raised, and the Board **APPROVED** the application.

6.2 Hamsterley Parish Council - Hamsterley MUGA

Amount of funding requested: £35,000

TV Cllrs Neighbourhood Budget: £10,000 (£5,000 from both Cllr Potts and Cosslett)

Match Funding: £51,250

Total Cost of Project: £86,250

Cllr RB asked does the match funding meet the TV funding criteria. PH confirmed this.

Cllr GR asked how the area will be secured. AW highlighted that the site is in an open, visible location within the village. Volunteers will also regularly check the site. This should help mitigate any issues. Cllr RP also indicated that environmental improvements have also been made to mitigate any issues with parking. AWard to feedback the question to the applicant. **(ACTION 2: AWard)**.

No further comments were raised, and the Board **APPROVED** the application.

AWard to forward the Towns and Villages applications to the DCC Funding Team for technical appraisal. **(ACTION 3: AW)**

Cllr RB thanked the work of the task group in supporting the allocation of Area Budget and Towns' and Villages funds.

7. Neighbourhood Budget

AWard confirmed that a summary sheet for both NB proposals has been circulated in advance with the meeting papers. The Board received the following Neighbourhood Budget applications for information and comment only.

AWard gave a brief outline of each proposal.

7.1 Woodland Village Hall Phase 2

AWard confirmed that the request for NB is £5,000 (£2,500 each from Councillors Potts and Cosslett).

No comments were raised.

7.2 Romalldkirk Parish Council – Notices for village greens

AWard confirmed that the request for NB is £1,493.15 (£746.57 Councillor Bell and £746.58 Councillor Henderson)

No comments were raised.

AWard to forward the NB applications to the DCC Funding Team for technical appraisal.
(ACTION 4: AWard)

8. Locality Neighbourhood Issues

8.1 Locality Policing Issues

Sgt Angela Drasdo gave an update on the main issues for the TAP area:

- A Public Space Protection Order has been in place from April around Low Force, High Force and Gibson Cave. To date there have been no complaints received and no fixed penalties issued.
- The speedwatch van has been mobilised across the TAP area. Staff and volunteers are currently being trained to use the equipment.
- The Police have attended Egglestone Show.
- Crime in the TAP area remains low however there has been an increase in farm related thefts. Crime preventing equipment has been issued.
- The Ruralwatch scheme continues to work well and is very productive.

8.2 Neighbourhood Issues

AW confirmed there has been two neighbourhood issues raised, in advance of the meeting. A Board member has raised concerns with regards to the proposal to switch off the Public Switched Telephone Service at the end of 2025. **AW** suggested sending a letter, from the Board to Digital Durham to express the Board's concerns.

The Board **AGREED** to submit a letter to Digital Durham highlighting the concerns raised. **(ACTION 5: AW)**

AW suggested inviting Alli Walker to provide an update on the switchover to a future Board meeting. This was **AGREED** by the Board. **(ACTION 6:AW).**

In addition, a forum member asked for an update on the new camera that has been installed at the County Bridge and asked what provision is there for making the violation, enforcement, and penalties statistics available to the public. **AW** stated that a response has been obtained from DCC Parking Services and highlighted the following:

As new legislative powers have come into force which allow local authorities to apply for moving traffic enforcement powers, Durham County Council has been granted the power to enforce the weight limit on the Barnard Castle Bridge.

The new powers means that we will be able to take over enforcement from the police and issue penalty charge notices under the Traffic Management Act 2004, with non-payment resulting in enforcement action taken against the vehicle owner.

The infrastructure is now in place and enforcement is imminent, however we, alongside all other local authorities who have applied for these powers, are still awaiting camera certification approval from the Vehicle Certification Agency before we can commence enforcement.

We intend to publish our statistics on an annual basis within our Parking Annual Report, which will be available online at www.durham.gov.uk.

AW stated that the Police reiterated the comments from DCC and stated that, under part 6 power of the traffic management act, the Police will not intervene once an offence has been designated for enforcement.

A **forum member** asked can TAP be updated once the Vehicle Certification Agency certificate has been received. **AW** to obtain an update from DCC Parking Services, once the cameras are live and to request the launch date be publicised. In addition, to obtain regular updates on the number of violations, enforcements, and penalties. **(ACTION 7:AW)**.

A **forum member** reported that the annual parking statement released on the DCC website is 'unintelligible'.

8.3 Task Group

LB provided an update on the work of the task group. The task group have visited venues that have previously received funding from TAP to showcase the work that has taken place. Project leads have been invited to attend task group meetings in order for them to provide an overview of their project and answer any questions regarding their project proposal. **LB** commented positively on the work of the task group and the geographical spread of projects that have been supported.

AW stated that the task group have raised concerns with the impact of the rising costs of living and fuel costs for local organisations. **AW** suggested having these issues on TAP's radar for future funding. **Cllr RB** stated that a 'Warm Places' scheme will be launched on the council website in the coming weeks. **LB** stated that Durham Community Action are offering support to community hubs. Consultation has

taken place with community hubs and the following key priorities have been identified:

- Energy efficiency,
- Digital connectivity
- Community resilience

LB stated that workshops have been established for each of the priorities with the first workshop, to discuss energy efficiency, taking place on 28 September 2022, 8pm via Zoom.

9. Coordinators Update

9.1 TAP Press Article

The Board were provided with an update on the press coverage TAP has received in Teesdale Mercury over the July - September 2022 period. **AW** thanked Teesdale Mercury for the press coverage.

9.2 Area Budget Spend

The Board were provided with the Area Budget Spend Profile for 2022/23. The report includes the status of each project. A copy of the spend profile was circulated, in advance of the meeting, with the meeting papers. **AW** highlighted there are also several projects in the pipeline.

9.3 Q1 Monitoring Update

AW confirmed that the quarter 1 updates (April – June 2022) have been circulated to project leads. These will be collated and circulated to the Board, shortly. **AW** stressed; if any Board members would like to submit individual comments for circulation that they are more than welcome to do so.

AW stated that project updates are also provided at task group meetings.

9.4 AOB

- **A66 update**

Cllr RB stated that the routes at Rokeby junction will be going to public enquiry. The Council has written into the planning inspector and are awaiting further information.

- **Solar Farm**

TV raised concerns with information on social media with regards to a solar farm being erected on Cockfield fell. **Cllr RP** stated that the information on social media is incorrect and there is not a conclusion as to where this will be situated, work is taking place locally to discuss the location.

10. Date/Time/Venue for Next Meeting

Cllr RB thanked Board and Forum members for attending the meeting.

The TAP Board meeting will be held on Wednesday 9 November 2022, 6pm, Butterknowle Village Hall.