

## **Farming in Protected Landscapes**

Minutes of the FiPL Local Assessment Panel (LAP) held at 5.30pm on Thursday 27 January 2022 using Zoom.

**Present** Pieter Montyn (Chairman)

Jen Walter Romy Jackson Sam Wilson Henri Brocklebank

### **Officers**

Sarah Chatfield Richard Austin Colin Hedley Rosie Chase (minutes)

### **1.0 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- 1.2 Apologies for absence were received from Ann Briggs, Kate Bull, Charlotte Bartlett and Jack Bentall.
- 1.3 The Panel noted the resignation of Charlotte Bartlett due to conflicting work pressures.

### **2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 2.1 Angus Sprackling declared an interest in the projects for which he has applied for funding at items 6a) CH001 Eames Farm, Geo-Tagging & No Fence Technology and 6b) CH011 Eames Farm, No Till Drill
- 2.2 Sam Wilson declared an interest in the projects for which he has applied for funding at item 6e CH014 Public Interaction at Stoke Fruit Farm.

### **3.0 MINUTES**

- 3.1 The minutes from last LAP meeting, held on the 17th of January 2022 were agreed as a true record of the meeting and were signed by the Chairman.

### **4.0 MATTERS ARISING**

- 4.1 **Feedback from Defra regarding intervention rates.** Sarah Chatfield confirmed that Defra have said that a LAP cannot increase the intervention rate above that which the applicant has applied for. She went on to say that where countryside stewardship rates exist for an item, the LAP must take these rates into consideration. There are CS rates for both bio filters and wash down areas and so the panel must compare the grant request to these when considering the intervention rate. She said if the panel wish to agree an intervention rate above the countryside stewardship rate there needs to be a strong justification for that increase. The project must deliver over and above that which would be delivered under the requirements of the CS scheme. It was felt that Andrew Huxham's application showed that justification. It was an exemplar project to lead the way in pesticide handling in the catchments of the rivers that feed into the harbour and addressing a key AONB management priority. As part of the project, the applicant would be a FiPL ambassador, promoting best practice and sharing his learning from the project, holding farm open days and supporting other FiPL events.
- 4.2 Colin Hedley said he had confirmed with Andrew Huxham that he was not already receiving any Countryside Stewardship funding for this project. Sarah Chatfield said

that the applicant was applying for a bigger scheme than is provided for under the Countryside Stewardship rate which helped to demonstrate that 'value for money' was being achieved.

- 4.3 **FiPL End of Year Review.** Richard Austin ran through the questions which were circulated before the meeting.

**What has gone well with Chichester Harbour FiPL?** Richard Austin said that the panel had been properly constituted as per Defra's requirements, with the right balance.

**What could have gone better?**

- A member said that returning to meetings in person would make life more difficult for them to attend.
- Another member said that the AONB Manager and CHaPRoN Manager were to be congratulated for their hard work. They went on to say that if partner organisations have ideas on how a farmer can improve an idea, there should be a way for them to feed back to those farmers before it was scrutinised.
- A member said that having a designated officer would be useful, with the purpose of helping farmers to put together schemes, with knowledge of all the different funding streams and their different terms and conditions. They went on to say that it can be very complicated to apply for some grants and other funding streams have quite restrictive conditions.
- A member said the grants are not just for nature recovery and the environment, and people should be encouraged to apply under all the requirements.
- The AONB Manager asked for all responses to be with him in the next 24 hours.

**5. NEW APPLICATIONS**

**CH001 Eames Farm, Geo-Tagging & No Fence Technology.**

- 5.1 Sarah Chatfield said that Defra have agreed this technology can be trialled and that an 80% intervention rate would be appropriate. The applicant said that collars around the cattle act in place of fencing, he would be using them on his Galloway herds which graze the rougher marshier land, for conservation reasons. He said it would be nice to see the cattle grazing over a larger area, some of which has not been grazed before.

*Angus Sprackling left the meeting.*

- 5.2 Members agreed the scoring for the project as follows;

Project Outcomes (40%)	Value for Money (20%)	Sustainability (20%)	Delivery (20%)	Total Score	Score after weighting
8	8	8	8	32	8

- 5.3 The intervention rate was agreed at 80% - with a grant level of **£5517.96** and the panel heard that the applicant is funding the rest of the project.

- 5.4 Members approved the project.

### **CH011 Eames Farm, No Till Drill**

- 5.5 Sarah Chatfield said that this application had to be compared to the Farming Technology Fund, where there is a direct drill (3metres) and the allowance under that scheme is £12,054. She said she had checked with Defra that the correct comparison had been made.

*Angus Sprackling re-joined the meeting*

- 5.6 The applicant said he had missed the deadline for the Farming Technology Fund. He said the technology would allow him to grow cover crops for his cattle, concentrating on heritage grains. He said that his machinery supplier had recommended this model and it was also the cheapest.

- 5.7 Members agreed the scoring for the project as follows;

Project Outcomes (40%)	Value for Money (20%)	Sustainability (20%)	Delivery (20%)	Total Score	Score after weighting
8	10	8	8	34	8.4

- 5.8 Sarah Chatfield said the applicant had provided a plan for what crops would be delivered and how the equipment would be used for the duration of the FiPL programme.

- 5.9 Members approved the project. Grant request **£12,054.00**

### **CH012 Northney Farm Bird Boxes**

- 5.10 Members were informed that the application for Northney Farm bird boxes was not going to be ready until the next financial year.

*Angus Sprackling re-joined the meeting.*

### **CH013 Chichester Harbour Conservancy, Hay Rake**

- 5.11 The Conservancy's Rangers have put forward a proposal for equipment to help with the management of wild meadows at Cobnor and Itchenor. The hay rake can also be used for other landowners who may want to develop wild meadows. Three quotes were obtained and the cheapest was used, with a cost of £1500 with a 100% intervention rate as there is no commercial gain.

Project Outcomes (40%)	Value for Money (20%)	Sustainability (20%)	Delivery (20%)	Total Score	Score after weighting
8	8	8	10	34	8.4

- 5.12 Members approved the project. Grant request **£1500**

### **CH014 Public Interaction at Stoke Fruit Farm**

- 5.13 Richard Austin informed members that he would be letting Defra know what the underspend would be the next day. He went on to say that items of equipment under £5,000 do not now need three quotes so long as any quote obtained was reflective of the going rate. He introduced the proposal for Stoke Fruit Farm and said that said that delivery within the next six weeks would be challenging.

5.14 The applicant said that the Stoke Fruit Farm was open to the public, for purchases at the farm shop and to see the sunflowers. He said funding would be used to improve the facilities at the farm for users, with signage to describe what crops are growing and routes showing where people can walk. He added that there will be owl boxes with cameras, with live streaming. He said that five acres of wildflowers were planted last year. He said that the Countryside Stewardship fund would not support the project as the wildflowers are grown on an annual basis, being removed in the November, and then replanted in the April.

*Sam Wilson left the meeting*

5.15 Sarah Chatfield said that the intervention rate was determined using the countryside stewardship rate where they applied.

5.16 Members agreed the scoring for the project as follows;

Project Outcomes (40%)	Value for Money (20%)	Sustainability (20%)	Delivery (20%)	Total Score	Score after weighting
8	10	8	10	36	8.8

5.17 Members approved the project. Grant request: **£8980.00**

## **6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

6.1 The date of the next meeting will be on the 7<sup>th</sup> March from 2pm at Eames Farm.