**THE GLENGARRY TRUST**

**Quarterly Meeting**

**Monday 14th June 2021**

**8.20pm Glengarry Community Hall awning**

**TRUSTEES PRESENT:** C. Grant (CG), M. MacRae (MMR, Chair), M. MacLennan (MM), C. MacLennan (CM), J. Sutherland (JS), B. Swannell (BS) and D. Collins (DC)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** A. Cooper (AC, Secretary)

**Minutes of the last meetings**

There were three sets of minutes to review. Quarterly meeting minutes were proposed by CG and seconded by MM. There were also additional meetings in April and May and the minutes for these were proposed by CG and seconded by MMR.

Feedback was provided that the P6/7 alternative activities were a great success.

Discussion about a plan for data storage with a proposal to move everything online through scanning documents in and using Google Drive. Suggestion a Student might be able to help with this.

**Action:** AC to explore options around data storage and get a photograph of the bus stop for the FB page.

**Coronavirus**

The response provided by the Trust and partners is now coming to a close, however anyone in need can still apply for a welfare grant.

**Scoring sheets**

A revised scoring system was shared by AC with Trustees, this will be piloted to see if this works well.

**Declaration of interests**

CG declared an interest as Board Member of Community Woodlands

DC also declared a conflict.

**Applications for discussion**

**XX/265**

CG noted there is a section on hardship in our Deed. MM commented that the impact is far reaching and felt that there should be support provided as a result. MMR expressed the view that evidence is required of the shortfall.

**Action:** AC to write to the applicant to request a letter that there is a shortfall and should the grant be awarded, evidence of the costs will be required as a condition of the grant. AC is also to seek clarification about discussions with the Community Council the applicant has mentioned in the application.

**GSC/266 – Shinty Club**

MMR explained that there had been lots of communication with the Club about this application. MMR had been contacted by the Fort Augustus and Glenmoriston Community Company who had asked whether an application had also been made to the Trust as one had been received by them. However, this has now been withdrawn. DC commented that applicants should notify regarding any other funding being pursued within the application form and this had not been completed. All agreed however that although a request had been made to review a vulnerable adults policy, this was not relevant to this application which is to support Juniors only.

Although the majority of Trustees were broadly supportive of the application, it was noted that at the point of application £800 had been fundraised and that successful fundraising had continued since the application was submitted. In light of this and the issue of not disclosing the approach to another funder,

Trustees would like clarity from the applicant as to how much money has been raised for this specific project to date before they are able to make a decision about a grant.

Despite the issue around the approach to the other funder not being disclosed, the application was well completed on the whole, and the number of Juniors attending training is at an all time high.

For future applications affecting the whole club the Trustees would be keen to see a vulnerable adults policy.

**Action:** AC to write to the applicant to ask for further information about the ongoing fundraising for the project to support Trustees in their decision making about the grant award.

**GCW/267**

MMR explained that her Father is a proposed contractor for this project and therefore she cannot be involved in a decision.

CG did not take part in these discussions as he is a Board member of the Community Woodlands.

JS wished to raise the issue of the letter received from the Board of the Community Woodlands. She commented that Glengarry Community Woodlands may be inferring that the Trust are not performing in the interests of the community and that they might do the job better. JS also speculated as to whether the Community Woodlands should be applying for more commercial funding. JS expressed the view that if the inference is that Trustees are not careful enough with public money, then we should take additional time with the application and proposed a timescale stretching over several months in which to consider the application. JS went on to say that she had discussed this with MMR who had suggested that the application is passed to SSE (anything over £25,000 they have asked to see, although this application is only for £14,000 from the Trust the total project amount is over £25,000). JS stated that she felt the criticism was unfair as the Trust deal with the wider community not just the Community Woodlands. CM commented how upset she was about the letter that had been received. CM commented that it is a lot of work to go through such a large application and as a result of the letter she had not felt able to score it prior to the meeting. BS asked whether the letter received from the Board should affect the decision making

around the application. MMR commented that it should as the Woodlands are suggesting the Trust cannot score applications properly so it raises the question of how equipped Trustees feel to score this one. DC asked whether the application for discussion at the current meeting was last year’s one referred to in the letter from the Board or a new one. MMR explained it was a new one. MMR went on to explain that an issue arose last year due to the Trust wanting to fund part of a different application subject to planning permission when elements of the project were not reliant on this. MMR went on to list the various Community Woodlands projects the Trust had funded and the sums involved. DC said that she thought the intention for the eco cabins was that they would be self-sustainable so that grants were not required in the future. MMR commented that the Development Officer was supposed to be self-sustaining by this September and it does not look like this will be the case. However, MMR reflected on the fact that the timescales for this would likely have been adversely affected by Coronavirus. DC said that there might be benefit in asking SSE for their view. Comments were made that Falck could also be approached. MMR commented that the letter from the Community Woodlands had come in after the decision had been made to include the Woodlands in the changes to the Trust deed and that this was unfortunate, as one of the concerns raised is that the Community Woodlands were not represented on the Trust.

BS asked for clarity – were Trustees saying there is concern about ongoing requests for funding for this applicant. MMR said she felt the applicant was contradicting themselves by saying they would be self-funding in 2021 and she was concerned that funds need to be shared amongst the whole community and not just on one project. MMR went on to say that other big projects might arise as well and funds should be shared equitably. DC commented that it is a very valuable resource and asset for the community but it is important to take account of the proportion of funding spent on different projects.

Notwithstanding all of the concerns raised above, all agreed that it looks like a very good project and the application is well completed.

**Action:** AC to write to the applicant to explain that following a review of the application and acknowledging the concerns highlighted in the letter from the

Board, Trustees would like to refer the application to the funders (SSE and Falck) for their independent and objective evaluation and advice.

**Action:** Going forward AC has been asked to publicise that any applicationover £5,000, applicants should be encouraged to ask for a meeting with Trustees. Suggestion that future applications for larger amounts provide a short presentation.

**Completion reports**

The following completion reports were received during the quarter:

* GCW/245
* SG/252
* ICP/261

BS and DC enquired about the paperwork for applicants. AC said she would send this on to them for their reference.

**Action:** AC to send forms to BS and DC relating to applications and reporting.

**Report on applications to date**

Shared with Trustees in a new format which all agreed worked well.

**Finances**

Only update following the AGM report is a Student asked for an alteration to their grant and AC has purchased some stationary.

Need another signatory – BS and DC both volunteered.

**Action:**  MMR and AC to change signatories as above.

**AOCB**

1. Student application came in late – for discussion in September.
2. Application for something unusual was discussed. Seek further information on future plans from the applicant.

**Action:** AC to write as per above

1. Ness News have asked for an article by the following morning – all agreed to include application deadline and information for school leavers on Apprenticeship.

**Action:** AC to provide copy for Ness News

**The meeting closed at 22.10 pm**