Ready for noting at your next PC meeting:

Minutes of 6 Parish Councils, re Community Disruption Fund (CDF) Mallard Pass Solar,

meeting held on Wednesday 9th September 2026 at 6pm in the village hall at Carlby.

Please note; the minutes are not verbatim yet should pick up the pertinent issues and comments accordingly, and capture the essence of each Cllr's questions. All questions are good questions. A full recording will be filed until such time the minutes are formally ratified as a true representative of the meeting.

Present: in order of introduction

Trevor Burnfield, Essendine member of public, acting Facilitator, chair of this meeting... FTB

Joe Stainsby, Cllr. Chair Essendine PC, **Vote** ..... CJS

Graeme Hepburn, Cllr. Chair Uffington PC, **Vote** ..... CGH

Susan Burgoin, Cllr. Braceborough and Wilsthorpe PC..... CSB

Di Holden, Cllr. Braceborough and Wilsthorpe PC..... CDT

David Wilby, Cllr. Ryhall PC..... CDW

Kevin Corby, Cllr. Ryhall PC, **Vote** ..... CKC

David Kentish, Cllr. Chair Braceborough and Wilsthorpe PC, **Vote** ..... CDK

Steve Collins, Cllr. Braceborough and Wilsthorpe PC..... CSC

Sarah Gresty, Clerk to Ryhall and Carlby PCs..... CSG

Lesley Sweeting, Cllr. Carlby PC ..... CLS

Steve Markham, Cllr. Carlby PC ..... CSM

Philip Britton, Cllr. Chair Greatford PC, **Vote**..... CPB

John Bavister, Cllr. Chair Carlby PC, **Vote** ..... CJB

Sue Fortune, CEO of Lincolnshire Community Foundation..... LCF

Objective of the meeting:

To decide whether to appoint or not, LCF as the Management Administrator for the 200k construction distribution fund proposal, gifted from PEP/Quinbrook.

To listen and interact with LCF, inconclusion of no further questions LCF to leave the meeting.

Take further discussions prior to the 6 voting PC's democratic decision on the outcome?

The meeting opened under the chair of FTB with LCF giving an overview of the history and activities in the arena of grant making and fund dispersal. Expanding on the LCF proposal previously circulated.



Mallard Proposal.pdf

Relevant explanation points by Sue Fortune CEO noted:

LCF, are an independent Lincolnshire grant maker established for 24 years with a sole purpose being the distribution of grant funding.

LCF, receive many donations from businesses, general public members and families; many funds can be Gov.uk grant matched. Donated permanent endowment funds currently at £4.5 to 5 million, the investment return is distributed as grant funding within the county of Lincolnshire.

LCF, also distribute value in Community Benefit Schemes (CBS) their first one being Bicker's on shore wind plant running now for 20 years with a forecast life of 25 years from commencement.

LCF, do not make the decisions on funding. All resources determined by local panels, to the funds aims and objectives. LCF are there to help, guide and administer the funds.

LCF, are currently talking to ~ 20 infrastructure developers' significant development going ahead in Lincolnshire. Some small developments are best re directed to Parish Councils to manage their own schemes. As LCF fees would be out of proportion with the value of the fund granted by the developer.

LCF, are fundamentally set up to grant funds to grass roots organisations.

LCF, to increase our fund gifting activity, having just secured £1.5 million from Lincolnshire County to support domestic oil top ups. Previously known as 'household support funding', has now transition to the 'Government crisis and resilience funding', related to the cost of living, inflation and predicament price increase impact. Funding individuals and households who are in extreme difficulty.

LCF, just signed off last year's accounts, with a clean audit of £3.8 million distributed.

LCF, each county will have a community foundation; not all have experience with Wind and Solar. LCF are engaged with Leicestershire and Rutland Community Foundation (LRCF) who have no experience of wind and solar, managing community benefit schemes. Both have spoken together on this dual subject. LCF being the lead administrator yet acting as one. LCF is aware of the proportion of impact in the Parishes of Rutland.

Questions and *answers,* and some discussions that may need additional comments by LCF address:

FTB, can LCF work alongside LRCF answered above. *Yes*

FTB, LCF have quoted 10% £20,000 for the CDF in their circulated proposal. *LCF fees start at 10-15%. LCF judge fees on the work load involved. When the level of involvement is understood it would not be less than 10% but probably no more 12% in this case to be reviewed.*

FTB, the 10% 20k, can LCF confirm the amount is linked for the construction period expected to be 2 to 2.5 years? *Yes.*

FTB, can we confirm the group are only considering at this stage the CDF and you would have to take the issue of two elements, the second element CBF not being considered as yet. At present there is no fixed annual sum agreed for the CBF with PEP/Quinbrook? *LCF would report to the board but able to sign this separation off as CEO.*

FTB, raised the issue of investment vehicles, expected no deployment for one year from receipt of £200k. Guidance required where the best route is for a risk adverse investment? *LCF It would be invested alongside LCF investments 'ring fenced as Mallard Pass Community disturbance fund'. No option to specify where this investment is placed independently, LCF finance group decide where it is invested. There will be a clear donation agreement. Assume it will be with the developer? There is no delay from the board of trustees when money goes out, with a very quick turnaround from when the local panel agrees a donation.*

CJB, does the £200,000 get invested as is or does the LCF fee come off prior, being £180k the invested value? *LCF* will *probably take a view that LCF fee is taken off post investment year.*

CJS, to clarify as the fund CDF increases due to investment return, does LCF fee go up? *LCF No, it is a fixed fee as in the agreement as a fixed percentage of the amount originally gifted.*

CGH, with CBF is the fee the percentage agreed? *LCF Yes, as the annual sum increases due to index linked it remains the agreed % fee of that sum received per year.*

CDK, how does it work, communication, set up, etc.? The best way for a win-win?

**Note: this generates a lot of good clarifying discussion, listing the relevant points from LCF.*

- ✓ *Work out the priorities for the CDF, for the area of benefit*
- ✓ *Local delegated representatives panel of the area affected*
- ✓ *Based on local knowledge/intelligence*
- ✓ *If requiring a quorate of 3, will require 5 representatives in a panel*
- ✓ *Local priorities for the fund, LCF can only advise*
- ✓ *Panel representative ebb and flow may change over time*

CDK, how have panels made their decisions do they go back to the stake holders?

- ✓ *LCF facilitates re CBF*
- ✓ *LCF make sure there is a clear process*
- ✓ *LCF have the role of in forming applications but not the decision. Give reasons why if no.*
- ✓ *LCF usually oversubscribed, applications summary sent to panel in advance prior to coming together.*
- ✓ *LCF refine the process; panel members can communicate direct with their grant maker on questions.*

CGH, assuming LCF influences are only advisory, applications are compliant, our money is being considered correctly, does LCF have the right to say no to applications?

- ✓ *Only if a grant request goes way beyond the funds remit*
- ✓ *Comes back to the agreement, which will clarify what LCFs role is*

CGH, doesn't the group set the remit?

- ✓ *Priorities are set on local needs, local knowledge*
- ✓ *LCF agree the priorities with the group as LCF would not know them specifically*
- ✓ *LCF would help setting out the guide lines for the funding.*

CDW, what insurance against our investment does LCF hold? *LCF have trustee collective and personal indemnity, can provide copy of insurance policy doctrine with Charity insurers.*

CDW, the CDF money has been gifted to us the parish councils as a group, i.e. the group decide what to do with the money? *LCF The funding comes from the developers, the group decide how it is distributed.*

CJB, has added (within minimal restrictions required by the PEP/Quinbrook, No religious or political grants)

FTB, the group need to have this clarified, who's money, is it? *LCF Make sure the groups interests are covered in the agreement, CDF is a unique situation, possibly this could be a triparty agreement.*

CDT, would the group have to get authority from the developer to use the money? *LCF Not within the terms of your objectives in the agreement.*

CKC, as the CDF is our money, comes under the terms of reference, does the CBF have to come under the same terms? *LCF Previously has had one previous disturbance fund that went straight into the CBF yet can have separate agreement as their disturbance fund was a one of lump sum. Their CBF goes on for 40 years paid annually.*

CKC, do the terms reference, the terms of funding, the terms of allocation, then would be broadly the same? *LCF It depends on what remit the group require.*

FTB, calls important excellent question, and clarifies the difference between CDF and CBF

CJS, comments do not assume it will be the same management company for the CBF

CPB, ask for clarification, is the lump sum an advanced forward sum for the CBF? Group members who were collectively at the George hotel meeting clarified PEP/Quinbrook gifted the 200k as a constructional disturbance fund lump sum solely, not linked to the CBF.

CJB, comments not forgetting there is a potential consideration of Great Casterton in the disturbance fund, they have no vote at this meeting! Not represented in the CBF following the construction phase.

FTB, any question is not a bad question.

LCF, would like something written in consideration of that, if doing acceptable management on CDF, LCF would continue as the management company for the CBF? That would inform my board as CBF is LCFs bread and butter that's what LCF do. CDF is probably a differing model.

CJS, suggest putting a caveat (some legal phrase) in the CDF agreement to give a level of confidence and reassurance for both parties.

FTB, to the group, if we go ahead, this is where the real work begins, to arrange an agreement, to agree terms of reference etc.

CJS, requests do LCF have any draft terms of agreement the group, could use as guidance to model on?

LCF, yes, we do, I will send copy of, and suggest request same from PEP/Quinbrook. PEP/Quinbrook's may be very exhaustive terms compared to ours, more legalistic! Use only relevant paragraphs with specific points.

CLS, is that correct LCF have only delt with one other construction disruption fund as a one-off lump sum, as CBFs are completely different. Many CBF funds are Gov.uk linked in value?

LCF, yes correct, we haven't funded any households to date with CBF values. LCF has funded over 200 individual households and individuals who have been 'disadvantage and in poverty' in dire need of support.

The board may ask are we funding households that are in need, probably not, but they have been disadvantaged by disruption, which is key to CDF.

CDK, If LCF fund multiple households will this impact on the charges? *LCF, no from 10 of 1000 the charge remains the same, as assessed at the beginning within the work load. As an example, LCF expect to be inundated by the requirement for oil top up which the charge is 15% and remains the same as agreed to the local authority. LCF fees are commensurate to the level of work, if your work load is low the fees will be lower.*

CPB, Is there a review period for the contract agreement? Can we review every 5 years etc*. LCF, haven't reviewed an agreement so far but there is probably or should be a clause in the agreement if either party wished to review with notice.*

CJB, it's a very valid point as the legacy we leave, different generations will be looking too this fund's agreement and may wish to review and insert some changes.

FTB, most have been involved in commercial contracts which are typical for 3-5years with a review pending

FTB Closed and thanked Sue Fortune,

LCF has left the building.

Some good individual discussions continue back and forth,

Do not get confused between 'C Benefit F' and 'C Disruption F.'

It needs to be a group of 4-5 delegated persons to engage with LCF to start the work.

LCF reference ideally the group should be 3 or 4

But there are 6 parishes, it has to be democratic majority decisions, with a quorate of 3

If 6 parish representatives come to a democratic understand of terms or a remit for the CDF, it only needs a messenger to take this to LCF, not 4-5 persons this is the number required for the deciding panel in the CBF

The 6 representatives should remain the same, until one resigns then replaced by a fully authorised Cllr by that parish. Minutes taken, protocol as PC procedure. Could have a rotating chair?

Voting considerations:

The meeting passages to the second phase with a short opportunity to discuss then moving to a democratic decisive **Vote** on the proposal.

Those who **vote** are the 6 parish Cllrs. endorsed representatives as listed above.

The proposal is: **Does** the group wish to engage or **Not** with Lincolnshire Community Foundation to be the managing administrator of the groups Community Disruption Fund?

Raise of hands for those in favour. 6 hands raise the decision is unanimous.

Points of action:

CJB, to inform Sue Fortune of LCF as to our decision and request sample of terms of reference.

FTB, to inform Rachel Ruffel of PEP/Quinbrook of our decision, following on from the first point of action. To ask Quinbrook for their terms of reference as a guide.

FTB, to call the next meeting where work begins with the 6 parish council representatives to raise the terms of reference and outline embryo points of remit.!

Now agreed as a true representation of the meeting by the 6 voting PCs