



## European Union

European Regional  
Development Fund  
Investing in your future

### Minutes of the Stage One PEACE IV Review Panel Meeting

Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017, 10.30am  
SEUPB Offices, Belfast

**Project Applicant** – Newforge Community Development Trust  
**Project Title** – Newforge Shared Space Community Complex

---

In Attendance:	Gina McIntyre	SEUPB (Chair)
	Sean Kelly	MC Panel Member
	Ivan Cooper	MC Panel Member
	Philip Graham	Independent Member
	Mark Feeney	SEUPB (observing)
	James Russell	SEUPB (observing)
	Tara McCormick	SEUPB (minutes)

---

#### 1. Introductions

The Chair welcomed Members to the Stage 1 Review Panel meeting of the PEACE IV 2014 – 2020 Programme which has been reconvened to consider the Stage 1 application; *Newforge Shared Space Community Complex* (Newforge Community Development Trust), submitted under the Shared Spaces Capital Development call.

#### 2. Register of Interests/Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Panel.

#### 3. Review

The Chair reminded the panel that the applicant has requested a review on grounds of reasonableness, i.e. –

- (a) The outcome was a decision that no reasonable person would have made on the basis of the information provided to the Steering Committee.

The Chair provided an overview of the process regarding this project to date, as summarised by the Managing Authority in Section 4 of the Review Panel packs.

The Review Panel noted;

- the amended scores under the Value for Money and Project Design criterion following re-assessment by the Steering Committee, and;
- the score awarded under the Project Design criterion (2) did not meet the threshold (3).

The Review Panel assessed the score of 2 under Project Design against the original project application, considered the applicant and JS written submissions, and made the following comments and observations;

- The concept behind the proposal was sound, even exciting, however the application lacked sufficient detail around peace building and how a transformative effect would be achieved to merit the level of investment;
- The application did not sufficiently demonstrate the required contribution to the peace and reconciliation outputs;
- The application did not offer sufficient analysis/commentary of the perception of the site as exclusive to members of the PSNI, or outline ways of changing this perception;
- The applicant did not significantly evidence that there had been adequate community engagement to support the development of the building and surrounding facilities.

The Chair reminded Members that the Review Panel role is to decide on the reasonableness of the Steering Committee assessment and subsequent scoring and either support or overturn the Steering Committee decision.

The Review Panel had an intense and detailed debate on the merits and potential of the project, however, they felt the project did not provide sufficient evidence to alter the score of the Steering Committee and progress the application to Stage 2 assessment.

**In conclusion, the Review Panel agreed that, while the concept behind the proposal had merit, on the basis of the evidence presented the case had not been made to allow the Panel to alter the score of the Steering Committee and progress the application to Stage 2. The decision taken by the Steering Committee was therefore reasonable.**

The Chair thanked the Panel and concluded the meeting. The Review Panel decision will be communicated to the applicant in writing within 14 days of the Review Panel meeting.