

---

**Please find attached the Public Minutes in respect of  
Item 6 on the agenda for the above meeting**

6.	<p><b>Committee Minutes</b></p> <p>Consider Minutes of the following Committees:-</p> <table data-bbox="255 739 1141 985"><tr><td>(a)</td><td>Berwickshire Area Partnership</td><td>4 March 2021</td></tr><tr><td>(b)</td><td>Teviot &amp; Liddesdale Area Partnership</td><td>9 March 2021</td></tr><tr><td>(c)</td><td>Local Review Body</td><td>15 March 2021</td></tr><tr><td>(d)</td><td>Jedburgh Common Good Fund</td><td>22 March 2021</td></tr><tr><td>(e)</td><td>Local Review Body</td><td>19 April 2021</td></tr><tr><td>(f)</td><td>Executive</td><td>20 April 2021</td></tr><tr><td>(g)</td><td>Planning &amp; Building Standards</td><td>26 April 2021</td></tr></table> <p>(Copies attached.)</p>	(a)	Berwickshire Area Partnership	4 March 2021	(b)	Teviot & Liddesdale Area Partnership	9 March 2021	(c)	Local Review Body	15 March 2021	(d)	Jedburgh Common Good Fund	22 March 2021	(e)	Local Review Body	19 April 2021	(f)	Executive	20 April 2021	(g)	Planning & Building Standards	26 April 2021	5 mins
(a)	Berwickshire Area Partnership	4 March 2021																					
(b)	Teviot & Liddesdale Area Partnership	9 March 2021																					
(c)	Local Review Body	15 March 2021																					
(d)	Jedburgh Common Good Fund	22 March 2021																					
(e)	Local Review Body	19 April 2021																					
(f)	Executive	20 April 2021																					
(g)	Planning & Building Standards	26 April 2021																					

This page is intentionally left blank

- |     |                                      |               |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| (a) | Berwickshire Area Partnership        | 4 March 2021  |
| (b) | Teviot & Liddesdale Area Partnership | 9 March 2021  |
| (c) | Local Review Body                    | 15 March 2021 |
| (d) | Jedburgh Common Good Fund            | 22 March 2021 |
| (e) | Local Review Body                    | 19 April 2021 |
| (f) | Executive                            | 20 April 2021 |
| (g) | Planning & Building Standards        | 26 April 2021 |

This page is intentionally left blank

# SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL BERWICKSHIRE AREA PARTNERSHIP

MINUTES of Meeting of the  
BERWICKSHIRE AREA PARTNERSHIP  
held Via Microsoft Teams on Thursday, 4  
March 2021 at 6.30 pm

- Present:- SBC Councillors: J. A. Fullarton (Chairman), J. Greenwell, C. Hamilton, H. Laing, D. Moffat and M. Rowley;  
Other organisations attendees: Ms J. Amaral (BAVS), Mr A. Brooking, Mr J. Brown, Mr K. Dickinson (Gavinton, Fogo & Polwarth CC), Ms A. Fisher (Sea the Change/Berwickshire Marine Reserve), Mr B. Forrest (RAGES), Mr T. Hodge (BHA), Mr A. Manley (Foulden, Mordington & Lamberton CC), Ms D. McKinnon (Eat, Sleep, Ride), Ms A. McNeill (A Heart for Duns), Mr A. Mitchell (Duns CC), Ms R. Noble (Outside the Box), Ms H. Paxton (Greenlaw & Hume CC), Ms H. Smith (Re-Tweed), Ms J. Sutton (Cockburnspath Community).
- In Attendance:- Locality Development Co-ordinator, Strategic Community Engagement Officer and Communities and Partnership Manager; Clerk to the Council.

## 1. **WELCOME AND MEETING PROTOCOLS**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Berwickshire Area Partnership. The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams and the Chairman outlined how the meeting would be conducted and how those both in the meeting and watching via the Live Stream could take part.

## 2. **FEEDBACK FROM MEETING ON 17 DECEMBER 2020**

The Minute of the special meeting of the Berwickshire Area Partnership held on 17 December 2020 had been circulated and was noted.

## 3. **TRANSPORT**

Dan Cathcart, SBC Localities Transport Officer, joined the meeting and gave an update on the local bus services which were currently operating at 80% of pre-Covid levels, subject to CSGR payments from Transport Scotland. The Council was currently conducting a review of all public service contracts to try to ensure that this suited the travelling public. NHS and Care sector ticket discount scheme was available for all bus services so, on presentation of ID on any bus service, these staff would get 50% discount and a free service operated for those leaving Borders General Hospital. With regard to Reston Station, planning consent had been given in February 2021 and the opening would hopefully be in late 2021, subject to funding. Scotrail services were currently running at 65% of timetable and Scotrail was fully supportive of Reston station. Bus services would be reconfigured around train services. The school bus service was returning to normal pending a phased return of pupils to school. Announcements were expected by Scottish Government. Currently a 2 metre distance was required on transport so only 7 or 8 pupils could be on a bus and it was hoped 1 metre distancing would come in for 15 March. In response to some questions, Mr Cathcart advised that in terms of publicity for the ticket discount scheme and free transport from BGH, a PR campaign on the discount scheme had been launched in October 2020, stretched out to the care sector and the free bus in the New Year just as lockdown came back in. More publicity would be put out once wider travel was permitted by Scottish Government. Bus operators had had a certain level of payment maintained from the Council despite the fact school services had not been running and this allowed them to maintain their trading status and keep operating. It was hoped that a 1m distance would be introduced for school transport to allow more pupils to get safely back to school as there were insufficient buses available should the current 2m distancing rule be maintained.

Councillor Rowley asked that others also promote the discount scheme for care workers and confirmed that while some Council buildings had been unoccupied, they still needed maintained and the cost of PPE, additional cleaning, etc. had meant little in the way of savings, with income way down. Mr Cathcart further confirmed that he was also happy to pick up with Barrie Forrest about integrated transport links for Reston Station.

4. **FIT FOR 2024: REVIEW OF AREA PARTNERSHIP AND COMMUNITY FUND**

- 4.1 With reference to paragraph 4 of the Minute of 3 December 2021, copies of the findings and proposals from the Berwickshire Area Partnership Review Sub-Group had been circulated. The Chairman of the Review Sub-Group, Mr Keith Dickinson, gave a presentation on the work of the Sub-Group, thanking the members of the Group for their work and effort in considering a number of issues. The Group had met on several occasions during January and February 2021. With reference to the future of the Area Partnership, the Group favoured the Partnership continuing as a Council committee and was content with the current role, remit and purpose of the Area Partnership as it related to the development, implementation and monitoring of the Berwickshire Locality Plan and Action Plan; and the delivery of the Berwickshire Community Fund. However, in the future, significant modifications to the working/operation characteristics of the Berwickshire Area Partnership would be required to ensure that the core functionality of the Partnership was discharged in a more effective and participatory manner. A key activity of the Partnership related to how the Berwickshire Locality Plan was developed and monitored. The Group believed that the current Partnership model was rather unwieldy, lacked focus and failed to engage with many communities. Discussions in the Group had highlighted how planning at a more local “place” level was seen to be more relevant and would attract greater engagement within communities, and the Group therefore proposed a model of “bottom up” planning from several/many communities. It was recognised that more needed to be done to collate and review existing community plans, bring “place” plans together into a coherent Locality Plan, and regularly monitor all plans. In order to achieve this, it would likely be necessary to undertake substantial capacity building within communities. Good practice already existed throughout Berwickshire, but further efforts would be required to share this experience and operate more effectively as a Partnership.
- 4.2 With regard to the best way forward for the Community Fund, the Group favoured initially (in line with recommendations of the Scottish Community Development Centre report to Scottish Borders Council in early 2020) that no changes be made to the grants for Community Councils, Village Halls and local Festivals. The key outcome from further discussions in the Group was that substantial benefit would derive from a change in the criteria and decision-making processes associated with the Community Fund. It was proposed that a Sub-Committee of the Area Partnership be set up with full delegated powers to undertake the assessment of applications and make awards. All applications to the Community Fund would be dealt with through a single process, to ensure rigour, rationale and uniformity in the assessment of applications. The proposed 10 person Sub-Committee would be drawn from the membership of the Area Partnership and would comprise a combination of experience, representation and “new blood”. While allowing flexibility, it was envisaged that membership would include 3 SBC Elected Members, with an open recruitment process for the remaining members. In general, the Group felt that Area Partnership meetings had yet to realise the level of community engagement and involvement that was originally envisaged. The term “partnership” implied a level of equality between parties and participation in the management of the business and therefore a greater involvement in agenda setting and facilitation of meetings was proposed. In addition, the Group favoured the introduction of a rotating Chair. While a committee of Scottish Borders Council, and therefore for Council to appoint the Chair, the view of the Area Partnership prior to the appointment of a Chair should be sought. If all this was taken forward then the Group considered this would give confidence that the Area Partnership could work in a more effective way in future. The Chairman thanked Mr Dickinson and the Review Sub-Group for all their hard work.

- 4.3 Comments were then received from the meeting attendees:
- Fantastic piece of work; the role of the Chair or a Facilitator was about empowering and enabling but keeping the focus on the purpose of the meeting.
  - The Area Partnership was about people having control and participating.
  - A clear role for SBC officers in the proposed Sub-Committee; the Sub-Committee would be accountable to the Area Partnership.
  - The Sub-Committee would make the decisions on awards of grants from the Community Fund and advise the Area Partnership accordingly.
  - Area Partnership would have an annual discussion on how well the process was working.
  - Consideration would need to be given to widen participation and involve communities; if the business of the Area Partnership was interesting and valuable, with good decisions, then people would participate. If the meetings were just talking shops then it would not work. There should be a group looking at agenda items.
  - When discussing greater community engagement the Review Sub-Group recognised the amount of work happening at a very local level and this could feed in to the Locality Plan and the wider Borders Community Plan e.g. Eyemouth Plan.
  - There were some excellent examples of community place planning; Heart for Duns group was working with Duns Community Council to take forward planning for the local environment and wanted to pilot that model if successful and roll it out further in support of local communities.

#### **DECISION**

**AGREED to support the recommendations of the Review Sub-Group:**

- (a) **the continuation of the Area Partnership as a Council committee;**
- (b) **the continuation of the current role, remit and purpose of Area Partnerships;**
- (c) **the development of a model of bottom-up community planning, assisted by appropriate capacity building and the sharing of good practice;**
- (d) **the retention of the existing Community Councils, Village Halls and Local Festivals grant schemes;**
- (e) **the creation of a Sub-Committee of the Area Partnership – the Berwickshire Community Fund Assessment Group – with full delegated powers to undertake the assessment of applications and subsequently make awards;**
- (f) **the introduction of an Area Partnership sub-group with responsibility for setting and facilitating future meeting topics; and**
- (g) **the request that the Council sought the views of the Berwickshire Area Partnership prior to the appointment of the Chair.**

#### **5. BERWICKSHIRE COMMUNITY FUND 2020/21**

5.1 The Chairman advised that there was a similar problem to the last time when the Fund was oversubscribed, with £33,988 available and applications totalling £62,869. Gillian Jardine, Locality Development Co-ordinator, presented highlights for each project. The applicants were available at the meeting to answer questions, and then left the meeting prior to decisions being made.

(a) **Eat, Sleep and Ride**

This project sought funding of £24,267 to start 'Take the Reins', a personal development programme designed to provide a learning opportunity to high school children aged 13-17 years who were not in full-time education. The programme would be delivered over 26 weeks, with space for 12 young people. In response to

a question, it was confirmed that spaces would be offered to young people from Berwickshire first and then opened to the rest of the Borders.

(b) **Berwickshire Marine Reserve**

This project sought funding of £12,511 to contribute to the costs of employing a Project Officer and project costs for “Conserve Your Marine Reserve”. This Citizen Science project would engage users of the Marine Reserve to help identify pressures that threatened the survival of marine ecosystems and promote people’s ability to appreciate and protect it.

(c) **Sea the Change**

This project sought funding of £7,684 to commission a feasibility study to explore solutions to changes to Coldingham beach infrastructure which were identified in an Access Audit report. The 5 key issues identified were access to the disabled parking, beach wheelchair storage, disabled toilets, the beach and the boardwalk. The Area Partnership expressed some concern about the cost of the feasibility study and queried whether funds would be better spent on the solutions rather than the feasibility study.

(d) **Re-Tweed**

This project sought funding of £5,504 to pilot the delivery of a minimum of two (maximum three – depending on resources) 6-week intensive skills based training (one day/week) in Berwickshire village halls in communities where no other provision existed – Cockburnspath and Westruther or Longformacus. It was confirmed that the Board had talked about this for some time with various organisations, trying to encourage more young people into the mix. A course had taken place in Cockburnspath but due to social distancing requirements, only 4 places were available for the 11 applicants. The aim was to take these courses to smaller communities in Berwickshire where no other provision existed.

(e) **Outside the Box**

This project sought funding of £12,903 for staffing costs for a project to reconnect individuals with each other and encourage and support people back to attending group sessions. The aim would be to deliver 1 to 2 sessions (physical or virtual) per group to raise confidence of individuals, maintain connections and reduce isolation. In response to a question it was confirmed that the organisation worked with individuals to identify gaps in support and encourage peer support so after one or two sessions groups could be self sustaining.

5.2 Members of the Area Partnership considered the applications and discussed whether a reduced amount of funding could be offered to applicants and whether this would have an impact on projects. While officers were able to work with groups on other funding sources, the availability of these could not be guaranteed. The applicants then left the meeting and members of the Area Partnership considered each of the various projects in turn.

**AGREED to the following:**

- (a) **to award Re-Tweed £5,504 from the Community Fund for skills based training training;**
- (b) **to award Berwickshire Marine Reserve £12,511 from the Community Fund for the “Conserve Your Marine Reserve” project;**
- (c) **to award Sea the Change £4,000 from the Community Fund towards access works at Coldingham Beach;**

**(d) to award the remainder of the Community Fund (c. £11,973) to Eat, Sleep, Ride towards the “Take the Reins” project; and**

**(e) to not award any funding to Outside the Box.**

**6. CURRENT CONSULTATIONS**

The Area Partnership noted the following consultations were current:

- Mainstreaming Equality in Scottish Borders Council and the Scottish Borders – consultation to close on 7 March 2021.
- Update Supplementary Planning Guidance – Planning Brief – Former Borders College, Galashiels – consultation to close on 31 March 2021.

**7. BERWICKSHIRE LOCALITY PLAN & ACTION PLAN**

It was noted that the Berwickshire Locality Plan and related Action Plan which outlined the priorities for the Berwickshire area were published on the Council website.

**8. RESTON STATION PROJECT**

Mr Barrie Forest, Chairman of the Rail Action Group East of Scotland, and Allan Brooking of Network Rail were at the meeting. Mr Forest explained that the campaign to reinstate Reston Railway Station went back to 1999, with the first meeting held in Reston Village Hall. The full planning application had now been approved and while it had been a long haul, this would help Berwickshire residents to go north and south by train and also bring people into the area. Mr Forest thanked everyone who had supported the campaign which would bring much benefit to Berwickshire. People understood that the construction period would bring some disruption and the only outstanding matter was that of toilet provision, which Network Rail would not provide at an unmanned station. Councillor Rowley paid tribute to Mr Forest’s work, commenting that Scottish Borders Council had contributed £4m to the project. In terms of toilet provision, this was up to Network Rail as it was their land and station. Councillor Hamilton also paid tribute to the hard work and persistence of Mr Forest and the campaign group which would especially benefit young people by opening up access to college, sports, theatres, shops, etc. Mr Forest added that this would also allow young people to stay at home if they wished.

**9. COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT 2015**

It was noted that no formal participation or asset transfer requests had been received. There was one informal asset transfer request currently under discussion, but no details of that could be released at the present time.

**10. COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT FOR AREA PARTNERSHIPS**

The Area Partnership noted the links to information on Community Empowerment on the previously circulated paper.

**11. FIT FOR 2024**

James Lamb, SBC Portfolio Manager, joined the meeting and gave a presentation on the Council’s proposals for Place Making. Rather than engaging on the Built Estates, the focus would be on Service Redesign. This was a more joined-up, collaborative, and participative approach to services, land and buildings, across all sectors within a place, enabling better outcomes for everyone and increased opportunities for people and communities to shape their own lives. Place making would be carried out in four phases, with Phase 1 being preparation and planning (up to July 2021); Phase 2 the initial place making engagement (from August to October 2021); Phase 3 developing the place programmes (September to November 2021); and Phase 4 delivery, monitoring and review (November 2021 into 2022). A workshop would be held at the end of March/beginning of April, to consider alignment, narrative, timescales, themes, governance and best use of resources. During April, high level principles would be drafted, including the criteria for the selection of communities, and initial testing of the engagement plan. Support was being requested from communities for the approach and direction of travel, including making it happen, and linking – over time – Place Planning

with Strategic and Service Planning cycles. Feedback could be given at the meeting or later via email. This linked in very well with the development of the Area Partnership and in response to a question about how this would be prioritised, Mr Lamb confirmed that this would be carried out in all localities and then one or two places would be selected in each locality to take things forward. This was not just the Council but its partners, including South of Scotland Enterprise Agency. Juliana Amaral of BAVS advised that that exercise was already happening in Berwickshire with conversations with communities so it was important to bear that in mind and have joint exercises where possible. Keith Dickinson commented on the workshop and high level plan, and whether a better option would be to support plans at a lower level, which were currently in place or under development, which could feed into a high level plan. It was important that community representatives were involved in the development of the high level plan, rather than having it imposed on communities. Mr Lamb gave assurance that input was being sought from everyone. Councillor Rowley commented that in an ideal world, every village and community would have its own plan and that would be aggregated up. A gate check was in place for each of the 4 phases so the Council would receive a report at each stage for approval before moving on to the next stage. This was a fantastic engagement opportunity. There was also a balancing act between those communities which already had plans in place and these needed to be weighed up as some of them were ready to go. Andrew Mitchell supported the concerns expressed by Keith Dickinson about a top-down approach, referring to the development of the Community Plan and Locality Plan, so it was essential that communities' views were given primacy.

12. **COVID-19**

Links to the NHS Borders website for current updates and Covid support were noted.

13. **NHS BORDERS WELLBEING SERVICE**

The link to the NHS Borders Wellbeing Service was noted.

14. **NHS BORDERS WELLBEING POINT**

The link to the NHS Borders Wellbeing Point was noted.

15. **CARING CONNECTED COMMUNITIES WINTER NEWSLETTER**

The link to the Caring Connected Communities winter newsletter was noted.

16. **NEXT AREA PARTNERSHIP MEETING - AGENDA ITEMS**

No agenda items were raised at the meeting but it was noted that these could be forwarded after the meeting to local Community Councillors, SBC Elected Members or the Communities & Partnership Team.

17. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Juliana Amaral advised that BAVS was creating a directory for emergency food response, community larders, etc. and was currently liaising with others on this.

18. **OPEN FORUM**

No matters were raised.

19. **DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

The dates of the next scheduled meetings of the Berwickshire Area Partnership were noted.

***The meeting concluded at 9.30 pm***

# SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE AREA PARTNERSHIP

MINUTES of Meeting of the TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE AREA PARTNERSHIP held Via Microsoft Teams on Tuesday, 9 March 2021 at 6.00 pm

-----

Present:- Councillors N Richards (Chairman), W McAteer, C Ramage, G Turnbull and R Tatler

30 representatives of partner organisations, Community Councils, and members of the public

Apologies Councillor S Marshall and D Paterson

In attendance:- Service Director Customer & Communities (Part), Communities and Partnerships Manager, Locality Development Co-ordinator (G Jardine), Democratic Services Officer (J Turnbull).

## 1. **WELCOME AND MEETING PROTOCOLS**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Teviot and Liddesdale Area Partnership held remotely via Microsoft Teams, which included Elected Members, guests attending and those watching the live stream.

## 2. **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

The Chairman varied the order of business as shown on the agenda and the Minute reflects the order in which the items were considered at the meeting.

## 3. **FEEDBACK FROM MEETING OF 12 JANUARY 2021**

The Minute of the meeting of the Teviot and Liddesdale Area Partnership held on 12 January 2021 had been circulated and was noted.

## 4. **TRANSPORT UPDATE**

Dan Cathcart, SBC Localities Transport Officer gave an overview of the current local area transport services for Teviot and Liddesdale. Mr Cathcart explained that currently local bus services were operating at 80% of their pre-Covid timetables. Bus services had managed to continue to operate with payments from Transport Scotland's Covid Support Grant, and this payment would continue until June 2021. Mr Cathcart further advised that last summer the NHS and Care Sector had received a 50% ticket discount for bus transport across the Scottish Borders. SBC had also negotiated with services which depart from the Borders General Hospital (BGH) and they would offer a free ticket for anybody boarding at the BGH to their home destination. Mr Cathcart went on to advise that Passenger Transport were currently conducting a review of all public sector contracts including Hawick Town Centre and Bonchester Bridge, and, also commercial services passing through the area to ensure they linked with ancillary services. Passenger Transport were also considering trialling Demand Response Transport (DRT) which was a software package for buses. This was a service similar to Uber and would enable passengers to dial a bus. Mr Cathcart concluded by advising that the school bus service had now reduced social distancing from 2m to 1m for High School services which would make a difference transporting children to schools. The Chairman thanked Mr Cathcart for his attendance and informative update.

## 5. **FIT FOR 2024 – PROPOSED PLACE MAKING APPROACH**

There had been circulated copies of a report by on the Fit for 2024 Proposed Place Making Approach which had been presented to Council on 28 February. The report proposed a phased introduction and development of a Place Making approach to community engagement and participation across Borders' communities. James Lamb, Portfolio Manager for SBC was in attendance to give more detail to the proposal and advise of timescales. Mr Lamb began by referring to the Cosla definition of the Place making principle which was: "A more joined up, collaborative, and participative approach to services, land and buildings, across all sectors within a place, enables better outcomes for everyone and increased opportunities for people and communities to shape their own lives". Mr Lamb advised that the Scottish Government was establishing a Place Based Investment Programme with funding, over five years, to support Place Making-related projects and activity. Details were still being developed, including the eligibility criteria for funding. Mr Lamb went on to explain that the Place Making process was a cyclical, bottom up approach which would feed into partner organisations. There were four distinct phases to the process and between each phase there would be a review. The first phase was preparation and planning, raising awareness of the approach, alignment of activity and governance. Mr Lamb explained that resources might be required to support subsequent phases. Phase 2 was the High Level Place Briefs – initially at Locality level where priorities and needs would be identified. In future years, Place Briefs would be developed for individual communities, recognising that there was no one-size-fits-all and some communities already had community-led action plans. Phase 3 would translate the learnings from the previous phases to develop Locality Place Plans. In effect, these would refresh the locality plans which sit under the community planning process. Phase 4 would be the delivery of quick wins and the establishment of projects as well as identifying what activity needed to be included in the Council's – and partner organisations' service planning and capital planning processes. Area Partnerships would play a central role in monitoring and evaluating progress. Mr Lamb went on to advise that timescales were necessarily ambitious, particularly for the first phase – with Phase 1 to be completed by July and delivery from November onwards. However, timescales were, at this stage, indicative and would be revised at the end of Phase 1. In response to questions Mr Lamb advised the work communities had already undertaken would feed into activity and hopefully taken forward to Locality Place Plans in Phase 3. The Council would support and collaborate with communities in relation to funding for capital projects. However, the criteria for accessing funding was still awaited. Timescales were indicative and could be accelerated to deliver and create programmes. The Area Partnership considered the process should be simplified and accelerated. Engagement should also be with local communities not just through Area Partnerships. The Chair thanked Mr Lamb for his attendance and informative presentation.

## 6. **COVID-19 UPDATE**

Jenni Craig, Service Director Customer and Communities gave an SBC update on the Covid-19 current position. Mrs Craig explained that currently there were nine cases per 100k of Covid-19 in the Borders with 22 cases over the last seven days testing positive. Mrs Craig highlighted that although it was an improving picture, because of the highly contagious variant, cases could rapidly increase and the 'Stay at Home' message remained in place. With regard to education, all primary school children were back in schools with senior pupils returning on a phased basis. A full-time return for secondary pupils would take place after the Easter holiday. SBC were planning for the return to schools and information would be released over the next few days. Mrs Craig advised that plans were being finalised to expand the local programme of community testing for asymptomatic cases. This was important as many people might not have symptoms and would be spreading the virus without realising. Anyone who had Covid-19 symptoms should book a test and self-isolate immediately ([www.gov.uk/get-coronavirus-test](http://www.gov.uk/get-coronavirus-test) or call 0800 028 2816). Ms Craig went on to advise that business support funds were still available and administered by the Council. In addition, there were funds available from other organisations the Strategic Framework Business Fund, Newly Self-Employed Hardship Fund and the Mobile and Home Based Close Contact Services Fund. Information on all business support available was on the Scottish Government website.

With regard to the Community Assistance Hubs (CAHs) Mrs Craig explained that they remained operational to coordinate support required within localities. The CAHs continued to work closely with a range of partners and could be scaled up if necessary. Mrs Craig concluded her presentation by advising of the positive progress of the vaccination programme with almost half of the population receiving their first vaccine. Wave 3 was expected to be completed by mid-April and the rest of the adult population completed by end of July. In response to questions Mrs Craig acknowledged that it would be important to stick by the rules to ensure restrictions were lifted. Local Area Commander Fisher added that policing was based on the four Es - engage, explain, encourage and lastly enforcement. The Chairman thanked Mrs Craig for the informative presentation.

*(Note: Following the meeting the presentation slides and the link to testing information was forwarded to the Area Partnership circulation list).*

## 7. FLOODING

- 7.1 The Chair explained that that this item had been requested following the recent extreme weather conditions and the devastating impact on local communities. Community Councils shared their experiences:-
- 7.2 Southdean Community Council – issues with runoff, cundies, timber transport, increase in house building, verges have been badly damaged and drains required clearing. Greater participation required from SBC with regard to road clearing. Engagement required with Forestry Commission as vertical planting creates flooding downstream. SBC responded quickly to properties affected by flooding. Should be building standards in place for planting – more control by SBC required. Flood protection measures to be commenced before 2022 to give community hope.
- 7.3 Upper Liddesdale & Hermitage Community Council – SBC responsible for producing a working flood risk management plan so should lead on flood prevention – nothing in place for the Liddle Water catchment area. Lack of joined up thinking by SBC - actions they take were causing issues further downstream. For example, SBC replaced pipes but did not enlarge the pipe under the road to prevent flooding to a cottage. SBC have advised that the pipe will be replaced this summer. Forestry Commission – furrows for planting should be across hills. Forestry clearance was resulting in water runoff and causing water pollution and water rising in Newcastleton.
- 7.4 Newcastleton & District Community Council – debris including increased water flow causing a serious of pinch points and a challenge getting water away from community. Aware that dredging was not a long term flood planning solution but something needed to be done to release pinch points. The Holmbridge effects flood levels and also the drainage to homes being flooded. SEPA rules regarding dredging need to be revisited. Trees being felled are causing the Slitrig to flood in Hawick. Forestry Commission responsible for much of the flooding. Difference of opinion in timeline with Council's emergency planning team. Not allowed to call out fire service which was a disgrace. Planting at south of Hawick is going to risk the Slitrig flooding again.
- 7.5 Hawick Community Council – Houses at Crowbyres need to be protected. Hawick Flood protection scheme works will be accelerated over the coming months.
- 7.6 Duncan Morrison, Flood and Coastal Management Team Leader was in attendance and advised that any issues in relation to emergency response should be raised with Jim Fraser at the emergency planning debrief. He explained that the Solway Flood Management Plan covered Newcastleton and was available on the Council's website. In terms of flood risk management, flooding cannot always be prevented, protection was key. Following the discussion it was agreed that Mrs Elbron set up a Flooding Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee would consider the wider process of flood management plans, forestry and SEPA.

**Action: Mrs Elborn would set up a framework for the Flooding Sub-Committee and circulate an agenda. Mr Morrison, on request, could arrange for representatives from SEPA and the Forestry Commission to attend.**

**8. CURRENT SBC CONSULTATIONS**

The Chair advised that the updated Supplementary Planning Guidance – Planning Brief – Former Borders College Galashiels consultation closed on 31 March 2021.

[https://scotborders.citizenspace.com/regulatory-services/updated\\_spg\\_former\\_borders\\_college\\_gala/](https://scotborders.citizenspace.com/regulatory-services/updated_spg_former_borders_college_gala/)

**9. TWENTY'S PLENTY**

9.1 The Chair gave an update on the Twenty's Plenty scheme explaining that a second survey was due to be circulated to Community Councils shortly and ask for consideration on:

- Has the 20mph trial had any influence on walking and cycling in your community?
- Are there any streets you would like to revert back to 30mph?
- Are there any streets that need some more work to remain at 20mph?

9.2 A wider public consultation was scheduled for the last week in April and the first three weeks in May. The public consultation would ask for feedback on experiences of the 20mph trial, any influences on walking and cycling and if there were any streets they wanted kept at 20mph and any to revert back to 30mph. Many communities would also begin to see the roll out of electronic signs from now until the end of April. SBC was working with the trunk road authority to see if it was possible to trial the electronic signs on trunk roads.

**10. COMMUNITY COUNCIL SCHEME REVIEW**

Cameron Knox, Hawick Community Council and Philip Kerr, Southdean Community Council provided an update on the Community Council Scheme Review Group meeting. Points raised included: Code of Conduct and that this should be the same as for Councillors. No community council boundaries had changed, however, membership to be considered. Constitutions should be harmonised across all community councils. Online banking meant a different mechanism required for signatories. Mr Knox added that four years between elections was considered too long and the term should be three years. Attracting a diverse and younger membership had also been discussed.

**11. FIT FOR 2024: REVIEW OF AREA PARTNERSHIPS & COMMUNITY**

With reference to paragraph 5 of the Minute of 12 January 2021, Gillian Jardine advised that each Area Partnership had given suggestions on how Area Partnerships and Community Funding could be developed. Reports on both the Community Fund and Area Partnerships would be presented to Council on 25 March. Following the Council meeting the Working Sub-Groups would be advised of the next steps for each locality.

**12. TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE HUB**

12.1 Gillian Jardine gave an update on the work of the Community Assistance Hubs (CAHs) advising that feedback received from services involved with the hubs and people receiving support had been positive. Building on the success, the intention was to build a locality model with a single point of contact for a range of services e.g. third sector housing, health and social care partnership and resilience groups. Currently the CAHs operation remained the same and contact was through the Council's 0300 number. In the future the CAHs would have a physical location based on the What Matters Hubs, so that people could come along and discuss any assistance they required with a range of partners and services. Ms Jardine went on to advise that they were also considering the use of video technology for virtual consultations with the Borders General Hospital. A trial of a virtual

Whats Matter Hub would commence at the end of April. Information would be circulated to promote the service to communities.

- 12.2 The health and social care partnership were meeting daily to review and agree packages of support to local communities and individuals. There was weekly community partnership meetings attended by a range of organisations to provide support. Ms Jardine would feedback emerging priorities from and to the Area Partnership and this could inform the locality plans. In response to a question regarding coordinating with Place proposals, Ms Jardine explained that because a range of services attend the Community Partner meetings, they would be able to advise of the communities needs and suggest solutions. It was noted that the Hubs should be promoted to make the public aware of this service.
13. **TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE LOCALITY PLAN AND ACTION PLANS**  
The Chair advised that the Teviot and Liddesdale Locality Plan and related Action Plans were available on the Council's website. These plans outlined the priorities for the Teviot and Liddesdale area and were live documents and would change as local need and priorities changed and this Area Partnership evolved. Ms Jardine explained that the Locality Plans and Actions Plan had not been progressed during this past year because of Covid but that the plans would evolve as the Area Partnership develops and the CAH provides updates on local need.
14. **COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT 2015**  
The Chair further advised that currently, there were no formal Participation Requests or formal Asset Transfer requests being considered within Teviot & Liddesdale. Further information can be found in the useful links in Section 4 of the agenda.

#### **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ramage declared an interest in the Railway Film Project in terms of Section 5 of the Councillors Code of Conduct and left the meeting during the discussion.

15. **TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE COMMUNITY FUND 2021/21**
- 15.1 Gillian Jardine, Locality Development Officer, advised there were four applications to be considered this evening amounting to £43,955.00, which meant the Teviot and Liddesdale Community Fund was oversubscribed by £1,413.00. Ms Jardine summarised each application, detailed information on each application had been provided in the supplementary agenda pack circulated prior to the meeting.
- 15.2 **Hawick Recreation Association – Heating System**  
The application for consideration from Hawick Recreation Association was for £6,637.00 to replace the existing heating system at the Auld Baths. The hall was used by a variety of groups who had commented that the hall was cold and there was a concern that bookings might stop which could impact on HRA's income. £7,374.00 had been ring fenced from Hawick Common Good so if they were successful this evening they would be able to complete the project.
- 15.3 **Future Hawick – Salaries for Welcome Hosts**  
This application from Future Hawick was for the Hawick Welcome Initiative requesting £14,950.00 to pay wages of four Welcome Hosts and an administrator this summer. Two of the hosts would be young people interested in a career in tourism. Feedback from visitors for the Welcome Hosts was positive and local businesses were also supportive with many providing financial donations. Due to the pandemic, funding activities have been limited this year and reserves were not sufficient to cover full project costs.
- 15.4 **Newcastleton & District Community Council – Railway Film Project.**  
This application was from all eight community councils seeking £4,878.00 to commission Alchemy Arts to produce a film on the communities' thoughts on extending the Borders Railway from Tweedbank to Carlisle and would focus on the social gains of extending the railway. The film would be accessible and allow communities to express what the railway

would mean to them. Participation would be open to everyone and would include archive footage of the railway from the past. The film would be shared through social media platforms and the digital discussion taking place in the spring.

15.5 **Newcastleton & District Community Council - CCTV**

The final application for consideration was from Newcastleton and District Community Council for £17,490.00 to assist with costs of installing a CCTV system. The CCTV would provide a series of linked cameras for all entrances to the village and locations prone to antisocial behaviour. Two cameras would also be placed at the River Liddle and could be monitored by the emergency planning team and resilience team and would give a 20 minute warning of flooding to the village. This could be used to inform a future flood scheme. Ms Jardine explained that the application still required planning permission and therefore did not currently meet the criteria of the Fund. However, the Area Partnership could award on the proviso that planning permission was granted, but the earliest a decision would be reached by planning would be early April.

15.6 All four applications were discussed and fully supported by the Area Partnership. The Chair suggested that because of the shortfall, and that planning permission was still required, the CCTV application should have the slight shortfall with the proviso that this would be paid from the 2021/22 Fund. Ms Smith advised that as the application did not meet the Community Fund criteria, there would need to be a caveat in the award letter in the event that planning permission was not granted. In response to a question Mrs Elborn clarified that the £17,400 already secured by Newcastleton & District Community Council would be used to commence the first element of the project ahead of planning permissions being secured. Ms Smith explained further that the community funding would not be awarded until planning permission was granted and this condition would be included with the other terms and conditions in the award letter for Newcastleton and District Community Council.

15.7 Following consideration of all four applications, the Area Partnership unanimously approved community funding as follows:-

- £6,637.00 to Hawick Recreation Association;
- £14,950.00 to Future Hawick – Welcome Host Initiative;
- £4,878.00 to Newcastleton and District Community Council – Railway Film Project; and
- £16,077.00 to Newcastleton and District Community Council – CCTV. (The remaining £1,413.00 to be paid from the 2021/22 Community Grant Fund). The grant for the CCTV not to be issued until planning permission was granted and this would be included with the other terms and conditions of the award letter).

16. **DATE OF NEXT TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE AREA PARTNERSHIP – 8 JUNE 2021**

16.1 The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, 8 June 2021. Suggestions for agenda items could be sent to the Locality Development co-ordinator at [gjardine@scotborders.gov.uk](mailto:gjardine@scotborders.gov.uk)

16.2 It was suggested that following consideration by Council of the Fit For 2024 proposals an additional meeting be arranged, this could be an informal meeting.

17. **YOUTH PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT**

The Chair welcomed Ram Rigby, SBC Youth Engagement Worker and Emily Gibson Youth Ambassador for Sustainability. They shared a short film clip on climate change which highlighted some of the problems that required addressing in the Borders and their hopes for the future. The film suggested the Scottish Borders could accelerate change by increasing car charging points, rewilding green spaces, encouraging organisations to divert from fossils to green value, increasing public transport and creating more green

jobs for the local community. The Youth Ambassadors were launching #OurPromiseToThePlanet campaign on 19 March.

**Action: further information would be circulated to communities.**

18. **MEETING EVALUATION**

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and asked that attendees complete the meeting evaluation which was open until 23:45 on Friday.

*The meeting concluded at 8:40 pm.*

This page is intentionally left blank

# SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL LOCAL REVIEW BODY

MINUTE of Meeting of the LOCAL REVIEW  
BODY conducted remotely by Microsoft  
Teams Live Event on Monday, 15 March  
2021 at 10.00 am

-----

Present:- Councillors S. Mountford (Chair), A. Anderson, J. A. Fullarton, S. Hamilton,  
H. Laing, D. Moffat, C. Ramage, N. Richards and E. Small

In Attendance:- Principal Planning Officer – Major Applications/Local Review, Solicitor (S.  
Thompson), Democratic Services Team Leader, Democratic Services Officer  
(F. Walling).

## 1. **REVIEW OF 20/00956/PPP**

There had been circulated copies of the request from Mr D. J. Irvine, per Ferguson Planning, 54 Island Street, Galashiels, to review the decision to refuse the planning application for the erection of a dwellinghouse, with integral garage, on land North East of Balcladach, Easter Ulston, Jedburgh. The supporting papers included the Notice of Review (including the Decision Notice and Officer's Report); papers referred to in the Officer's Report; consultations; objections; general comments; additional representations and response from applicant; and a list of policies. In their initial discussion Members agreed that there was a building group at Easter Ulston and that there was capacity to add to that building group within the current Local Development Plan period. After further discussion, paying particular attention to the natural existing boundary of the group and the fact that the site was located in an undeveloped field, Members concluded that the proposal was not an appropriate addition to the group.

### **DECISION**

#### **AGREED that:-**

- (a) **the request for review had been competently made in terms of Section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997;**
- (b) **the review could be considered without the need for any further procedure on the basis of the papers submitted;**
- (c) **the proposal would be contrary to the Development Plan and that there were no other material considerations that would justify departure from the Development Plan; and**
- (d) **the officer's decision to refuse the application be upheld but varied and planning permission be refused, for the reasons detailed in Appendix I to this Minute**

## 2. **REVIEW OF 20/00923/PPP**

There had been circulated copies of the request from R. E. Wood & Sons, per Erich Planning & Property Consultants, Gifford House, Bonnington Road, Peebles, to review the decision to refuse the planning application for erection of dwellinghouse on land North West of Whinneybrae, Skirling. The supporting papers included the Notice of Review (including the Decision Notice and Officer's Report); papers referred to in the Officer's

Report; consultations; objections; additional representation and response from applicant; and a list of policies. Members noted that the site of the proposed dwellinghouse was outwith any settlement or building group. They went on to give consideration to the applicant's submissions regarding the justification for the house which was intended for an agricultural worker to care for a flock of pedigree sheep on the land within which it was located. Whilst accepting the economic viability of the farm business and, to provide maximum health standards, the reason for keeping the pedigree flock on a separate holding from the applicant's other two farms, they questioned whether alternative accommodation for the farm worker had been sufficiently investigated. After lengthy debate, Members' opinion remained divided as to whether the case for a house, at that location, had been sufficiently justified.

#### VOTE

*Councillor Anderson, seconded by Councillor Ramage moved that the decision to refuse the application be upheld.*

*Councillor Fullarton, seconded by Councillor Richards, moved as an amendment that the decision to refuse the application be reversed and the application approved, subject to a legal agreement tying the dwellinghouse and buildings to the land holding.*

*Members voted as follows:-*

*Motion - 6 votes*

*Amendment - 3 votes*

*The motion was accordingly carried and the application refused,*

#### **DECISION**

##### **DECIDED that:-**

- (a) the request for review had been competently made in terms of Section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997;**
- (b) the review could be considered without the need for any further procedure on the basis of the papers submitted;**
- (c) the proposal would be contrary to the Development Plan and that there were no other material considerations that would justify departure from the Development Plan; and**
- (d) the officer's decision to refuse the application be upheld and the application be refused, for the reasons detailed in Appendix II to this Minute.**

*The meeting concluded at 11.25 am*

# SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL JEDBURGH COMMON GOOD FUND SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of Meeting of the JEDBURGH  
COMMON GOOD SUB-COMMITTEE held  
via Microsoft Teams on Monday, 22 March  
2021 at 4.30 pm

Present:- Councillors J. Brown, S. Hamilton, S. Scott, Community Councillor  
J Taylor.

In Attendance:- Treasury Business Partner, Solicitor  
(Steven Robertson), Democratic Services Officer (F. Henderson).

Members of the Public:- 0

## 1.0 MINUTES

1.1 There had been circulated copies of Minutes of the Jedburgh Common Good Fund  
Sub-Committee held on:-

- 13 November 2020
- 9 December 20220
- 15 December 2020

Councillor Scott referred to funding allocated to the Jedburgh Leisure Trust towards the refurbishment of the Swimming Pool and the fact that a hoist had not been fitted, which had been raised by a constituent. Councillor Scott went on to request a follow up report.

## DECISION

(a) **NOTED the Minutes.**

(b) **AGREED that the Democratic Service Officer provide information on the grant made from the Jedburgh Common Good to the Jedburgh Leisure Trust.**

## 2.0 MONITORING REPORT FOR 9 MONTHS 31 DECEMBER 2020

2.1 There had been circulated copies of a report by the Executive Director, Finance and Regulatory which provided the income and expenditure for the Jedburgh Common Good Fund for the nine months to 31 December 2020, a full year projected out-turn 2020/21 and projected balance sheet values as at 31 March 2021 and proposed budget for 2021/22. Appendix 1 provided the projected income and expenditure for 2020/21 which showed a projected surplus of £23,778 for the year. Appendix 2 provided projected Balance Sheet value at 31 March 2021 and showed a projected increase in the reserves of £144,383. Appendix 3(a) provided a breakdown of the property portfolio showing projected rental income for 2020/21 and actual property expenditure to 31 December 2020. Appendix 3(b) provided breakdown of the property portfolio showing projected property expenditure for 2020/21 and actual property expenditure to 31 December 2020. Appendix 4 provided a breakdown of the property portfolio showing projected property valuation at 31 March 2021. Appendix 5 detailed the value of the Aegon Asset Management Investment Fund to 31 December 2020.

The Treasury Business Manager highlighted the main points in the report and explained that Appendices 3(a) and 3(b) had been introduced to provide more detail and consideration to the sustainability of Buildings in their ownership. Members requested that maps be provided giving details of what exactly was owned by the Common Good. The Treasury Business Manager answered Members questions.

**DECISION**

**(a) AGREED the:-**

- (i) projected income and expenditure for 2020/21 in Appendix 1 as the revised budget for 2020/21;**
- (ii) proposed budget for 2021/22 as shown in Appendix 1;**
- (iii) Treasury Business Manager detailed maps be provided on land and building in the ownership of the Common Good Sub-Committee**

**(b) NOTED the:**

- (i) projected balance sheet value as at 31 March 2021 in Appendix 2;**
- (ii) summary of the property portfolio in Appendices 3 and 4; and**
- (iv) Notes the current position of the Aegon Asset Management Investment Fund in Appendix 5.**

*The meeting closed at 4.45 p.m.*

# SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL LOCAL REVIEW BODY

MINUTE of Meeting of the LOCAL REVIEW  
BODY conducted remotely by Microsoft  
Teams Live Event on Monday, 19 April 2021  
at 10.00 am

-----

Present:- Councillors S. Mountford (Chair), A. Anderson, S. Hamilton, H. Laing,  
D. Moffat, C. Ramage, N. Richards and E. Small

Apologies:- Councillor J. A. Fullarton

In Attendance:- Principal Planning Officer – Major Applications/Local Review, Solicitor (F.  
Rankine), Democratic Services Team Leader, Democratic Services Officer  
(F. Walling).

## 1. **REVIEW OF 20/01236/FUL.**

There had been circulated copies of the request from Hawick Angling Club, per Roxburghe Home Solutions Ltd, Unit 1, Block 1, Galalaw Business Park, Hawick, to review the decision to refuse the planning application for replacement windows at the Angling Club, 5 Sandbed, Hawick. The supporting papers included the Notice of Review; Decision Notice; Officer's Report; papers referred to in the Officer's Report; objection; and a list of policies. Members noted that the property within which the replacement windows were proposed was located within the Hawick Conservation Area. Whilst expressing the view that replacement of the windows would be likely to improve the appearance of the building, they agreed that insufficient information had been put forward, about the detail of the replacement windows proposed, to enable a decision to be made in terms of their visual impact on the character of the building and of the Conservation Area.

### **DECISION**

#### **AGREED that:-**

- (a) **the request for review had been competently made in terms of Section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997;**
- (b) **the review could not be considered without further procedure in the form of written submissions;**
- (c) **the applicant be requested to provide further information as follows:-**
  - **Detailed specification of the frame thickness of the proposed uPVC outer frames and transom with a comparative specification of the width of the existing wooden frames and evidence of how much thickness of the proposed frame would be visible from outside, in comparison with existing thickness (include photographic evidence of existing frame);**
  - **Clarification as to whether the proposed frame would be recessed or flush with the surrounding shop front and if recessed, by how much; and**
  - **Photographic evidence of the context of the proposed replacement windows in terms of windows in surrounding shop fronts.**
- (d) **consideration of the review be continued on a date to be confirmed.**

*The meeting concluded at 10.40 am*

This page is intentionally left blank

# SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES of Meeting of the EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE held via Microsoft Teams on  
Tuesday, 20 April 2021 at 10.00 am

-----

Present:- Councillors S. Haslam (Chair), S. Aitchison, S. Mountford, G. Edgar, C. Hamilton, S. Hamilton, E. Jardine, M Rowley, R. Tatler, T. Weatherston.  
Also Present: Councillors S. Bell, W. McAteer and Ms S Harkins (South of Scotland Enterprise).  
In Attendance:- Chief Executive, Executive Director, Corporate Improvement and Economy, Executive Director, Finance & Regulatory, Service Director - Assets & Infrastructure, Principal Officer, Housing Strategy, Policy & Development, Democratic Services Team Leader, Democratic Services Officer (J Turnbull.)

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BUSINESS

Present: Mr G Clark (Federation of Small Businesses) and Ms E McGowan (Scottish Borders Chamber of Trade)

### **CHAIRMAN**

Councillor Rowley chaired the meeting for consideration of Economic Development Business).

### **1. SCOTTISH BORDERS BUSINESS GATEWAY DELIVERY**

- 1.1 There had been circulated copies of a report by Executive Director Corporate Improvement and Economy, which set out the actions taken by South of Scotland Enterprise (SOSE) in preparation for the transfer of the Business Gateway Service from Scottish Borders Council (SBC), detailing the future SOSE Business Gateway delivery model in Scottish Borders and the Performance Management Framework to be utilised in reporting by SOSE to SBC. The Executive Director summarised the report, highlighting SOSE's approach, resource, roles and responsibilities. He explained that the main purpose of the report was for Members to agree the performance management framework and associated indicators which were detailed in paragraph 8 of the report.
- 1.2 Members considered that in terms of the quarterly reporting, the focus should be on outcomes and not outputs. Ms Harkins from SOSE advised that outcome measurements would be included as the contract progressed. In response to a question about assistance for businesses wanting to export, Ms Harkins explained that this was an important outcome for the region and a programme and process would be established around exporting. In response to a further question the Executive Director clarified that the £250k per annum to SOSE for Business Gateway delivery was an indicative figure and once the pay award settlement had been agreed the amount would be confirmed.

### **DECISION**

- (a) **NOTED the work undertaken to transfer the Business Gateway Service to SOSE.**
- (b) **AGREED:-**
  - (i) **the Performance Management Framework and associated indicators for 2021/22 proposed within the report; and**

- (ii) to receive the necessary performance management information as part of the scheduled Quarterly Performance Management reports Executive already receives.

## **2. UPDATE ON THE SCOTTISH BORDERS STRATEGIC EVENTS PLAN**

- 2.1 There had been circulated copies of a report by Executive Director, Corporate Improvement and Economy which provided Members with an update on the Council's Events Strategy and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the events sector. The report outlined the significant impact events had in the region and highlighted some future opportunities. The report recommended that a new Events Strategy should be produced this year and reflect the Event Scotland National Strategy, the VisitScotland National Tourism Strategy and take account of the significant challenges associated with the Covid-19 Pandemic. One of the key events in the forthcoming years was the Enduro World series. This event would be held in the Tweed Valley and an allocation of £10,000 from the Scottish Borders Council Events budget was recommended to support the major event during the current financial year.
- 2.2 Members discussed the report and received answers to their questions from the Director. They recognised the Covid-19 Pandemic had had a catastrophic effect on events and that support going forward was critical. In response to a question from Councillor Tatler, Chair of the Scottish Borders Living Wage Group, the Executive Director gave assurance that where funding pertained specifically to employment, the Council's commitment to the living wage would be clear. It was suggested that events relating to sport be identified in the Strategy as 'sporting events'. Regarding 'event' criteria, the Director clarified that events must demonstrate economic activity not already obtained within the Scottish Borders and would tend to involve overnight stays and a significant number of visitors. Funding for local events was already in place through the Customer and Communities team.

### **DECISION**

#### **AGREED:-**

- (a) that a new Scottish Borders Strategic Events Plan 2022 – 32 was presented for approval later this year following discussions with event organisers, Event Scotland and VisitScotland;
- (b) funding of £10,000 for the Enduro World Series during the current financial year; and
- (c) to delegate authority to the Executive Director Corporate Improvement & Economy in consultation with the Executive Member for Economic Regeneration & Finance to provide financial support for Events in 2021 as follows:
  - (i) Up to £2.5k to plan an entirely new event in 2021 or 2022.
  - (ii) Up to £5k in 2021 to prepare to hold an existing event in 2022 where no event was held in 2021.
  - (iii) Up to £10k to hold an existing event in 2021.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

## **3. MINUTE**

The Minute of the Meeting held on 16 March 2021 had been circulated.

### **DECISION**

**AGREED that the Minute be approved and signed by the Chairman.**

4. **PROPOSED FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TO FUND DEDICATED EMPTY HOMES OFFICER**

- 4.1 There had been circulated copies of a report by Executive Director Corporate Improvement and Economy seeking approval to use £40,000 from the second homes council tax affordable housing investment budget to fund a full time, dedicated Empty Homes Officer for a period of 24 months. The Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 placed a statutory requirement on local authorities to develop a Local Housing Strategy, supported by an assessment of housing need and demand. The strategy set out the strategic direction for housing investment and service delivery in the Scottish Borders for 2017-22 and was approved by Scottish Borders Council and submitted to the Scottish Government in September 2017. The LHS identified the need to bring empty properties back in to effective use. Since 2010 the Scottish Empty Homes Partnership, funded by the Scottish Government and co-ordinated by Shelter Scotland, had been working with Councils and their partners to develop services aimed at bringing private sector empty homes back into use. One focus of the partnership was to support local authorities to develop empty homes work and ensure dedicated resources to work with owners. The Empty Homes Partnership would fund 50% of the staffing cost for 24 months as kick-starter funding. 22 Local Authorities across Scotland currently employ a dedicated empty homes officer. The Principal Officer presented the report and answered Members questions. With regard to the process for reporting empty homes, the Principal Officer advised that information was available on the Council's website. For homes empty for over two years the Council had introduced a 200% Council Tax surcharge as an incentive for owners to bring properties back into use. However, there had been no significant difference in the number of empty homes as many could be exempt from Council Tax. The Principal Officer explained that an evaluation of the Empty Home Officer post would take place after 12-18 months to determine the impact and whether a permanent post would be advantageous.

**DECISION**

- (a) **NOTED that a contractual arrangement would be finalised with the Scottish Empty Homes Partnership (SEHP) to utilise lock-starter funding to support the recruitment of an Empty Homes Officer.**
- (b) **APPROVED that the additional funding for the post be provided from the Revenues raised from the second homes council tax affordable housing investment budget.**

5. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2021/22 – BLOCK ALLOCATIONS**

There had been circulated copies of a report by Executive Director Finance and Regulatory seeking approval for the proposed individual projects and programmes within the various block allocations in the 2021/22 Capital Financial Plan. Appendices A – R contained proposals for various projects to be allocated resources from the block allocation within the 2021/22 Capital Financial Plan and those budgets approved at the meeting of Scottish Borders Council on 19 March 2021. Not all projects had been fully identified at this point and as and when this information was available this would be brought to the Executive Committee for consideration.

**DECISION**

**APPROVED the block allocation breakdowns contained in Appendices A – R of the report.**

6. **PRIVATE BUSINESS**

**DECISION**

**AGREED under Section 50A (4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 to exclude the public from the meeting during consideration of the business detailed in Appendix 4 to this Minute on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1, and 6 of Part I of Schedule 7A to the Act.**

**7. MINUTE**

The private section of Minute of meeting held on 16 March 2021 was approved.

*The meeting concluded at 11.00.*

# SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL PLANNING AND BUILDING STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MINUTE of Meeting of the PLANNING AND BUILDING STANDARDS COMMITTEE held via Microsoft Teams on Monday, 26 April at 10.00 a.m.

Present:- Councillors S Mountford (Chairman), A. Anderson, J. Fullarton, S. Hamilton, H. Laing, D. Moffat, C. Ramage, N. Richards, E. Small.

In Attendance:- Planning and Development Standards Manager, Lead Planning Officer (B. Fotheringham), Lead Planning Officer (Craig Miller), Lead Roads Planning Officer, Solicitor (Fraser Rankine), Democratic Services Team Leader, Democratic Services Officer (F. Henderson).

## 1. MINUTE

There had been circulated copies of the Minute of the Meeting held on 29 March 2021.

### DECISION

**APPROVED for signature by the Chairman.**

## 2. APPLICATION

There had been circulated copies of a report by the Chief Planning and Housing Officer on an application for planning permission requiring consideration by the Committee.

### DECISION

**DEALT with the application as detailed in Appendix I to this Minute.**

## 3. APPEALS AND REVIEWS

There had been circulated copies of a briefing note by the Chief Planning Officer on Appeals to the Scottish Ministers and Local Reviews.

### DECISION

**NOTED that:-**

- (a) **There remained two appeals previously reported on which a decision was still awaited when the report was prepared on 14 April 2021 and related to the sites at:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land West of 8 Ballantyne Place, Peebles</li></ul>          |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land East of Knapdale, 54 Edinburgh Road, Peebles</li></ul> |

- (b) **a review request had been received in respect of the Erection of boundary fence (retrospective) at 1 Raeburn Lane, Selkirk – 20/01234/FUL;**

- (c) **There remained one review previously reported on which a decision was still awaited when the report was prepared on 14 April 2021 and related to the site at:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Angling Club, 5 Sandbed, Hawick</li></ul> |
|---|

- (d) **There remained one S36 PLI previously reported on which a decision was still awaited when the report was prepared on 14 April 2021 and related to:-**

- **Crystal Rigg Wind Farm, Cranshaws, Duns**

*The meeting concluded at 12.25 p.m.*

**APPENDIX I**  
**APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

<b><u>Reference</u></b>	<b><u>Nature of Development</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
19/00090/FUL	Erection of 64 dwellinghouses and associated Infrastructure	Former Earlston High School Earlston

Decision: Approved, with powers delegated to Officers to secure appropriate noise mitigation, subject to a legal agreement (covering development contributions towards play space) and the following conditions:

1. The residential units hereby approved shall meet the definition of "affordable housing" as set out in the adopted Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 and accompanying supplementary planning guidance and shall only be occupied in accordance with arrangements (to include details of terms of occupation and period of availability) which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.  
Reason: The permission has been granted for affordable housing, and development of the site for unrestricted market housing would attract contributions to infrastructure and services, including local schools.
2. No development shall commence until precise details (including samples where requested by the Planning Authority) of all external wall and roof materials for the approved buildings (which shall include more than one wall render colour), and full details of the surfacing of all shared surfaces and footways have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.  
Reason: To ensure the material finishes respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
3. Notwithstanding the details illustrated on Drawing No L(02)H-01, no development shall commence until revised elevation drawings of House Type H-J have first been submitted to an agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. The amended elevations shall include additional architectural interest through the use of additional and complementary materials as well as adjustments to the fenestration. Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.  
Reason: Further details are required to ensure the external appearance of the colony units respects the character of the surrounding area.
4. No development shall take place except in strict accordance with a scheme of hard and soft landscaping works, which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority, thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. Details of the scheme shall include:
  - i. existing and finished ground levels in relation to a fixed datum preferably ordnance
  - ii. soft and hard landscaping works
  - iii. precise design of nodes/feature planters
  - iv. a programme for completion and subsequent maintenance.Reason: To ensure the satisfactory form, layout and assimilation of the development.
5. No development shall commence until a revised masterplan has first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority which provides one additional disabled

car parking space. Once agreed the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure sufficient parking provision is provided.

6. No development shall commence until a scheme of details relating to the following pedestrian improvements and the provision of cycle storage facilities has first been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details. The details shall include;
  - i. improvements to the pedestrian route to the west of the site via the industrial estate;
  - ii. improvements to the pedestrian link to the north of the site past the tennis courts;
  - iii. provision of cycle storage facilities to serve the colony units; and
  - iv. a programme for completion.

Reason: To ensure that the development hereby approved is served by appropriate pedestrian and cycle storage facilities upon completion.

7. The development hereby approved shall only be carried out in strict accordance with a programme of phasing which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the estate proceeds in an orderly manner.

8. No development shall commence until a Traffic Management Plan has first been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details. The details shall include;

- i. access arrangements for construction traffic
- ii. temporary traffic measures required during the construction period
- iii. access arrangements for staff traffic during the construction phase

Reason: To ensure the traffic associated with the construction of the development does not have a detrimental impact on the existing road network within the vicinity of the site and its users, particularly with regards the adjacent school premises.

9. No development shall commence until a scheme of mitigation measures designed to reduce noise levels across the development site generated by operations carried out within the Station Road business and industrial site shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. The scheme of measures shall reflect the recommendations of the submitted RMP Noise Impacts Assessment (Former Earlston High School, Earlston TD4 6HE - Technical Report R-8461-RRM-RGM, dated 8th May 2019, and Addendum (Ref:L-8461C-RRM-RGM) to Noise Impact Assessment Ref: R-8461-RRM-RGM, dated 11th September 2019) and any other additional measures which may be informed by subsequent Noise Impact Assessments. Once agreed, the scheme of mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the first dwellinghouse hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that the residential amenity of the development will not conflict with operations undertaken at the adjacent Station Road Industrial and Business site.

10. No development shall commence until a scheme submitted by the Developer to identify and assess potential contamination on site has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Thereafter no construction work shall commence unless in strict accordance with the scheme so approved.

The scheme shall be undertaken by a competent person or persons in accordance with the advice of relevant authoritative guidance including PAN 33 (2000) and BS10175:2011 or, in the event of these being superseded or supplemented, the most up-to-date version(s) of any subsequent revision(s) of, and/or supplement(s) to, these documents. This scheme should contain details of proposals to investigate and remediate potential contamination and must include:-

- a) A desk study and development of a conceptual site model including (where necessary) a detailed site investigation strategy. The desk study and the scope and method of recommended further investigations shall be agreed with the Council prior to addressing parts b, c, d, and, e of this condition, and thereafter;
- b) Where required by the desk study, undertaking a detailed investigation of the nature and extent of contamination on site, and assessment of risk such contamination presents.
- c) Remedial Strategy (if required) to treat/remove contamination to ensure that the site is fit for its proposed use (this shall include a method statement, programme of works, and proposed validation plan).
- d) Submission of a Validation Report (should remedial action be required) by the developer which will validate and verify the completion of works to a satisfaction of the Council.
- e) Submission, if necessary, of monitoring statements at periods to be agreed with the Council for such time period as is considered appropriate by the Council.

Written confirmation from the Council, that the scheme has been implemented completed and (if appropriate), monitoring measures are satisfactorily in place, shall be required by the Developer before any development hereby approved commences. Where remedial measures are required as part of the development construction detail, commencement must be agreed in writing with the Council.

Reason: To ensure that the potential risks to human health, the water environment, property, and, ecological systems arising from any identified land contamination have been adequately addressed.

11. No development shall commence until the developer has secured a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) detailing a programme of archaeological works. The WSI shall be formulated and implemented by a contracted archaeological organisation working to the standards of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). The WSI shall be submitted by the developer no later than 1 month prior to the start of development works and approved by the Planning Authority before the commencement of any development. Thereafter the developer shall ensure that the programme of archaeological works is fully implemented and that all recording, recovery of archaeological resources within the development site, post-excavation assessment, reporting and dissemination of results are undertaken per the WSI.

Reason: The site is within an area where development may damage or destroy archaeological remains, and it is therefore desirable to afford a reasonable opportunity to record the history of the site.

12. No development shall commence until written evidence is provided to the Planning Authority that mains water and foul drainage connections are available to serve the development. All public mains services shall be provided prior to occupancy of the dwellinghouses hereby approved and shall be maintained thereafter throughout occupancy of the dwellinghouses

Reason: To ensure the development is adequately serviced and to maintain existing surface water run-off levels from the site.

13. No development shall commence until precise details of the design of the SUDS scheme has first been submitted to and approved in writing with the Planning Authority. The sustainable urban drainage system shall comply with CIRA C753 SuDS Manual. Once approved the development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the agreed details. Prior to occupation of the first dwellinghouse hereby approved written evidence shall be supplied to the planning Authority that the development has been connected to the public water drainage network.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not have a detrimental effect on public health or ecological interests.

14. No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan incorporating the good practice guidelines and statutory advice to protect the River Tweed SAC has first been submitted to and agreed in writing in writing by the Planning Authority. Thereafter no development shall take place except in strict accordance with the approved scheme.  
Reason: To ensure that species and habitats affected by the development are afforded suitable protection during the construction and operation of the development.
15. No development shall commence until a Species Protection Plan (SPP) for bats, otter, badger and breeding birds has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The SPP shall incorporate provision for a pre-development supplementary survey and a mitigation plan. No development shall be undertaken except in accordance with the approved in writing SPP.  
Reason: To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies EP2 and EP3.
16. No development shall commence until a Landscape and Habitat Management Plan (LHMP) has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The LHMP shall incorporate provision for measures identified in the Ecological surveys including planting of native trees and shrubs and SuDS enhancements. No development shall be undertaken except in accordance with the approved in writing LHMP.  
Reason: To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies EP2 and EP3.
17. No development shall commence until a sensitive lighting scheme to safeguard protected species incorporating the latest good practice guidelines (as outlined: Guidance Note 8/18 (2018): Bats and artificial lighting in the UK) to protect bats has first been submitted to and approved in writing in writing by the Planning Authority. Any works shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved in writing scheme  
Reason: To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies EP1, EP2 and EP3

### Informatives

1. The applicant shall give consideration to the provision of additional electric vehicle and electric cycle charging points and associated infrastructure.
2. The applicant shall give consideration to the use of sustainable construction techniques and inclusion of appropriate measures to maximise the efficient use of energy and resources. This shall include, but is not limited to, the use of solar panels and air source heat pumps.