

SCOTTISH BORDERS
COMMUNITY PLANNING STRATEGIC BOARD

MINUTE of MEETING of the COMMUNITY
PLANNING STRATEGIC BOARD held in
Committee Room 2, Council Headquarters,
Newtown St Boswells on 5 March 2015 at
2.00pm.

- Present:- Councillors D. Parker (Chairman), S. Bell, C. Bhatia, J. Brown; Mr A. Girrity (Scottish Fire and Rescue Service); Mrs M. Hume (3rd Sector Interface); Mr R. Licence (SBHA); Superintendent A. MacInnes (Police Scotland); Ms M. Peers (Berwickshire Housing Association); Mr D. Rennie (Scottish Enterprise); Dr D. Steele (NHS Board); Ms R. Stenhouse (Waverley Housing).
- Apologies:- Councillor M. Cook; Mr T. Burrows (Eildon Housing); Mr J. Dickie (Scottish Fire and Rescue Service); Cllr G. Edgar (SESTRANS); Chief Superintendent G. Imery (Police Scotland); Mr T. Jakimciw (Borders College); Mr A. McKinnon (Scottish Enterprise); Mr J. Raine (NHS Borders).
- In Attendance:- Dr E. Bajjal (Joint Director of Public Health), Mr R. Dickson (SBC Corporate Transformation and Services Director), Mr N. Istephan (Eildon Housing Chief Executive), Ms T. Logan (SBC Chief Executive), Mrs J. McDiarmid (SBC Depute Chief Executive [People]), Mr D. Scott (SBC Senior Policy Adviser), Ms S. Smith (SBC Communities and Partnership Manager), Clerk to Council.
-

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. 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.

MINUTE

2. There had been circulated copies of the Minute of the Meeting held on 27 November 2014.

DECISION

APPROVED the Minute for signature by the Chairman.

ECONOMY AND LOW CARBON THEME GROUP

3. With reference to paragraph 6 of the Minute of 27 November 2014, there had been circulated copies of a briefing paper by the SBC Director Corporate Transformation and Services. The paper gave updates on mobile phone coverage, the Economic Strategy Action Plan refresh 2015, Borders Railway Blueprint, Construction Industry Forum, Events and conferences facilities, Business Week 2, and the Learning and Skills Partnership. SBC Director Corporate Transformation and Services, Mr R. Dickson, advised of a possible solution being investigated regarding mobile coverage in the Ettrick Valley through DCMS, although this was very early days and there were issues regarding capital and operational costs. If this provided viable there was the possibility this could be applied at other 'not-spots' in the Borders. Mr Dickson further confirmed broadband rollout across the Borders over the next 3 to 4 years, with St Boswells being the latest town to go live.

DECISION

NOTED.

REDUCING INEQUALITIES THEME GROUP

4. With reference to paragraph 8 of the Minute of 27 November 2014, Ms Erin Murray, SBC Research and Policy Officer gave a presentation with a sample of information from a profile which had been prepared to inform the Reducing Inequalities Strategy, to define areas where

new work would be required, and to see what needed to change i.e. current strategies. It was intended that the profile would also recognise the 9 'Protected Characteristics' as defined in the Equality Act 2010, as well as being a starting point to help understand the issues associated with multiple deprivation and where these were most concentrated. The information was to be used in conjunction with established inequalities work and specialist knowledge, although it was recognised that the information was incomplete and there would be omissions and knowledge gaps. The domains for the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2012 were employment, income, crime, housing, health, education, and access. The information was divided into data-zones and there were 130 data-zones in the Scottish Borders, which were divided into deciles (1 – 10) from the most deprived to the least deprived areas.

5. A number of examples were shown of the information, including the % of pregnant women smoking at booking, S4 % with English and Maths at Level 3, S6 % with 5 Awards at Level 6, attainment at S4 – S6 by gender, % of Working Age who were employment deprived, % household incomes less than £400/week, occupation types by gender, % employed in occupation groups 'Process, plant and machine operatives' and 'Elementary occupations', and proportions of households in fuel poverty. Information was also provided on energy efficiency of buildings and anti-social behaviour incidents per 1,000. Poverty was a key to multiple deprivation, with Scottish Borders having a relatively small share of Scotland's Multiple Deprivation. However, there were inequalities in the Scottish Borders, not just in Langlee and Burnfoot, but scattered in other parts of towns or settlements. All of the main Border towns had areas of relative deprivation which fell just outside the 'worst 15% in Scotland'. It was also noted that the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation was a relative measure; if other areas in Scotland improved more quickly than in the Scottish Borders then the proportion of areas in the 15% most deprived could stay the same or increase. It was also noted that there was a great deal of interdependence among the different themes. These profiles could be used to adjust and realign existing strategies and an action plan developed to address specific issues, identifying any new partnership actions, and recognising where a universal and/or targeted approach was required. In terms of the way forward, this would involve the further development of the vision and strategic aims, by considering the challenges and opportunities presented by the analysis, creating additional actions where required, and creating a performance management framework to measure success. The aim was to bring a report for consideration to the Joint Delivery Team on 1 April 2015 and then to the Strategic Board at its next meeting on 11 June 2015.
6. Members welcomed the information and expressed an interest in having the full data. The Working Group would be working on measures to ascertain whether inequalities had been reduced, including possibly an increase in healthy life expectancy and positive destinations for children. Jeanette McDiarmid, SBC Depute Chief Executive People, advised that some areas would take a lifetime to see the benefit, hence the need for a long term vision, with some areas of attainment which could be measured and others more ethereal. Further funding was available through government on 'closing the gap' but as the Partnership worked together there could be a need to take decisions on where money was best placed. Some of the least deprived areas may see a reduction in spend to balance an increase in spend in the most deprived areas. Tracey Logan, SBC Chief Executive, advised that there was an obligation on the partners to undertake joint resource planning as a Community Planning Partnership, so resources from each partner would be looked at and tied to actions. Ray Licence of SBHA spoke of the 'Wrap Up Warm' programme installing insulation in property and Rita Stenhouse of Waverley Housing referred to the Scottish housing quality standard to which all RSL property must comply. Dr Steele requested the presentation be given to a development session at NHS Borders. The Health and Social Care Integrated Joint Board could do joint work with the Community Planning Partnership going forward. Health Scotland had also offered assistance on health inequalities and Dr Steele would contact the Chair of that body in this respect. In terms of front line service providers from different organisations working together, Tracey Logan advised that locality planning would bring that further together.

**DECISION
NOTED.**

BURNFOOT COMMUNITY HUB

7. Charles Finnie, Director/Trustee and Chair of the Hub Project Sub Group, and Jan Pringle, Community Hub Project Manager, from Burnfoot Community Futures gave a presentation on the Burnfoot Community Hub. Burnfoot Community Futures company objectives were to improve the well-being, quality of life, and opportunities of the people of Burnfoot; and for the purpose of general community benefit, to enhance the social, cultural, recreational and educational facilities, environment and economy of Burnfoot. Since 2007, Burnfoot Community Futures had delivered a range of smaller scale projects such as the Multi-use games area, shop front improvements, and community events. The Burnfoot Community Hub was to be a community facility which aimed to deliver long term sustainable change, tackling inequalities through the enablement and empowerment of the community and its own resources. The project would transform a derelict, disused former public house into a sustainable Community Hub - using £2.1m raised by the community – managed by Burnfoot Community Futures, a charitable company limited by guarantee. The funding package of £2.1m (capital and revenue) had been secured in January 2014 and the building acquired in April 2014. Full public procurement has been completed in September 2014, with the main contractor commencing on site on 3 November 2014 on a 42 week contract. There would be a phased completion of the Hub – Community section completed by July 2015; and the Nursery in September 2015. A 3 year operational Business Plan for 2015 – 2018 had been produced, with a fully funded core staff infrastructure of 5 FTE, with a focus on enterprise and sustainability. The services to be delivered through the Hub were a community café incorporating soft play; a fully flexible childcare facility (0 – 16); meeting/rental office space x 5; a multi-purpose function room; and working garden space for cultivation of plants, food and new skills for the local community. The Hub project outcomes were that the Burnfoot Community felt stronger, more empowered and confident; their environment and future was sustained; the community had increased capacity and opportunity to take up training, employment and volunteering; and that the community was healthier with the inequalities gap reduced. There were strategic and corporate links through community benefits in procurement; reducing inequalities; progression of CPP's equality outcomes addressing poverty and employment; the Community Empowerment Bill; early intervention and prevention; and the development of Scotland's Young Workforce (Wood Commission). Burnfoot Community Futures aimed to work in partnership to deliver operational services, back office support, commissioning of services, delivery of community engagement services and provide opportunities for joint project development. The next step was a half day workshop between Burnfoot Community Futures and Community Planning partners to progress the relationship. The aim was to look progressively at what actions could be taken to utilise the assets of the community and co-produce future services based on local need.
8. Members of the Board congratulated Mr Finnie and Ms Pringle on the project and asked a number of specific questions. Ms Pringle advised that the business plan contained details of proposed activities and how these would be marketed to Burnfoot and the wider Hawick community. There was no other soft play area in the rest of Hawick and nursery/child care could be open to others in Hawick, although the project was aware of not displacing the latter service from other providers in the town. It was important to look at sustaining the viability of the Hub in the future, with current consideration of a dementia café and community bakery. What was important was what would deliver for the Burnfoot community and what that community wanted. The first 3 years of staff costs had been fully funded, and expectations were from Year 4 the Hub would break even. The Hub would need to generate enough revenue to cover running costs. Ms Pringle offered tours of the facility for any of the Partners who wished to see how it was progressing. The Chairman thanked Mr Finnie and Ms Pringle for their presentation and helpful responses to questions.

DECISION

AGREED that the SBC Communities and Partnership Manager would take forward the work for the half day workshop between Hawick Community Futures and the Community Planning Partnership.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCOTTISH BORDERS COMMUNITY PLANNING PARTNERSHIP OF THE COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL

9. With reference to paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Minute of 27 November 2014, there had been circulated copies of a report by the SBC Service Director Strategy and Policy, setting out the implications of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill for the Scottish Borders Community Planning Partnership. The Bill aimed to empower communities, make the most of the talent existing in communities, deliver high quality and improving services, and support strong local democracy. The most important part of the Bill was the Community Planning section, with several implications for consideration by the Partnership. A review of the membership of the Scottish Borders Community Planning Partnership would need to be undertaken to ensure that the potential contribution from the wider range of public service bodies was fully brought into the community planning process. Consideration would also need to be given as to whether the Community Planning Partnership should become an incorporated body; whether the proposed community engagement framework could be used to carry out consultation and engagement at a local level; how community planning partners should contribute specific resources to the Partnership; and what local outcomes improvement plan reporting and monitoring processes would mean to the Partnership. The community participation requests process, whereby community organisations could make representations to public bodies with suggestions on improving services, could impact on plans to change the delivery of services, and also lead to the need for greater support for those community organisations which did not have the capacity to take part in the community participation process. With regard to community right to buy, the Bill proposed that this be extended to certain urban areas, including Galashiels and Hawick in the Scottish Borders. While this could provide more opportunities for community groups in the Borders to buy land and property, there was a risk that some community groups may not have the understanding, business skills, or capacity to fully understand what they was involved in making a success in the long term of such purchases. Further information was provided in the report on asset transfer arrangements, common good properties, allotments and non-domestic rates.
10. Mrs Hume advised that the 3rd Sector already supported community groups and was planning a conference - once the final Bill contents were known – on how to develop community participation at local level. The 3rd Sector had also already been in contact with disadvantaged groups in this respect. Further reports would be provided to the Board once the contents and implications of the Bill were finalised, likely to be in autumn 2015. There were still uncertainties on who would be included e.g. Arms-Length Organisations, Trusts, etc. In terms of cost, the Financial Memorandum for the Bill was not clear or explicit. There was likely to be more detail available in the Guidance once the Bill became an Act. Cosla was currently looking at costs and the Chairman suggested that the Community Planning Partnership could put information from this area into that.

DECISION

AGREED to:

- (a) **receive further reports, once the Community Empowerment legislation had been passed, on –**
- (i) **a review of the membership of the Scottish Borders Community Planning Partnership to ensure that the potential contribution from the wider range of public services and other bodies was fully brought into the community planning process;**
 - (ii) **consideration on whether the Community Planning Partnership should become an incorporated body;**
 - (iii) **whether - building on the work of the 3rd Sector - further support would be required for community groups, particularly those in more disadvantaged areas, to ensure that they could effectively engage in community planning**

(including influencing the services delivered in a locality), community participation requests, community right to buy, and asset transfers;

(iv) how community planning partners should contribute specific resources to the Community Planning Partnership; and

(v) what the proposed local outcomes improvement plan reporting process and monitoring would mean to the Scottish Borders Community Planning Partnership;

(b) use the Community Engagement Framework to carry out consultation and engagement at a local level; and

(c) to request the Joint Delivery Team to carry out localised costing of the impact of the Community Empowerment Bill on the Scottish Borders and feed this information into the work being carried out by Cosla.

CPP COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

11. With reference to paragraph 8 of the Minute of 11 September 2014, there had been circulated copies of a report by the SBC Chief Executive proposing a Community Planning Partnership Community Engagement Framework for formal adoption. One of the areas identified for improvement in the 2013 Audit of Community Planning in the Scottish Borders was the need to effectively co-ordinate community consultation. The proposed Framework addressed this need with an overarching statement document, presenting the Community Planning Partnership's Key Principles of Community Engagement (Appendix 1 to the report), which was supported by a library of reference material. A toolkit for community engagement was developed (Appendix 2 to the report), along with a 'Jargon Buster' (Appendix 3 to the report) and a guide to Contacting Community Groups (Appendix 4 to the report). It was anticipated that a further set of guides would detail different methods of community engagement e.g. focus groups and public meetings. Development of these guides would be an ongoing process to ensure information was kept up to date and reflected good practice. There were 3 main tasks associated with the implementation of the Community Engagement Framework – developing a shared mechanism for sharing community engagement activity; establishing a community engagement practitioners group; and designing and developing community engagement training to be delivered with the Partnership. Members of the Board welcomed the revised documents. In response to how the Police and Fire and Rescue Services would use the Framework, Superintendent MacInnes confirmed that the Police could use the methodology in these documents as well as others being developed nationally by Police Scotland and translate national initiatives into the local context. Mr Girrity gave a similar undertaking on behalf of the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service.

DECISION

AGREED to approve the Community Engagement Framework and associated documents for formal adoption by the Community Planning Partnership and to thank the SBC Strategic Community Engagement Officer and the wider team for their work on producing the documents.

FUTURE SERVICES REFORM THEME GROUP

12. With reference to paragraph 7 of the Minute of 27 November 2014, there had been circulated copies of a briefing paper by the Chief Executive of Eildon Housing. There had been 2 recent meetings of the Future Services Reform Theme Group, one setting out the broad agenda of the group and the other to scope out the activities and agree initial priorities for progressing key actions. The Group would look at a number of areas – Estates and Asset Management; Procurement and Community Benefit; Digital Services; Health & Social Care Integration; and Shared Services. The Group had agreed to establish a short life working group to look further at Estates and Asset Management across the Partnership, to better understand and share the pattern of asset ownership and future intentions, which would allow the identification of opportunities for effective disposal, sharing, maintenance and efficient use. A settlement by settlement approach was planned, starting with Hawick. One of the

proposed outcomes for the work-stream was to develop and test an approach for sharing future plans related to the estates and asset management plans of partner organisations, initially in the Hawick area, to better co-ordinate use of collective assets. It was anticipated that this pilot process would report at the end of 2015 and would inform bi-lateral discussions on assets. A further working group was being established to take forward Procurement and Community Benefit. This group would ascertain what would be required to align procurement activity to ensure maximum community benefits were achieved, by ensuring the collective Partners' efforts were balanced, delivered/deliverable, sustainable, and met local needs. It was not intended that the group would seek to influence individual Community Planning Partners' procurement processes in any other way. The proposed outcomes for this work-stream were, by summer 2015, to establish a common understanding of significant procurement exercises across the partner organisations over the next 3 to 5 years; also by summer 2015, to share knowledge, experience and best practice with respect to securing community benefits and ensuring that they were delivered; by autumn 2015, to seek to co-ordinate an agreed optimal mix of community benefits from partner investments; and by winter 2015, to assess the need for a standing Community Planning Partnership group to enable Partners to keep abreast of developments and opportunities with respect to procurement collaboration.

13. In terms of Digital Services, the main focus of this activity in the Community Planning Partnership was currently the development of the 'Looking Local App' pilot, and the group intended to follow up on opportunities that emerged out of this pilot. The proposed outcome would be, by Autumn 2015, to identify learning from the 'Looking Local App' pilot process to help inform future collective digital service delivery initiatives. With regard to Health and Social Care Integration, it was proposed that the group acted as a reporting channel for the integration structure to feed into the Community Planning Partnership. The proposed outcomes would be, by summer 2015, to establish an appropriate reporting mechanism linking the Integration Board with the Community Planning Partnership; and to ensure that wider opportunities arising from the development and implementation of the Integration agenda were identified on an on-going basis. For Shared Services, the group had taken a cautious approach and was currently gathering information on Shared Services initiatives elsewhere in Scotland in order to assess successes and failures and inform future activities in this strand. More specifically, the group was investigating the opportunity to develop co-produced material/literature which promoted the benefits of living and working in the Borders that Partners could use when recruiting staff. The proposed outcome for this work was, based on identified best practice, to establish the opportunities and appetite to progress shared services activity in the Scottish Borders where relevant partner agencies had signalled serious consideration of an opportunity.
14. Members asked a number of questions. In terms of Health and Social Care Integration, Tracey Logan advised that this would be covered in the governance paper on the Integration Joint Board, including at strategic level with the Community Planning Strategic Board. A half day housing related Health and Social Care Integration Event was planned for 22 April, although that date had still to be confirmed. The RSLs would be invited to attend. Councillor Bhatia advised of two more rounds of community engagement and that from April 2015, it would be an Interim Integration Board. Nile Istephan confirmed that Hawick had been the natural choice for Estates and Asset Management programme due to the level and nature of the assets and the amount of information already available. Once the methodology had been established, this could be applied in other areas which could be progressed quickly.

DECISION

NOTED the update, including the outcomes for each strand of work of the Future Services Reform Group.

COMMUNITY PLANNING JOINT DELIVERY TEAM

15. There had been circulated copies of the Minute of Meeting of the Community Planning Joint Delivery Team held on 11 February 2015.

16. With reference to paragraph 9 of the Minute of the Community Planning Joint Delivery Team of 11 February 2015, Councillor Bell asked about when an update would be brought to the Strategic Board. Tracey Logan responded that an action plan would be brought to the next meeting of the Joint Delivery Team, and thereafter on to the Strategic Board.

**DECISION
NOTED.**

URGENT BUSINESS

17. The SBC Communities and Partnership Manager advised the Board that there would be an event in Jedburgh on 24 March 2015, following the Council's Executive Committee meeting where the paper on localities was being considered, to which partners from the Community Planning Partnership would shortly receive an invitation.

**DECISION
NOTED.**

The meeting concluded at 3.55 p.m.