

Public Document Pack

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE AREA PARTNERSHIP

MINUTES of Meeting of the TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE AREA PARTNERSHIP held in Hawick High School on Tuesday, 11 June 2019 at 6.30 pm

Present:- Councillors M Richards (Chair), C Ramage, W McAteer and G Turnbull together with 24 representatives from Partner Organisations, Community Councils and members of the public.

Also present:- Councillor S Aitchison.

1. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Councillor Richards welcomed everyone to the Teviot and Liddesdale Area Partnership and thanked the Community Councils, Partners and local organisations for their attendance. He outlined the programme for the evening and introduced the speakers.

2. **INSPIRE LEARNING**

- 2.1 The Chairman extended a welcome to Catherine Thomson, Quality Improvement Officer, who was in attendance to give a presentation on the Inspire Learning Programme, explaining how the programme would benefit all teachers and pupils across the Scottish Borders. Ms Thomson advised that the world was changing and technology was important in the way we communicated, lived and worked. It was therefore important that digital skills were brought into the classroom and that resources were available for young people to ensure they were digital citizens who could adapt to a changing environment. The Inspire Learning Programme was a key part of the Digital Learning Strategy which would transform teaching and learning in schools. It included the provision of iPads to all P6-S6 pupils and shared devices for P1-P5 pupils. The rationale was aimed at raising attainment and supporting equality and inclusion for all young people, with improved outcomes and success. Ms Thomson highlighted that it was not just the provision of iPads as a device, but was about the Pillars of Inspire Learning through: professional learning and teaching, strategic planning, correct infrastructure and environment, school clusters and school leaders. The Programme would enhance learning, teaching and assessment and there would be opportunities for employees, parents and young people to upskill and drive the programme forward. Young people would be able to make use of a high-quality, creative resource which would equip them to become more independent in learning and increase their employability skills. Ms Thomson went on to advise that partnership with CGI had brought knowledge of the wider IT marketplace and the Apple iPad had been chosen as the best value option.
- 2.2 Ms Thomson then introduced Ali Taylor, one of the trainers on the project. Ms Taylor explained that one of the tools on the iPads for teachers was 'Classroom' which allowed the teacher to view any iPad in the classroom permitting them to control lessons and give support to students when required. Volunteers then took part in an interactive exercise with the iPads taking photographs of angles in the room, which Ms Taylor then showed on the screen, demonstrating how lessons would be more interactive and how direct learning would be carried out in the classroom.
- 2.3 Ms Thomson concluded the presentation by discussing the iPad deployment programme which would commence on Monday 17 June in Selkirk and continue until Friday 28 June

2019 to Hawick, Kelso, Berwickshire, Eyemouth, Earlston, Jedburgh, Peebles, Galashiels and Peebles. Pupil deployment would be August/December; Selkirk, Kelso and Hawick; January/March: Earlston, Peebles, Eyemouth; April June: Galashiels, Jedburgh, Berwickshire. Ms Thomson also clarified the next steps through the training plan for secondary schools, with the Apple teacher sign up and the digital learning strategy in place. The Inspire teams would include CGI and Apple and would allow secondment opportunities for teaching staff for two years with project teams, clusters and school leads, an executive board and an education strategic group. In response to a question, Ms Thomson advised that there would be a special area of their helpdesk dedicated to dealing with any issues, any problems identified would have a quick turnaround so there would be no lost opportunities. The Chairman thanked the speakers for their presentation and wished them well in the implementation of the project.

3. **PUBLIC PLAY FACILITIES STRATEGY - TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE**

- 3.1 There had been circulated copies of a report by the Service Director Assets and Infrastructure setting out guidance and recommendations for the Teviot and Liddesdale Area for future investment in Public Play facilities and proposals for the removal of obsolete play areas, agreed as part of the 2018/19 Capital Investment Plan and updated within the Capital Investment Plan 2019/20. The 2019/20 Capital Investment Plan had funding of £5.036m for investment within Outdoor Community Spaces over the 10 years. This presented a tremendous asset for communities, however also brought a maintenance burden, for which no additional revenue resources were being provided. As part of the original investment within the 2018/19 Capital Investment Plan, it was simultaneously agreed by Council to review the distribution of play equipment provision across play parks in the Borders which could: (1) inform decision making around future investment in communities; and (2) guide the rationalisation of obsolete play facilities which were deemed no longer fit for purpose, ensuring a cost neutral impact on established budgets with the Service. The programme of investment in play facilities aimed to improve community wellbeing and enhance activity levels for all ages with a beneficial impact on the health of the population. The programme of proposed projects across the Scottish Borders and an indicative timescale for delivery, was detailed in the report, for the period 2018/19 to 2022/23. The programme proposed a range of provision including Children's Playparks, Pump bike/Skate tracks and Fitness/Youth Shelter provision as well as the rationalisation of obsolete equipment, where this was no longer fit for purpose. It was noted that the Pump Track at Wilton Lodge Park was £200,000 not £300,000 as detailed in the report.
- 3.2 The Neighbourhood Area Manager, Fraser Dunlop, explained that officers had undertaken an assessment of play value using the Fields in Trust Scoring criteria and taken into consideration the proximity of play areas to other play facilities and the planning history of sites. The evaluation had been undertaken to ensure that the Council retained and developed a network of valued, well equipped spaces for local communities. Where there was only one facility serving a community, this was retained and formed a consideration for future investment. Where there were lower value play facilities in areas of multiple provision, these were proposed for decommissioning to reduce the maintenance burden and focus investment to maximise value. In the Scottish Borders currently, the quantity of play provision was high per head of population, but the quality was very low (compared to national benchmarking) and this diminished the wider benefits of these facilities to communities. This programme of investment would address the challenge of balancing quantity against quality, ensuring optimal provision of play facilities across the network. As no additional revenue resources were being provided to support the long term management and maintenance of the new play parks being created, the removal of obsolete facilities was essential to ensure there was a cost neutral impact on established budgets with the service. Mr Dunlop highlighted that there were 243 play parks across the Scottish Borders of which 11, in the Teviot and Liddesdale area, had scored 20 or less in the Fields in Trust Scoring assessments. These play parks were proposed for decommissioning. A discussion was held and officers were asked how the strategy met the needs of all users, particular in rural areas, where there was no provision

for adult facilities, which were free to use, and a lack of public transport to reach existing play parks? With regard to grants available for the provision of play facilities, Mr Dunlop gave examples of work undertaken by groups in Stow and Selkirk, explaining that alternative funding could be available to community groups for enhancing play parks and assistance would be given with regard to submission of funding applications. Mr Hedley added that community groups had to ensure future maintenance of play facilities to ensure sustainability. Regarding the timescale for closures, Mr Dunlop advised that no play facility would be decommissioned until the appropriate investment in new facilities in the locality had been completed. However, Wilton Lodge Park play area had been completed and decommissioning of obsolete play facilities in Teviot and Liddesdale was programmed for the coming winter months. Denholm and Burnfoot community councillors raised child safety concerns as the alternative playparks in their respective areas meant children crossing busy main roads. Mr Hedley and Mr Dunlop would discuss with both community councils out with the meeting. With regard to developers' play areas required by planning permission, Mr Hedley explained that the Council had ceased adopting these areas in 2005. However, if they predated 2005 the Council were still responsible; this issue would be the subject of a report to Council in the near future. The Chairman thanked Mr Dunlop and Mr Hedley for their report and the feedback from communities in the Teviot and Liddesdale area.

4. **FEEDBACK FROM MEETING ON 16 APRIL 2109**

The Minute of the Meeting of the Teviot and Liddesdale Area Partnership held on 16 April 2019 had been circulated along with a summary of the discussion, which was also available online. It was requested that the draft Locality Plan included a section on renewable energy and reference renewable alternatives, electric vehicles and electric charging points.

5. **RURAL TRANSPORT: AREA PARTNERSHIP PRIORITIES**

Those present at the Area Partnership meeting then split into groups to discuss specific rural transport related issues and priorities to be raised at the planned rural transport conference to be held on 28 June 2019. The flyer for the conference was circulated at the meeting. The transport related discussion document was attached as an appendix to the minute. Outcome from the conference would reported at the next meeting.

6. **DRAFT LOCALITY PLAN**

It was noted that this item would be deferred to the next meeting.

7. **NOMINATION FOR SBC ELECTED MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY COUNCIL SCHEME REVIEW WORKING GROUP**

The Chairman advised that nominations were required for the SBC elected member for the Community Council Scheme Review Working Group. Councillor McAteer was nominated by Councillor Richards and seconded by Councillor Turnbull. Councillor McAteer was happy to accept and asked community councillors to contact him with any issues they wished raised.

8. **TEVIOT AND LIDDESDALE COMMUNITY FUND 2019-20 APPLICATIONS**

8.1 Gillian Jardine, gave an update on the Community Fund referring to the flow diagram on the discussion tables. Ms Jardine explained that an application would be assessed and officers would make a recommendation to either proceed to Area Partnership for approval; to hold until further information received; or that the application would not progress any further. If the application was agreed at the Area Partnership meeting, an award letter and payment would be processed in accordance with the terms and conditions along with a monitoring and evaluation form for completion at the end of the project. With regard to the funding available, Ms Jardine explained that non-constituted groups could bid up to £5,000.00, the maximum for constituted groups was £10,000.00. Six to eight weeks was required for consideration of any application. Ms Smith added that in the case of an equality of votes, the Chair would have the casting vote.

8.2 Ms Smith explained that owing to an issue with the online voting process, the deadline for return of postal ballots had been extended to 14 June 2019. The successful projects would be announced in June/July 2019.

8.3 It was noted that a consultation on community funding would be undertaken during the summer.

9. **OPEN FORUM**

9.1 Councillor McAteer asked that consideration be given to the scheduling of Area Partnerships to avoid conflicting with community council meetings.

9.2 Southdean Community Council requested that there be no changes to the SBCCN grant allocation.

9.3 Councillor Turnbull requested a review of car parking arrangements within the Civic Space area in Hawick to establish if there were parking bays that could be made available for short-term parking and residents, especially overnight.

9.4 There was a discussion on public conveniences and there was an enquiry as to the income generated from the new charging policy.

10. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Teviot and Liddesdale Area Partnership was scheduled for Tuesday, 17 September – venue to be agreed. Councillor Richards thanked all those who had attended the meeting for their participation and input.

The meeting concluded at 8.20 pm.

Transport related discussion output to date

Issues:

Impact of roadworks on businesses

Poor transport corridors – North, South, East and West

Road deterioration – HGVs, bridges etc

People need to travel for learning but cost of travelling is expensive

Transport to BGH is rare and expensive

People didn't use the small bus scheme transporting people to the BGH

Lack of transport to Langholm High School for young people in Newcastleton

Transport needs to be improved for housing in the countryside

Solutions

Improved communication between SBC and D&G (roadworks etc)

Extension of railway line will draw people in to the area

Litter bins needed in laybys

Future technologies – ie electric vehicles

Parking on Hawick High Street needs to be policed as cars parked all day

Development of cycle pathways

Rural Transport Discussion Points	Comments	Suggestions
<p>Rural bus network How could rural bus networks better meet the needs of users?</p> <p>What role could technology have in providing a better service?</p> <p>Examples of good rural networks?</p>	<p>What is the need in the area for public transport? Connectivity is a real issue – very difficult to travel from A-B-C</p> <p>Review possibility of smaller buses being used to pick up passengers and transport them to main buses</p> <p>What is the sustainability of initiatives Who would need to invest in IT Infrastructure?</p> <p>The number of people using the feeder bus services has dropped due to the certainty of whether there will be space for them on the X95.</p>	<p>Ask Border Buses what take up there is of local and borders wide routes and get feedback from passengers on what their transport needs are.</p> <p>Could set up passenger groups using IT platforms to plan journeys/ use of local transport.</p> <p>Online booking system could drive/determine what size of transport is needed for the journey ie a taxi, small bus etc.</p> <p>Use of technology/smart bus signs that show when next bus is due/minutes to wait</p> <p>Flexibility in school service to go further than just as ‘far as the last pupil’s stop.’</p>
<p>Community transport Examples or ideas of flexible and innovative community transport solutions?</p> <p>Could communities play more of a role in providing transport solutions / opportunities?</p> <p>Are there other transport schemes we could learn from?</p>	<p>Post buses provided transport opportunities- could they be re-instated?</p> <p>Yorkshire community transport model</p> <p>Liability can make community transport difficult</p> <p>Is there sustainability of funded transport programmes</p> <p>Pembroke Association of Community Transport Pacto Dial a bus G Bike scheme- more funding required- use windfarm money?</p> <p>There is community operated transport in Newcastleton</p>	<p>Use smart boards in shops to inform people when the next bus is.</p> <p>NHS scheduling could be more flexible to group patient appointments based on where they live.</p>

	<p>Community transport undertook 31,000 passenger journeys in the Borders last year.</p> <p>Need to expand the consultation to a wider audience – not just current users but also those that want to use passenger transport but can't (for whatever reason) inc. school children. It should be a CPP consultation (not just SBC). Frontline staff can engage with their clients.</p>	
<p><i>Other transport solutions</i> What role could the new SBC E-Car club scheme & other car club schemes, and South of Scotland Economic Partnership, play in improving transport opportunities in the area?</p>	<p>Car clubs could be set up but what liability of transporting people as a community scheme? Need a facility for people to share what journey they need to make and ask for a car scheme share</p> <p>E Car club to be routed on to rural areas? Explore energy points Scotland model. Not enough charging points in rural locations</p>	<p>Is there any opportunities from businesses driving in the area to carry passengers Encourage incentives for sharing cars to work, using cycle schemes etc</p> <p>Base e-cars at village halls, community could establish a pool of volunteer drivers.</p> <p>Private bus companies could take (paying) passengers on the first and last journeys of the day i.e. outward and inward journey from/to the depot.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank