

MINUTE of Meeting of the BERWICKSHIRE
AREA PARTNERSHIP held in Whitsome
Ark Village Hall, Whitsome on Thursday 6
February 2020 at 6.30 pm

Present:- Councillors J. Greenwell, H. Laing, C Hamilton, D Moffat, M. Rowley (together with 16 representatives from Partner Organisations, Community Councils and members of the public.

Apologies:- Councillors J A Fullarton

In Attendance:- Strategic Community Engagement Officer, Locality Development Co-ordinator (J Pringle), Clerk to the Council, Trainee Democratic Services Officer

1. **CHAIRMAN**

In the absence of the Chair - Councillor Fullarton - Councillor Laing chaired the meeting, welcoming everyone to the Berwickshire Area Partnership and thanking the Community Councils, Partners and local organisations for their attendance. Councillor Laing outlined the programme for the evening and introduced the speakers.

2. **MINUTE**

The Minute of the Meeting of the Berwickshire Area Partnership held on 5 September 2019 had been circulated. The Chairman gave a brief outline of the previous discussion, which was attached to the Minute as an Appendix.

DECISION

APPROVED the Minute.

3. **TRANSPORT UPDATE**

With reference to paragraph 4 of the Minute of 5 September 2019, Scottish Borders Council Passenger Transport Manager, Mr Timothy Stephenson, gave a verbal update on Transport Planning. Mr Stephenson explained that local bus services were not a statutory requirement, with subsidies on local bus services (LBS) costing £1.5m per annum, and moved 1m travellers. As with other Local Authorities, budgets of the LBS were always being reviewed. Savings made in 2018 totalled £200k and were based on data collected on-bus and passenger trends, providing alternatives and some innovative thinking. Savings in 2019 of £85k were already secured without further cuts to bus services and £165k of budget savings were needed in 2020. The Plan for 2020 and beyond identified a number of under-performing bus routes, declining passenger numbers; re-tendered pricing across Scotland was around 20%; the cost per passenger (subsidy) was very high and was not sustainable. There were some tough decisions to be made to secure a workable plan to save £165k and look at alternatives rather than cutting services. In August and September 2019 officers met with communities and had conversations on meeting their local needs. Mr Stephenson advised that four bus routes within the Berwickshire area (the No. 32, 85/87, 710 and 902) were being reviewed due to the high cost per passenger. The Berwick/Hutton/Paxton service was not doing well and was currently on a 1-2 year contract. He advised that he would meet with the Hutton/Paxton community to assess what the route should look like before going back out to tender as there were very few passengers using the service at the moment. It was proposed to try and get the cost down from £5.33 to £3.60 to bring in line with the average cost per passenger for the Borders. The 85/87 service would be reduced to 2 days per week (Tuesday and Thursday) and a revised timetable had been sent out to all Community Councils on the route. The service was only carrying 4.5k passengers per annum and

was the most expensive route in the Borders. The 710 service would go entirely as it only had 110 passengers last year. The 902 timetable had been changed to include the link through Greenlaw, Leitholm and Kelso, with a consultation out at the moment and due to close in a few days. Engagement had taken place with Hutton & Paxton CC to look at a provision to replace the 87 service and a workaround was being assessed. In response to a question about the re-opening of Reston Station, Mr Stephenson advised that he would be happy to sit down with the Community Council and the wider community to see what transport links could be made. With regard to the loss of the 87 service, there could be further discussions on the use of an on-demand service similar to that provided to West Linton. Mr Stephenson confirmed that Berwickshire Wheels had secured another year of SBC funding for their Hub and was aware that they were struggling for volunteer drivers due to the size of the area. The operating model would be assessed as it was recognised the importance of this service in the area and the need for a gradual change going forward to have paid drivers. The Chair thanked Mr Stephenson for his time in attending the meeting.

4. **JIM CLARK RALLY 2020**

- 4.1 Copies of a joint report by the Executive Director and Service Director Assets and Infrastructure on the Jim Clark Rally 2020 Public Consultation Process had been circulated. Revised legislation for motor sport events on closed public roads had been introduced in 2019 and gave increased rigor to the planning process for such events which aimed to reduce the likelihood of a repeat of the tragic events of 2014. As part of that process, the organisers of the Jim Clark Rally had applied to the Council, as local roads authority, for a Motor Sports Order, to hold a rally on closed roads in the Scottish Borders on 30 and 31 May 2020. In determining whether to make a Motor Sports Order, the Council had to consider a number of factors laid out in the Regulations. The report outlined those factors and provided an opportunity to examine the proposals submitted by the rally organisers in respect of the routes and timings for the rally on 30 and 31 May 2020.
- 4.2 It was noted that the event organisers had, prior to submitting the application, been in consultation with representatives of Scottish Borders Council and Police Scotland through the established Safety Advisory Group (SAG) system in place at the Council. The intention of the Jim Clark Rally organisers was for the event to be based in Duns and to run a total of 8 rally stages (over 4 different routes) on the Saturday and 6 rally stages (over 3 different routes) on the Sunday. The four routes on the Saturday were Westruther, Scott's View, Eccles and Longformacus – Abbey St Bathans. This would see a single run, in an anti- clockwise direction of travel, over the first three routes followed by vehicle servicing and refuelling in Duns and then a repeat of that earlier sequence. Following a further re-group and service in Duns, the day would then conclude with two runs over the Longformacus – Abbey St Bathans route. Sunday would see routes at Edrom, Ayton and Whitsome; the intention being to run a clockwise loop of those routes followed by servicing and refuelling in Duns, before a repeat loop over the three routes and a podium finish in Duns.
- 4.3 The Chairman welcomed the SBC Infrastructure Manager, Mr Brian Young; the Chairman of the Jim Clark Rally, Professor Dan Wright; and the Jim Clark Rally PR Manager, Mrs Frances Renton to the meeting. Mr Young emphasised that the Jim Clark Rally was a major sporting event and brought significant economic benefit to the Scottish Borders. It attracted a high number of spectators, supporters, staff and competitors to the area, many of whom stayed a number of nights. By extending the route it would spread the benefits throughout the Borders. It had been acknowledged the significant officer time spent getting the rally back to the Borders following the tragic events in 2014. In response to a request that the Community Councils affected be contacted individually, Mr Young confirmed that the organisers had already committed to doing so. Clarification was sought with regards to the timings of the planning of such an event and why the information had not been made available earlier. It was confirmed that this event had been planned out-with the normal schedule and it would have usually been planned a year in advance. There was a full discussion held and the representatives from the Jim Rally answered the following questions:-

Questions/Comments

- (a) Question – the community of Whitsome has a programme of events which run for 6 months and include a plant sale on the weekend of the rally. It was only discovered on 22 January what the plans were for the rally, but the application must have been made back in October, so why was the community not informed earlier?
Response – Mr Young confirmed that the application to SBC came in at the end of November. Prof. Wright explained that the organisers had started looking at routes early on and normally this would take a year to organise. The event had stopped running while the Fatal Accident Inquiry was underway and the new legislation was only enacted in June 2019. An event of this size had about 600 volunteer marshalls. The preparation for the event could not start on the normal timetable and reconnaissance of routes only started around the end of November after the rally held on 9 November had finished. The first step was to come up with a set of proposals for a route which were legal, and then apply for a permit. Having got that permit and worked with the police, etc. the next step was to go out to the community (as was happening now) to find out the consequences of that route for the community and try to see what could be done to accommodate them e.g. change of timing. The timing of planning in future would revert to one year and again it was explained that this was a one-off arrangement for this year only
- (b) Comment – you knew the dates last November and it was not out in the community until January this year which has caused us issues.
Response – the dates were partly down to the rally organisers and partly due to the need to negotiate with other rallies due to the national support required. Prof. Wright would need to check to see if the information could have come out earlier. It was already known that the rally would run on the last weekend in May in 2021 and 2022.
- (c) Comment – the plant sale is booked for 31 May which is the main source of income. Someone could have given us the heads up.
Response – before you change the date, please check with the rally organisers to see if the event could be accommodated as part of the timing of the rally.
Comment – people come into the village from all over for the plant sale and would be put off by the road closures.
Response – there would be extra marshalling and signage put up and the organisers would do anything to help with this. At the previous event, additional marshalling and signage had been put in place to accommodate a wedding at Wedderburn Castle.
Comment – the plant sale has been planned since the previous year and if it had been known the rally was to be on that weekend then a different date could have been chosen. Publicity notices were already out. They were not against the rally but concerned as to its impact.
Response – if publicity notices needed to be changed then the rally organisers could help with that, including funding. The rally could only run with the support of the community and organisers would be happy to attend meetings with the Community Council and other groups.
- (d) Question – have you gone round the Community Councils giving presentations?
Response – the Rally PR Manager had sent an email to all Community Councils in the area to be affected, but had only received 3 responses so far.
- (e) Question – the letter received from the Rally organisers stated that the lane at Whitsome was to be closed to both vehicular and foot traffic. There were 9 properties on this lane and the residents would like to know the exact timing of the start, the duration and no of vehicles anticipated as people were concerned about access to their properties?
Response – the organisers would be happy to come back and have a look. The road closure was quite long as there would be up to 140 cars at 30 second intervals at this part. They would do everything they could to allow people access to their

properties during that time and would look in more detail to see if anything could be changed.

Comment – it was appalling to have an event like this in the country on a single track road.

Comment – notification was only received last week.

Comment – it was far too late to get notification. Some people have holiday cottage lets to consider with bookings made well in advance.

Response – as previously explained, normally planning started much earlier but this year was a one-off. This stage was a proposal with the road closure due to start at 09:21, the first car due at 12 noon, and then the second run through from 14:20, and the road due to re-open at 16:21. However, this could be earlier, as when the last rally car had gone through and the checks made on the road, then it could re-open earlier. Two hour closure prior to the event was needed to get set up. If you did need to access your property during the road closure then the rally organisers would visit you in advance and look at more detail to see if anything could be changed.

- (f) Question – with regard to the overall consultation process what happens if the route was felt to be inappropriate in its entirety for the village? Do you have a backup plan if the Whitsome stage was cancelled and what consultation would there be on any backup plan?

Response – the planning was done before the event and a stage could be moved if there was an accident. Tests and desktop exercises were carried out before the event took place so scenario planning with SAG and all contingencies tested before a permit would be granted. It would not be practical to reroute the rally so the backup plan was for that stage to be cancelled.

Response – Councillor Laing commented that for very specific individual issues, these could be sent on to local SBC Councillors who would pass them on the rally organisers. It was appreciated that this information and consultation had been issued at short notice but Prof. Wright had explained the reasons that this was for this year only. It was necessary to thrash out the issues with each community. Mrs Renton confirmed that any comments and complaints could be sent to communities@jimclarkrally.org and also through the consultation process website which was due to end on 8 March <https://scotborders.citizenspace.com/>. Prof. Wright confirmed that this consultation was the Council one and the rally organisers worked all the time on the event making changes as necessary e.g. work access, pregnant ladies, hospital appointments, etc.

Comment – one thing that would not change would be the rally dates.

Response – it was confirmed that assuming the Motor Sports Permit was granted, the dates for the rally would not change. It was not likely the Permit would be granted until about 15 May, with tests run on the routes before then and if these tests were not satisfactory then the Permit would not be granted.

- (g) Question – it has not been possible to find the strategy about sustainability and carbon neutral stance for the rally – where could it be found? Formula One had managed to aim to have all events net zero carbon foot print by 2025. If the event could not be carbon neutral then it should not go ahead.

Response – all the information, including policies, was on the MotorsportUK website as that was the governing body for all rallies. In Formula One carbon reduction was normally handled by technical changes to vehicles. It was not possible to run rally cars at the moment without carbon fuel as the technology did not exist.

Comment – Duns Community Council welcomed the return of the rally; although it was a pity it could not start outside the Jim Clark Museum.

Response – unfortunately, logistics dictated it was impractical to start the rally at that point.

DECISION NOTED:

- (a) **the application by organisers of the Jim Clark Rally to run an event on 30 and 31 May 2020; and**

(b) the comments made by individuals on the proposed route, restrictions and timings for the event detailed above and given to the rally organisers.

5. COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT ACT

Copies of the Scottish Borders Council Participation and Asset Transfer Requests Annual Reports 2018/19 had been circulated. The reports summarised each request, a description of the request, and also gave details of its status. The Strategic Community Engagement Officer, Ms Clare Malster, gave an explanation on how requests could be made by an organisation of a public body stating they wished to be involved in reducing inequalities. A total number of 5 participation requests had been received. Of the 5, 3 had been agreed from Eyemouth Community Council and the 2 requests refused were from Selkirk Regeneration Company and Scottish Borders Community Councils' Network. The Scottish Community Development Centre had put together some information on community empowerment which was very useful. The Community Asset Transfer Policy had come into force in 2017 and gave certain types of bodies the ability to approach public bodies for lands or buildings to lease/use/buy. The application would need to show benefits to communities. Seven asset transfer requests had been received and 3 groups had moved to the formal transfer request stage: Men's Shed in Selkirk; the community orchard in Kelso; and one pending for an old primary school in the Borders. All the information was available on the SBC website. Ms Malster advised that she would be happy to discuss the Community Empowerment Act further with anyone and if anyone had any ideas for community empowerment for the next meeting, then again she was happy to chat about these.

6. BERWICKSHIRE LOCALITY PLAN & ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Copies of the Berwickshire Locality Plan and Action Plan had been circulated. The Locality Development Co-ordinator, Ms Pringle, advised that the Plan showed that the Area Partnership was about creating a space where the aspirations and ideas of the community could be heard, and community planning could be strengthened through communities and public bodies working together; the Locality Plan was part of that process. The Plan outlined the priorities of the Berwickshire area with a focus on reducing inequalities to improve the area for those who lived, worked and visited there. The Plan linked to the Scottish Borders Community Plan and set out the priority improvements over the next five years and the commitment to work in partnership and use shared resources. The Plan was structured around 4 themes: Economy, Skills and Learning; Health, Care and Wellbeing; Quality of Life; and Environment and Place. Ms Pringle explained that comments and feedback gathered at previous Area Partnership meetings were incorporated into the Plan and reflected the prioritisation of outcomes and the difference sought by local individuals, groups, organisations and businesses. It was the intention of the Area Partnerships to involve as wide a group of people as possible to ensure the Plan reflected the needs of the community. In developing the Plan further there was an aim to increase participation and create more opportunities for people to attend the Area Partnership meetings, to talk in person to the Communities and Partnership team and also to take part in surveys or contact could be made online. Any suggestions or views would be welcomed either by e-mail: communityengagement@scotborders.gov.uk or through the SBC website: www.scotborders.gov.uk/community_councils. A further discussion was then held on the Locality Action Plan which clearly showed each of the priorities, the associated actions, delivery, timeline and progress made, and the following questions were answered.

Questions/Comments

(a) Question – what happens to the Plan now?

Response – the Plan was a reference tool which will help drive change across the public, private and third sector. The Action Plan was now being compiled to take the priorities and assign what activities were happening. This would be delivered across the community planning partners and an explanation was also given on the monitoring process of the plan. If there was no progress with the Action Plan then it would be cascaded up to the Community Planning Partnership Strategic Board.

- (b) Question – what about accountability? Who owns the process? There was a gap in the resource being put in for implementation of the Plan.
Response – the Action Plan gave details on who is doing what and the associated timelines which would enable a level of accountability. The Action Plan was a first start, and would be a fluid document which would change on an ongoing basis. The Plan would be on the SBC website and copies would be going out to partners to see what activity was being undertaken and then it would be brought to the Area Partnerships to consider progress.
- (c) Question – what about funding for activity?
Response – the Action Plan does not have a specific budget assigned but aims to influence organisational expenditure at a local level. Councils across Scotland have given a commitment to 1% of their Council budget being allocated to participatory budgeting; the specifics of how this would be done has not been determined but gives scope to influence spend in accordance with the Locality Plan. This was not just a wish list for the Council, but a Plan that included other CP partners, with activities for them to do out of their budgets. It was a great record of what the people in Berwickshire wanted to happen or see in the area. The Plan could be used in a number of different meetings and everything mentioned within it would be the combined responsibility of all partners with one partner taking the lead.
- (d) Comment – it was not known in advance that the Locality Plan needed to be approved at this meeting.
Response – apologies were given if it was not clear from the agenda that approval was being sought. The Plan represented a snapshot in time and would be brought back to the Area Partnership if it needed any substantive changes. The Area Partnership needs to drive that and the Plan acted as the voice of the community so the community needed to say what changes it wanted.
Comment – I felt that the Plan had been very much an officer-led process at the time with little chance to add in more.
Comment – this should be so dynamic that the formal approval process was not as important as getting on and doing something.
- (e) Question – how up to date are the statistics as some dates are 3 years old?
Response – the figures were the most up to date data available at a locality level and were the last published statistics available. If things do change, the information would be updated. It was noted that the Action Plan would continually be changing as things progressed.
- (d) Question – can it be arranged to have a focus on a particular theme for a future review day and to not try to do everything at once?
Response – it was agreed to assess the Plan theme by theme as that would give more focus and to review any progress achieved in the action plan and to follow up if no progress had been made.

The Chair advised that the Locality Plan needed to now be approved and asked if more time was required for further consultation with communities. After a further discussion, the Plan was approved and it was agreed that it would be further reviewed at a single meeting in the Autumn, if possible, on a theme by theme basis.

**DECISION
 AGREED:**

- (a) **to approve the Berwickshire Locality Plan and Action Plan; and**
- (b) **to review the Locality Plan and progress with the Action Plan at a single meeting (if possible) of the Area Partnership in the autumn on a theme by theme basis.**

7. BERWICKSHIRE LOCALITY PLAN – HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

- 7.1 The Chairman welcomed Jenny Wallace and Amanda Christie from Trust Housing Association, to talk about their Extra Care Housing provision in Duns. Ms Christie advised that the Extra Care Development for Duns was a priority in Trust Housing's operational plan for the next year. Whilst the build was progressing well they were working to identify suitable residents and working to ensure there was a well skilled local workforce. There was a selection of information available at the meeting, including newsletters, guidance on support, independent research and case studies along with the statistics on the Trust and performance. Trust Housing was a national organisation established in 1973 and had 3,600 homes and around 600 staff. It was a housing, care and support provider, predominately for older people. Ms Christie advised that within the Borders the Trust had an extra care housing facility in Galashiels and a sheltered development in Chirnside, with the new development in Duns due to be completed in September 2020. It was hoped that the facility in Duns was not just a resource for Duns but a hub for the whole community. There were architects plans at the meeting for the new development in Duns which showed the physical use of the building, parking and garden space. In essence, extra care housing brought together a landlord service, housing service and personal care in the one development. By combining this range of services through a dedicated, locally based trained staff team, benefits were felt by the people supported and there were economies of scale to each service area. The Trust had 10 extra care housing developments across Scotland and feedback from tenants showed they particularly liked the meal service; a lot of the social activities within the development and in the local community; and they liked their own space. Feedback from the Commissioners showed they liked the flexibility and the ability to respond especially with those who had high care needs; and that people could come out of hospital more quickly. The users of the service benefitted from a seamless and more flexible care and support service provided in a holistic and person-centred manner.
- 7.2 Ms Wallace then spoke about the Todlaw project, with the Trust starting work with SBC 2½ years previously as part of the Strategic Housing Plan. The development would have 30 flats with a Hub and be surrounded by 19 amenity cottages. There would be a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom properties. Design guides were used to meet visual and early stage dementia issues. Staff in the Hub would provide services to those in the flats/cottages and meals would be available in the Hub. The development would also be available to the whole community as a complement to other services in the area. The Trust was already working with the local Social Work team as well as other providers so in terms of recruitment the Trust would not take over their work e.g. overnight service. They could also buddy up to react to an emergency situation. Within the development there was a large lounge and dining space which was open to others, with lots of programmes of activities (such as film nights, social events, craft sessions, exercise). The facilities could be used by other community groups, as long as tenants were able to join in. Within the development there were assisted bathrooms so if people from the community who could only use a shower at home, could come in and have a bath. There was also a hairdressing facility. It was a case of trying to make the best use of the physical resources within the development and partner with the other providers in the area. A lot of thought had gone in to the building but also the garden. Once the site was safe, an open day would be held for local people. Staff worked in partnership with other local providers in the delivery of services to the community and shared resources to provide a flexible approach to service delivery, employment and training opportunities, as well as making best use of local resources. In response to a question on how tenants would be chosen, referrals came through SBC and NHS and a panel would assess and prioritise those who required access to the facilities. There would be a mix of tenants from the community; from those who needed little assistance, to those who may have quite complex needs. Although the development was a housing offering, with a Scottish Secure tenancy, it also provided a lot of resource in support and care through social work. The final allocation of a tenancy rested with the Trust as landlord. With regard to inter-generational opportunities, there was good experience elsewhere such as North Lanarkshire where some of the 6th year pupils had come into the facility in their free periods to train residents in social media skills. This had also happened in Galashiels but had then grown into something else and the young people continued to visit residents.

7.3 The Community Capacity Building Worker, Juliana Amaral gave a presentation on the work of the Berwickshire Locality Services (Older Adults). This preventative service supported people to connect with their communities and build better lives. The service encouraged and enabled individuals to build their confidence and increase social connections by establishing and maintaining links within their local communities. This was carried out by: thinking about what mattered to the individual; increased social connections; links to community opportunities; build confidence and resilience; help people manage their health condition; help people to become active members of the community through participation in walking football, a gentle exercise class, Soup Club, Men's Shed, and Happy Friday Group, Chirnside. The Shared Support was a partnership initiative between LAC Older Adults, Chest Heart & Stroke Scotland, Trust Housing and Berwickshire Wheels. It was emphasised that this service could not function without Berwickshire Wheels. During the presentation, videos were included showing the activities of the group along with the outcomes from individuals, their families and carers. The benefits of the services offered included: improved health and wellbeing; fewer hospital admissions and GP visits; better quality of life; improved confidence and independence; improved community links and social interactions; positive use of community assets and resources; and an increased level of people engaging and volunteering. Ms Amaral advised that they were looking to start another group in Eyemouth in April and would be happy to look at Duns with the Trust LAC team that covered all the Borders.

8. **BERWICKSHIRE COMMUNITY FUND**

Information on the Berwickshire Community Fund had been circulated and was available on the tables at the meeting. Ms Jan Pringle, SBC Locality Development Co-ordinator, gave an explanation of the Scottish Borders Council's Community Fund process. This was a fund available to the community and voluntary groups to help support community activity. Grants of up to £5k for non-constituted groups and £10k for constituted groups were available. In exceptional cases up to £30k was available for constituted groups. Applications submitted to Scottish Borders Council were assessed by the Communities and Partnership team and if they met the fund criteria, would go forward to Area Partnership for a decision to be made by the attendees present. Assessments would be included in agenda papers and those who attended the Area Partnership meetings would be asked to consider the facts and make a decision on whether to support the application. Ms Pringle referred to the Interim Assessment forms, already circulated and summarised below, which gave details of an application for Berwickshire Area Partnership to consider:-

(a) Community Fund Position – Information Sheets

There had been circulated copies of the Interim Community Fund Overview Map 2019-20. The total budget allocation for the interim community opening fund was £172,692, with an outstanding amount available for January 2020 of £119,788. Ms Pringle outlined the details of the allocations which showed the Community Council commitments totalled £13,680; Berwickshire Federation of Village Halls at £13,502 and the local festival grant commitments at £14,060. In response to questions, Ms Pringle confirmed that the grants did not include individual village halls as this was administered by the Federation of Village Halls. The future budget availability was unknown at this time and was subject to budget confirmation and agreement by SBC Elected Members; similarly any underspend in this year's budget was not guaranteed to be carried forward and this would also require a decision by the SBC Elected Members.

(b) Approved Fast Track Application Assessment – Keeping Duns Blooming Marvellous

It was noted that this application was from Keeping Duns Blooming Marvellous with a funding request of £1,500. The group had identified five planting areas around Duns: Langtongate, Willis Wynd, Barn End, Industrial Estate Wild Flowers and a large square by the memorials in the park. It was proposed to improve the spaces with sustainable planting. The funding would enable the purchase of shrubs, perennials and wild flowers. The group worked closely with SBC Neighbourhood Services and the proposed planting would ensure an attractive and complementary scheme. The works would be undertaken by over 40 gardening volunteers and they

had been formally supported by a Heart of Duns and Duns Community Council who had previously contributed their time and funding. This application had been fast-tracked and was for information only as the funding for £1,500 had already been approved.

- (c) **Application Assessment - Chirnside United Football Club**
An application had been received from Chirnside United Football with a funding request of £2,328.65 to support the installation of floodlights at their new training area to the north of their existing pitch. The proposal was to erect three, 8m galvanised street lighting columns and the funding was sought to support the purchase of the lights and the electrical installation works by a select registered installer. In response to questions raised, it was confirmed that the pitch was also used by the Junior Teams and Chirnside Chasers (athletics group). It was noted that the schools used their own pitches throughout the day, although children used the Chirnside football grounds out-with school hours. It was also noted that the application met the criteria and it was agreed to approve the request for the installation of lighting at the football ground and noted that the running costs would be met by the club.

DECISION

AGREED to approve the application from Chirnside United Football Club for a grant of £2,328.65 to support the installation of floodlights at their new training area.

9. OPEN FORUM – QUESTIONS FOR ELECTED MEMBERS

The following questions were received:-

- (a) Question – what was the position about SCDC review of Area Partnerships and the Community Fund following the meeting held in Chirnside?
Response – it was anticipated that the report would be published soon following some further internal consultation with senior officers and elected members. The follow up work required after the Peebles High School fire had impacted on the availability of senior officers.
- (b) Question – what about settled status and the assistance from SBC?
Response – information from the SBC Communications team had been issued through social media for about 6 months. There had been some concern raised that people were not applying but the Council was using all channels it could.
- (c) Question – why have communities not been kept informed on the recent decision made on the £40k budget for CCTV as many communities fund-raised for CCTV in the first place?
Response – the Council report was on the public SBC website and information also was on social media. The maintenance contract was in place to maintain the current cameras but not to replace any cameras or equipment. There is a varied position with regard to CCTV across the Borders. It would cost up to £1m to replace all cameras. The Council was keen to work with other groups to see if other funding could be sourced. Limited information was available of the effectiveness of the cameras with Police Scotland unable to provide details. The matter was strongly debated at the Council meeting.
- (d) Question – what was the ongoing proposal for SBC Elected Members to put more resources into the economy in Berwickshire given the massive investment in the central Borders?
Response – the Jim Clark Museum had received funding. The proposed new community campus at Eyemouth would cost £18m, with further investment in the new Reston Station. Almost £1m was due to be spent on redeveloping the harbour front in Eyemouth. The new South of Scotland Enterprise Agency would also bring in other funding.

- (e) Question – what was the Council doing about the lack of gateway at Lamberton with no stopping point on the A1 for tourists?
Response – some of that tourist development would happen around Reston and Eyemouth and there was the possibility that the South of Scotland Enterprise Agency may pick this up in future.
- (f) Question - why are the names of the Community Council representatives in attendance at these meetings not included in the Minute?
Response – arrangements would be put in place for the sederunt sheet to be circulated at the meetings for those who wished to put their details of their name and/or organisation down and this would be included in future Minutes.
- (g) Question – the give way signs at some entrances were facing the wrong way?
Response – an e-mail had already been sent to Amey with regard to this.

10. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

The Chairman asked for any suggestions/proposals for future agenda items or any suggested venues to be submitted to Ms Pringle for the next meeting.

11. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Berwickshire Area Partnership was scheduled for Thursday 7 May 2020, with the venue confirmed nearer the time of the meeting. The Chairman thanked all those who had attended the meeting for their participation and input.

The meeting concluded at 8.55pm