

Pinwherry & Pinmore Community Council

Notes from PPCC Business Meeting held on Thursday 16 May 2019 in Pinwherry Community Hall

Agenda	Action
<p>1. Sederunt</p> <p><u>Community Councillors</u> Mike Chamberlain (MC) David Logan (DL) Hal Maxwell (HM) Veronica Norman (VN) Ian Yellowlees (IY)</p> <p><u>Speaker</u> None</p> <p><u>PPCDA/2Pins Rep</u></p> <p>Minutes: Irene Climie (IC)</p> <p><u>South Ayrshire Council (SAC)</u> Peter Henderson (PH), Councillor</p> <p><u>South Ayrshire Council Link Officer</u> Chris Campbell (CC)</p> <p><u>Police</u> None attended</p> <p><u>Members of Public</u> Hugh Armour (HA) Ann Berry (AB)</p>	
<p>2. Apologies: Graeme Gordon</p>	
<p>3. Declaration of interest: None.</p>	
<p>4. Police Report: Sgt Chris Hynds reported that there had been 1 x suspicious vehicle, 4 x road reports and 1 x missing person in the area over the past month.</p>	
<p>5. Presentations: There was no presentation this month.</p>	
<p>6. Minutes of Meeting on 18/04/19 IY began by stating that there had been a complaint over the minutes from last month but, due to the late arrival of the complaint, there had not been time to investigate this fully. A copy of the minutes with the amendments by the complainant was produced. Subject to the complaint being dealt with next month, the minutes of this meeting were approved by VN and MC.</p>	
<p>7. Matters arising Due to the circumstances that had highlighted that the CCTV cameras were not working, IY expressed regret and offered the thoughts and condolences of the Community Council to the family of Emma Faulds.</p> <p>There followed a discussion of the cost of repair of the cameras which IY stated was in the region of £6,000 but was of no direct benefit to the community. PH confirmed that South Ayrshire Council (SAC) had extended some CCTVs.</p>	

<p>CC asked why the CCTVs had been installed and HM said that PPCC had commissioned these for bridge and road damage. CC asked if damage to the bridge had reduced since the cameras were installed. PH said that that SAC was replacing many of the CCTVs with mobile units. HA was concerned at the provision of electricity to cameras which were not working.</p>	
<p>8. Reports</p> <p>a) <u>Link officer</u> CC informed the meeting that a Community Council conference had been held at the weekend but noted that no-one from PPCC attended. The conference had consulted on Community Council boundaries. IY stated that he had not received any correspondence about this. PH explained that a consultation had started on boundaries of CCs and polling stations. This had been suspended until after the euro elections and would most likely be centralised in Girvan.</p> <p>b) <u>PPCDA / 2Pins</u> There was no report as PW was not present.</p> <p>c) <u>Elected members report</u> PH started by urging everyone to vote in the forthcoming Euro elections. PH then reported on the local Development Plan 2 which would go before the full Council in June in confidence. PH said that the meeting would look at major recommendations of building in rural areas outwith boundaries. After this the project would go out to public consultation. PH said that the Council was making good progress with rural housing and had identified plots of land to provide, in good measure, for mobility issues. PH reported that, in principle with Transport Scotland, future diversionary roads would be filled in before and after every diversion. PH also reported that SAC had recovered £2.1m in VAT, which will be put into a capital budget for sport, leisure and tourism. PH informed the group that Clare Monaghan had been appointed as Head of Culture, Leisure and Tourism while Brian McGinley had been appointed Head of Economic Development. Finally PH reported that Barr Gala would take place on Sat 01 June.</p>	
<p>9. Open Forum</p> <p>AB reported that, during a walk around with the residents in Pinmore, it had been noticed that bins have come off the posts at the Pottery. PH said that the depot in Girvan would attend to this. IY said that part of Pinmore pavement had still not been repaired. PH said that he would chase this up. AB said that Jubilee Bridge also required to be cleaned and the edging attended to. IY said that this request had been sent to the department in SAC responsible for this. PH said that it should be Fiona Ross, who was Head of Neighbourhood Services.</p>	
<p>10. Date of next meeting</p> <p>The next PPCC meeting will take place on Thurs 20 June 2019.</p> <p>This ended the public section of the meeting</p>	

11. Private Session

a) Amendment of the minutes of the PPCC Business meeting of 18 April 2019.

There was a discussion regarding the complaint received regarding the minutes of the 18th April.

MC could not see how this could be done without PW (the complainant) being present.

IY said that he had emailed PW to advise that the points referred to in the complaint should be sorted out between PPCC and PPCDA.

IY said there had been no reply to the email and he had then copied it to PH.

IY said that PH had spoke to Foundation Scotland (FS) but had been told he did not understand the Memorandum of Understanding. PH had then suggested a meeting in Ayr. The meeting was largely over the same complaint – the way the Memorandum of Understanding was written and the role of FS.

IY said that he was working hard with changes to the Memorandum of Understanding:

- As a CC, IY had been advised not to produce minutes of the meeting, objected to by PW.
- Notes would be taken and put away on record.
- Some organisations need a Data Controller e.g. PPCDA and 2Pins.

VN wondered if there might be a problem with some people in both organisations.

IY pointed out that FS was now appointed for the 2nd phase of Kilgallioch. HM thought they should re-clarify where the reporting responsibility lies as there seemed to be some confusion as to whether it was Assel Valley (AV) or Kilgallioch (Kil) over FS or SAC. He noted that SAC thought they did Kil.

MC said that, if replying to AV or Kil, it should be to Marie Welsh at SAC. He said that Kil was administered by PPCC and so it needed to send in an annual report on what it was doing.

IY agreed that FS would be looking at what was coming out of the community.

b) Meeting Updates

HHCBF – IY stated that this was one of three communities which had not completed it's final document. From the meeting, IY said that two members wanted Hadyard Hill Community Benefit Fund (HHCBF) split into three separate sections – one PPCC, one Barr and one Dailly. There was to be a panel of nine people. IY also reported that the fund was changing e.g. endowment funds for long-term and a community management fund to spend without referring to FS.

c) Treasurer's Report

HM had sent out a spreadsheet of the accounts and had been looking at internet banking.

HM said that the total balance was £78,357.68. The grants process, audited by SAC, was not complete as they had decided not to spend the extra money.

IY said that PW had complained about a private minute and PPCC had agreed that it should be corrected.

MC argued that, if it had been at a private meeting, then it should not be considered. This was proposed by MC, seconded by VN.

d) Funding Bids

HM said that he had a full list of applications and that some were carried forward.

MC said that, as a Carrick Futures (CF) director, it had been agreed that they could split funds.

IY stated that the regulation said they could not split the funds into two parts. This was approved by AB as it had been discussed on 14 March 2018.

HM wondered if this was a regulation or a guideline? If a guideline, they could choose in exceptional circumstances as protocol had to be followed to the letter.

IY thought there was a problem when everyone was putting in £500 bids for first Responders.

HM asked if MC was able to get a minute of the meeting?

IY noted that small grants are approved if following guidance.

MC said this had been done this for years and no-one had reported it. PPCC used to be well-known for giving to Girvan organisations e.g. OIR and Girvan Attractions and Entertainments but had now decided to only give to the villages.

DL pointed out that Barr forest had been given two grants.

MC thought they could make two applications if they were fairly similar and that one application for OIR could be done.

Community Development Officer

HM asked whether the application should be sent back to FS with a recommendation that it should be accepted.

IY argued that it was an initial assessment report. Because of a change from Asset Transfer to the Scotland fund, the amount of work was enormous. IY said that there had been some acrimony at the meeting.

It was decided to defer this till the next meeting.

Maintenance person

HM said there was a bid for funding for a maintenance person to maintain the 2Pins field. There were actually two separate bids – one to CF and one to HH, both for £500. HM said it was the intention of 2Pins to appoint someone by open tender.

HM said there were two options: they could agree in principle to fund the post or they could fund it on condition that any further money spent was refunded.

It was decided to fund the post.

MC said that they could not give more than £1,000.
IY agreed but said the tender must not be more than £1,000. He also asked if there was documentation.
MC said he would send the papers for this to HM.

Work on 2Pins field

HM said that he had asked for updated costs.

VN asked about the fence and gateway which IY said would cost £3000.
HM suggested the fence was to separate the parking area from the park with picnic tables where children would be running about.

HM pointed out that some of the money had been paid.
IY suggested asking for justification.
HM thought it would be difficult to get other tenders for the work.

It was decided that, when the work was underway, the remainder could be paid.

OIR

HM stated that they had submitted two separate bids, one for £500 to CF and one for £365 to SSE. HM suggested that they approve but indicate a maximum.

It was felt that one area of the H&SCP priorities was looking at providing social activities / combat social isolation and that the bids would fit this criteria.

MC thought there was no reason not to fund this and noted that many locals go into Girvan to the fireworks display each year.

IY felt that, as the Community Council, priority should be the village hall.

HM wondered if the way forward was to contact them and say they were constrained by current guidelines. They would be asked what their membership was and how many local members.

It was decided to approve the application.

Club Diamonds

HM reported that this bid was to cover hall rentals. The organisation claimed 24 members, of whom 4 were local.

VN noted they had come to a compromise last time.

HM wondered if they could support the first bid to a sum of £150 for publicity material and support the halls proportionally for £500.

It was decided to give £650 but to inform the group that they would not support the same next year.

This concluded the meeting.

The meeting finished at 21:30