

# Pinwherry & Pinmore Community Council

## Minutes of PPCC Business Meeting held on Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2017 in Machair, Pinwherry.

Agenda	Action
<p>1. Sederunt</p> <p><u>Community Councillors</u>            Anne Berry (AB)            David Logan (DL)            Hal Maxwell (HM)            Veronica Norman (VN)            John McAlley (JMCA)            Ian Yellowlees (IY)</p> <p>Minutes: Irene Climie (IC)</p>	
<p>2. Apologies:</p> <p>HM had received an apology from Mike Chamberlain (MC).</p>	
<p>3. Declaration of interest:</p> <p>No declaration of interest was received.</p>	
<p>4. Minutes:</p> <p>a. Meeting of 17 September</p> <p>The minute of the meeting of 17.09.17 was proposed by IY and seconded by JMCA.</p> <p>b. Meetings of any sub-committees</p> <p>There are no sub-committees at present.</p>	
<p>5. Matters arising:</p> <p>a. Footpath</p> <p>HM referred to a query at the last meeting as to whether SAC had a statutory towards the footpath. The answer to this was a definite "no".</p> <p>HM said that he would ask MC to forward a bid to Cara of Foundation Scotland (FS). IY asked if this was a priority?</p> <p>JMCA said that the biggest issue requested was a general tidy-up of the village and an upgrade to the footpath would certainly meet this need.</p>	HM

<p>He also said that it was felt that the Two Pins site should be fenced off properly.</p>	
<p>6. Funding</p> <p>HM felt it was important to determine / clarify funding priorities.</p> <p>IY mentioned that the money in the bank +funds from Assel Valley (AV) and Hadyard Hill (HH) and from the dissolution of the old company should amount to somewhere in the region of £1.435m. He felt it was a question of how this funding should be approached and queried whether PPCC should get ring-fenced funds like Barr. At the end of the day, IY pointed out that PPCC must show what had happened to the money allocated.</p> <p>HM acknowledged he had received a letter from FS but had not read this yet.</p> <p>IY stated that the current money which Barr got annually amounted to £27,000 which was to be spent among the community. IY admitted he did not know what method FS used to decide whether grant applications were good or not.</p> <p>HM said that he would ask Cara for guidance. JMCA pointed out that this question had been asked before.</p> <p>IY thought they should be able to decide how the £27,000 was spent.</p> <p>JMCA suggested that one application might be higher at one particular time but might be equalled out later on, which he thought was Cara's philosophy. The money might possibly be ring-fenced for each village.</p> <p>IY indicated that Clause 2.4 described how each application was assessed by FS who decided if it was good and if the panel thought it was good.</p> <p>AB asked how the panel could decide if they weren't part of the community.</p> <p>IY said that groups had money recommended to come from AV based on the school that children attended.</p> <p>JMCA pointed out that the Stinchar Valley magazine had to include Dailly. He also noted that Cara, from FS, had said to include Barr in PPCC's community bid because one of Barr's residents apparently lived within the PPCC postcode.</p> <p>IY felt strongly that FS had to work on the boundaries of the council area as money could only be spent within the physical area. This would have to be ratified by PPCC and Dailly.</p> <p>HM suggested that he dropped a formal note to FS saying that PPCC was not in agreement with these developments.</p> <p>IY noted that this did get PPCC £27,000 per year and that perhaps they</p>	<p>HM</p> <p>HM</p>

could move gently along and ask what transparency was expected.

JMCA asked whether PPCC could put in a higher amount? This would surely defeat the purpose of the group's fund.

IY said that communities decide if any application complies with FS criteria and there was no need for ring-fencing. He felt strongly that it was wrong to have someone in a big city deciding on grants for rural villages.

HM said that he would contact Cara and note the grant of £27,000 per year. He said that he would express concern that the process was not transparent and that there would be a faceless assessor.

HM

JMCA queried whether it was only Barr who had money ring-fenced?

IY stated that £46,000 was ring-fenced for five years with Barr being the host village and that this money was to be used for the village hall. He pointed out that further funding could not be used and so the grant had been spent on other things. Now Barr wanted a hall and were being given £46,000 to offset the £200,000 spent on other projects.

HM noted that the £27,000 would come to PPCC each year.

IY suggested that the grant could be split and taken from a pot if it was felt the PPCC area could gain advantage from the money. He felt that there must be some mechanism to appeal the decision.

HM wondered if HH had more than £27,000 to give out.

IY indicated that there was more than £155,000. Barr ring-fencing stops in 2021, which had been RPI indexed.

HM said that the HH bid had come first – PPCC would accept £27,000. If there were any allocations which cut into this, PPCC would want to know about this.

IY warned of the danger of social engineering.

HM felt that the CC needed a simple one-page summary of the issue, which could be used to inform the community.

IY felt that the website and SV magazine could inform the community.

HM stated that the money coming in is divided into phases and must lead to common benefit for the community. Small grants could be up to £500.

IY thought that it would not be difficult to meet the criteria. The main part is a strategic part of ring-fencing funds for the longer term.

HM spoke of a five-year rolling programme and that PPCDA was being funded to produce a development plan. Phase 1 would be a Community Benefit issue, and Phase 2 would be a Small Grants issue. These were two different plans.

IY pointed out that there were Kilgallioch concerns – last year they gave out winter fuel payments, the concern being that these were individual

payments.

IY said that the main Kilgallioch fund was administered by FS who had to defer anything over £5,000. Six months later a summary had to be provided. Kilgallioch was entitled to audit what they were doing at any time.

IY noted that Altercannoch provides £156,000 annually with 80% going to Barrhill and 20% to others.

HM said that some projects should come along with PPCDA. IY felt they should be able to pull money in from other funds.

HM suggested that projects should be introduced as "The CC objective is to support .... ". A document had been presented by Peter Walker (PW) at the last meeting. HM felt that it was essential that PPCC needed to have a clear, covering statement on how it would allocate funds.

IY suggested putting an item stating how grants would be allocated in the next SV magazine. IY

HM noted some of the items on the notice-board:

- Curtains, which had to be fire-resistant
- Tables – social & leisure purposes
- 2Pins site – multi-year funding
- Leaflet – fits under tourism. JMCA felt these could be expensive and wondered how many would be needed.
- SV walks – tourism
- 2Pins website

IY asked if PPCC supported PPCDA objectives?

HM felt that the website would need day-to-day maintenance.

JMCA expected that regular bills for the website would be paid for by PPCDA. He pointed out that PPCDA had been created by PPCC as a CC is unable to own land. JMCA felt that many thought they were two separate companies.

HM felt that the website should be accepted as a CC expenditure and be set against a proportion of the admin budget.

JMCA felt that the design needed to be made easier.

HM wondered about the cost of the water supply – how would it be funded? Cost of excavation? Laying of pipes?

JMCA suggested the cost should be referred to South Ayrshire Council (SAC) and Scottish Water.

IY wondered if this could be multi-year funding

HM said that he would report to PW that PPCC would support the work.

HM

- Country Dancing – they had requested a metal cabinet to store swords - HM queried where they were stored at present?
- HM felt that the 2Pins site needed upgraded. This would come under infra-structure

Phase 1 Community:

- Defibrillators – HM stated that the box at Barrhill had been fitted to the wall of the surgery. This had been paid for by the surgery.

IY pointed out that there was no such facility in Pinmore

HM said that Colmonell Hall could provide a site.

JMcA felt that Cara could not understand how this works.

HM thought that they needed somewhere safe and secure in Pinmore & Pinwherry + the facility to charge batteries.

Phase 2 Small Grants:

- Lay-by – IY thought this could be broken down into elements. VN wondered if community payback could do this work.
- Enhancement – SAC had predicted a cost of £1900 for planting the planters, on a three-year contract.

HM wondered if this could come out of the Small Grants. He said he would speak to MC regards chasing this up with SAC.

HM noted that for 2018 onwards, notice-boards and milestones had been designated for improvements.

IY asked how many notice-boards were needed?

HM thought six.

IY felt that plenty of people would do the work. However they would need to get three quotes.

HM wondered if this could be passed back to PPCDA under Infrastructure. The enhancement could be a cost to SAC under infrastructure.

IY reminded all that the Local Environmental Study needed costed. He stated that the monthly skip had gone back to SAC but other communities got it free of charge.

IY said that he had been originally asked to go onto PPCC because of an imbalance between Pinmore & Pinwherry. He felt that it was important that the Pinmore Playpark should go ahead.

JMcA pointed out they had gone to SAC at the beginning as it was their land.

IY felt it important to request through SAC what they could / couldn't do.

DL asked if there was a need for a playpark at Pinmore?

HM

JMcA felt that the decking was dangerous when wet.

IY wanted a definitive answer.

HM felt it desirable to get the Environmental Study carried out and reported to PPCDA. He also felt the skip was desirable and also the swimming passes.

HM felt that the Assisted Patient scheme should be continued.

Phase 3:

HM felt there was money sitting - investment bond.

IY agreed that investment bonds could be created. He felt there was a lot of money sitting in AV funds, which was not being used in the short-term.

JMcA asked what sort of amount was being considered?

IY wondered if those present could agree going to allocate residual funds into other projects? He felt that they should be thinking of ring-fencing money for a project in three years time.

JMcA indicated that Pinwherry School might have ownership soon – the only problem had been that PPCDA was not a SCIO.

IY wondered if they needed to start looking at the school again?

JMcA pointed out that there were some on-going costs with the building.

HM felt they should be flagging up Pinwherry School for the future allocation of funds.

IY noted that they would soon have £50,000 in small grants per year, which was quite a lot. He felt that once the Community Development Officer was on board,

HM pointed out that the costs of the school were unknown.

IY felt that it was essential to fund the summer programme.

HM said this was a Phase 3 project but that he would be happy to support it and pass it onto Phase 2.

IY reminded all that it was not a deprived community but a disadvantaged one.

HM noted specific demographic criteria – not income-based but broader e.g. age, transport links etc

AB asked why they should keep applying and getting knocked back?

IY felt there could be alternatives which were cheaper and quicker. He agreed that against inner-city bids, they were not going to do well.

- Rail Halt – IY felt that if passenger numbers fell, there would be no answer.

HM felt there could be a case if it helped to improve transport and

<p>infrastructure was supported.</p>	
<p>7. Tralorg</p> <p>HM reported that Tralorg was looking for two volunteers. He reported that IY and JMcA had indicated they were willing to put themselves forward. HM said that he would email Chris Little with reference to communication and give the contact emails of IY and JMcA</p>	
<p>8. Funding Bids:</p> <p>a) 2 Pins Company re insurance (£468.30)</p> <p>This funding was discussed and agreed. HM said this would be forwarded to MC and he would copy in PW.</p>	<p>HM + MC</p>
<p>9. Nominations to CC</p> <p>HM provided a nomination form which was agreed as appropriate.</p>	
<p>10. Any other competent business</p> <p>IY said that he would like to see an approved for of grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A three-year history of grant applications from applicants</li> <li>• Proof that the applicant(s) had tried to get funding elsewhere. He gave examples of previous applicants who made repeated applications for funds.</li> </ul> <p>HM said that he would look at the questions on the grant application forms and draft a new version.</p>	<p>HM</p>
<p>11. Date of next meeting</p> <p>The next meeting will take place on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017.</p> <p>HM thanked all for attending.</p>	

The meeting finished at 21:00.