

**South West Edinburgh Area Board
7pm, Tuesday 13 October 2009
Meggetland Function Suite**

In Attendance

Maud Wylie (Chair)	Hailesland Park Neighbourhood Council
Hellen McDonagh	Longstone Community Council
Norman Tinlin	Fairmilehead Community Council
Judy Wightman	Ratho & District Community Council
Ken Shade	Balerno Community Council
Anne Denholm	Dumbryden Neighbourhood Council
Helen Kelly	North Sighthill Residents Association
Cllr Alastair Paisley	Pentland Hills Ward

Officials

Mike Avery	City of Edinburgh Council
Debbie Herbertson	City of Edinburgh Council
Scott Neill (minutes)	City of Edinburgh Council
Rachel Somerville	City of Edinburgh Council

Observers

Eddie Thorpe	Resident, Hailesland Park
David Simpson	Resident, Murrayburn
Justine Bradd	Edinburgh Tenants Federation

Apologies

Cllr Jason Rust	Colinton/Fairmilehead Ward
Cllr Andrew Burns	Fountainbridge/Craiglockart Ward
Cllr Elaine Aitken	Colinton/ Fairmilehead Ward
Cllr Ricky Henderson	Pentland Hills Ward
Cllr Ronald Cairns	Pentlands Ward
Cllr Eric Barry	Colinton/ Fairmilehead Ward
Lyn Bryan	Dumbryden Neighbourhood Council
Alex Paton	Independent Tenant
Maureen Jarvis	Oxgangs Central Residents Association

<p>1. Welcome, Introduction and Apologies</p> <p>Maud welcomed the group and Scott Neill read apologies as above. Maud thanked the Area Board Steering Group for all their hard work over the summer, which has culminated in the papers presented this evening.</p>	
<p>2. Papers for discussion – South West Area Board Steering Group – Joint Proposal with SWNO (appended)</p> <p><u>Role & Remit</u></p> <p>Justine Bradd presented the first part of the paper on behalf of the Steering Group. She noted that there had been a great deal of discussion around what the role and remit of the group would be. Clarification was sought on what falls under the title Environmental Project, and it was explained that, within the context of the Area Board, projects were for Housing Revenue</p>	

Account assets (land and property) only.

Membership

There was extensive discussion around the role of Community Councils and their right to representation alongside the RTO's. Norman Tinlin queried whether a Community Council that has an active RTO for one area within their boundary could represent the remaining area.

While it was understood by the group that RTOs should be encouraged to participate in the Area Board, all agreed that in the absence of such a group the local Community Council would be welcome to take this role.

Justine Bradd commented that she was available to support any RTO's that would benefit from her input.

While some felt that Community Councils should have only an observers role if they are not a tenant, CC members noted that there would be no purpose for them attending if they were observers, and that they could not stipulate who would be voted onto which committee and as such they could not guarantee a tenant the role on the Area Board. Further comments were that there are few tenants who are members of their local Community Council, and that they are all here to do their best for their Communities regardless of their status.

Maud Wylie felt that it was unfair that the RTO's were unable to participate in the Neighbourhood Partnership. Norman Tinlin noted that the sub-group structure was designed to over come this.

Mike Avery clarified that the structure is in place for the representation of view's from RTO's through the Area Board but that there was inadequate representation from these groups. He went on to suggest cross seeding between the subgroups such as the Community Safety group, which may hold some interest for the members of the RTO's.

Where there is no representation from an RTO within an area, a Community Council can vote: All Agreed.

Role of Staff

Justine Bradd made the suggestion that, should a project not be accepted onto the Capital programme, officers should send a letter out suggesting alternative streams in which the work can be done.

Neighbourhood Partnership Involvement

Cllr Paisley queried whether an annual report to the NP would be enough. Mike Avery stated that there would be regular inputs to the NP from the Area Board at Business Meetings, and that the mechanics of this could be considered at a later date when considering overall processes.

Chair

Historically the Area Board Chair has always been a tenant. As an unconstituted group, there is no obligation for it to be a tenant however it was

felt that a tenant would be preferential, however it was recognised that Community Councillors had equal rights to the Chair/ Vice Chair positions if they are active in this area of work. This position was supported by Cllr Alastair Paisley, who commented that there could be an equal rights issue with so many other groups excluded.

Justine Bradd explained that the Area Board was a forum for council tenants to discuss how rent money from HRA assets (land and buildings) would be reinvested into the stock. This is why the Area Board takes the views of Council Tenants or those representing such.

Review of the Neighbourhood Investment Programme

Mike Avery talked about the proposal to use a ranking system for the projects which would then be ratified by the Area Board. The scoring system has not yet been set up.

Norman queried when the scoring would take place – would this be when they were submitted or later on in the year as a group.

It is proposed that suggestions would be collected into a project bank and at a certain point in the year, the Area Board would sit down and score them. This would provide an opportunity to discuss options and provide any further information.

Judy Wightman felt that projects should be re-scored each year to allow for any changes in circumstance.

Scott Neill referenced the lack of flexibility in the current system. The recent tour around the ongoing projects allowed Tommy Walker to demonstrate this – within the same estate one drying green had been upgraded using NIP Money at a cost of £10,000. A 2nd green could have been improved for £5,000 but the current system prevented this economy.

Mike Avery felt that the scoring system would allow the merit of each project to be clear. The decision would have to be ratified by the Partnerships however it is unlikely that they would intervene. For example, the Area Board would score projects in the March and they could be submitted to the May Partnership meetings.

It was agreed that individuals would arrange for deputies, and if the Board member could not make the meeting, the deputy could step in on their behalf. The onus is on the absent individual to pass the relevant information on to their deputy. Each elected member can cast one vote.

Norman Tinlin queried whether the Area Board should be signing a **Code of Conduct** as Elected Members and those who sit on the Funding Panel do, as the Area Board deals with significant levels of funding.

Mike Avery clarified that the **concept of declaration** made sure people were open and honest about any personal or financial gain connected to their

<p>duties. A code of conduct and register of interests provides protection for all parties.</p> <p>Area Board Meeting Mechanics – Proposed Hybrid Model Eddie Thorpe queried how much it was costing to book venues compared to when all meetings were held in Wester Hailes Library. Scott Neill confirmed that it cost more now however it was at the request of the group that the venue was rotated.</p> <p>There was split opinion on the benefit of rotating venues with some feeling that a regular meeting point was preferable. Transport and the journey home was noted as being a key issue in selecting venues.</p> <p>Recommendations of the South West Area Board Steering Group – 28th July 2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I) Agenda Pro-Forma amendments as detailed in the paper – Agreed II) The Board adopts the NIP scoring scheme, and appoints a small working group to define the process – Agreed. Similar scoring schemes will be looked at as a starting point. All in the Area Board membership will be given to option of participating in the working group. III) The meeting schedule and venues remain as they are – Agreed. This will be reviewed next year. IV) The Board approves the development of the hybrid model, as detailed in paper – Agreed. <p>Anne Denholm queried the role of ETF within the Area Board. Justine Bradd clarified that ETF were there to support tenants sitting on the board.</p> <p>The Chair thanked all for attending and closed the meeting.</p>	
<p>3. Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>The next meeting will be held: 10th November – Currie High School – 7pm</p>	