

PSG Area Partnership

MINUTES

Meeting of the Preston Seton Gosford Area Partnership, 21st January, 2015, 7-9pm The Pennypit - Prestonpans

Chair

Ray Montgomery, Head of Infrastructure, East Lothian Council (RM)

Members (and substitute members) Present

Andrew Crummy, Three Harbours Arts Festival (AC)

Cllr Peter MacKenzie, Elected member, East Lothian Council (PM)

Rachel Menzies, Prestonpans Primary School Parent Council (RMz)

Iain Stewart, Longniddry CC (IS)

Karen Caldwell, Cockenzie and Port Seton CC (KC)

Aaron Doidge, Preston Lodge Pupil Representative and member of Scottish Youth Parliament (AD) – part-attendance

Bryan Hickman, Cockenzie and Port Seton CC (BH)

Zoe Inglis, Prestonpans CC (ZI)

Cllr Willie Innes, Elected member, East Lothian Council (WI) – part attendance

Margaret Kay, Prestonpans CC (MK)

Jim Melvin, Cockenzie West TRA (JM)

Ian Patterson, Prestonpans Community Sports Hub (IP)

Isobel Robertson, Cockenzie West TRA (IR)

Jen Welsh, Prestonpans Infant and Primary School Parent Councils (JW)

Gareth Jones, CRA (GJ)

Others Present

Kaela Scott, Local Community Planning Officer, East Lothian Council (KS)

Iain McFarlane, Planning Service Manager, Development Management (IM)

Douglas Proudfoot, Head of Development (Interim) (DP)

Lori Tragheim, Community Development Officer, East Lothian Council (LT)

Esther Wilson, Service Manager Economic Development and Strategic Investment (EW)

Paolo Vestri, Service Manager- Corporate Policy (PV)

Mike Ash, Chair of the East Lothian Resilient People Partnership (MA)

Ferhan Ashiq, Prestonpans CC (FA)

Stephanie Carr, Asst Local Community Planning Officer, East Lothian Council (SC)

Apologies

Lynne Lewis, Preston Lodge High School Parent Council (LL)

Jeni Gibson, Preston Lodge Pupil Representative (JG)

Sharon Malcolm, Cockenzie Parent Council (SM)

Agenda Item	Key discussion points	Action
<p>1. Welcome</p>	<p>RM welcomed members to the meeting of the PSG Area Partnership.</p>	
<p>2. Approval of the minutes</p>	<p>Minutes of the meetings dated 29th October 2014 and 3rd December 2014 were approved without amendment.</p>	
<p>3. Matters arising</p>	<p>a) Update from Multi-Agency Action Group</p> <p>IS commented on the momentum of the Action Group, noting the linkages formed with Strive in seeking potential funding as well as the importance of specific projects such as the 'breakfast bus', 'midnight football' and initiatives targeted at girls. IS also emphasised the importance of working closely with the Red School and maintaining links with Active Schools.</p> <p>KS noted the next meeting of the Multi-Agency Action Group will be taking place Wednesday 28th January 15 and further reinforced the effectiveness of the Action Group in assessing the availability of existing resources and how these can be maximised to ensure long-term effectiveness.</p> <p>b) Update from CAPP</p> <p>IS noted the success of a recent 'smart-water initiative;' piloted by Police Scotland to attempt to reduce house break-ins. The initiative looks to identify stolen items and has already been very effective in its first pilot with a 35% reduction in house break-ins already observed in Port-Seton.</p> <p>c) Workshop on Health Inequalities</p> <p>SC noted the workshop that took place on Saturday 17th January was well-attended and encouraged any feedback from those who participated. FA highlighted the interactive group tasks with scenario-based activities was very interesting and thought-provoking. FA further noted however, that the workshop was very much process-focused</p>	

rather than directed to action. Further feedback from those who attended was also similar, and also pointed out perhaps the workshop lacked in specific local relevance.

SC noted this feedback was highly valuable and will be taken on-board, and it will be the next step following on from this workshop that will be much more action-focused. SC proposed an initial workshop follow-up meeting to take place to look at how the PSG Area Partnership want to take what they have learnt there and turn it into actions for the Area Plan.

SC put forward the date of **Wednesday 11th February** for the first PSG action meeting on Health Inequalities. Following no objections, this date was agreed and will be confirmed via email invitation. SC encouraged attendance by anyone interested from both the Area Partnership and the groups and/networks they represent.

WI pointed out the importance of not 're-inventing the wheel' and suggested conducting background work and audit of current services and resources relating to health inequalities. SC agreed, and will present background work at the meeting.

d) Any other matters arising

MK expressed concern over the significant time delays being experienced by people receiving the care packages they require. She noted the same concern was felt by district nurses, who also acknowledge there is a delay in obtaining carers, particular care at home assistance.

RM acknowledged that these health and social care services are not currently matching demand, and it has also been an issue that has come out of the Health and Social Care Consultation. RM suggested that this concern could be raised to the NHS Board, and Margaret can be contacted with any updates or information.

- MA noted this issue is not necessarily attributed to limited funding availability, but rather, not enough people to fill the necessary positions.
- LT noted this could be due to the employment package on offer- and put forward the idea that people may not be attracted to the job.

MA further reinforced that this is not solely an NHS issue, but rather Adult social care, and it is something that the Joint Board are very aware

	<p>of and will continue to investigate.</p>	
<p>4. MIR Consultation- Developing a ward-wide response</p>	<p>IM explained the MIR as the first stage for ELC in developing a new Local Development Plan. He noted it as a research and consultation document, one that is essentially a precursor to the final plan. IM noted the MIR consultation will be closing on 8th February 2015.</p> <p>The AP requested clarification on a separate ‘Call for Sites’ documents, with questions raised regarding the likelihood of these plans to go ahead, and if comments should be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IM noted that despite the extensive list of potential sites for development, these will not all be necessarily be included in the final plan. IM encouraged the AP however, to provide feedback on the proposed sites in this document as well. <p>Concerning the implications of the MIR proposed sites in PSG specifically, the AP highlighted the importance of considering availability of and pressures on current infrastructure. IM went on to explain the importance of using school capacity formulas and transportation modelling to ensure infrastructure met demands and individual needs of the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IS questioned the formula which is used to determine school capacities. IM noted it is a Central Government formula which is used, which is based not only on what is feasible, but what is acceptable too. IS highlighted the importance of the formula being implemented in accounting for individual differences in schools and communities in regards to student capacities. <p>RM emphasised the importance of obtaining AP views across a spectrum of issues covered by the MIR, and thus went on to allocate ten minutes discussion for each of the topic areas.</p> <p>The following views from members of the AP are recorded below.</p> <p>➤ Key Local Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification was requested on the type of housing that is intended to be provided and the housing-mix that will be considered. IM explained a needs and demands assessment will be carried out as part of the development process and eventual plans will incorporate extensive research in this area taking into account variables such as expected population growth, increases in single-person households. FA pointed out the potential advantages and benefits of high-density housing, particularly if 	

	<p>they are of high quality and well thought-through design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IS questioned the concept of affordable housing and how this is being incorporated into housing provision. IM confirmed the current policy of 25% affordable housing. <p>➤ Employment and the preferred site at Cockenzie/Prestonpans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One of the main issues raised by the AP in response to this area was the <i>type</i> of employment that would exist on this proposed site. One perspective was that if there is just in one type of employment, it is essentially ‘putting all their eggs in one basket’, and the risks must be considered if for example this industry falls through. There was a general feeling by the AP that the employment provided (if it were to go ahead) must be diverse, varied and sustainable. ● There was also concern raised over surrounding roads, with Edinburgh Rd named specifically and clarification needed that the main route wouldn’t be removed. ● There was a degree of objection to the <i>size</i> of employment allocated land, and general agreement that the AP do not want to see development occurring outside the existing site. Comments were made in regards to the extended pier out to sea and the ramifications this could have on greenspace and fishing industry. ● RM looked to summarise some perspectives of the AP in regards to this discussion area and noted that the AP are not necessarily against the use of the land for employment use, but rather, the critical considerations are the scale of the proposed site and the type of employment. He went on to summarise the view from the AP as being that it should only exist on the industrial land as it sits now. <p>➤ The preferred strategy and sustainable planning in relation to housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One of the main points raised in this discussion area was issues surrounding infrastructure. ● There were specific references made to carpark capacities at stations and the potential requirement for these to be extended. ● Some members of the AP felt the compact strategy and subsequent high concentration of housing was being imposed on them. ● There was a view by some, that by not developing further east, in 	
--	--	--

	<p>other words, not going with a dispersed strategy, it is in fact limiting growth, and reducing the likelihood and ability for the facilities and services to improve further East.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a degree of acknowledgement that although the demand or market is not there at the moment, perhaps directed development would encourage this. It was noted that market-driven factors do have the ability to drive development forward. • AC pointed out that one of East Lothian’s greatest assets is its coastline and that it was critical that future development really capitalises on such a beautiful and unique feature. KS noted that this is something that can be focused on by the AP and put forward in the Area Plans. • There was debate over the idea that despite infrastructure being readily available in the West of the county, <i>quality of life</i> must also be considered. – that many people living in this area chose to move away for the city for a more rural area. • Discussion followed on the term ‘quality of life’. One perspective was that ‘quality of life’ can have a different meaning to different people, and this subjectivity presents further complexities and challenges. To some people, quality of life may mean accessibility in terms of transport, shops, employment etc, and when considering the compact strategy, there is opportunity to capitalise on this. <p>➤ Blindwells</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was acknowledged that this site development has experienced a variety time constraints and delays in moving forward. • The AP conveyed concern over transport congestion and further infrastructure issues such as education and implications for health services if development was to begin there • There was general agreement over the utmost importance of coordinated thinking between planners and the relevant services and/or bodies involved eg. ensuring ongoing consultation with the NHS to ensure sufficient and high quality health services/facilities in accordance with development proposals. <p>➤ Countryside around Towns and Greenbelt issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of those present agreed with the importance of retaining greenbelt and countryside around towns to reinforce the concept of distinct communities and prevent coalescence. • Proposals to protect open spaces had an overall positive 	
--	--	--

	<p>response.</p> <p>RM thanked the planners and encouraged the AP to submit their responses via the Consultation Hub.</p>	
<p>5. Developing our Area Plan</p>	<p>KS acknowledged that the work of the AP in developing their Area Plan has been stalled to some extent due to the timing of valuable consultations on Health and Social Care and the MIR. KS reiterated the importance now, in moving forward, for the AP to be focusing on what they want to prioritise locally, and developing agendas for the next meetings ahead.</p> <p>a) Confirmation of AP budgets</p> <p>KS confirmed that the December Council Meeting approved a devolved Area Partnership budget and £200,000 has been allocated to the PSG Area Partnership for the next financial year. Portions of this are ring-fenced around specific service areas – eg Transport . Landscape and Countryside while £ 50,000 is a more general allocation able to be used to deliver on priorities identified in the Area Plan.</p> <p>This link will take you to the Council Paper http://www.eastlothian.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/16033/10_area_partnerships-devolved_budgets</p> <p>b) Appointment of Area Managers</p> <p>KS confirmed four Area Manager posts have been established by East Lothian Council and advertised internally, with applications closing on Friday 30th January. The Area Manager will work directly with the AP as well as carry out a liaison role between the AP and council service providers to promote the better co-ordination of service and deliver on priorities identified in the Area Plans</p> <p>KS also highlighted that at the next meeting we would begin discussions regarding appointing a local Chair to the Partnership who would have to work closely with the Area Managers once they were appointed.</p>	
<p>6. AOCB</p>	<p>Four dates were proposed to form the four core meetings of the PSG AP throughout 2015. These dates were as follows: (venues tbc)</p> <p>Wednesday 4th March Wednesday 6th May* Wednesday 2nd September Wednesday 4th November</p>	<p>Action: ELC staff- Reschedule May meeting</p>

	<p>*It was pointed out that the second proposed meeting on Wednesday 6th falls during the election week and it was agreed that this should be changed.</p>	
<p>7. Date of next meetings</p>	<p><i>Core Dates (venues tbc).</i> Wednesday 4th March Wednesday 13th May - rescheduled as per earlier email to members Wednesday 2nd September Wednesday 4th November</p> <p>Members are urged to book these into their diaries to ensure their organisation is represented at these key business meetings.</p> <p>It was also noted that there may be a need for further meetings / sub-group meetings to address specific issues or further consultations and that these would be negotiated with members as and when required.</p>	<p>Please send apologies to: psg-ap@eastlothian.gov.uk</p>