

**Steinmeyer Legacy Interim Committee**

**Meeting at 6.30 p.m. on Tuesday, 26 September 2017**

**Comrie Parish Church**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

1. Attending: Murray Lauchlan, Judy McDowall, Joan Carmichael, Lynne Douglas, Sandra Bacon, John King, Ken Heiser, Joyce Carnegie, Jane Reid, Colin Sears, Neill Aitken, Andrew Reid
2. Apologies: Hugh Rose, Liz Kemp, Ian Pinkerton, Agnes Drysdale, Stephanie Cameron, Mairi Philp
3. Minutes of Meeting 6.9.17

The minutes of the meeting of 6.9.17 were accepted. Neill Aitken raised the fact that items 6 to 8 on the agenda for that meeting had not been concluded. Murray Lauchlan noted that they would be addressed at the current meeting.

4. Matters arising

Andrew Reid said that the draft section on the legacy work for the CDT 2016/17 Annual Report and Accounts had not as yet been approved. The Interim Committee agreed that any comments should be made by the end of the week, after which the section would be submitted to CDT.

5. Legacy Use

- a) Working Groups - proposals

Neill Aitken questioned the validity of decisions by the Interim Committee in relation to the proposals being made. Murray Lauchlan said there is a legitimacy in progressing matters since the community vote will determine what proposals will be pursued. Joan Carmichael emphasised the importance of the fact that the Interim Committee's working groups had been taking forward proposals arising from the community survey.

Andrew Reid had proposed using legacy funds for a part-time development/information worker for a period of time because of the amount of work involved in preparing and producing public information on village services and resources and delivering developments against the total legacy fund of nearly £400,000. Neill Aitken did not think employing someone for this purpose would be acceptable to people locally and that the work could be done on a voluntary basis. Murray Lauchlan said that volunteer expenses could be paid. John King said that someone was needed to administer the legacy funds. Joan Carmichael said that this should be an issue for the elected Legacy Committee. It was agreed that there should be no proposal put forward for an information/development worker.

Murray Lauchlan stated that information had come out of all of the discussions over the last few months as a key issue, which needed attention. It was agreed that there was a need for legacy funding support towards the production of an information booklet, with the process of updating. Ken Heiser said the community website is also an important source of information. Judy McDowall noted the importance of being aware of data protection laws. It was agreed to propose funding, with a budget yet to be determined for the provision of information.

## Support and Care proposals

Respite Care - John King reported on his contact with Linda Patterson, proprietor and manager at Dalginross House about the idea that legacy funding could be used to purchase a bungalow in Dalginross Gardens for respite purposes, with care support provided from Dalginross House. This would require additional staffing based there. Linda Patterson is providing a list of pros and cons about this proposal. Respite care is sometimes provided by Dalginross House, but there is no dedicated respite bed there. Murray Lauchlan expressed concern about the financing of a respite bungalow, especially if there was less than maximum occupancy. Joan Carmichael emphasised that it would not be free service, or one dependent on revenue from the legacy – contributions would come from Perth & Kinross Council and from people using the service. Andrew Reid commented that more people, completing the legacy survey earlier in the year, had wanted legacy funding committed to supporting and care than any other category. It was important therefore to ensure that there was some legacy funding developments in this area. There were other possibilities for respite than the purchase of a bungalow. Neill Aitken pointed out that there is accommodation in Cameron Court suitable for this purpose and asked that this be investigated. Work on this was just beginning. Perth & Kinross Council Social Work had expressed a willingness to get involved in the work. There needed to be flexible approach exploring a range of possible respite developments. It was agreed to move forward with a proposal for legacy funding on some kind of respite facility or accommodation.

Drop-in information and advice centre - it was noted that information and advice had come out as a key issue from the community survey, both as a concern directly raised, and because many respondents did not appear to know of existing services and resources available in the village. Neill Aitken emphasised that the White Church is the community centre and has available rooms.

## Social Places

Views were expressed about the various village venues identified for legacy funded development. Murray Lauchlan talked about the plans for St Kessog's Square and the possible uses of a building constructed at the back of the square (behind the fencing currently there). Neill Aitken said that purchase and conversion of the Ancaster would be very expensive. Colin Sears said he thought Cultybraggan Camp was too far from the village for legacy developments for older people.

Joyce Carnegie provided details about the Rural Hall renovation and refurbishment plans, which have been costed at £230,000. So far, £163,000 has been raised and it was hoped that the balance of £70,000 could come from the legacy fund. If the balance is not found by the end of the year, the match funding grants already committed will be lost and the renovations cannot go ahead. Work was still underway to find cost savings in the total development budget – for example, the VAT on certain items such as accessible toilets and eco-heating, might be zero rated because of the nature of the improvements and WRI's charitable status. John King spoke in support of legacy funding being committed urgently to support the building improvements on the basis that the hall is so well used by older people. Colin Sears raised the issue of Rural Hall parking.

Murray Lauchlan talked about the proposal made in the community survey for the establishment of a "men's shed" – Murray said that he did not like the name, but legacy discussions had highlighted merits in the proposal. The question was raised about whether this could be in a St Kessog's Square building – John King clarified that the proposal involves a fully equipped workshop, with equipment and tools permanently located. Colin Sears raised the risk of vandalism and the need for security.

Joan Carmichael spoke in support of giving every village group £1,000 - £2,000 to carry out whatever legacy work fitted with their interest. Others spoke against this blanket distribution, but said there might be some potential for the elected committee to allocate funds to village groups presenting specific project proposals.

Murray Lauchlan said that there were positive points about all of the venues proposed as possible places for legacy funding developments, and the way forward should be to put the suggestions to the planned public meeting and community vote to establish the views of the village. It was agreed to include the various proposals for the village vote.

### Activities and Leisure

It was suggested that funding specifically identified within the current proposals for the Silver Circle group should be taken out of the list and be subsumed under the general heading of grants to village groups. Andrew Reid said that he felt a grant to Silver Circle should remain as a specific proposal, because of what the group does and who it supports locally. This was agreed.

Andrew Reid also said he thought that funding for a mobile library service should also remain in the proposals for older people with mobility problems who could not get to the village library. His understanding is that the current mobile service is only provided once a month, with the van parked by Cameron Court. Sandra Bacon felt that to reduce isolation and loneliness in the elderly it would be better if transport could be provided to get them down to the village to use, amongst other things, the library. Neill Aitken said that work was underway to research individual needs for transport support, and this may enable some to visit the village library. Judy McDowall said that this service is already provided through the WVS working with the village library, delivering books to people at their request to their homes, and therefore a new service was not needed, although the current voluntary service needs additional volunteers. On the basis of this information it was agreed to remove the mobile library proposal from the listing.

There had been a proposal for funding materials and local artists to work with older people producing artworks to be displayed in village venues. Interim Committee members stated that legacy funding was not necessary as there are already art groups involving older people in the village, and it was agreed that this proposal should not be listed.

The proposal for open air exercise & older people games equipment in various locations, such as Laggan and Legion Parks, at Cultybraggan Camp and in St Kessog's Square was also felt to be unnecessary for legacy funding on the basis that it was a council responsibility – Joyce Carnegie reported that PKC has a programme of equipment provision in public spaces.

The validity of providing the proposed all-terrain vehicle (ATV) for hire to less mobile older people was questioned by interim committee members. Andrew Reid explained that the proposal was to provide a means for older people to access paths and tracks in countryside, hill and mountain areas that would otherwise be impossible for them. Older people who had previously been active outdoors, but are now less mobile would be able to resume previous activities. There are new projects across the country, including in the Trossachs, providing ATVs. John King, Ken Heiser and Neill Aitken spoke against the proposal on the basis of the physical hazards and insurance costs involved in such a development. Neill Aitken also suggested that, if the proposed Comrie Croft base was pursued, this would not be appropriate use of legacy funding as it involves a private organisation. The proposal was removed from the list of recommended developments.

### Village Environment

In relation to the proposal to put tables/benches on the Boulevard, questions were raised about the ownership of this area. It was noted to be Council owned, with PKC notices on lampposts stating Riverside Park and having Council contact details located at the river end of Commercial Lane and on the path below the White Church. Further questions were raised about the implications of the flood defence work, although it was also noted that the tables/benches could be secured into the ground. It was agreed that this should remain in the proposals.

It was decided to take out the proposal to have grants available for improving disabled access to shops, on the basis that they are private businesses, with their own responsibility for providing reasonable access.

Committee members decided to continue the recommendation to fund community gardens. It was noted there is community raised funding for Bumblebee Square/St Kessogs Square, and that this needs to be taken into account in the funding for any developments there.

It was also decided to support the earlier survey proposals for the incorporation of some way of publicly commemorating the legacy funding as coming from Heinrich Steinmeyer. John King suggested that there should be one memorial plaque rather than having multiple notices.

### Transport

Neill Aitken identified the need to note items, which do not require capital spend, as not recommended for funding, although the Transport Group was pursuing investigations into how they can be delivered.

In relation to the proposed amount of funding to be provided to First Response, John King (First Response Treasurer) said that a grant of £10k was the maximum needed to be placed in reserve for any future First Response financial needs. It was agreed to take forward this proposal as primarily a matter under the support/care heading, which covers health issues.

Neill Aitken also noted that further work was being carried out on various issues in relation to the provision of disabled scooters/buggies, and this should remain as a proposal. Lynne Douglas spoke about the need for training to be given to anyone wanting to use the scooters, and Neill responded that this is one of the matters being taken into account.

### Funding Options

Lynne Douglas said that the reference in the draft choices voting paper to a Common Good Fund could be misleading, and it would be better to refer to the funding as the Comrie Elderly Fund. It was also suggested the name might be the Steinmeyer Legacy Fund or the Comrie Legacy Fund.

#### a) Proposals Voting Paper Format

The interim committee discussed whether the draft proposals voting paper column providing estimated costs should be included in the public version. Neill Aitken suggested that, as the figures were incomplete, with most of proposed developments uncoded as yet, and only likely to evolve over a period of time, it would be preferable to exclude this column. This was agreed.

The committee considered whether or not it would be better to ask people in the community to put the proposals in rank order by preference, or simply to mark those proposals they wished to see funded. It was felt that requesting rank orders would be too complicated, because of the number of proposals, and it was therefore agreed to simply ask respondents to tick the proposals they supported.

It was agreed to ask for name and address to be inserted on the proposals voting paper.

Murray Lauchlan suggested the voting papers should be distributed around the village and area in the same way as the previous Legacy survey and this was agreed.

## b) Principles to govern spending decisions

Andrew Reid suggested that there was a need to formally agree and make public the principles governing spending decisions. These might include, as a requirement for legacy funding, for example, i) the need for funded developments to be sustainable over a long period of time, rather than spend on one off events; ii) the need for funding on capital projects to have sources of income to make them self financing; or iii) that certain types of spend might be excluded from legacy funding, such as grants to fund the situations of individuals in the community. He suggested that the interim committee had in practice been working to certain principles, such as funding not being provided for items which were the statutory responsibility of Perth & Kinross Council or NHS Tayside, but that work to establish a more formal set of principles should be left to the elected Legacy Committee. This was agreed.

## 6. Legal Status of Legacy Group

### a) Options

Andrew Reid had been looking at the organisational options for managing the legacy funds by a community organisation, independent of Comrie Development Trust, and had circulated papers with the agenda about the alternatives, which his web search had established as the following:

- ❖ Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation (SCIO); which could also register as
- ❖ Company Limited by Guarantee; or
- ❖ Charitable Trust.

He said that the distinction was that an SCIO is a body with a governing document, which carries out transactions as an organisation, and that the organisation can hold titles to property, may have members, that various things can only be decided on the basis of resolutions by members, that members meetings are required at least 15 monthly, and that trustees have limited liability. This is significantly different for the legal arrangements with a Charitable Trust, in which all Trustees carry out transactions as individuals, property titles are held by individuals or several Trustees in their own names, trustees have more significant levels of personal liability, and there is no membership structure, but a governing document defining how the Charitable Trust should operate. Andrew Reid felt, on the basis of these distinctions, that registration as a Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation would be the more appropriate course of action for a community organisation in Comrie, responsible and accountable to people in the local community for legacy funding work. He proposed that they should be taken forward to a conclusion by the elected Legacy Committee. This was agreed.

### b) Governing document

Andrew Reid also referred to the paper listing the terms of a standard governing document for any body set up to administer the legacy funds. This governing document should include a range of items including: the definition of aims; details of the committee organisation; the arrangements for elections and meetings; the nature of the authority carried by the management committee; and how the committee would be accountable to the membership. It was agreed that most of these items should be finalised by the elected Legacy Committee in a governing document, which would require to be approved by the community

### c) Items for approval – Committee size, voting and member qualifications, consultations

Andrew Reid said items from a governing document needed to be defined to set up an elected Legacy Committee. These included: Legacy Committee size and quorum; qualifications to vote; Committee Member qualifications.

## 7. Nominations/Election of Legacy Group Members

- a) Legacy Committee size – it was agreed to establish a committee with 10 elected members, and the potential for two additional co-opted members;
- b) Legacy Committee quorum – it was agreed that the Legacy Committee quorum should be six members;
- c) Qualifications to vote – it was agreed that voters would require to be residents of Comrie, who are entitled to vote in PKC elections;
- d) Committee Member qualifications – it was agreed that to stand for election to the Legacy Committee, people need to be a resident of Comrie, entitled to vote in PKC elections, and be proposed and seconded by Comrie residents with the same voting entitlement.

## 8. Next Steps

Joan Carmichael emphasised the urgent need to elect a Legacy Committee and progress spending decisions. Murray Lauchlan identified the need for a press release, nomination forms, and a public meeting. It was agreed to further consider timetable options.

### Meeting arrangements

No further meeting arrangements were made for the Interim Committee.