



**Perth City Action Partnership**  
**Thursday 5 April 2018, 18:00 – 20:00**  
**Glenearn Community Campus**

**Present:**

- Sam Finlayson, Community Rep (SF) (Chair)
- Alison Fisher, Community Rep (AF)
- Pauline Leitch, Community Rep (PL)
- Susan Scott, Community Rep (SS)
- Councillor Andrew Parrott (AP)
- Councillor Chris Ahern (CA)
- Rebecca Higgins (RH) (Minutes)

**Apologies:**

- Lorna Cameron, Interim Executive Director, Housing and Community Care (Lead) (LC)
- Gareth Dimmock, Community Rep (GD)
- James Gardner, Communities Team, PKC (JG)
- David Stokoe, Service Manager – Communities, PKC (DS)
- Katharine Shepherd, Perth & Kinross Health & Social Care Partnership (KS)
- Councillor Willie Wilson (WW)
- Chris Sanderson, Communities Team, PKC (CS)
- Sharon Doyle, Communities Team, PKC (SD)
- Caroline Moore, Communities Team, PKC (CM)
- Heather Shields, PKAVS (HS)

Item	Note	Action
1	<p><b><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></b></p> <p>SF welcomed the meeting.</p>	
2	<p><b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b></p>	
3	<p><b><u>PB Event/Voting Feedback</u></b></p> <p>The Partnership discussed feedback with regards to the PB event on Saturday 24<sup>th</sup> March.</p> <p>Positive Feedback:</p>	

- The Communities Team helping to support groups who weren't successful at the events.
- The small amount the groups could bid for (up to £1,500) allowed for more groups to receive funding.
- Each event is a learning process for the next year.
- The Drop-In sessions run by the Communities Team were useful.
- The work of the Communities Team can't be faulted.
- The number of votes was up from last year which shows development.
- The feedback forms will be helpful.
- The networking opportunity at the event was very useful.
- There was no pressure on the day about voting which made the event less tense and more enjoyable
- The event brought people together which is really valuable.
- It was positive that we didn't charge for tea/coffee/food for groups.
- The circus activities from one of the community groups helped draw kids in.
- The data from online voting can help for next year e.g. 75% of people who voted were women.

Feedback on the preparation for the events:

- The process needs to be started earlier, in November or December.
- People from community groups could be involved in the preparation.
- Forward planning will allow for quicker decision making.
- There is work to be done around communicating with communities as a lot of people still didn't know about the funding.
- As soon as we know about the funding we should be communicating this information to the public e.g. through the funding alert. If we know in principal that the Scottish Government funding will be there, we don't need to wait until we know the exact amount before making it public.
- We need to confirm the event dates sooner rather than later.

Feedback on the PB process

- There could be a minimum amount of funding for each group who are successful to the event stage so that everyone gets at least something, for example £100. Gifts of flowers were suggested instead although this could take away from spending on projects. There was a suggestion that this might make groups write 'over the top' applications as they know they will get £100 regardless.
- Groups who are not as well organised or who do not have the capacity might be something to consider as they will miss out on funding.
- There is an issue that this process goes against organisations that are smaller as bigger organisations are more likely to receive funding.
- There wasn't sufficient time to organise everything.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There could be a cap on income of groups who can apply. On the other hand, this would mean we would have to check everyone's income and this would be a lot of administrative work.</li> <li>• The funding should be for smaller organisations especially as the funding application is relatively simple.</li> <li>• We need to address the issue of organisations entering more than one application.</li> <li>• We don't want groups to rely on this funding each year; groups need to be self-reliant</li> <li>• SS said as she is part of a bigger organisation, her group won't be applying again to allow more chance for smaller organisations.</li> <li>• Funding could be applied for city-wide funding rather than splitting it into the separate areas.</li> <li>• Larger groups that were aware of PB could hold money in their bank accounts for smaller groups. We could expand on this.</li> <li>• Larger groups could mentor smaller groups.</li> </ul> <p>Feedback on voting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some people will have voted 6-7 times and the bigger the organisation, the more likely to receive funding.</li> <li>• Need to tighten up the rules for next year.</li> <li>• The main concern about the PB process is with the voting process.</li> <li>• Online voting needs to be improved and there needs to be a more robust system. There is inequality that some people can't access online such as some older people.</li> <li>• We could use iPads out in the community for voting.</li> <li>• We could learn from the Dundee Decides online voting process as it was very clear.</li> </ul> <p>Feedback on eligibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It might be sensible to divide money into portions such as &lt;£500 and £500-£1000. This would mean smaller projects might have more chance of receiving funding.</li> <li>• We should target marginalised groups.</li> <li>• PB could be thematic rather than geographical. For example, substance misuse and mental health are big themes in the City Centre.</li> </ul>	
4	<p><b><u>Standing Orders</u></b></p> <p>The Partnership decided that the existing terms of reference need to be amended. There was a suggestion that a skeleton document could be created which the group could then add to.</p> <p>SF will ask DS about creating a skeleton document.</p> <p>The group would like to invite reps from different organisations, for example a rep from children and a rep from health. There may be an issue that separate reps will only be interested in the theme of their</p>	SF/DS

	<p>field.</p> <p>There was a suggestion about forming a subgroup of young people where one member would be able to come along to the Partnership meetings. SF suggested a young person from the Scottish Youth Parliament.</p> <p>It was noted that a lot of staff and elected members at the Partnership meetings can be intimidating.</p> <p>SF suggested 5 subgroups for the themes of the Action Plan that meet regularly then feedback at the main meeting.</p> <p>SF praised the Community Capacity Building workers for their work on PB.</p> <p>It was suggested to wait until SF/DS come up with a framework.</p>	
5	<p><b><u>Core Budget</u></b></p> <p>Money from the core budget has been set aside for Community Councils and Residents' Associations. Money has also been set aside for the Mini-public for young people.</p> <p>The Partnership decided that a Budgetary Statement should be included as a routine part of the Action Partnership meeting. This would involve one side of A4 including information about ring-fenced money, any money added, spent, still to spend and budgetary plans.</p> <p>The Budgetary Statement will always be item 3 on the agenda.</p>	<p><b>CPP Team</b></p>
6	<p><b><u>AOCB</u></b></p> <p><u>Community Fridge</u></p> <p>SF described the idea of a Community Fridge that a community member approached SF about. There are some examples in Scotland already and the Partnership discussed potentially funding the community member and a member of the Partnership to visit an existing Community Fridge.</p> <p>The group discussed the logistics around the Community Fridge, suggesting that Tesco, Co-op or the Foodbank could be involved and the fridge could be located outside the Riverside Church or outside Letham Climate Challenge.</p> <p>It was discussed that funding would be required for an industrial size fridge and electricity, an agreement would have to be made with a supermarket and volunteers would be required for non-intrusive management of the fridge as well as to fill the fridge.</p> <p>The Partnership suggested piloting the fridge in one area in Perth City Centre. It was suggested that initially the fridge would only be open at certain times when there are people around.</p>	

	<p>The Partnership agreed that this project is all about communities working for themselves with community volunteers running it and it is important to involve the community member who initially came forward with the idea. The Partnership also agreed that the only rule for using the Community Fridge would be for community members to close the fridge door once they are finished.</p> <p>It was decided that going forward, the community member would be invited to the next meeting to give a presentation and then the community member and the Partnership can look at ways of moving forward.</p> <p>The Partnership discussed the challenges such as if there were too many fridges, the food available would have to diluted and therefore there would be less available. It was also said that fridge would be more accessible if it is in a centralised area.</p> <p>In the future, once one Community Fridge is working as a cycle, food could then be sourced from another supermarket for a second fridge. There was also a suggestion of if this was made into a social enterprise, whether PKC could help with a premises.</p> <p><u>Core Funding Proposals</u></p> <p>AP proposed two projects that could potentially be funded from the core budget.</p> <p>Tactran are interested in becoming involved in engaging with the Community Planning Partnership, especially with regards to transport and infrastructure and co-funding community projects. AP suggested a project to price and cost robust seats at the best used bus stops in the Perth City locality area. AP suggested funding this project using money from the core budget, contacting PKC about running the project and then speaking with Tactran.</p> <p>The second project is for Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) for people who are registered disabled in the Perth City locality to make their engagement with activities easier and help people who are isolated. PKC already run DRT in 2 areas in Perth and Kinross - West Kinross and Kinloch Rannoch. The principle would be to engage local taxi drivers to allow eligible people to receive a taxi ride at the price of a bus fare. There would have to be a limit such as a person cannot use the service more than 4 times a week and can only travel within the 3 wards of the city. The Partnership would have to look at how much this would cost and the process of registering taxis up to bus service.</p> <p>AP asked if the Partnership is happy with the proposals. The community reps agreed. AP said that once the group know the core budget, AP is happy to have the conversations to take forward these proposals. CA suggested that the DRT could get other funding, for example, from Community Transport Partnership.</p> <p><u>Standing Order</u></p>	<p><b>SF</b></p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------

	<p>The group discussed the need for a set of standing orders in terms of how the core funding is spent. There needs to be decisions around who has a casting vote and whether attendance at the meetings should impact who should be able to vote. It was suggested that elected members should not be left out of voting.</p> <p>AP suggested a rep from South Perth Partnership, North Perth Partnership and Central and then thematic group reps all attending Action Partnership meetings.</p> <p>SF to ask Perth YMCA to ask young people to join a sub group.</p> <p>SF asked RH if people could be added to the distribution mailing list for the Action Partnership. Suggestions were for a rep from Perth YMCA and a rep from Number 3. SS offered to assist SF with this.</p>	<p><b>SF</b></p> <p><b>RH</b></p> <p><b>SF/SS</b></p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b><u>Next meeting/Dates of Future Meetings</u></b></p> <p>The Partnership will usually meet every 4 weeks on a Monday, apart from the last Monday of the month, from 6pm-8pm.</p> <p>May 21<sup>st</sup> (changed from May 14<sup>th</sup>)  June 11<sup>th</sup>  July 9<sup>th</sup>  August 13<sup>th</sup>  September 10<sup>th</sup>  October 15<sup>th</sup>  November 12<sup>th</sup>  December 10<sup>th</sup>  January 14<sup>th</sup> 2019</p>	