

# MINUTE

## ‘A’

**Services Committee**  
**Council Chamber, Town Hall, Lerwick**  
**Thursday 2 December 2004 at 10.30am**

**Present:**

F B Grains	L Angus
A J Cluness	C B Eunson
R G Feather	B P Gregson
I J Hawkins	J H Henry
J C Irvine	E J Knight
W H Manson	Capt G G Mitchell
J P Nicolson	W H Ratter
F A Robertson	J G Simpson
T W Stove	W N Stove
W Tait	

**Apologies:**

B J Cheyne	J A Inkster
------------	-------------

**In Attendance:**

J Watt, Executive Director – Community Services  
A Drummond-Hunt, Asset and Properties Manager  
C Ferguson, Community Care Manager  
J Reyner, Acting Senior Education Officer  
G Smith, Head of Community Development  
F Waddington, Head of Social Work  
N Watt, Sport and Leisure Services Manager  
T Watt, Museum Curator  
L Geddes, Committee Officer

**Also:**

S Laurenson, Chief Executive, NHS Shetland  
M Johnson, LHCC Manager, NHS Shetland  
S Jack, Director of Patient Services, NHS Shetland  
Acting Inspector M Miller, Northern Constabulary

**Chairperson**

Mrs F B Grains, Chairperson of the Committee, presided.

**Circular**

The circular calling the meeting was held as read.

**Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2004, and the special meeting held on 25 October 2004, having been circulated, were confirmed.

**Members' Attendance at External Meetings**

Captain G G Mitchell advised that he had attended the annual conference of the Scottish Federation of Housing Associations, and that one of the sessions involved Edinburgh City Council on their stock transfer programme. Edinburgh City Council also had a large housing debt, and could not afford to meet the requirements of the new Scottish housing quality standards. They were being offered large sums of money for both refurbishments and new builds if they proceeded with stock transfer. Due to the benefits to the tenants, Edinburgh City Council felt that they had to proceed, although the unions were advising tenants against it.

Captain Mitchell went on to say that there appeared to be a change from the previous policy where there was little incentive to transfer. He also understood that the Western Isles had successfully negotiated a negative settlement for their stock transfer, so it would appear that the climate was changing and that more incentives were being offered. The Head of Housing was currently preparing a paper on the financial implications to the Council in meeting the new housing quality standards, and Captain Mitchell advised that he would be seeking to set up a Member/Officer Working Group to explore this in greater depth, and to ensure that Members had greater input.

68/04      **Community Health Partnership (CHP) – Draft Scheme of Establishment**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director – Community Services and the Manager – Local Health Care Co-operative (Appendix 1).

Ms S Laurenson introduced the report, advising that whilst this was a Scottish Executive initiative, NHS Shetland had been determined that anything created in Shetland should be an appropriate model for Shetland. A great deal of the Scheme was formalising what was already being done in Shetland, and the main extra component was related to public services working closer together in localities across Shetland, and ensuring that the public had a voice. She added that the proposals did not involve the creation of new posts or increased bureaucracy.

Mr M Johnson then went on to give a presentation to Members that outlined what it was hoped to achieve, what the differences would be from the existing arrangements, and the next steps to be taken. He emphasised that it was hoped to achieve local autonomy for Shetland and within Shetland. A CHP Committee would be set up which would be a statutory committee of NHS Shetland, but local authority representation had been added into this Committee. He concluded by saying that it was hoped to formalise the Scheme of Establishment in April 2005.

Members spoke in support of the proposals, and welcomed the efforts being made to formalise existing arrangements and

relationships, and to promote joined up working between the Council and NHS Shetland and other agencies.

A Member said that he had concerns at what would happen in circumstances where structural and functional arrangements may break down, and the resulting effects on individuals and families. He questioned if a mechanism could be included for both agencies to pick this up.

Ms S Laurenson said that consideration would be given to building this into the process.

It was noted that there were a number of pagination errors in the appendix.

On the motion of Mr W A Ratter, seconded by Mr B P Gregson, the Committee approved the recommendations in the report.

69/04

**Dogs Against Drugs (DAD)**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director – Community Services (Appendix 2).

The Executive Director advised Members that the grant assistance being offered by Community Development was £1,000, not £10,000 as stated in paragraph 6.2. It was also noted that the word “budget” should be removed from recommendation 8.4.

(Mr J C Irvine left the meeting)

Members spoke in support of the charity, commenting favourably on its role as a deterrent and in helping to increase in the number of seizures.

Mr B P Gregson referred to paragraph 5.6 of the report in respect of the lobbying taking place by DAD for Shetland to receive a percentage of the seized assets programme. He advised that this was also being followed up by Shetland Alcohol and Drugs Action Team (SADAT), and he requested that the Convener also write to the Scottish Executive on behalf of the Council asking them to take this forward as a matter of urgency. He also suggested that external funding in relation to promotion of wellbeing should be explored, as should the possibility of offering services to Orkney on a contract basis to raise the revenues.

Mr Gregson went on to move that the Committee approve the recommendation in the report, and Mr F A Robertson seconded.

Mrs F B Grains said that she would like to add that a report on an evaluation of all drug related groups’ outcomes should take place, and the mover and seconder of the motion agreed to this.

The Convener agreed to write a letter on the Council's behalf, and it was suggested that he should liaise with SADAT beforehand.

It was commented that it was disappointing that SADAT and NHS Shetland had not come forward with any funding.

In response to a query regarding paragraph 5.4, the Executive Director confirmed that DAD was requesting the shortfall of funding over the next three years. She went on to say that it would be useful to have a discussion at the Social Forum using information from SADAT, and that a report should be brought to the Committee on the work of SADAT, as they had a co-ordination role.

70/04

**Service Developments for People with Learning Disabilities**

The Committee considered a report by the Community Care Manager (Appendix 3).

A Member commented that he was pleased to see things being done in partnership, but felt that he had to comment on ASN provision in for primary age children. Whilst the facility being developed at Gressy Loan for secondary school age children would assist with the situation at Bells Brae, the numbers moving on were made up for by younger children coming in to the service. He felt that Bells Brae was very overcrowded, and that this had a knock-on effect on mainstream education as special needs pupils had to be integrated into classrooms, and it also created demands for the teachers. He emphasised that this issue needed to be considered with some urgency, and pointed out that the report on primary provision in Lerwick requested by Members had yet to be presented.

Mr W H Manson, Education Spokesperson, said that the information available to him did not indicate that integration of special needs pupils was affecting maximum class sizes in Bells Brae. He outlined work that was in hand to make significant improvements for those of all ages with special needs, and said that it may be necessary to assess if another unit was required.

The Executive Director added that these issues were being addressed with some urgency, and that the report referred to was being prepared and should be presented in the next cycle. She said that Member involvement would be welcomed, and pointed out that Members were represented on the Disability Strategy Group.

In response to a query regarding the Independent Living Properties (ILP) at the Quoys development, the Community Care Manager confirmed that there would be a net increase in provision. Some of the current ILP properties were not suitable for those with a higher

level of dependency, and it was intended to use these properties for clients with a lesser level of need.

A Member advised that he had had representations from parents of children with special needs, and that they were concerned that no progress was being made.

The Community Care Manager said that a meeting had taken place since the report was written regarding the Eric Gray Resource Centre. Funding had been agreed, and the Capital Projects Management Team had been asked to progress this with some urgency. Families and the Special Needs Action Group had been present at this meeting, and she felt that they thought that real progress was being made. Progress was also being made with services for young people into adulthood and for older age groups, and service users were involved to make sure that their views were captured.

71/04 On the motion of Mr B P Gregson, seconded by Mr L Angus, the Committee approved the recommendations in the report.

**Mental Health (Care & Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003**

The Committee considered a report by the Community Care Manager (Appendix 4).

The Community Care Manager summarised the main terms of the report and, in response to a query regarding the allocation of funds, said that there were indications that the funding would continue for the foreseeable future.

It was noted that the appendices had inadvertently been omitted from the report, and that they would be circulated before the Council meeting.

Mr B P Gregson moved that the Committee approve the recommendations in the report, subject to the appendices being circulated before the Council meeting. Mr W A Ratter seconded.

A Member said that he had had representations from families with children with mental health problems regarding the lack of mental health in-patient facilities in Shetland. He pointed out that, in the past, it had been argued by the medical establishment that there were not sufficient patients for a consultant psychologist. However this had not been the case, and a consultant psychologist had been appointed. There were continuing requests for in-patient psychological facilities, but clinicians said that Shetland did not warrant this. As it was at least 20 years ago since these issues had been considered in depth, he suggested that the Council should write to NHS Shetland to ask them to reconsider the provision of in-patient psychological services in Shetland.

Another Member concurred and said that it was estimated that at least 2,000 people in Shetland had, or would have, mental health problems. There was no residential unit in Shetland for extreme cases.

Mr S Jack said that an approach from the Council would be welcomed, but that it would not be appropriate for health service managers to go against the advice of clinicians. The regrettable conclusion was that these services could not be sustained in Shetland, but that the Council should approach NHS Shetland if they felt that this should be revisited.

The Executive Director pointed out that community planning funding had been authorised for three-year funding for the "Choose Life" initiative, and that mental health was part of this. There was also a Mental Health Strategy Group that did not have elected member representation at the moment, but that she would put this on the agenda for the next meeting.

(Mr R G Feather and Mr E J Knight left the meeting)

72/04

**Draft Criminal Justice Strategic Plan**

The Committee considered a report by the Service Manager – Criminal Justice (Appendix 5) and on the motion of Mr W A Ratter, seconded by Mr L Angus, approved the recommendation contained therein.

A Member referred to page three of the Executive Summary appended to the report, and said that the second paragraph should be reworded as a change in Sheriff should not lead to a change in sentencing.

(Mr R G Feather and Mr E J Knight returned to the meeting)

The Head of Social Work said that it had been agreed that the existing three-year plan should be rolled forward for a further 12 months, given the uncertainty regarding the future delivery of Criminal Justice Services. However there was evidence that some work needed to be undertaken this year, and work was ongoing to try and build up good practice. The work programme for 2005 would build on the good practice and initiatives to date, and would include the introduction of a Bail Information and Supervision Scheme and development of a Drug Treatment and Testing service.

73/04

**A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: 2003-2006 Funding**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Education (Appendix 6) and on the motion of Mr W H Manson, seconded by Mr J P Nicolson, approved the recommendation contained therein.

74/04      **NatWest Island Games – Use of Schools**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Education (Appendix 7).

Mr W N Stove declared a non-pecuniary interest.

On the motion of Mr J P Nicolson, seconded by Mrs I J Hawkins, the Committee approved the recommendation in the report.

(Mr W A Ratter and Mr F A Robertson left the meeting)

75/04      **Review of the Ongoing Management and Maintenance of Play Areas in Shetland**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Community Development (Appendix 8).

The Head of Community Development summarised the main terms of the report, and said that it was being proposed that a further review of the management of parks and playing fields should be carried out in conjunction with Shetland Recreational Trust. A further report would take forward the staffing requirements to maintain and develop play areas, and it was anticipated that this could be maintained within existing budgets.

(Mr F A Robertson returned to the meeting)

A Member expressed concern that play areas were being provided, but that there was not enough money in the budget to maintain them. Members said that it was important that communities were consulted and that there was a need to be careful about parameters, although it was agreed that there may be a need for rationalisation due to population changes.

(Mr J C Irvine and Mr W A Ratter returned to the meeting)

A Member enquired about the policy regarding new play areas, and the Head of Community Development confirmed that the development of new play areas had not been encouraged recently. Whilst communities could seek external funding for play areas, this added to the number of play areas that the Council were asked to maintain. He went on to reassure Members that Community Councils and existing users of play areas would be consulted, and the first step would be to meet with Community Councils to set the parameters of the review for each geographical area.

On the motion of Mr J P Nicolson, seconded by Mr B P Gregson, the Committee approved the recommendation in the report.

76/04      **Capital Grant to Voluntary Organisations: Whalsay Boating and Sports Club – Extension and Refurbishment of Clubhouse**

The Committee considered a report by the Grants Co-ordinator (Appendix 9).

Mr J G Simpson declared an interest as a member of the above Club.

On the motion of Mr W A Ratter, seconded by Mr E J Knight, the Committee approved the recommendations contained therein.

77/04      **Supporting Sporting Achievement**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Community Development (Appendix 10).

The Head of Community Development summarised the main terms of the report, and advised Members that a Shetland athlete was the first athlete from the three island authorities involved to be nominated to the Highland Institute of Sport.

On the motion of Mr L Angus, seconded by Mr E J Knight, the Committee approved the recommendation contained therein.

78/04      **Joint Future Update Report**

The Committee noted a report by the Community Care Manager (Appendix 11).

79/04      **Integrated Children's Services Plan Update**

The Committee noted a report by the Head of Social Work (Appendix 12).

The Executive Director pointed out that this Plan pulled together four previous statutory strategic plans into one, and she assured Members that there were links with all other aspects of children's services. In response to a comment from a Member, she said that she understood that Shetland Childcare Partnership could not use the entire Bruce Family Centre for safety reasons, but that she would follow this up again.

**In order to avoid the disclosure of exempt information, Mrs F B Grains moved, and Mr B P Gregson seconded, to exclude the public in terms of the relevant legislation during consideration of the appendices of agenda items 13 & 14.**

(Mr L Angus left the meeting)

80/04      **Shared Management Pilot Scheme for Schools in Shetland**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Education (Appendix 13).



It was pointed out that although it was indicated that there was a small saving, the actual savings were likely to be marginal, and the proposal was not being recommended due to savings in cost.

Mr F A Robertson outlined the background to the shared management pilot scheme operating in the West Side, and went on to say that the current acting Head Teacher in Walls would be in post until December. The question of joint management had been raised with the School Board and parents, and whilst there had been a majority in favour of this arrangement, he had concerns that not all parents fully understood what joint management meant. One of the main concerns at Happyhansel was that there would be a change of teacher in the middle of the academic year, and he said that some of these concerns would be allayed if there was some assurance that present teacher could continue in post until June. In order that there was continuity within the school, he requested reassurance that the present teacher could continue within the post until June.

(Mr L Angus returned to the meeting)

The Acting Senior Education Officer confirmed that this would be offered to teacher, but that he could not guarantee that the teacher would accept.

In response to a query regarding visiting teachers, the Acting Senior Education Officer said that there would be no affect on visiting teachers. However there was an ongoing review across the board on visiting teachers, as it was felt that there wasn't equality of provision across Shetland.

It was noted that the pilot scheme on the West Side had been largely successful, but that it needed some further modifications and that efforts would be made to alleviate the concerns of parents. As it was a pilot scheme, it would be monitored and a further report would be brought forward next year.

A Member commented that Shetland had a very expensive model of primary education, and the most expensive secondary school model in the UK. He went on to say that Members had requested a report on primary provision in Lerwick, and had requested that the Lerwick Members should be involved in the discussion to prepare this report. He noted that Lerwick had not been included in the Best Value Service Review of Education reports, and questioned when this would be considered.

Mr W H Manson, Education Spokesperson, said that a report would be presented in the next cycle, and the Acting Senior Education Officer said that he had no problem with Lerwick members being involved in discussion with the author.

On the motion of Mr W A Ratter, seconded by Mr J P Nicolson, the Committee approved the recommendations in the report, subject to the assurance requested by Mr F A Robertson.

(Members of the public and representatives of the media left the meeting)

81/04

**Acquisition of the Loki by Shetland Museum Services**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Community Development (Appendix 14).

(Captain G G Mitchell left the meeting)

The Head of Community Development summarised the main terms of the report, advising that it was felt, from a curatorial perspective, that there would be real value in trying to acquire the vessel for the museum's collection. However there were resource issues, and it was hoped that these could be minimised by securing external funding.

(Captain G G Mitchell returned to the meeting)

Mr E J Knight said that he felt this was a unique opportunity to acquire a part of Shetland's heritage for the museum. Other museums in the country had also expressed an interest, so efforts should be made retain the vessel in Shetland. The survey for the vessel had been favourable, and there would be opportunities to charter the vessel as there was a consistent demand for charter yachts in Shetland. He went on to move the recommendations in the report, and Mr B P Gregson seconded.

Mr J C Irvine moved, as an amendment, that an offer based on the valuation of the hull and machinery only should be authorised. Mr C B Eunson seconded.

Mrs I J Hawkins gave notice of further amendment.

Members spoke in support of retaining the vessel in Shetland as she was a unique part of Shetland's maritime heritage, and said that they felt that the new museum should have a strong maritime theme. However concerns were expressed about the indicative revenue costs, and it was felt that they were not realistic. It was noted that the present owner had spent considerable time maintaining the vessel himself.

The Museum Curator advised that it was intended to keep the vessel as she was, and he believed that she could make money without changing her. The costs had been based on what had been spent on the "Pilot Us", and the expenditure of the Swan

Services Committee  
02 December 2004 Public Minutes

Trust. Indications were that external funding would be available to enable the vessel to be purchased and restored to working condition.

He went on to say that there were a considerable number of people interested in maintaining and running the museum's collection, and that volunteer support was very important and would be encouraged. It was hoped to avoid some of the regulations that existed for charter hire by avoiding taking fee-paying passengers. The vessel was smaller than the "Swan" and would not have a skipper, so comparative costs would be less.

After summing up, voting took place by show of hands and the result was as follows:

Amendment (Mr J C Irvine)	9
Motion (Mr E J Knight)	9

The Chairman gave her casting vote in favour of the motion.

Mrs I J Hawkins moved that an offer consistent with the offer made for the "Pilot Us" should be approved. Mr J P Nicolson seconded.

After summing up, voting took place by show of hands and the result was as follows:

Amendment (Mrs I J Hawkins)	5
Motion (Mr E J Knight)	10

Mr Knight's motion was therefore declared the finding of the meeting.