

SBSH Advisory Board Meeting 4

Note of Meeting: 8th September 2025

1.0		Welcome/Apologies:	Actions:
	1.1	Welcome: LS welcomed everyone to the meeting. LS chaired as GM was having some IT technical difficulties at the start of the meeting.	
	1.2	Attendance: Stephen Garvin (SG) – Head of Building Standards Division representing BSD. Neil Mitchell (NM) – Head of Development Unit Building Standards Division representing BSD. Mark Lawler (ML) – Director MGL Consulting Engineers Ltd. representing Certifiers. Garry Mees (GM) – Gary Mees Architectural Technology representing Construction Industry. (Chair) Stuart Parker (SP) – Managing Director Scotland of Morgan Sindall representing the Construction Industry. Nigel Kerr (NK) – Head of Protective Services Fife Council representing Fife Council. Laura Shanks (LS) – Building Standards Team Manager City of Edinburgh Council representing LABSS. (Vice Chair) Craig Hatton (CH) – Chief Executive North Ayrshire Council. Representing SOLACE. Alan McAulay (AMcA) – SBSH Director (Technical/Operations/Services). James Whiteford (JW) – SBSH Director (Business/Strategy/Transformation). Apologies: Robert Nichol (RN) – Chief Officer Environment and Economy CoSLA representing CoSLA. JP Breslin (JPB) – Building Standards Team Leader Stirling Council representing LABSS.	
	1.3	Intimations/Conflicts of Interest: RN asked that if there were any issues which crop up at the meeting for COSLA, to let him know. GM intimated that he also sits on another couple of regulatory panels but did not foresee any issues regarding this. The Board agreed that there was not an issue.	

2.0		Previous Actions:	
	2.1	<p>Action 5.1: Review the balance of Board members in the future if other organisations appear to be more representative to oversee SBSH:</p> <p>Longer term action for noting – retain on actions to be looked at again June 2026.</p>	Board
	2.2	<p>Action 5.2: Split the current Business Plan/Annual Report document into a simpler stand-alone business plan and separate annual report linked to the quarterly operational reports:</p> <p>Item covered below, under 3.1 and 3.2.</p>	
	2.3	<p>Action 5.3: Review the current SBSH reporting criteria and KPOs and suggest potential new reporting measures that suit what the hub does and positively reflect on the contribution that the hub brings to the delivery model:</p> <p>Longer term action for noting – retain on actions to be looked at again at a later date.</p>	SBSH
	2.4	<p>Action 5.4: Revisions within SBSH documentation to better signpost the changes, either by highlight, or covered in the description:</p> <p>Description of document changes have been expanded to signpost revisions easier.</p>	
3.0		Update:	
	3.1	<p>2025/26 Business Plan: The revised business plan was presented to the Board, noting that the new version has been much shortened, with the aims and outcomes set out more clearly.</p> <p>Operational reporting has wholly been taken out, as has budget reporting as these are reported on in separate documentation.</p> <p>The Boards consensus was that the business plan is now much cleared and easier to digest.</p>	
	3.2	<p>SBSH Periodic Operational Report Q1 2025/26: Similarly, as per the business plan, the revised formatting of the quarterly report was presented to the board with confirmation that, the report is the same as before in terms of reporting position against strategic aims. Data is however now populated for each</p>	

	<p>quarter, with last year's performance provided for reference. This report will now be updated quarterly rather than a complete new report, so easy comparisons can be made to previous reporting periods. It will also be updated at the year-end. Examples provided are now clearer.</p> <p>The board had some suggestions for future reports to include a RAG status, indicate priority, and re-priority, of outstanding tasks, and to report on STAS peaks, by exception.</p> <p>There were several points of discussion relating to the topics covered in the director's operational update, particularly around the proposed provision of fire engineering related training, the Structural Hub and Certification.</p> <p>The directors also confirmed that in terms of looking at future budget setting for 2026/27, the SBSH was producing a paper to take to the BSD confirming the intended budgetary spend. NM confirmed that they had started discussions with CoSLA in this respect, which are ongoing.</p> <p>The directors also intimated that, as previously reported, they were now intending not to fill the vacant 0.5 FTE administration and technical support officer post. There were two main reasons for this, firstly, after review of the workload and progress in IT infrastructure, it was now not felt necessary at this time. Secondly, to help make the 2026/27 budget stack up in relation to the training we wish to deliver, the saving will be better reinvested here. The post will not be deleted, just remain unfilled.</p> <p>There was some discussion within the board as to what level of ratification was needed for this. The Board confirmed that whilst this was seen as an operational matter, CoSLA and Scottish Ministers should be made aware of intent by reporting this to them.</p> <p>In relation to the current budget, the Board were asked to note that there is still a carry forward of funding which is being drawn down over subsequent years as services and activity is delivered back to local authorities and spend against additional funding support is spent on projects.</p> <p>Whilst reviewing the spread sheet of time on activity, the directors confirmed that the previous action to sub divide the 'other' and</p>	<p>SBSH</p> <p>BSD</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------

		<p>'leave' categories had been undertaken and data will be there for reporting at the next Advisory Board meeting. Noting the high proportion of time spent on learning and development, there was a suggestion whether this should be sub-categorised further to see what elements of learning time is being spent on. The directors confirmed that this could be revised once the learning and development surveyor commenced employment with the SBSH.</p>	
	3.3	<p>Risk Register: Previous Risk O4 – 'Establish formal Structural Hub' can now be closed as work on establishing it has now commenced.</p> <p>Previous Risk G6: 'Procurement, approval of large orders. (>£50,000.00)' can also be closed as procurement arrangements are now in place, bulk approving major spends.</p> <p>SG had a suggestion to expand the risk descriptors to better indicate what the potential risk is. This will be taken on board for future risks.</p>	SBSH
4.0		AOCB:	
	4.1	<p>AOCB: GM intimated a potential conflict of interest. (This has been noted above.) The Vice Chair thanked everyone for their contribution.</p>	
	4.2	<p>Date of next Meeting: Monday 15th December 2025 at 13:30.</p>	
5.0		Actions:	
	5.1	<p>For June 2026: Review the balance of Board members in the future if other organisations appear to be more representative to oversee the SBSH.</p>	Board
	5.2	<p>For future consideration: Review the current SBSH reporting criteria and KPOs and suggest potential new reporting measures that suit what the hub does and positively reflect on the contribution that the hub brings to the delivery model.</p>	SBSH
	5.3	<p>Future operational reports to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A RAG status • An indication of any priority, and re-priority, of outstanding tasks • Reporting on STAS peaks, by exception. 	SBSH

	5.4	Alert/inform CoSLA and Scottish Ministers of the intention to leave the 0.5 FTE administration and technical support officers post vacant.	BSD
	5.5	Expand the risk register descriptors to better indicate what the potential risk is.	SBSH