

**STONEHAVEN TOWN PARTNERSHIP
MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING
HELD ON 26 FEBRUARY 2013
AT THE INVERCARRON RESOURCE CENTRE**

	Item	Action
1	<p>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</p> <p>Present: Doug Samways (DS) Peter Bellarby (PB) Edwards (WE) David Fleming (DF) Alan McConachie (AM) Michelle Ward (MW)</p> <p>In attendance: Elaine Cleary (Aberdeenshire Council) as contact in place of Reid Hutchison Karen McWilliam (for Area Manager) George Strang (GS) Charles Sands (CS)</p> <p>Apologies: Frank Budd (FB) Alan Sutherland (expected)</p> <p>It was noted that Rachel Shanks is to attend in March (8.30pm), rather than this evening.</p>	
2	<p>MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING – approval</p> <p>It was noted that AS had submitted his apologies. The Minutes were approved, subject to changes (Proposed DF, seconded DS).</p> <p>Matters arising</p> <p>AGM MINUTES DF – the AGM Minutes were not sent through, as it was thought WM was too busy to review them. Agreed that DF would send them now.</p> <p>CARAVAN PARK ACCOUNTS DF – we are still waiting for final accounts to see if we owe anything or are for a refund. The final electricity and gas readings have been found and we are waiting for Graham Wall to complete the accounts.</p> <p>BEACH TOILETS DS has written to Lennie Lawrence about the beach toilets. The letter was recent and there has been no response yet.</p>	<p>DF</p> <p>DF</p> <p>DS</p>

<p>STREET AUDIT MW has made progress with the Street audit. Allardice Street and Market Square have been surveyed, and photos are being put into power point. The beach front is next to be done. It was agreed it was ok to carry on using Maureen for an hour on Thursdays.</p>	<p>MW</p>
<p>FURTHER DIRECTORS MW has tried to contact John Robertson of the running club. She has spoken to wife but has not got back about being a director.</p>	<p>MW</p>
<p>MW has also spoken to Dave Lawman as a possible director. He would need to get the Lions to nominate him.</p>	<p>MW</p>
<p>BIDS PROJECT DS reported that as far as he knows from Maureen Newlands the BID project seed corn application is ready to go in. She has been working with Niall Menzies on that.</p>	<p>DS</p>
<p>DIRECTORS OF COMMUNICATIONS REPORT The Director of Communications report had been amended & sent out, and put on the website.</p>	
<p>LOGO The new logo has gone out with templates and logo, which everyone is encouraged to use. The discussion forum is up and running, and we should all make use of it.</p>	
<p>WEBSITE The old website is in transition. The new website live.</p>	
<p>PROJECT REPORTS DS still to review these and the evaluations – hope to have it done by mid year / August</p>	
<p>SEA CADETS There was been nothing at all further from the sea cadets.</p>	
<p>CARAVAN PARK FEES The fee note has been received – it was for £4,000 as expected. We are awaiting an itemised list to be circularised in due course.</p>	
<p>ALL WEATHER PITCH Remember it is a facility, not a pitch.</p>	
<p>DF confirmed there was meeting but it was not well attended and project was not advanced much. The architect was asked to draw up a few more things in outline. There was still a concern over the possible dominance of football, and warning that funds are at risk if that is the case. No one person feels they are driving it through.</p>	
<p>REVIEW OF CARAVAN PARK TRANSFER DS reported that there would be movement soon.</p>	<p>DS</p>

	<p>TOWN HOUSE / CLOCK TOWER We have received an acknowledgement only from Willie Munro</p> <p>The officer in charge is Brian Watt. The timing of funding is not an issue as it is now down for financial year 2013/14. Raymond Milne has had a positive report and hopes work will start in the next month. Ideas are required for what to use inside space for.</p> <p>Brian Watt could not make this meeting; DS suggested we invite him to the next one.</p> <p>STREET AUDIT MW had already reported on the Street Audit.</p> <p>Not all businesses were members of the Stonehaven Business Association (SBA). Everyone was keen on regular maintenance for a small amount. The BIDS project may cover this area, but that is some years away.</p> <p>In reply to how much this would cost and how it would be funded, it was thought there were 100 business and 100 residencies. - £10,000 would do a lot of work. This could be discussed further later.</p> <p>ENERGY COOPERATIVE Rachel Shanks is invited to next meeting</p> <p>SCIO DS is to circulate to everyone to help. PB says Marr Area and KMAP and MAP are all going down the SCIO route.</p> <p>COMMUNITY AWARDS Community Awards is to go onto the website in advance of Wed 13th March. See DS' previous email. MW is going.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>DS</p> <p>WE</p> <p>DS / All</p> <p>MW</p>
3	<p>FINANCE (CS)</p> <p>The Accounts were circulated. There were only two transactions.</p> <p>It was agreed to meet the expenses for Mark to come up if necessary to speak to Councillors – the matter should go to the Policy and Resources Committee after it has gone through Area Committee at the end of March.</p>	
4	<p>REPORT FROM DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS (WE)</p> <p>Membership of QR Codes Group The application from QR codes (Alan Craig) was discussed and approved.</p> <p>Website and emails The new website went live on 18th February. The website is www.stpweb.org Please use new email addresses firstname@stpweb.org The new addresses are David@, Alan@, Allan@ and so on.</p>	

	<p>Distribution lists should therefore change. WE will send an updated list to DF ASAP after 12th March.</p> <p>The chatroom is open, and directors are encouraged to log in and use it. It should be checked regularly. It is private but users should still take care of what you say.</p> <p>New logo is now valid, and should be used, as should the templates. If anyone has stuff to put on website, please provide it. MW is to provide photo.</p> <p>The old domain being transferred – it will point to new domain eventually.</p> <p>MRI and Boathouse MRI is now closed. The premises will be taken over by Maersk who will use for Opito training. It seems likely that nothing will happen at the Boathouse. The hope is that Maersk will invest.</p> <p>There was a meeting with the RNLI last week – they are covering Stonehaven from Aberdeen & Montrose meantime. Ultimately something may be put here, but who knows what.</p> <p>KMcW asked if we should be lobbying? WE thought that would be a waste of our time. It was agreed that a letter would do no harm and DF is to write.</p>	<p>WE</p> <p>MW</p> <p>DF</p>
5	<p>REPORT FROM DIRECTOR OF STRATEGY (DS)</p> <p>Long term use of funds</p> <p>DF pointed out that the caravan park rent was an income stream for a long time to come. Some of the money should go to longer-term usage. It is a lot of money and we should be ready to use it, and use it wisely.</p> <p>DS suggested short, medium & long term plans, DF confirmed we could expect £27k per annum as a “guesstimate”. It is unlikely we will get nothing from Auquhirie. We need to think ahead. A lot of it is not in our gift, but we need to advise people to be ready to apply (once a year).</p> <p>KMcW thought the Tullo criteria are likely to be followed by the others. DF suggested we should find out a bit better what is appropriate. We need to contact the STP member groups and say do you have anything ready and can we help you to so that. For example could we go to the Sea Cadets and the yacht club, and encourage them to become members?</p> <p>We need a project manager and a sum of money to kick-start it. We should talk about it next time.</p> <p>PB asked where the money to pay this person come from. It was suggested we could apply ourselves to Meikle Carewe for pump priming money. We have our caravan park money, so we could provide something. One option might be to consider Maureen long term.</p>	<p>**</p>

WE was anxious to avoid spending money we don't know we have. DF agreed – but we did not want to be caught out then the time comes.

Bervie Braes Road (DS/George Strang "GS")

There was a meeting yesterday. WE and MW and GS are seconded onto Bervie Braes subgroup.

Yesterday's meeting with Willie Murdoch. His preference would be to have the road opened. He did not know why removed from Area Committee agenda. He believed they were now waiting for further info, but he did not know what. He was ambivalent about the Jacobs report – which was apparently all based on 2 lanes being opened. He thought that was not the case but understood why that might be perceived.

WE suggested the Jacobs report needed to be taken in context that they hoped to be doing the work. WE thought that was not too cynical. The decision for councillors was about risk and mitigating it. So further info must be about that. So our "no action" solution was again received ambivalently as there was greater risk to cyclists and pedestrians.

WE's greatest concern is that all the council can do to mitigate risk is to do nothing and keep the road closed. But even then there is a risk – all it will do is minimise it. Now it is open to pedestrians and cyclists and there are more risks to them than to cars. So the next risk-reduction step is to close it completely.

GS said he didn't know why the matter was cancelled from the Area Committee agenda. GS expected a report from the legal department on risk. He accepted Jacobs' view on the cars, but did not share it. We should not argue against it. It is a temporary solution we are proposing – move barriers for pedestrians and cyclists - and that is what was used when there was traffic.

There were costing estimates in the November report.

- Primary solution (pinning & regrading) £1.9m.
- Second (catch fence) £1.85m) – doesn't stack up.
- Purely to reopen the road as it and barriers for cars £100k – again no idea how they came to that.

It was pointed out that these amounts have to be seen relative to the £9m pa economic impact of having the road closed.

The Council had no budget allocated and so there was no saving to be made!

GS stated that the slopes from the North of the town are steeper than those to the South. Once a problem is pointed out, you have to do something about it. The Council know the figures and so they have to take them into account. Litigation is their biggest concern.

There is a problem with the Jacobs report; there is no mention of one-way. System. GS thinks it reads "two way", but Willie Murdoch did not share that view.

We must press for the road to be open for summer and monitored for that.

It can be closed if necessary for winter and drainage. Planning permission would not be needed for that.

Permanent stopping up of the road was not as easy and it was certainly not a no-cost option.

If you do the multiplication in the table – in the do nothing solution a minor slip (5) highly likely. The risk to pedestrians is (2) and for vehicles is (5). So you need to do something for the cars. A barrier system would mitigate that.

MW asked Willie Murdoch if he would take account of GS' options. The answer was not clear but he will certainly not dissent from the Jacobs report. The risk assessment is inherently subjective.

AS thought we needed a meeting with MSP Alex Johnston. The Nigel Don article supported us, but didn't mention the Council's report. He says "rethink" which suggests a decision is made. Alex Johnston says common sense says the road should be open, and we should continue with what we are doing. We are back to litigation being the basis of this decision. It would not be constructive to look at why the report was pulled – we should concentrate on where we go from here.

WE asked if any report re legal aspects would be a public document. It was thought that if it were presented to area committee it would probably become public.

Karen Wiles (in response to a question) had said a risk report was requested, It was asked if that was the Jacobs report, or a legal department report. It was suggested that no one has sat down and said what "being sued" really means. Who is suing and what for? AS said he thought we needed to meet with Karen Wells and sort that out. DF thought being sued was only part of it - you also need to decide if you have a defence. DF thinks if you have taken a reasonable judgement and reasonable precautions then that is an absolute defence. To use the phrase "we might be sued" is about 1/4 of what it should contain.

AS thought being sued is not the reason. Instead we should ask if it is just a way to get another road built.

The message that should go to the legal department is that the people and councillors want it open – so what can you do to mitigate any potential liability. Can you effectively tell people you use the road "at your own risk"? The lawyers should be giving advice along the lines – here is what you need to do to open the road.

DF we have had the engineers view and the economic one. Those needs balanced with the legal risk. Someone needs to balance those three – or they are heading for judicial review. WE asked if that could take place at the area committee? DF asked who is the officer producing the report - DF asked KMcW who replied that matter is not on the agenda unless area manager or director approves it, but "it depends" was the answer. DS – what exactly was asked for (Area Report) and is required.

Willie Murdoch had a copy of the report – the same that went to Policy &

<p>Resources in November plus Jacobs. It was "bounced" because of the lack or a reply to legal questions.</p> <p>What kind of report is going to area committee in march, and how can we influence the scope? WE though it was already written and would per Willie Murdoch be addressing the risk. The engineering matters were addressed by Jacobs report, but a further report was needed to address litigation that would follow from serious injury or death.</p> <p>AS suggested we had to go by what we are told. He said we got a copy of the report and if it was pulled that can only be because they were not happy with what was in it.</p> <p>DS – what do we do with the Jacobs report? The FOI request (30 December) and then told you can have it without FOI. Took a while for a reply – you have given it. Then asked for a review, so now going to write a summary of chain of events. 20 days for council to give an answer and confident we will get it. Asking for Jacobs report. Don't have it officially but in FOI terms it is in the public domain.</p> <p>So can we start to refer to it? What was going to the area committee? Is it the Jacobs report or is it a report on the Jacobs report. Is it in the public domain? The fact there is a report on the website, but the content is not officially out there. We have that. Do we make that public? Does it matter that the positive way we got that may never be repeated?</p> <p>Do we meet Karen Wiles?</p> <p>DS thought what we needed to clear up here is when the papers are published and it goes public. When the Committee get it, it is published on he council website. It was arguably out there already.</p> <p>KMCW said that the report was never available. Councillors have not got it. It has never been released by the area committee. (DF/AS – thought the report was circulated the week before).</p> <p>There were two reports. They are published. Does that include the report on the Jacobs report? Presumably yes. Scheduled for end of March (26th and not 5th).</p> <p>GS pointed out that we have only spoken to 3 councillors. Do the other 9 have it? Remember it needs to go to Policy and Resources after the Area Committee.</p> <p>WE suggested one course of action allows us to do both. We need to keep this pot bubbling. It was suggested DS did an interview with local press (and further afield) – expressing concern with reasons for sequence of events and the fact that the longer this goes on the longer the road is closed. In that discussion he should highlight the economic report and our solutions. It would be better if that were an interview with the Leader rather than a letter. He should allude to report but not quote it – the options were raised at community council meeting.</p> <p>The Community Council meeting is on 13th March, and we could address it to</p>	<p>DS</p>
--	-----------

	<p>garner support. Every single councillor wants the road open and the MSPs. MW organised a facebook campaign (ages ago), and we have 1,000 names in support.</p> <p>The temporary closure notice has a date on it and they need to renew it or put in a full closure. There will be a legal procedure for either. At the moment the cliff path is closed. The road is closed. The message is that "Stonehaven is shut", and we need to change that.</p> <p>DS tried to draw the wide-ranging discussion together. We should request meeting with Karen Wiles to go through her department's concerns, We ask for clarity of K&M meeting report. We ask for SDCC hearing on 13th March where we put the economic points to get backing.</p> <p>DF thought we should also be having a meeting with economic development and get them to agree to the numbers, Send our report to Reid Hutchison and ask for a meeting. Presumably someone in his department (Steven Archer?) will get the report to comment on it and the methodology in it. So we should send it to Reid and ask for a meeting with him (and Mark).</p> <p>It was agreed that DS should go to press – next week's Mearns Leader – with concerns over motivation. Default position is road closed and here is our proposed solution - with follow up for P&J & EE nearer the time. WE will try to get interest from STV.</p> <p>Policy and Resources councillors should be lobbied after the Area Committee. We need to set it up at a suitable time (with Mark and George) and invite them to a briefing - individually or in clusters.</p> <p>DS said we hope that the Kincardine & Mearns councillors say yes, but we have to go ahead anyway. We need to be briefing the Policy & Resources councillors that <u>all</u> the info is needed – not bits of it. Raymond, Peter & Wendy were the only 3 that came to Mark's briefing meeting, with apologies from only another 2. If they won't come, all we can do is circulate a briefing pack and follow it up with a phone call.</p> <p>As far as Karen Wiles is concerned, GS thought our line had to be that we all want to open the road. That being the case, what do we do to mitigate the risk?</p> <p>20.35 AS & GS left.</p>	DS
6	<p>BUSINESS PLAN ITEMS (Report on progress of individual projects)</p>	
	<p>Queen Elizabeth Caravan Park (DF)</p> <p>DF confirmed there is site meeting on Thursday. The question that will be asked soon (because of the storage issues) is when the static caravans can be put on the site. The public opening date is perhaps going to be brought forward, but it is too early to be sure.</p> <p>Roads – safety fence and the banking – are being discussed.</p> <p>WE advised that there is concern in Cowie about the drainage system and</p>	

	<p>how to resolve the flooding issues around the pool. What needs to happen to the drains? The worry is the effect the work at the caravan site will have on the existing system. How will it cope when it can't manage a moderate rainfall just now? Allan Sutherland has copies of the actual reports? Main guy is Gus Macdonald (3rd cottage along Boatie Row – one with the driftwood). That is a serious concern and DF should raise it at site meeting.</p> <p>MW also wanted DF to ask about Hogmanay opening. Obviously it needs to be well managed. DF to ask, and to set up occasional liaison meeting.</p> <p>The Den of Logie road will be closed when the AWPR is built. There will be no view of the town on the way in or out.</p>	<p>DF</p> <p>DF</p>
	<p>All weather Facility (DF) Already covered above.</p>	
	<p>Town House / Clock Tower (RM?) incl. Council's lead officer Already covered above. Suggestion was again that the NE Preservation Trust supervised with work going out to tender. Raymond had got an assurance that local trades people will be able to be involved.</p> <p>By putting it to tender, you push the costs up. KMcW said it is a difficult one for the council to follow but they are aware of what local members would want.</p> <p>The NE preservation work with the council – so not a big issue to involve the trust.</p>	
	<p>Street Audit / Improving our Town Centre (DF) Already covered above</p>	
	<p>Planning for Real – including next date and reporting (DF) Town hall not available (for day and evening) for a PFR event, and so DF is investigating other venues. He is also looking for a date – which is likely to be late April or early May (avoiding bank holiday weekend).</p> <p>The PFR consultant had visited. Per DF we should have only one report covering all three PFR events – i.e. Cowie and the Old Town, and in due course the Town Centre too.</p> <p>No need to incur production costs just yet</p>	<p>DF</p>
	<p>Energy Co-operative (WE/Rachel Shanks) Rachel Shanks will attend 26 March (8.30pm). SEAS is focussed on a wind energy project, and they are at a sensitive time for report on potential progress, They have had significant grant money. SEAS could ultimately form a part of a larger scale project for STP.</p> <p>There is not one single solution to the whole energy problem and there is increasing need demonstrated for a project like this. After March / April WE</p>	

	can put forward a firmer proposal	
7	BUSINESS ITEMS	
	<p>Feein' Market Stall – Sat. 1st June</p> <p>A circular has been received. DF won't be here then. The feeling was we didn't gain much from the previous year but a number of people came and talked. We could be more proactive about what we do and have a prize (raffle?) to attract people, and have a presentation to the winner.</p> <p>It was agreed we should book, and ask about a power supply.</p>	DF
	<p>Constitution/SCIO application</p> <p>SCIO – DS to circulate application form for comment</p>	DS
	<p>Web site</p> <p>Already covered above – we need new pictures to keep it current. Everybody has a duty to provide content</p>	All
	<p>Disbursement arrangements for QECPS income</p> <p>The Stonehaven Festivals and Events are waiting for their VAT registration, and won't know what funds they have for distribution until this is clarified,</p>	MW
8	<p>AOCB</p> <p>40th anniversary of the Stonehaven Business Association is on 12th March at the golf club. DS and wife to attend on behalf of STP.</p> <p>The old gas works at Cowie is owned by the Gas Board/Transco(?). They have no money to decontaminate the site, and it does not seem cost effective to do anything.</p>	DS
9	<p>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS – 4th Tuesday of the month</p> <p>Future meetings are on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26 March 2013 • 23 April 2013 • 28 May 2013 • 25 June 2013 • 23 July 2013 • 27 August 2013 • 24 September 2013 • 22 October 2013 • 26 November 2013 (AGM followed by brief directors' meeting) • No meeting in December, then back to 4th Tuesday from January onwards <p>Meeting ended 9:25pm</p>	