

**Stonehaven Town Partnership  
Minutes of Board Meeting  
Held on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012  
In the Invercarron Resource Centre**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b> (** = Appears on next agenda
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Welcome &amp; apologies</b></p> <p>Present: Doug Samways (Chair) (DS), Cllr. Peter Bellarby (PB)  David Fleming (DF) Dennis Collie (DC)  Frank Budd (FB) Alan McConachie (AM)  Andrew Newton (AN)  Wynne Edwards (WE)</p> <p>In attendance:  Maureen Newlands (MN - New development worker)  Michael Innes (SDCC)  A member of the public</p> <p>Minute Secretary: Charles Sands.</p> <p>Apologies: Niall Menzies (NM) Raymond Milne (RM)  Karen McWilliam (KMcW) Michelle Ward (MW)  Jim Henderson (JH) Allan Sutherland (AS)</p>	
	<p><b>New Directors</b></p> <p>[NB New directors have still to sign forms for Companies House]</p>	DF / CHS
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Minutes from Last meeting</b></p> <p>The Minutes were approved, subject to changes.</p>	
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p>DS suggested inviting the caravan park warden to a meeting to thank them. KmcW and DC thought we should not dip into funds. DF suggested an invite to the AGM and DS would attend to this. WE suggested publicity in the Mearns leader. DS agreed to draft with input from FB</p> <p>AOCB Maureen did go to training. MAP and KMAP are contributing to Maureen's time.</p> <p>Nothing heard from MW for social date – carry forward</p>	DS / FB   MW **

<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Finance (DC)</b></p> <p>The total funds £17,611 of which the Tolbooth still retains £7,705. There is no Tolbooth account yet to transfer funds into. That leaves £9,906. The caravan park deficit is -£3,974, which we would expect to recover from the Council in due course. That is mainly recent wages.</p> <p>FB wondered about publicity for takings and transfer to the Stonehaven Tolbooth Association. SDCC should get publicity about it too. AN queried whether the publicity would make obtaining future funding from Aberdeenshire Council more difficult. PB agreed as displaying the amount in big letters on a presentation cheque was not going to be helpful. However WE said we needed to make it clear we are transferring everything, and that we are not keeping management fees. WE agreed with publicising money going to body and coverage. A Leader article on the flying start for the Stonehaven Tolbooth Association was suggested.</p> <p>To confirm all the funds were handed over, and Independent Examination of the accounts before the handover was suggested by AN. FB suggested George Forrester (ex RBS) and will check with him if he could look at the Receipts and Payments but not do a detailed audit.</p>	<p>FB</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Staffing</b></p> <p>Maureen started work 3 weeks ago. DS met with her for induction, and identified a few tasks for her to work on.</p> <p>PFR phase 2 is something Maureen wants to get involved with. Maureen is to contact Diane tomorrow for handover. There will be no parallel running as Diane is not going to be involved in phase 2 at all.</p> <p>It has not been possible to find training available in the vicinity. DF suggested we got in touch with PFR and leave them to decide if we need to go through training. Maureen to contact them and make arrangement if training available. Funds are set aside for training if required.</p> <p>DF said we had received approval of £420 – DF to sign service level agreement, which he has done – but we have to spend before we receive it. There could be more for the next phase.</p> <p>BID – Maureen went to see Neil. You need to be a member to log into the website. However her uncle was involved in preparing the Lerwick BID so Maureen will phone him for details.</p> <p>Report back for next directors’ meeting from Maureen.</p>	<p>MN</p> <p>MN</p>

<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Report from Director of Communications</b></p> <p>WE presented a report on JH's behalf. The business plan and feedback form was emailed to all member groups. So far, there have been no responses whatever.</p> <p>DS said he had raised it at Fatherland Burns Club and it will be discussed at their next meeting. It was agreed not to amend the date for responses – it is up to members to respond.</p> <p>Website – A meeting had been held with George McGillivray advising of intention to seek alternatives. He confirmed there were options for design &amp; hosting, and was advised of the STP view that the site not suitable and not in line with market trends. He will offer to build the site – based in what JH has told him. No spec has been agreed.</p> <p>WE had discussed circulating member groups for assistance but that was against what the subcommittee had thought, and WE did not know if that had been done.</p> <p>WE had also given NE Creative the design less the site plan pages. If we agreed that was the basis then (when JH is back) we can make sure there is A spec. The idea is that we have full administrative control of the site ourselves. The proposed hosting is through AN for now - perhaps with full admin control through director of communication.</p> <p>The preference was for Wordpress – being the market leader.</p> <p>WE is to ensure George McGillivray has same info as WE's contact, and for bids to be circulated - hopefully before the next meeting.</p> <p>An identity – a logo for the STP – was discussed. Various people expressing their preferences. PB asked when logo to be launched, and it was suggested this should coincide with the SCIO launch.</p>	<p>WE</p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Report from the Director of Strategy</b></p> <p>DS reported that there had been a Ward Forum for Stonehaven and Lower Deeside last Tuesday. There were about 20 people there (of which 9 were representatives of the community). Albert Ross gave a very informative talk on how they had got a fitness centre up and running in Fraserburgh. There was then a mapping exercise. Those attending were then split into groups to discuss issues such as what gets in the way of sports and leisure development, and what can be done to overcome it. One of the outcomes was recognition of the need for a vision for sports &amp; leisure in Ward 18. A group was needed to draft that vision, and then a public event to put the final touches to that with STP taking the lead in putting together that draft vision. DF mentioned the Baird Park meeting to discuss the proposed all-weather pitch, which is associated with such a vision. Basic info was required from local clubs on what was needed and a draft questionnaire had been sent out to those at the meeting. DF said a short list of potential sites had been discussed but further consideration was necessary as each has a downside, but there is no spare land in Stonehaven. A public meeting is needed to decide on this and what kind of pitch and associated facilities people want. When the outcomes of the agreed questionnaire had been analysed we would be in a position to</p>	

	<p>organise the public meeting.</p> <p>PB gave an update on section 1 funding. The Area Committee made changes to what was originally proposed for K&amp;M. Councilors agreed that if the cost of renovating the Clock Tower was not as much as budgeted, the extra would go to the all-weather pitch. Projects are approved in tranches. Tranche I as of now includes the clock tower at £174k. £320 was allocated to the all-weather pitch, which is in a future tranche. Supervision of the spend is delegated to the area committee. The Area Manager will be calling two meetings of interested parties — one for the clock tower and one for the all-weather pitch. The 1st tranche is to be spent in the 2013/14 financial year. The 2nd lot has a longer timespan.</p> <p>AN asked if it was an all-weather football pitch. PB confirmed that it was certainly not for football only. A management group would have to be established by the user groups and they need to think about the use of the associated building/pavilion, which needs to be as multi-purpose as possible.</p> <p>Michael Innes advised that the pitch, including drainage, fencing, electrics, would cost in the region of £490k; a pavilion would be extra. The £320 from the Council should help attract matched funding from the Lottery or other sources. The ideal is a sports facility — not just an all-weather pitch. DF said a business plan would need to be developed and if it is multi-purpose the funding can be multi sourced.</p> <p>AN asked who pays the running costs? The people who use it are going to have to pay for it, replied DS. AN thought it would be necessary to employ people to manage it as it couldn't be run effectively by a group of volunteers.</p> <p>Michael Innes said he and DS had already spoken to the football clubs and we need to speak to others before we go forward. DS agreed and said that the questionnaire was the start of that process.</p> <p>DS thought we needed to decide exactly what the role of the STP was going to be. DF suggested we should act as a facilitator as we have a modest expertise in setting up a new organisation.</p> <p>FB asked why STP and SDCC were acting jointly — why was it not SDCC alone. DF repeated that both were involved. DS thought STP was involved primarily because we had a locus. DS did not think that there was any reason why the two organisations shouldn't be working together, at least in the first instance, but there is clearly a need to keep the communication channels open between the two groups. Michael Innes said he has replied to the Health &amp; Sports Minister who had emailed SDCC. He wants to come up in the new year to discuss the project. Mr Innes also said that there is going to be a meeting with the acting Head Teacher Jennifer Macdonald at Mackie and other council officials to discuss siting the facility at the Academy.</p> <p>Nigel Don has also been contacted by the Sports Minister and wants a meeting with the STP and SDCC chairs. The UK sports minister has been in touch to find out what is going on.</p> <p>AN asked PB if the funds were secure, and PB said the Administration had agreed to it so they were there. There had however to be a business plan</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>for the all-weather pitch and that is where the STP perhaps has experience, which can help us work together with the SDCC.</p> <p>WE asked if we are looking at an all-weather pitch or that plus an enhanced sports facility. DS replied that if we could get only the pitch we would take that, but we were looking for more. If we had to settle for just the pitch now and more later then that was also a possibility.</p> <p>It was agreed that DS would invite a representative from the sports and leisure group which attended our February meeting to the next meeting.</p>	DS
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Health Check</b></p> <p>There were 3 forums last week and discussions took place in North Kincardine about the possibility of setting up equivalent of the STP – in that area which covers Newtonhill, Portlethen, Blairs and so on.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Business Plan Items</b></p> <p>CARAVAN PARK  FB gave feedback on the caravan park. Planning permission went through quickly. There was every possibility that problems with the lease could delay the start of the building work. The official opening was scheduled for next July, but with fair weather a May/June opening was possible.</p> <p>Area committee had agreed the necessary changes – PB said. And he had impressed on area manager the need for urgency. DF thought the leases were all but ready, with nothing controversial still to be finalised. Our solicitor is ready to go, but awaits the other two solicitors.</p> <p>DF said the Area Manager was prepared to issue a letter of comfort in the event of delays. There was consensus that we need to get that letter - to give Tony Barnett of the Caravan Club the reassurance that Aberdeenshire Council is willing to allow the Caravan Club to go on site on 29<sup>th</sup> October. DS said the Area Manager still thought the leases would be signed in time.</p> <p>DF suggested we just ask NOW for the letter of comfort rather than wait a few weeks. FB said the Caravan Club had not been idle – 3 of their staff had been on site last week and 5 were expected next week (re advertising) DS proposed we sought the letter now – carried.</p> <p>DS asked of there was an issue of the static caravans. DF confirmed the park closes on 26<sup>th</sup> October. All the static owners have been told they need to be gone by that evening. It has been clearly stated that come Monday 29<sup>th</sup> the park is a building site where access is impossible. DF has told everyone he can get in touch with. 1 is using Dee Valley. 3 think Dee Valley will help them. Do we need to check with Dee Valley ourselves? They have all had notice. 2 are going to park at home. 1 has not yet been contacted.</p> <p>8 have not replied. DF asked agreement to phone them tomorrow and it was agreed he chase them. FB questioned if this was really necessary but DF thought it appropriate to check there was no problem.</p>	<p>DS</p> <p>DS/DF</p> <p>DF</p>

	<p>There are 3 static caravans that we think are on site for this season only – the residents are going home at weekends. We don't think they will require next year. DF is to go and see them one weekday night.</p> <p>Ken has work to do and again he won't (possibly) be allowed there either from Monday 29<sup>th</sup>. For example the fire extinguishers to be removed. He doesn't want every one to arrive to move their static caravans at 4pm on Friday 26<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>FB thought Dee valley take statics off site – to Banchory Lodge over the winter. But site isn't going to be open at the normal time they would be returned. We need to assure them or ask them about these 5/6 vans who can't get off site as usual. DF will go down to Dee Valley to check - but at least the numbers are not large. Tony Barnett has already said that if part of site is ready they can use it.</p> <p>DF said that 7 have applied for next year and as of tonight we say they have got it. FB pointed out that we didn't put a closing date. DS suggested DF did his final calls and then we close for applications. We give them certainty on Friday 28<sup>th</sup>, and that gives Dee Valley some certainty with numbers too.</p> <p>WE asked if there is a contingency plan in case they are not removed? DF said legally yes in that they are liable for costs, but in practical terms the answer was no. WE suggested we discuss this with Dee Valley. DF was trying in advance to make sure we don't have a problem.</p> <p>In answer to a question about whether the STP was selecting the statics in the future it was confirmed that it is our responsibility to get the site clear. However if there are just the 7 applicants then DF has to inform the Caravan Club and ask them to accept them. It is our responsibility to make sure the site is clear.</p> <p><b>TOWN HOUSE</b> If the Council did work on the Town House they would have to go out to tender. If the STP did it then that would mean local tradesmen could be used. Specification is also an issue per DF – if it goes through property department it will be more complicated.</p> <p>There were the 3 options for how the work was done on what is a grade B listed building - the Council, the STP, or the North East Preservation Trust (NEPT).</p> <p>FB thought NEPT don't normally take over control – they just carry out the work and then turn it back to some other body.</p> <p>It was confirmed that STP is ready to take on this as a project, if asked.</p> <p><b>TOLBOOTH</b> Cressida Coats is chairman of the new SCIO. George Strang is the curator, Dennis Collie is treasurer. Visitor numbers – 11,000 plus the last 2 weeks so well on the way towards 12000. It has been a longer season than last year</p> <p>PFR</p>	<p>DF</p> <p>DF</p> <p>DF</p> <p>DF</p> <p>DF</p>
--	--	---

	<p>We have a list of suggestions. Perhaps Diane can finish that off, it can be turned into a report and then be presented with "what next".</p> <p>Phase 2 of PFR is to focus on the Old town – and will be held at the weekend on Friday 16<sup>th</sup>/ Saturday 17<sup>th</sup> November. That was clear of the school holidays.</p> <p>As far as a venue was concerned – Shepherds Hall, or MRI (WE thought it might not be available) or Sea Cadets. DF to investigate the various options.</p> <p>List of stakeholders – DF will produce a list but would everyone tell DF of anyone that needs an invite?</p> <p><b>SPORTS &amp; RECREATION</b> Under all weather pitch</p> <p><b>TOWN HALL BOOKING SYSTEM</b> IT spec issued for comment within the organisation. AM to be the project manager on that.</p> <p><b>STREET AUDIT</b> There will be an open meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October. DF has let people who has expressed an interest know already but will send out invitations. For discussion was What to do, Where to cover etc. Landscape services and road services from the Council are invited. Horizon had queried why they needed to come to a meeting.</p> <p>DS thought this street audit would feed into a BIDs project.</p>	<p><b>Diane</b></p> <p>DF</p> <p>DF</p> <p>Everyone</p>
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Constitution</b></p> <p>SCIO constitution AN had previously circulated version 6 which highlighted issues and had sent out v7 for responses by last Tuesday. Only response was from DS. 5 clauses to look at and further 5 to talk about too.</p> <p>Clause 4.4 to disburse funds...to individuals or bodies... an activity would be to do this from caravan park lease or whatever. New clause agreed</p> <p>Clause 5 DF to supply map but PB thought map was not required. PB said definition of ward and boundary is decided by electoral commission. So don't make map part of constitution. Agreed.</p> <p>Clause 35 Mechanics of EGM. How many need to ask for it. 5% (2 bodies too low?) PB would advocate 20% in line with the quorum. If numbers drop, this is crucial. Agreed 25% or 5 member organisations, whichever is higher.</p> <p>Clause 43 Quorum for AGM or EGM. 20% of total membership? DC thought no reason for same rules to apply. FB thought same rules – agreed, so 25% or 5, whichever is higher.</p> <p>Clause 58 Suggested 12 – agreed to go with that.</p> <p>Clause 59 board minimum number. 4 of which 3 elected. Agreed.</p>	

	<p>Clause 63 My elected councillor may attend and speak but not vote. Agreed.</p> <p>Clauses 68.2 and 68.5 need to be read together. At the Tolbooth Association – all the trustees resigned because it wasn't quite clear they could stay on. It is proposed that the initial trustees can stay on until the 2<sup>nd</sup> AGM (as it may be a short period – 3 weeks – before the first AGM) Agreed.</p> <p>Clause 95 quorum for board meeting – same as before. Agreed</p> <p>The next step is to consult members. The Constitution is therefore to be put on website and members invited to look at it there. PB suggested AN produce a summary to issue for comments in advance of agreement at AGM. The AGM is on 27<sup>th</sup> November so comments should be back by 1<sup>st</sup> week in November (AN to decide based on how long it takes him to make changes). So at AGM we ask for initial trustees . PB suggested all the existing trustees.</p> <p>PB took advice from Alan Thomson of CVS – there is no legal process to convert to a SCIO – so you need to wind up the old-co when possible. There is clause dealing with winding up in the constitution.</p>	AN
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>AOCB</b></p> <p>None</p>	
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>Tuesday 23rd October 2012 at 7pm in Resource Centre</p> <p>Following dates are: 27<sup>th</sup> November (AGM) 2013: 15th January and then 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday.</p> <p>DF – date of next meeting. 27 November AGM – Willie Munro to talk. DF to circulate draft agenda. FB is not going to be able to attend but is prepared to stand again.</p> <p>Social before Christmas MW</p> <p>First business meeting in 2013 -15 January.</p> <p><b>Meeting concluded at 9.30pm</b></p>	<p>DF</p> <p>MW</p>