

**STONEHAVEN TOWN PARTNERSHIP  
MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING  
HELD ON 28 MAY 2013 at 7.00pm  
AT THE INVERCARRON RESOURCE CENTRE**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
1	<p><b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b></p> <p><b>Present:</b>            Doug Samways (DS)            Frank Budd (FB)            David Fleming (DF)            Alan McConachie (AM)            Michelle Ward (MW)            Alan Sutherland (AS)            Cllr Peter Bellarby (PB)            Cllr Graeme Clark (GC)            Cllr Raymond Christie (RC)</p> <p><b>In attendance:</b>            George Cameron            David Strang Steel            Lindsay Verstralen (LV)            Charles Sands (CS)            John Robson (Running Club)            Plus members of the public</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b>            Wynne Edwards (WE)</p>	
2	<p><b>STONEHAVEN MARINA</b></p> <p>George Cameron (Principal Civil Engineer, Harbours Structures and Roads at Aberdeenshire Council) addressed the meeting.</p> <p>GC: Last Tuesday we were given permission to assist the STP on setting up a feasibility study for setting up a Stonehaven Marina. The harbour is owned by the Council outright under the Harbours Confirmation Act of 1987, which means we own the harbour and the water around it. The only way we can divest ourselves of it is with an order, or by some sort of sharing programme.</p> <p>The basic process is that a business plan would need to be prepared by a third party – and that is normally a community-based thing. If the business plan indicates feasibility then we would move into an engineering options plan being prepared by the Council. In the first instance we would do a bathometric survey at our cost. We are not wasting any council money as that is something we would normally do in a harbour anyway.</p> <p>The basic numbers are that we are looking at generating an income from berthing fees of £150,000 to £250,000 per year. It would also generate two full time jobs.</p> <p>The current estimates on the marina are very “woolly” – we are looking at £3m - £5m as a baseline for that. It could go up to £5.8.</p> <p>There are some basic concepts that we have developed. As soon as we go beyond that, we would set up a steering group to work alongside an operational group.</p> <p>The technical expertise would come from the STAG group –environmental scoping, technical scoping, and producing the final option. That STAG group at all times would</p>	

<p>have cross representation into the steering group.</p> <p>The idea of the steering group is to get as many people and groups involved as possible – harbour users and local residents – to be as all inclusive as possible.</p> <p>The initial instance is a feasibility study and the engineering plan based on bathometrics – and until we get past that stage it is all just on paper.</p> <p>DS – from the STP’s point of view, there has been a suggestion that we have overreached our remit. I do not think we have, and it goes along with community asset transfer too. Our aim is to be point on contact and to coordinate growth and economic development – to prioritise, develop, and lead key projects. So STP’s remit fits wit a marina project. The paper passed at area committee was less than 2 pages long. Feasibility is mentioned 5 times. The only commitment is to a feasibility study and the possibility of drawing up a business plan. The marina is not planned and ready to be built. There would have to be normal planning procedures. When it comes to the steering group stage, there will be wider community involvement.</p> <p>DS – we have made an application to the coastal communities’ fund – part of which is the employment of a person to take this further. We are all volunteers and couldn’t do that. That is where we are. There is clearly a lot of interest.</p> <p>FB – said he saw comments in Leader and heard them. We should consider a public meeting like we held with the caravan site development. It is the lack of knowledge that causes problems. We should let everybody know the situation. I am not convinced a marina is right, but to not look at it would be a big mistake. It isn’t the STP’s decision – it is for the people of Stonehaven.</p> <p>DS – thought there wasn’t much to put into the public domain yet.</p> <p>DF – for the caravan site there had been a broad structure of how to go forward. There were no detailed plans and the Caravan Club was not involved at that stage.</p> <p>AS - But a meeting was held and we could learn from the way it was held.</p> <p>DF –Yes, the plans were still fluid and we had to have it at that stage.</p> <p>DF – can I just ask George? There are problems. Doing nothing is not an option in that there are problems in the harbour at the moment?</p> <p>GC – at the moment we still need to look at the three end caps of the three piers – that is a capital project. A new marina would address that. The harbour is not making money at the moment – it is deficit funded. Banff marina was smaller and went revenue positive in 3 years although that did not cover the big capital work. The capital funding for the marina would need to be dealt with separately.</p> <p>DS – Could I ask the councillors here if this is this part of core council business?</p> <p>PB – we have not declared the harbour to be non-core, in the way the caravan park was</p> <p>MW – could I ask how much the loss is?</p> <p>GC – Stonehaven loss is £20,000 - £25,000 pa</p> <p>AS – we would get a 250 boat marina and lose a bit of beach. Is there an optimum size?</p> <p>GC – have to achieve core capital – 10 times anticipated income – which is some £1.5m – £2.5m and then grants up to 100% of the potential cost - so looking at a 50% grant being required. The plan we drew up concentrates on core business at the</p>	
--	--

	<p>moment. We did not concentrate on the 10-15m visiting vessels. The big core number of boats is in the 6-8 metre range, so that would retain the current customer base. People that are there all the time are the best – not just the 3-day foreign visitor. All of the harbours in Aberdeenshire have an 85% - 90% local base with 15-10% from Aberdeenshire. We don't have a lot of boats from the South. So for Stonehaven you are looking at an Aberdeen to Dundee draw. And there is a waiting list. And there is a waiting list in Banff too.</p> <p>DS But the only proposal we have had is to arrange a public meeting at a suitable time. This was agreed.</p> <p>AS referred to a German magazine – the whole article of 5 or 6 pages about what women want when they come to a Scottish harbour. Who are we likely to attract and why. And could we fund it?</p> <p>GC that is the "secondary income" from the harbour. There is anecdotal evidence from the South that quayside house prices double and it is a generator for the town with more people visiting. But the extent of that was something that wasn't checked i.e. the visitors (not harbour users) who walk around in Banff, so we are not sure.</p> <p>Lindsay Verstralen – Visit Scotland raft of figures on the economic benefit of leisure sailing. But there is money there and it is being spent.</p> <p>DF – so are you suggesting a survey this summer?</p> <p>GC – yes, it is a good feed to the business plan</p> <p>MW – does the harbour master do that already?</p> <p>GC – no.</p> <p>DS – so we have another proposal for a survey of visitors along these lines. We are already going to carry out a survey of visitors to the castle, and it might be possible to combine them. Yes, agreed.</p> <p>The meeting was then opened up to members of the public and a wide-ranging discussion followed.</p> <p>Parking has to be part of the consideration at the end of the day. Not listening to local knowledge will lead to problems. If the harbour is full where do the Sea Cadets go? The timescale is perhaps 3 months for the business plan and 6 months for the bathometrics, with Banff having taken 3 years from feasibility to completion. The pricing of berths would be important (perhaps £600 - £1,200pa), which current users would oppose. It could generate interest and life in the area.</p>	
	<p><b>DAVID STRANG STEEL</b></p> <p>DS introduced Mr Strang Steel as a developer keen to talk to us, but stressed that this was not part of any formal consultation.</p> <p>Mr Strang Steel said he had been involved with Field 52, but Transport Scotland had now acquired that for fast link junction. The Council invited bids for next local development plan, which had to be lodged by 26<sup>th</sup> March. A new main issues report is going to be published in October, to be followed by various options and consultation. We put in two separate bids, which may not yet be visible on the council website, but a presentation is planned for Stonehaven in August/September.</p> <p>The New Mains of Ury South bid is for a supermarket (4,300sqm with 340 parking spaces), a filling station (roughly where the existing farm buildings are on the corner</p>	

<p>as you begin to go up the road), a restaurant and 60 bed hotel, houses and 51 allotments plus 3 community allotments (which could be extended) That is the extent of Bid 1.</p> <p>The developers said they would be happy to stick with that but in the last development plan the reporter said Stonehaven needed more housing to support a supermarket. Mr Strang Steel said he did not agree that was necessarily the case. However if the council want housing, there could be one part or two parts</p> <p>New Mains of Ury North is a further separate bid for 135 house plots. (112 plots in field where daffodils were). Added to that would be commercial / office type land. So put the two together and the combined proposal is for 240 houses, and offices with 213 car parking spaces.</p> <p>The developers have been in touch with retailers and house builders who are potentially interested. One individual (oil company) who set up business 4/5 years ago and now employs 100 wants a site to employ the 1,000 people in his business plan - and would love to be in Stonehaven as he comes from the area. He would want to build a Maclaren style oil company HQ building 4 – 5 metres high cut into the landscape.</p> <p>The street lighting associated with the AWPR Fast Link will radically change the Megray valley. The area drains into the Cowie rather than the Carron. Any development draining into the Carron would have to be questioned, suggested the developer.</p> <p>This is the gateway junction into Aberdeen and the fast link is going to be a "game changer" for people's perception of the junction. To make the most of it as a junction, as the gateway, it needs to be capitalised on.</p> <p>The proposed supermarket is slightly bigger than Tesco in Banchory, Sainsburys in Garthdee is 5,500 sqm. There is an element of brown field.</p> <p>AS – said we want to see town go forward, but does a big supermarket suck the life out of the town.</p> <p>Mr Strang Steel thought there was 75% - 80% retail leakage now. We would have thought that a food store in Stonehaven would mean shoppers are more likely to get hair done and go to café in town centre rather than go to Aberdeen. Some shops will be affected, but 200 jobs would be created in supermarket let alone the industrial site – so that has got to be good for the town.</p> <p>DF agreed the town needs a supermarket. But it needs business premises for small businesses as well as a larger one. So a business park would be preferred to an industrial site. He would support that. The Reporter's linkage to houses is spurious.</p> <p>DS referred to Chapelton of Elsick, and asked if the supermarket would draw custom from there?</p> <p>The developer thought yes, and from Laurencekirk and maybe even Westhill, so it could actually draw people into the town.</p> <p>MW – who are you looking at as a retailer?</p> <p>The developer said Sainsburys had it on their agenda, there is no feedback yet from Tesco, and Asda and Morrisons have not been spoken to yet. Last time Sainsburys might seem to have been preferred. Waitrose don't plan to come this far north any time soon. The developers have not spoken to M&amp;S either although it may be too big for them.</p> <p>The discussion was then opened up to members of the public.</p>	
---	--



	<p>TOWN HOUSE / CLOCK TOWER and COASTAL PATH DF wanted to thank Brian Ward – all very positive report on progress with the clock tower.</p> <p>AS – Cowie path? DS advised that the path may need diverted nearer the road? AS – I don't see how they could not open it to that point. DS – they might need to move it. There is a reference to people going through the barriers. Aberdeenshire council has applied through CCF for funding for the entire path.</p>	
5	<p><b>NEW DIRECTORS</b></p> <p>John Robson – founder member of the Running Club was in attendance as a prospective director and his input has been very valuable in discussions. Before he could be a director he needed to be nominated by a member group, so the Running Club should complete and return the website form to become members.</p> <p>It was agreed to co-opt Lindsay Verstralen as a member.</p> <p>DS –said that David lawman had advised the he felt it unlikely he would have time to commit to STP.</p>	<p>JR</p> <p>DF/CHS</p>
6	<p><b>FINANCE (CS)</b></p> <p>CHS presented draft accounts for last year.</p> <p>CHS to speak to Lesley Macdonald about her continuing to prepare statutory accounts.</p>	<p>CHS</p>
7	<p><b>REPORT FROM DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS (WE)</b></p> <p><b>WEBSITE / EMAILS (WE)</b></p> <p>There was no report.</p> <p><b>FEEIN MARKET (DF)</b></p> <p>A rota would be needed for the day, and a number of people were not going to be available. The presentation could be running on a loop.</p> <p>FB to bring caravan lead. AS would come and help if he can. Two people were needed for the middle of the day AM could help in the morning. MW was around. AS in middle of the day. DS and AM to finish off at 4pm.</p> <p><b>RECREATION GROUNDS (DS)</b></p>	
8	<p><b>REPORT FROM DIRECTOR OF STRATEGY (DS)</b></p> <p><b>FORDOUN VILLAGE HALL – MR RUNCIE</b> DF advised that Geoff Runcie, who was involved with Fordoun village hall development and came up against one or two problems, wanted help. DS put Geoff in touch with communities' hall sub group and DS wants to invite to next meeting.</p> <p>AS – he would be a useful asset. He used to be chief exec of Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce? MW – what is he asking for? AS basic stuff – he doesn't even know who owns the hall.</p>	<p>DS</p>

	DS – so invite along next time	
9	<b>BUSINESS PLAN ITEMS (REPORT ON PROGRESS OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS)</b>	
	<p><b>QUEEN ELIZABETH CARAVAN PARK – NEGOTIATION RE NORTH WEST BOUNDARY</b></p> <p>DF advised that the Caravan Club’s current plan was to open on 14<sup>th</sup> June. Wardens Richard Walker and wife Maggie are about and very full of initiative – they are already repairing things! Some weekends later in the year are already full, which is an incredible change from previous years.</p> <p>As far as the North-West boundary is concerned there was a meeting 2½ weeks ago – DF, FB and WE + Tony Barnett and 4 council officials were there. The council were immediately defensive, saying that they thought they were in the right.</p> <p>A suggested dog walking path outside the boundary was agreed (in theory) by the council. They will plant some seeds and some trees to replace the ones already taken down. Tony Barnett had photos and wanted like for like replacement. Willie Munro provided informal notes of the meeting. These were incomplete but 2 things were included - dog walking and seeding before opening. The Caravan Club has to build fence to stop campers going near the slope – a wise temporary precautions. And it was hoped (but not agreed) that the council will put in some shuttering on the southern half of the boundary to create some tent pitches.</p> <p>However DF said he received a phone call at 5.55pm today that goes against spirit of what was agreed, saying “Can we see seeds and diagram of dog walking path?” “That would delay matter further” was the reaction – but DF felt he had to step back rather than raise the temperature at all.</p> <p>FB – the council have also taken away noise screening by what they have done.</p> <p>DF – despite a request that they keep us informed, we have heard nothing. The Chief Executive knows what is happening and they will be in a position to do something by next week. Wardens know that wild flower seeds have been planted. There is great resistance to doing anything about the shrubbery. Willie Munro had told officers to keep us informed, and they have not done so.</p> <p>Tony Barnett has a good reason to be hostile. However he remained conciliatory as the meeting went on. But he needs shuttering etc. (which will cost tens of thousands) and if they do it he will take a hit on it.</p> <p>The council then said “If you want cash, it has to go to the insurers”. DF said we had to bite our tongues. FB thought they should now be looking at the cheapest way out rather than a “no cash” option.</p> <p>DF said the phone call did not give him any encouragement. The dog walking path is not part of the discussions with the chief executive. It could be part of the town / community rather than caravan park. In all, it was a fractious meeting.</p> <p>DF thought DS needed to phone the Chief Executive – things that had been agreed were not done, communication zero, and there was a reluctance to come to solutions as agreed. The Caravan Club and we were willing to take hits on things but in the end they have caused the CC to be in breach of contract and planning permissions. We will have to alter the lease to change the boundary.</p> <p>AS thought this came down to process, and we are still looking at that. Has an escalation been threatened?</p> <p>DS - We previously agreed not to send a solicitors letter.</p>	

	<p>DF suggested we should not do anything until caravan park was open. Nothing can be done after they are open. If no works are done by 14<sup>th</sup> June we (and the caravan club) will take this further.</p> <p>FB – we thought everyone was acting in good faith.</p> <p>MW – if this goes to litigation, the Caravan Club will sue us and we will bring in the council. That will make it impossible to find a corporate investor in the future.</p> <p>FB – if they start to quantify it – taking the screening in – it will be much more than £70k. Get the lawyers involved and it will escalate.</p> <p>Cllr Christie advised that he had received an email from Willie Munro a couple of weeks ago. The contract included restoring the pavement.</p> <p>Cllr Clark was disappointed; the wardens will help so from that point of view it will be magnificent. If it has to be through the lawyers after 14<sup>th</sup> then that is what it has to be. But the priority is to get the park ready for the 14<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>DF said the seeding, and planting of some trees, and the dog walking area should be in train already.</p> <p>AS asked if there was a Minute of the meeting.</p> <p>DF said they did not do a proper minute. The Caravan Club will put in 2 gates and dog walking bins.</p> <p>DS asked Cllr Christie and Cllr Clark to attempt to progress matters, and then he will follow it up?</p>	DS
	<p><b>ALL WEATHER FACILITY (DS)</b></p> <p>Officials are now being appointed. There is limited time so the likely result is a “pitch” at one of three sites - Mineralwell, Forest Park (late entrant) or Mackie Academy – and then developing the building part at a later date.</p> <p>DS said getting the right type of pitch was important but there was a disappointing lack of interest from clubs in the town which might benefit.</p> <p>Cllr Clark thought we needed a decision on whether redevelopment plans at Mackie meant it was not available. Hopefully the Council’s report we get back will clarify that.</p> <p>DF – said the next meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> June is an open meeting, for agreement on the constitution and the office bearers. At leisure centre. Clashed with community engagement meeting. DS is to chair it.</p> <p>Lindsay Verstalen – thought companies like Hunter Construction could offer advice.</p> <p>DS is to report back on that meeting.</p>	
	<p><b>TOWN HOUSE / CLOCK TOWER (DS)</b></p> <p>This is now proceeding quickly. The Area Committee report was very positive.</p>	
	<p><b>STREET AUDIT / IMPROVING OUR TOWN CENTRE (DF)</b></p> <p>MW and DF are working on a list of jobs and working parties, and need to get together to contact the owners.</p>	

	<p><b>PLANNING FOR REAL – RESULTS / PUBLICATION OF DRAFT ACTION PLAN (DF)</b></p> <p>DF reported the results of the exhibition. There were 350 comments by not far short of 100 people. The data has been analysed, and the community action plan expanded. It is a bit rough and ready but Maureen will do more work on it. DF will provide material but it is very much in draft.</p> <p>DF will also send around a spreadsheet suggesting who the “owner” of each issue might be and what can be done about it. Some of the suggestions have already been done as they were originally from last year.</p> <p>The highest are for the roads dept (53/205). – e.g. from Beach Road to David Street creating a 3<sup>rd</sup> lane for turning traffic. Leisure Services also own a number of issues. Maureen can help to find to whom a number of jobs belong to.</p> <p>It was suggested that the final report be sent out to everyone in the town. The cost would be £1,000 for printing and £500 postage but this would be an exceedingly good exercise. Maybe a further column could say why certain matters can’t be tackled?. DF sought approval of spending of those funds.</p> <p>DS – suggests where that can be done electronically it should be (e.g. though Stoney Voice), and a working copy is to be sent though the directors.</p>	DF
10	<b>BUSINESS ITEMS</b>	
	<p><b>CONSTITUTION / SCIO APPLICATION</b></p> <p>SCIO – timing. It might take 6 months for the SCIO to be approved. DS is waiting for feedback. Andrew Newton thought it might be quicker, as the Tolbooth went through in one month.</p>	
	<p><b>DISBURSEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR QECP INCOME</b></p> <p>We will know at the end of June what other funds are available. Meantime we can’t spend them (e.g. on Marina environmental impact assessment) or we won’t get them back.</p>	
11	<p><b>AOCB</b></p> <p>MW the cost of the train is £10k – for hire, transport and insurance. On top of that we (STP?) need to employ 3 part time PSV drivers doing 20 hours per week. £10,500 is already pledged in sponsorship, and further people wanting to sponsor more weeks. We are not sure of the additional diesel costs, but the train might only do 5 miles / gallon. We are awaiting written permission from police to apply through VOSA.</p> <p>FB thought we should quantify STP’s exposure, but MW confirmed she would underwrite so there was no risk.</p> <p>It was suggest the train runs through July, August and September, if we get permission. It would run 7 days and MW suggested a flat fare. The STP should decide on fares to cover wages and fuel, and there would not be much time, but we could make that decision be email.</p> <p>MW – need to cover diesel and drivers wages from the fare. 36 passengers. What is occupancy rate?</p>	

	<p>The route would be the castle, harbour, Allardice street, pool, Cowie and the Caravan site. It would travel at 10mph on the road!!</p> <p>MW to crunch numbers as soon as possible, consider the drivers' employment and – email the proposals.</p> <p>OTHER BUSINESS FM Developments can get 10 minutes at 7.30 during the next meeting</p> <p>The Harbour Festival is on 25<sup>th</sup> august.</p> <p>The Tourism Group brochure is starting to fall into place – with 3/4<sup>th</sup> adverts so not looking for funding from STP.</p> <p>DF has received a valuation notice for caravan park, but it is still classed as a building site so the valuation is zero.</p> <p>The Council has not invoiced the caravan park rent yet.</p>	MW
12	<p><b>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS – 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of the month</b></p> <p>Future meetings are on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25 June 2013</li> <li>• 23 July 2013</li> <li>• 27 August 2013</li> <li>• 24 September 2013</li> <li>• 22 October 2013</li> <li>• 26 November 2013 (AGM followed by brief directors' meeting)</li> <li>• No meeting in December, then back to 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday from 28 January 2014 onwards</li> </ul> <p>Meeting ended: 10.00pm</p>	