

**MINUTES OF THE 311th BUSINESS MEETING
OF THE
STONEHAVEN AND DISTRICT COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

HELD IN THE COWIE LOUNGE OF THE INVERCARRON RESOURCE CENTRE AT 7.00PM
ON TUESDAY 12th December, 2006

PRESENT:

David Fleming (Chairperson), Ian Balgowan, Peter Bellarby, Raymond Christie, James Cleves, Jane Davidson, Sarah Dickinson, Lynda Digney, Ian Hunter, Steven Hurrell, Michael Innes, Lyn Jardine, Lenny Lawrence, Isabel Parkes, David Wood.

Kincardine and Mearns Councillors: Jack Morrison, Mike Sullivan, Wendy Agnew

Minute Secretary: Sharon Hall

Also present:

2 members of the Press, 8 members of the public.

Item	Description	Action
1.	<p>Welcome, sederunt, apologies and declarations of interest Apologies were received from Ditta Neuman, Cllr George Swapp & Willie Munro</p> <p>Cllr Agnew stated a declaration of interest in regard to Item 5 & Item 7</p>	
2.	<p>Previous Minutes Item 9 No 8 - Vote on the Skateboard Park: Ian Balgowan asked that the minutes show the names of who voted in favour as well the abstentions.</p> <p>Approval: Proposed by Lyn Jardine. Seconded by Sarah Dickinson</p> <p>Matters arising and follow up of action items not dealt with elsewhere:</p> <p>a. Speed Limits (Glenury) Peter Bellarby advised that Mark Skilling is due to give a response to the Area Committee in January.</p>	Peter Bellarby
3.	<p>David Fleming asked Sarah Dickinson to take over the chair for the next item: Motion proposed by Raymond Christie: <i>“This Council will establish agenda meetings in accordance with paragraph 7.13 of the constitution which states ‘ Members may meet in private for dialogue on particular matters or for setting the agenda of formal meetings, not all members are expected to attend such meetings. The first agenda meeting will take place in February 2007 prior to the February 2007 business meeting.’”</i></p> <p>Raymond Christie stated that the agenda meetings had stopped six months ago, since when agendas had been too big and not been finished, important items missed and some agendas not adhered to. He felt agendas must have the input of all members and that full transparency is essential.</p> <p>Lynda Digney asked for clarification as to who makes the decisions about the agenda. David Fleming advised that he, as Chairman, oversees the agenda which he then discusses with the Secretary, Peter Bellarby. Items are included on request, providing they are submitted in time. Lyn Jardine opposed the motion. She stated that additional meetings would not make the agenda any more transparent. She personally would not be able to give any more time to her Community Council role.</p> <p>David Fleming also opposed the motion. He said that a pre meeting was not necessary to have an item included on the agenda. He acknowledged that the agendas had been very full but he felt that the required business had been dealt with appropriately. He apologised for any mistakes on past agendas which were entirely the responsibility of himself and Peter Bellarby, and were not due to “agenda management”. Members should contact either the Chair or Secretary as early as possible to request items to be included, or if there were any objections or queries once the agenda had been produced.</p> <p>Ian Hunter was in favour of agenda meetings as they ensured that priorities were not set by the</p>	

minority and also ensured absolute transparency. Peter Bellarby said that agenda meetings would not be transparent as the Press and public are excluded.

Raymond Christie cited an instance when he had asked for an item to be included but then had to ask for it to be brought forward on the night to ensure it would be included in discussion. In another instance he had put forward an item but it had not been included in the agenda. As a point of order David Fleming stated that this particular item had been submitted after the agenda had been produced. Raymond Christie pointed out that many issues on the current agenda were submitted either by David Fleming or Peter Bellarby.

Michael Innes stated that all members were free to submit agenda items to the Chairman or Secretary and he did not agree that separate agenda meetings were necessary.

Ian Balgowan suggested a compromise in that agenda meetings could be reinstated until the next AGM after which a decision could be made by members. Lynda Digney agreed with this suggestion as it would enable her, and other new members, to see how the meetings work and then to make an informed decision.

Raymond Christie agreed to amend his motion, by inserting the words “for a trial period of three months” after “This Council will establish.....”.

Motion proposed by Raymond Christie. Seconded by Ian Balgowan. Agreed unanimously.

4. **Future of Stonehaven Report – Sarah Dickinson**

109 people had attended the Town Hall meeting, including approx. 97 members of the public. A summary of the meeting had been circulated to members. [Note by Secretary: This will be mounted on the Community Council Web Site and will be available from the Secretary]

The following topics were discussed:

- Growth of the town. The preferred options were (i) Ury, (ii) Redcloak and (iii) East Newtonleys. However, these results need to be held in conjunction with the rest of the findings from the consultation. Issues such as amenity provision, improvement to facilities and the sense of community were deemed to be very important, along with the link of growth with developer contribution.

- New supermarket. The preferred options were (i) Field 52 (Ury Estate), (ii) East Newtonleys, (iii) Recreation Grounds. However, a high number were against East Newtonleys as an option at all. The Recreation Grounds area was chosen as an option by those who saw it as a means of protecting the retail centre of the town. On balance, there *was* a desire for a second supermarket in Stonehaven.

- Market Square and Town Hall

- Vandalism. Alcohol was identified as the most significant factor.

Overall, the meeting had been well attended and had provided good feedback. The Future of Stonehaven committee will meet again in the new year and will decide if further research is needed.

Jane Davidson felt that the public meeting appeared to have been very narrowly focused whereas the consultation had been very open. Sarah Dickinson said that the the meeting had deliberately concentrated on those areas that required further discussion and where there was no clarity as to the public viewpoint. She reiterated that the meeting had to be seen as one part of the whole consultation rather than “the final word” and it was necessary to use all the information gathered to inform future decision making.

Ian Hunter felt that the dynamics of the discussion groups at the public meeting had influenced the conclusions drawn by each group and he said it was a problem that the separate debates had not been heard by everyone. He also questioned why the supermarket issue had not been included on the website survey.

Lyn Jardine stated that that the consultation had been an organic, learning process and the methodology would continue to be developed.

5. **East Newtonleys**

Cllr Wendy Agnew left the meeting prior to discussion of this item.

- **Presentation by Harry McNab of Bancon Developments**

Revised proposals for a supermarket have now been submitted. These proposals meets a major criticism of the original application in that it is within an approved development area, on the land reserved for a business park. With regard to local impact it was noted that the Aberdeen shopping survey had shown that 75% of money spent by Stonehaven people is currently not

spent in the town. The proposed supermarket will have a projected income of £28M pa and will draw back approximately 50% of expenditure leakage. It will also have a continuing positive contribution to local employment. With regard to the impact on the town centre, this is estimated at only 10%, with only 2% impact on local stores and the main impact being on Somerfield. It is possible that conditions could be imposed on the type of goods allowed to be sold to mitigate any impact on local retailers. The competition would also have a positive effect in that the service provided by Somerfield would improve.

Other impact assessments have been considered:

Reports on road junctions, such as the one at Low Wood Road, have been adjudged satisfactory, as has the new roundabout planned towards the end of the dual carriageway.

The town bus service would be extended under an agreement reached with Stagecoach, and laybys and crossings would be provided for other bus services.

Cycle routes and footpaths would be provided to Braehead and Greenden.

Landscaping provision and buffer zones were outlined. The supermarket would fit into the landscaping already agreed for the Business Park.

Under developer contribution (planning gain) provision, the following areas would be covered:- affordable housing, town centre improvements, public transport, cycle/walking pathways and landscaping.

Seven alternatives sites were considered, as required by the planners, including the loop road (cemetery) site and the Recreation Grounds. All were mostly too small, whereas the East Newtonleys site runs to six acres.

- **Questions**

David Fleming reminded members that it was necessary for a decision to be made about the Community Council view on this application, a “holding letter” having previously been submitted to Aberdeenshire Council.

Jane Davidson asked if the land had already been purchased and was advised that the land is still owned by Dunecht Estates, who are joint applicants on the proposal with Bancon Developments Ltd.

Ian Balgowan questioned the provision of affordable houses. Harry McNab stated that the Braehead (Stewart Milne) development was the most likely site for this and the provision would probably be in conjunction with a Housing Association. David Fleming informed members that the term “affordable housing” generally means (i) smaller accommodation, (ii) part equity (iii) housing rented through a housing association.

David Wood asked for clarification about the size of the proposed supermarket and was advised that it would equate to three times the size of Somerfield.

Lenny Lawrence asked about those travelling by public transport from other communities such as Laurencekirk. There would be a long walk from the proposed laybys to the supermarket.

Steve Hurrell asked if buses might right go into the car park. Harry McNab advised this could be looked at, along with the possibility of free mini buses.

Ian Balgowan queried the idea that “expenditure leakage” would be improved by a new supermarket. Mr McNab stated that at least expenditure would be staying in Stonehaven and shoppers would be attracted from communities to the south. It might also have a positive effect on the town centre; for instance, the issue of car parking in the town centre would have to be addressed. With regard to traffic, the new application met the concerns previously raised - the car park spaces had been reduced to 300 and the new roundabout design would reduce any traffic flow problems.

Ian Hunter questioned whether the supermarket would keep any promises made about restriction on size and on the types of goods on sale. Harry McNab advised that, although the developers could not give any guarantees, the supermarket would not be any bigger than the current proposal, and the planning authority would take action against any abuse of constraint on use by the operators.

David Wood asked how the roads from the supermarket would link into other developments in the area. David Fleming reminded members that roads were not part of the current planning application and could therefore not be considered in the decision-making.

Sarah Dickinson referred back to the Future of Stonehaven consultation in which East Newtonleys came out as one of the preferred options for a new supermarket, but was also *not* favoured at all by 10% of participants. The main issues raised against this site were the impact on the skyline and the infill that would inevitably follow between the site and Braehead.

- **Decision**

Peter Bellarby proposed a motion opposing the supermarket development. He said that planning rules dictate that, in deciding the site of a new supermarket, the following should be considered:

- (i) Town centre sites (none available in Stonehaven)
- (ii) Edge of town sites (i.e. the existing Somerfield site, Recreation Ground area and possible sites going up towards the golf course)
- (iii) Other sites identified in the Local Plan
- (iv) Other sites accessible by public transport.

Referring to the consultation survey he stated that the Recreation Grounds was one of the preferred options and he felt that it would be possible to build a supermarket in this area without destroying the recreation facilities. Transport was also a major issue to consider. On the basis of the impact on the town centre, the need to look at other sites and the effect on transport the motion was put forward that: "This Community Council opposes the development of a supermarket at East Newtonleys".

Proposed by Peter Bellarby. Seconded by David Wood.

Members voting in favour: Ian Balgowan, Peter Bellarby, Raymond Christie, James Cleves, Ian Hunter, Lyn Jardine, David Wood.

Motion opposed by: Lynda Digney, Steven Hurrell, Michael Innes

Abstentions: Jane Davidson, Sarah Dickinson, David Fleming, Lenny Lawrence, Isabel Parkes
The motion was therefore carried.

7. Supermarket at Loop Road, Fetteresso, Planning Appeal (Item added to the agenda at the request of members)

David Fleming, Ian Hunter, Peter Bellarby and Sarah Dickinson are continuing to put together the S&DCC position, which was to oppose this application. This decision had been made by the previous Community Council members and was supported by the public view put forward in the recent consultation. The main issues included the proximity to the cemetery and to archaeological features, and the effect on retail trade in the town centre.

Lenny Lawrence stated that a previous survey carried out by the Tenants' Association was in favour of the proposed site and this view had not been taken into account. David Fleming asked him to search for those details and make them available. Ian Hunter proposed a formal motion to "reaffirm the position of S&DCC's view of this supermarket proposal, as previously outlined".

Seconded by Sarah Dickinson. The following voted in favour of the motion: David Fleming, Ian Balgowan, Peter Bellarby, Raymond Christie, James Cleves, Jane Davidson, Sarah Dickinson, Lynda Digney, Ian Hunter, Steven Hurrell, Michael Innes, Lyn Jardine, Isabel Parkes, David Wood.

Lenny Lawrence voted against the motion.

The motion was therefore carried.

Cllr. Agnew returned to the meeting at this point.

6. Midhill Wind Farm

This application proposes to add height to five of the turbines. This will result in minimal environmental impact or visual effect. Peter Bellarby therefore proposed a motion of "No Action". Seconded by James Cleves.

The following voted in favour of the motion: David Fleming, Ian Balgowan, Peter Bellarby, Raymond Christie, James Cleves, Sarah Dickinson, Lynda Digney, Ian Hunter, Steven Hurrell, Lyn Jardine, Lenny Lawrence, Isabel Parkes, David Wood.

Michael Innes voted against the motion.

Jane Davidson abstained.

The motion was therefore carried.

8. County Hotel Planning Appeals

Both current planning applications have been refused and the developer (Barratt's) had appealed both. However, David Fleming pointed out an anomaly in that the application for 27 flats is to go to a Public Enquiry whereas the application for 25 flats is to be decided by "Written submission". He is currently awaiting a legal opinion on this situation before taking the issue further.

**David
Fleming**

- 9. Meikle Carew Wind Farm**
 Peter Bellarby urged that, as this is partly in the S&DCC area, all members should look at the plans for the revised application so that this can be discussed at the January meeting. **All Members**
 David Wood asked when members would be given in-depth advice on wind farm policy, as had previously been discussed. David Fleming confirmed that at the January meeting he would arrange for discussion to focus on the principals of wind farms in general and on the Meikle Carew application specifically. **David Fleming**
 Peter Bellarby said he had written to all Community Councils in the Kincardine & Mearns Area to set up a joint meeting to discuss wind farms in general.
- 10. Sewage Upgrade Report**
 David Fleming, Peter Bellarby and Sarah Dickinson had attended a meeting with Scottish Water, Aberdeenshire Council and Horizon. Scottish Water is to produce a Method Statement and Communication Plan. Work at The Backies and at Cowie is due to start in January 2007 – the work will not be sequential but will start at the same time. There has so far been no opportunity given for public comment. Ian Hunter suggested that an exhibition at the Town Hall could be set up. There was discussion about the pipeline which is now to run the beach side of the sea wall rather than along the promenade. Sarah Dickinson stated that cost and maintenance issues meant that the pipe could not go across the bay; Scottish Water had advised that it would cost ten times more to do this and they did not have the resources of the large oil companies.
 The Scottish Water reports will be circulated once available.
- 11. Stonehaven Town Partnership**
 David Fleming had attended a meeting of the six organisations involved. The main issue was to clarify the chosen projects (Town Hall and Ambassadors Project) and identify the needs. Lenny Lawrence stated that the voluntary sector needs feedback and a copy of the minutes from the meeting. David Fleming will organise for this to be done. **David Fleming**
- 12. Strategy**
 The draft document (updated after the meeting of 7th November) has been circulated. David Fleming proposed that the strategy document in its current draft version should now be sent out to other organisations for comment. Seconded by Lyn Jardine. Agreed. [Note by Secretary: The draft document will be mounted on the Community Council Web Site and will be available from the Secretary.] **Peter Bellarby**
- 13. Christmas Tree**
 Peter Bellarby said that thanks were due to FM Developments for the provision of the Christmas tree and to Stonehaven Business Association for the lights.
- 14. Christmas Displays/Decorations Awards**
 The categories were community buildings, private houses and gardens, and shops and offices. James Cleve, Steven Hurrell and Isabel Parkes volunteered to be the judges. Raymond Christie suggested that it should be ensured that rural areas are also included.
Hannah Dyson Youth Award
 Raymond Christie advised this needs to be decided at the January meeting. There had only been one nomination from schools so far.
- 15. Royal Mail consultation**
 There had been no comments made about the collection and delivery times. Peter Bellarby therefore suggested there should be no action.
- 16. AOCB**
 Peter Bellarby asked to make a personal statement, as follows:
 “I wish to make a personal statement. There are two things I want to say. The first is to say that I have been selected by the Liberal Democrats as a candidate in next May’s election to Aberdeenshire Council. Secondly, I want to make it clear that there has been no party political

involvement in my role as community councillor. If there had been, there would have been party political meetings before our meetings; there have been no such meetings. As a community councillor I have acted myself by considering each issue on its merits, by considering what is good for Stonehaven and by considering what the people of Stonehaven are saying. I have not been slow to criticise Aberdeenshire Council, sometimes heavily. To take two examples, the stupidity and waste of money in erecting two bus stop signs where no buses whatsoever pass, and the launching of the new waste management scheme before the civic amenity site was up and running. As long as I remain a community councillor, I shall keep strictly separate my activities as a member of this community council and party politics.

Peter Bellarby. 12 December 2006 “

David Fleming commented on the difference between “political” and “party political”. Michael Innes questioned Peter Bellarby about his comments in the press opposing the Ury Estate development whilst being in favour of the restoration of Ury House. Peter Bellarby pointed out that these comments simply reflected the view of the Community Council.

Lyn Jardine advised that a new auditor will be needed next year.

There being no other relevant business, the meeting was then closed at 8:55 p.m.

17 The next business meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 9.