



**STONEHAVEN & DISTRICT COMMUNITY COUNCIL  
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES**  
19:00 – 21:00 14 March 2023  
Meeting held in the Sheriff Court Buildings, Stonehaven

|   |
|---|
| <b>Present</b>  |
| <p><b>Community Council Members:</b><br/>David Lawman, <i>Chairman</i> (DL), Raymond Christie (RC), <i>Vice Chairman</i>, Ian Hunter (IH), Daniel Veltman (DV) <b>via Zoom</b>, Jim Stephen (JS), Andrew McHardle (AMcH) <b>via Zoom</b>, Steve McQueen (SMcQ), Alistair Lawrie (AL) <b>via Zoom</b>, Fiona Tavindale (FT), Caroline Evans (CE) <b>via Zoom</b>, Pauline Brindley (PB) <b>via Zoom</b></p> <p><b>Aberdeenshire Council Elected Members:</b><br/>Alan Turner (Cllr T), Wendy Agnew (Cllr A) <b>via Zoom</b>, Dawn Black (Cllr B)</p> |
| <b>In Attendance</b>  |
| Jane Cruickshank – <i>The Bellman</i> , Fiona Malcolm – <i>Minutes Secretary</i> , Scott Copland (SC) – <i>Aberdeenshire Council</i> , Jonathon Milne (JM) – <i>Director, FM Property</i> , Daniel Arrandale (DA) – <i>Development Manager EG Group</i> , Stuart Alexander (SA) – <i>Trustee - Stonehaven Tennis Club &amp; Recreation Grounds</i> , Norman McKay (NMck) – <i>Trustee, Stonehaven Bowling Club and Recreation Grounds</i> , Richard Holman-Baird (RHB) – <i>Rickarton Estate</i>  |

| 1 & 2    | Chairperson's Welcome   | Action |
|----------|---|--------|
|          | It was agreed to record the meeting on Zoom (to be deleted once minutes agreed).  |        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Apologies and Declarations of Interest</b>   |        |
|          | Apologies received from William Watson (WW), <i>Treasurer</i> , Janine Esson (JE), <del>Caroline Evans (CE)</del> , James Morrison (JM), Adam Cadamerteri (AC), Donald Lawrie Morrison (DLM), Julia Lawrie Morrison (JLM), Michael Ogden (MO), Sarah Dickinson (Cllr D), David Charnley, Police Scotland (DC) |        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Police Report</b>  |        |
|          | The Police Report had been circulated to all members in advance of the meeting.   |        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Bervie Braes – Update Engineering Report – Scott Copland (SC)– Aberdeenshire Council</b>   |        |
|          | SC explained there are two problem areas on the Bervie Braes – the slope and the carriageway. Straightforward remedial work will reduce the amount of surface water on the slope that has caused the most   |        |

|                 |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
|                 | <p>recent landslips. The cracks on the road surface will be monitored, and the road can be reopened to traffic. He expects the tender for the remedial work to be issued by the end of March, a contractor appointed in April, and work should begin in May.</p> <p>JS asked if the Land Train will be able to use the road again?</p> <p>SC said that the current weight restrictions will not be lifted, so coaches will not be permitted either.</p> <p>DL asked if anything could be done to improve the 'look' of the barriers as they are overgrown and covered with weeds?</p> <p>SC said these must remain in place as the slope is still unstable, but those at the top of the road could be reviewed.</p> <p>AL asked if they can be painted?</p> <p>SC agreed to take this back to colleagues in the Roads Department.</p> <p>DL thanked SC for providing the update.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>6</b></p> | <p><b>Ury Estate Master Plan – Update – Jonathon Milne (JM) – FM Property</b></p>   |  |
|                 | <p>DL introduced JM from FM Property.</p> <p>JM explained that the Master Plan included proposals to develop housing, retail, build a new link road and a golf course on the estate. The proposed link road goes from the Slug Road across the current Kirkwood Housing Development to the Netherley Road. FM Property have bought East Lodge House, and have planning consent to build the road. Contractors will be back on site April/May and the road should be complete next year. The road is a requirement for the retail site which is now ready for development. Hillcrest Housing Association will be responsible for building affordable homes. There will be a new golf course, it is hoped to have the groundwork for completed this year, with the course opening in 2025.</p> <p>The former Ury House is now wind and waterproof, the lower floors will be used as a club-house, upper floors will be developed into a wedding/event venue and bedrooms. There are three main housing development areas on the site, these will include a mix of residential and holiday accommodation. JM invited questions from the floor.</p> <p>IH asked about the weight limit on the link road as HGV traffic may use it?</p> <p>JM replied that they were required to meet the requirements of Aberdeenshire Council Roads Department.</p> <p>JC asked about the plan for the retail development?</p> |  |

|  |   |                      |
|--|---|----------------------|
|  | <p>JM said the retail development, which includes a filling station and 42,000ft2 supermarket – Morrisons have submitted a planning application for this.</p> <p>Fiona Stewart (member of the public) asked if there would be rugby pitches on the development, as there is a campaign to save Mill of Forest Park.</p> <p>JM confirmed the Rugby Club has been offered land free of charge, and is due to meet with them next week. The link road should be complete by the end of 2024, he was not in a position to comment on dates for the affordable housing development as this is being taken forward by Hillcrest Housing Association.</p> <p>Cllr T said if the golf course is opening in 2025, what about housing?</p> <p>DL asked if any of the new houses will be developed by Kirkwood?</p> <p>AMcA asked if there had been any conversations with Stonehaven Golf Club?</p> <p>JM said they hope to attract more golfers to the area. ING will operate the golf course. They are also in dialogue with Mackie Academy, and there will be links with the new Campus.</p> <p>JS asked if there will be any other facilities in addition to the hotel?</p> <p>JM replied that they hope to create more opportunities.</p> <p>JS said that time delays have held the town back, but that everyone wants the development to succeed.</p> <p>JM agreed many issues have been overcome, but now they have the green light to proceed.</p> <p>DL noted that there would be affordable housing on the development.</p> <p>Julie Lindeman (member of the public) said that some Kirkwood residents had previously expressed their concerns about the link road.</p> <p>JM said they are obliged to build the link road as a major component of the development.</p> <p>A member of the public noted the original proposed route for the road has been changed.</p> <p>Cllr B offered to check the details of the weight restrictions for the link road.</p> | <p><b>Cllr B</b></p> |
|--|---|----------------------|

|                 |  |                      |
|-----------------|--|----------------------|
|                 | <p>Claire (Ury Estate Resident) asked if planning permission for the road had been granted by the Scottish Government having been rejected both by the Community Council and Aberdeenshire Council.</p> <p>Cllr B asked her to e-mail her query and she will check the details.</p> <p>DL noted that planning approvals had been given, but it was important to ensure public safety, e.g. speed restrictions.</p>   | <p><b>Cllr B</b></p> |
| <p><b>7</b></p> | <p><b>AWPR – Stonehaven Roundabout – Proposed Service Station – Euro Garages</b></p>   |                      |
|                 | <p>DL invited Daniel Arrandale, (DA), Development Manager at EG Group, to address the meeting.</p> <p>DA explained that EG Group is a fuel retailing business with 6.5k assets across the world. A planning application for a retail development at the junction between the A90 and A92 was submitted to Aberdeenshire Council last week. This proposes a five-island forecourt, coffee drive-through, HGV parking, hydrogen re-fuelling points for HGVs and potentially cars, and ten EV fast-charging points. There is still a strong demand for traditional fuel, but it is anticipated that within 10-15 years, this could become a hydrogen/EV hub with up to 50 EV charging points. A sequential test is required by Aberdeenshire Council. Research shows that most users of the new facilities would be existing road users.</p> <p>IH noted this is a strategic site, an excellent place for long distance coaches to stop, as well as local public transport, but suggested EVs do not need to be sited there.</p> <p>DA agreed this was a valid point. They are not expecting many pedestrian visitors, but there is a possibility to accommodate coaches, they are prepared to look at this, subject to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>DL said it would be very good if a local bus stop or Park and Ride facility could be accommodated.</p> <p>DA said that the success of the EV market depends on the availability of fast-charging points, not as ‘stand-alones’, but with complimentary services alongside.</p> <p>JS asked what is Stonehaven getting out of it?</p> <p>DA said the main gain is employment opportunities arising from a £5m-£6m investment. He encouraged people to make their views clear via the planning process.</p> <p>JS said he had made the same point about the Ury Estate Development.</p> |                      |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>IH noted the need to plan for the future, for example self-drive buses.</p> <p>DL suggested the potential to include public bus stops at the proposed development should be added to the plans.</p> <p>DA said he would pass on these points to the design team, however public safety remains most important.</p> <p>Martin Anderson (member of the public) asked about 'bunkering' fuel and how many HGV vehicles could be parked overnight? He thought that eight was not enough, there should be capacity for at least 25.</p> <p>DA explained it was not economical to develop the site to accommodate that many HGVs.</p> <p>SMcQ asked about pedestrian access from the EV charging points to the drive through coffee shop?</p> <p>DA said the forecourt building will include facilities for drivers to access whilst their vehicles are recharging.</p> <p>AL asked how many jobs would be created, and how many would be made available for young people?</p> <p>DA said there would be around 80 employment opportunities, both full and part-time.</p> <p>AL then asked about access to the site for employees?</p> <p>DA said there are no plans to upgrade existing access, the current footpath is on the other side of the road.</p> <p>DL noted employers have a duty of care for staff accessing the workplace.</p> <p>DA confirmed there will be some dedicated staff parking allocated.</p> <p>A member of the public asked how many staff car park places would be available, thought the development is too small and will be of no benefit to the town.</p> <p>DA said there was no specific number of staff parking spaces set aside at present.</p> <p>JS asked when will there be a public consultation?</p> <p>DA confirmed there are no plans for a public consultation exercise, but that he would be happy to have a more in-depth discussion (with CCs) in a couple of weeks.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|                 |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
|                 | <p>DL reflected concerns had been raised about access and the size of the site (it not being big enough). However, for the local community, is it not better to have something rather than nothing? He asked, will it work, or does the SDCC not want it?</p> <p>DA said that the hydrogen fuelling points could be removed, but they want to include these in anticipation of future demand.</p> <p>DL suggested to CC members there are three options – they are happy, unhappy, or do not wish to pass comment on the planning application. What response did they have?</p> <p>Cllr B noted there is time to comment up until 14 April 2023.</p> <p>JS suggested he was broadly in favour, provided the developers take on board the comments raised at the meeting.</p> <p>DL clarified these related to public safety and access for coaches and local bus services.</p> <p>IH said he would not be supportive unless the public transport access is included.</p> <p>DL proposed deferring a decision until the next SDCC meeting? But on the whole he felt if some minor issues were addressed, SDCC would be supportive of the proposal.</p> <p>AL could see no disadvantages to the plan, felt the safety issues could be addressed, and if bus access was possible, there would be potential to use the retail development to promote Stonehaven's attractions.</p> <p>DL asked if EG Group could give a written update prior to the next SDCC meeting?</p> <p>DA confirmed he would feedback the points raised to the architects, and provide a full response to written queries submitted by SDCC Chairman.</p> <p>Cllr T noted there is time for CCs to review public comments on Aberdeenshire Council's Planning webpage.</p> <p>DL proposed CCs will meet in the next couple of weeks to discuss, meantime he asked for any comments to be passed to him via e-mail.</p> |  |
| <p><b>8</b></p> | <p><b>Planning Report</b></p>   |  |
|                 | <p><b>a) APP/2023/0217 – Installation of Air Supported Structure over Tennis Courts at Stonehaven Recreation Grounds</b></p> <p>DL said SDCC had a previous request from the Tennis Club to discuss this proposal, but at that time it had not been fully developed. He</p>   |  |

suggested he invite Stuart Alexander (SA) from the Tennis Club to provide an overview of the proposal, this was agreed by the meeting.

SA explained that, since 2016, the Tennis Club has been looking at the potential to develop indoor courts. The costs were too expensive to apply via Tennis Scotland. The recent Participatory Budgeting (PB) exercise had presented an opportunity, as there is a real need for facilities for younger people. The Club was under pressure to develop proposals for the PB application, and had a plan for a low impact, low energy conversion of two existing courts (adjacent to the Bowling Green and Club). Stonehaven Leisure Centre was also receiving PB financial support. PB successful projects were required to have plans in place by 31 January 2023. He said the Tennis Club has tried to keep everyone up to date, and there is a public consultation event at 3pm on Sunday 19 March 2023. He acknowledged there will be a visual impact on the edge of the Bowling Green as the proposed structure is large. Although bowlers were concerned about shading on the Bowling Green, CGI modelling had shown no real impact. The planning application is open for comment, 90% of current Tennis Club members are supportive of indoor courts.

DL invited comments from the floor.

Norman McKay (NMCK) said he was a trustee of both the Recreation Grounds and the Bowling Club. Bowling Club? Trustees had agreed the planning application could proceed subject to them seeing the plans first, this had not happened. The proposal is for a 9m high tent. Trustees had asked to see the CGI modelling, but this was the first time he had seen this.

There are a number of issues relating to the proposal:

- Flooding of the Bowling Green
- Noise and the potential impact on bowlers and caravan owners
- The loss of two caravans and pitches, and the subsequent impact on the Bowling Club's finances
- The loss of a well-used outdoor area, with the lease of the Bowling Club café having just been agreed.
- When consulted at the AGM, most people were unhappy with the proposal.
- The Bowling Club has not seen a Business Plan setting out running costs, and the potential loss of revenue from the loss of two caravans.
- Where is the rest of the funding coming from and are the (Tennis Club?) Trustees liable?

Recreation Grounds' revenue comes from the Bowling Club and its bars, and caravans. The Tennis Club is independent and doesn't contribute anything to the Recreation Grounds running costs.

DL asked for a show of hands to ascertain that most of the members of public in attendance were there because of the Tennis Club proposal,

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>and how many people had concerns, this indicated there were quite a number on both counts.</p> <p>He clarified SDCC can only comment on the Planning Application itself. It would seem the Tennis Club and the Bowling Club are not in agreement. Therefore it was difficult for SDCC, as whatever decision (i.e. to support the application, or not), would be against one side. However, he acknowledged there was lots of public support for the proposal via the PB voting process.</p> <p>IH noted as the Recreation Ground Trustees are responsible for the land, it is they who need to make a decision.</p> <p>AL felt it was premature for SDCC to make a decision, and that it would be good to see CGI for someone who was walking along the seafront and looking at the proposed structure.</p> <p>SMcQ noted there is a consultation event on Sunday 19 March. He asked about the 'shelf-life' of the structure?</p> <p>SA explained it would last for 25 years, it can be deflated, but this is not recommended, it comes down safely in the event of a power cut, and there is a similar structure in place at Kippie Lodge.</p> <p>Martin Anderson (member of the public) asked what were the proposed operating costs?</p> <p>SA said the Tennis Club is working on a Business Plan, including costs. He said this will be a community facility, and they are seeking 'in principle' planning permission in order to comply with PB timescales. The previous plan (to develop indoor courts) was more expensive, and there is a need to invest in the courts anyway.</p> <p>A lady (member of the public) said she was supportive, but until the divisions amongst trustees were settled, the PB funding might be used elsewhere.</p> <p>SA agreed that Aberdeenshire would 'claw back' the money if plans were not put forward.</p> <p>JS noted the current tennis court is 'end of life' and queried whether this is the right place for the proposed structure?</p> <p>SA said the Tennis Club has looked at the flood plans.</p> <p>JS said as there is no new land available, there is a need to make use of existing facilities. He asked is it affordable, and can the Recreation Grounds afford to lose revenue (should the proposal go forward)?</p> |  |
|--|---|--|



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>SA said there had been lots of discussions, there is a demand for indoor tennis, so the Tennis Club is trying to meet that demand. He felt the Recreation Grounds need to change and invest. He emphasised that people can make their comments on the Aberdeenshire Council Planning Portal.</p> <p>SMcQ asked if there was any flexibility within the PB timetable?</p> <p>SA noted that Aberdeenshire Council failed to meet its own time limits in terms of the Leisure Centre PB application and requirements.</p> <p>AL asked how many children would benefit from the proposal?</p> <p>SA confirmed 160 of the current 300 Tennis Club members are juniors, and there are also two full-time coaches.</p> <p>DL then invited Richard Holman-Baird (RHB), Rickarton Estate, to address the meeting.</p> <p>RHB explained his family owned the Rickarton Estate, and had given land and a 30 year lease to the Rugby Club 25 years ago. He suggested the Tennis Club and Bowling Club work together to maximise opportunities for extended space.</p> <p>He said Rickarton Estate may have further land to sell for development, so there is potential for the Tennis Club, as the Estate is open to suggestions from other (community/sports) groups.</p> <p>DL noted that, previously, most land released for development focused on house building, looking to the future it should be more than just housing.</p> <p>JS reflected a Sports Hub should be on the cards.</p> <p>DL asked RHB if he could formalise what is on offer (from Rickarton Estate to the community)?</p> <p>RHB agreed, but said he wants to ask the community what it wants so the (proposed development) plan is ready to go forward.</p> <p>IH asked RHB if he would join the Place Plan discussions?</p> <p>DL summarised it was difficult for SDCC to make a decision (about the Tennis Club Planning Application), but suggested SDCC needs to support both parties to work together.</p> <p>JC (The Bellman) highlighted that the planning application is about the proposed structure, not the organisations, she suggested SDCC needed to decide now (to support it or not).</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|           |  |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|
|           | <p>SMcQ said he was not supportive.</p> <p>DL suggested SDCC make no comment (on the planning application)?<br/>AL felt the SDCC was not in a position to make a formal comment.</p> <p>This was agreed by all SDCC members present.</p> <p><b>b) ENQ/2023/0210 – Formation of Electric Vehicle Charging Hub, Retail Units with Associated Car Parking, Servicing Landscaping and Access – New Mains of Ury, Stonehaven</b></p> <p>See Item 7. The 2<sup>nd</sup> public consultation about this proposal is on 30 March 2023 between 3pm and 8pm in Stonehaven Town Hall.</p> |           |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>Matters arising from Previous Minutes</b>   |           |
|           | <p>a) Stonehaven Flood Group–Feedback from SDCC/Flood Group meeting - deferred to next meeting</p> <p>b) Hannah Dyson Award &amp; Community Award<br/>AL confirmed five nominations have been received for the Hannah Dyson Award, these have been passed to SMcQ and JE to consider.</p> <p>c) Community Council Participation Request – a hybrid meeting will take place between 7pm and 9pm on 29 March.</p>  |           |
| <b>10</b> | <b>Approval of Previous Minutes (14 February 2023)</b>   |           |
|           | The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved by AL and seconded by IH.  |           |
| <b>11</b> | <b>SDCC Committees/Sub-Groups</b>  |           |
|           | <p>a) Local Development Plan/Local Place Plan<br/>DL proposed 27, 28 or 29 March for the next meeting and offered to circulate the agreed date by e-mail. (Post meeting note agreed date is 27<sup>th</sup> March)</p> <p>b) Invercarron Resource Centre<br/>RC has made progress and will give an update at the next meeting.</p>   |           |
| <b>12</b> | <b>Treasurer’s Report</b>  |           |
|           | The Treasurer’s Report was circulated prior to the meeting and was approved.   |           |
| <b>13</b> | <b>AOCB</b>  |           |
|           | a) AL offered to attend the next meeting of the Stonehaven & Portlethen Community Sport Hub group at 4pm on Thursday 16 March. AL said other SDCC members are welcome to attend too.   | <b>AL</b> |

|           |   |  |
|-----------|---|--|
|           | <p>b) DL noted that the timeline for the development of Dunnottar and Carronhill schools had been put back, this was confirmed by Cllr B. Cllr T noted the project was supposed to be completed by 2025, however the pre-construction phase will not be finished until next year.</p> |  |
| <b>14</b> | <b>Dates of Next Meetings</b>   |  |
|           | <p>Agenda Discussion and Planning Meeting – Tuesday 4 April 2023<br/>                     Next full SDDC Business Meeting – Tuesday 11 April 2023</p>   |  |