



**STONEHAVEN & DISTRICT COMMUNITY COUNCIL
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES**

19:00– 21:00 Wednesday 3 July 2024

Meeting held in the Sheriff Court Buildings, Stonehaven

Present		
Community Council Members: Caroline Duguid (CD), David Lawman, <i>Chairman</i> (DL), Denise Bannerman (DB), Ian Hunter (IH), James Stephen (JS), Julie Lindeman (JL), Michael Ogden (MO) <i>Treasurer</i> , Norman MacKay (NMcK), <i>Vice Chairman</i> , Steve McQueen (SMcQ)		
Aberdeenshire Council Elected Members: Alan Turner (Cllr T), Dawn Black (Cllr B) via Zoom , Sarah Dickinson (Cllr D) via Zoom .		
In Attendance -		
Jane Cruickshank, <i>The Bellman</i> , Fiona Malcolm, <i>Minutes Secretary</i> , Tim Stevens, <i>Area Manager, Aberdeenshire Council</i> , Gillian Wood, <i>Live Life Aberdeenshire</i> , Alan Rae, <i>Live Life Aberdeenshire</i> , Tricia Gordon, via Zoom .		
1 & 2	Chairperson's Welcome and Rollcall	Action
	DL welcomed everyone to the meeting, including those who were attending via Zoom.	
3	Apologies and Declarations of Interest	
	Alistair Lawrie (AL), <i>Secretary</i> , Daniel Veltman (DV), Fiona Tavindale (FT), Janine Esson (JE), Raymond Christie (RC), Sarah Dickinson (Cllr D), Wendy Agnew (Cllr A)	
4	Stonehaven Leisure Centre – “Live Life Aberdeenshire” Re-opening Update and Proposed Name Change	
	Four Community Councillors visited the Leisure Centre on 1 July, DL said it was looking good. He welcomed Alan Rae (AR), Service Manager Operations, and his colleague, Gillian Wood (GW) from Live Life Aberdeenshire and invited AR to address the meeting. AR explained that £1.4m from the Participatory Budgeting (PB) fund had been 'topped-up' by with an additional £0.4m by Aberdeenshire Council. The refurbishment is almost complete, he hopes the building will open to the public on 22 July. The swimming pool will open on 7 September when the Outdoor Pool closes for the season.	

<p>In order to align with the Wellbeing and Place Based Approach policies, AR suggested the Leisure Centre might be re-branded as a 'Wellbeing Centre'. He offered to send a link to a video about Wellbeing, made by colleagues in Peterhead.</p> <p>DL said he and the three other Community Councillors were impressed with what they saw during their recent visit as the building looks great. However, expectations relating to the availability of expanded space, including storage facilities, were high. Given £1.4m has been spent on new changing rooms and upgrade of the Games Hall, he felt the refurbishment did not represent Value for Money (VFM). He thought a breakdown of project spend would be useful.</p> <p>AR said it was useful for the Comms team to have this feedback about how PB had been spent.</p> <p>TS clarified the total project budget was £1.4m, the amount of PB was less than this.</p> <p>SMcQ asked about budget set aside for raising the height of the building, and adding windows. If not spent on these, where had the money gone?</p> <p>AR said £7k had been allocated to installing a new window, however, the builders had concerns about the safety of the walls. This would also require moving the pool cover. Any underspend (of PB) would be re-allocated to the next PB project.</p> <p>SMcQ also commented that the door for the Disabled Changing Room is in the wrong place.</p> <p>NMcK felt lots of local groups will be disappointed as there is nothing new in the Leisure Centre.</p> <p>TS said there is significant additional new space in the building.</p> <p>JS was very happy as the facilities are new, however, storage facilities for local clubs remains a problem. The Gymnastic Club is looking at storage options outside Stonehaven. Rhythm and Dance, and The Lions' Den already use private space for their activities.</p> <p>AR said LLA will try to help these clubs, there are conversations to be had.</p> <p>JS was not supportive of the 'Wellbeing Centre' suggestion.</p> <p>IH was concerned there is no proper interface between LLA and the community, and suggested there should be a formal arrangement.</p>

	<p>GW confirmed that LLA plans to engage at an early stage with users to seek feedback about the new facilities and programme of activities.</p> <p>JS felt the community needs a say, 'Wellbeing' is LLA's agenda, not the community's.</p> <p>DL recalled that previous engagement with the community was formal, something similar is needed, as people feel they are not being listened to, but they need to be involved.</p> <p>SMcQ also thought that 'Wellbeing Centre' as a name doesn't work as people don't know what facilities are available, and there needs to be clarity about this.</p> <p>JS felt there was nothing left in the town, the Leisure Centre was the only remaining facility, he was still furious about the loss of Invercarron Resource Centre, and wanted what is best for Stonehaven.</p> <p>IH highlighted the lack of community involvement before the decision was made to close the Mackie Academy pool.</p> <p>DL summarised the discussion. Whilst there was no consensus about the proposed name, 'Wellbeing Centre', use of the term in the tagline would be acceptable. A breakdown of project costs, and how any underspend has been reallocated to other PB projects would be useful. He thanked AR, JW and TS for their contribution to the meeting.</p> <p>JS asked LLA to ensure people are aware of the public toilets at the Leisure Centre.</p> <p>GW said LLA will be happy to show people around the building once they have the keys.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>SSEN Hurlie (Fetteresso Forest) 400kV Substation – SDCC Response to SSEN's 2nd Pre-Application Consultation (PAC)</p>	
	<p>DL advised there had been consultation events in June. He suggested SDCC's response will remain the same as before. A draft of a composite response (from all Community Councils representing the affected areas) had been circulated to all members.</p> <p>MO felt that SSEN had responded well to queries raised at the consultation event in the Town Hall. He acknowledged there is a limit to the amount of power that can be transmitted either underground or sub-sea. However, he was concerned about the concept of generating more electricity here in NE Scotland to be sent south, and suggested a need to oppose any proposal for a second sub-station.</p>	

	<p>CD disagreed as the scale of the whole project is unknown, and suggested England build their own renewable power.</p> <p>DL clarified that this consultation relates to SSEN's proposal for the Hurlie Sub-station.</p> <p>MO suggested focusing on what is coming down the pipeline and opposing proposals for a second phase.</p> <p>DL reminded the meeting a response to SSEN must be submitted by 22 July. He suggested that, if concerns remained the same the original SDCC response be re-submitted, and the composite Community Council response be progressed. He also encouraged anyone with individual concerns to raise these directly with SSEN.</p> <p>IH wondered if overall power rests with the Scottish Government or the UK Government?</p> <p>SMcQ asked if there were any new concerns or are these the same as before?</p> <p>MO clarified that the National Grid holds overall responsibility, and answers to the UK Government.</p> <p>In summary, DL said the original response will be re-submitted, and work to finalise the composite Community Councils letter will continue.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>APP/2024/0962 – Erection of Retail Store, Electric Vehicle Charging Hub and Class 3 Café /Restaurant with Associated Car Parking, Servicing, Landscaping and Access</p>	
	<p>DL reminded the meeting that the Developers had delivered a presentation to SDCC at the May meeting. SDCC had been supportive of the planning application, except for concerns about the lack of facilities for long distance buses. A letter from a member of the public opposing the planning application had been circulated to all members earlier. He also noted that 966 local people had responded to the Local Place Plan survey, over 80% of respondents wanted a new supermarket in Stonehaven. Based on this, SDCC supported the proposed development, and SDCC comments applied to the whole planning application.</p> <p>JL said the town desperately needs a supermarket, SDCC would lose credibility if it didn't support the proposal.</p> <p>DB agreed, to withdraw support would be a backward step.</p> <p>MO was worried about the residents of cottages adjoining the site, and the traffic implications for using the recharging points, otherwise he was supportive.</p>	

	<p>JL asked about the Ury Estate site (for a proposed supermarket).</p> <p>DL said he understood there would be no progress at Ury Estate until the link road is complete. He invited Mr Forrest, a local resident who lives next to the planned development, to address the meeting.</p> <p>Mr Forrest had a general concern about the increased traffic, he recognised the need for a new supermarket, however his specific concern was about the lack of detail of the architect plans and drawings.</p> <p>DL noted that detailed plans are now available on Aberdeenshire Council's website. Alternatively, it is possible to ask to see them, he suggested asking questions of the relevant officials. He pointed out that the majority of people who currently access supermarkets outside Stonehaven already drive around the roundabout to get to them. However, he fully understood the comments raised by Mr Forrest.</p> <p>JS asked if the Developer has spoken to local residents?</p> <p>Mr Forrest replied there had been no dialogue since February 2023.</p> <p>Cllr B said that any issues relating to roads will be considered by the relevant departments and teams within Aberdeenshire Council, including Planning. She confirmed that the proposed Morrisons development depends on the link road being completed. She is due to meet with Ury Estate in the coming week, and will feedback any updates to SDCC.</p> <p>DL advised Mr Forrester to raise his specific concerns through the formal planning process.</p> <p>JC suggested he request a meeting with the appropriate Planning Officer.</p> <p>In summary, DL said the SDCC supports the Planning Application, as SDCC must represent the views of the wider community. However, he proposed SDCC ensures the Developer is aware of local residents' concerns, and urge them to consider these and alleviate where possible. IH seconded this proposal.</p>	
7	Approval of Previous Minutes (11 June 2024)	
	<p>These were proposed by SMcQ and seconded by IH.</p>	

8	AOCB	
	<p>a. DL asked for an update on the Stonehaven Town Bus service. Cllr T said this was still being considered. The current five-year contract is being re-tendered, and preferred bidders are being selected.</p> <p>b. DL reminded all members of the forthcoming Community Council elections. Nominations will open on 19th August and close on 9 September, with the inaugural meeting of the new community council expected to take place in October:</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: The “Inaugural Meeting” of the new Community Council shall take place on the 23rd September and the first full “Business Meeting” is expected to take place in October (TBC at the “Inaugural Meeting” by the new Community Council.)</p> <p>c. JS noted the number of tour buses coming into the town. He felt the need to be proactive and wondered if there was merit in inviting all interested parties, including Stonehaven Business Association and Stonehaven Town Partnership to meet to discuss. DL suggested this be added to the agenda for the next meeting, and contacting all relevant parties. Cllr D asked members to tell Councillors of any issues such as coaches reversing at the Harbour.</p> <p>d. JS was concerned about the increase in waste and litter around the town, and the responsibilities of local fast food takeaway businesses.</p>	
9	Dates of Next Meetings	
	<p>Agenda Discussion Meeting: 6th August 2024 @ 7pm Business Meeting: 13th August 2024 @7pm</p>	