

MUCKHART COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of Muckhart Community Council, held in the Coronation Hall, on Wednesday 20th March 2019, at 7:30pm

Present: Patrick Thompson (PT) Vice-Chair
Mike Wilson (MRW) Secretary
Danny Conroy (DC) Treasurer
Philip Lord (PL) Minute Secretary
Stuart Dean (SD)
Jon Jordan (JJ)
Marlene White (MW)
Val Whyte (VW)
Peter Wyatt (PW)

PC Barry Ritchie (for item 5), Councillors Graham Lindsay and Bill Mason

Neil Martin, Springfield Properties Plc (for item 6)

Status: **Approved**

In John Anderson's absence Patrick Thompson took the Chair

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from MCC members John Anderson (JA) and Matthew Pease (MP).

2. Declarations of Interest

SD declared an interest as Chair of the Friends of the Ochils (FotO) in respect of the consultation on the management of the Glendevon Woodlands to which FotO has responded.

3. Minutes of Meeting on 30th January 2018 and 6th February 2019

The minutes of the meeting of 30th January were accepted without amendment, proposed by PW, seconded by VW.

The minutes of the Special Meeting of 6th February were accepted without amendment, proposed by PW, seconded by VW.

4. Matters Arising

- Re item 10 (Budget Consultation - Update): PT reported that the budget had now been approved and that funding for schools was safe and also that the Council will continue to fund the Community Councils (see Addendum 1 for Cllr Mason's report).

- Re item 7 (Upper Hillfoot Road): MRW reported that in response to representations on behalf of the residents, regarding the passing places, the Council's Planning Department had noted that all the changes were according to plan. The request for a Metrocount traffic count system to be installed had been turned down by the Council and the residents had since confirmed they would not progress this. No more actions are anticipated.

5. Police Report

PC Ritchie presented his report for the period since the last meeting, noting there had been no reported crimes in the area. Regarding the issue of unreported crimes discussed at the previous meeting, he noted that a gate lock at a nearby quarry site had been broken. This crime did not appear on the Police reporting system under Muckhart, as a location, however, it did appear under the Muckhart police beat number. In future, a search will be conducted under both 'headings' to allow the reporting of all crimes within the Muckhart area.

In response to a question about speeding, he noted that speed monitoring was still taking place.

MRW noted that JA had completed the recent survey on policing services on behalf of MCC, agreeing strongly with all the statements presented therein but noting the need for a continued active presence of police in the area.

PC Ritchie was thanked by the Chairman.

6. Planning Sub-Group

- **Feedback on H49 Drop-in Event: Springfield Properties**

PT welcomed Neil Martin (NM) of Springfield Properties to the meeting and invited him to present the results of feedback from the Drop-in Consultation Event that took place on 6th March.

NM introduced himself and noted that 23 responses to the Drop-in Event had been analysed (and another had just been received, but not yet included in the analysis). He distributed a summary of the analysis to date, noting that there was still time to provide feedback (until 3rd April) and the results were, therefore, interim. He confirmed that the results included information from both the feedback forms and the yellow "post its" available at the event. He summarised the results, as follows:

- Positives reported about living in Muckhart: the rural/village character of the place, the Community, and the environment were each suggested by over 50% of respondents. The school and accessibility (walks) were also strongly represented in comments
- Priorities for improvement in Muckhart included, notably, traffic calming and public transport

- 67% of respondents said the event was helpful. He noted these figures were “tainted” by many people not wanting the development
- 61% of respondents were from the Pool, 30% from the Yetts (9% gave Other)
- 13 points were offered which were judged positive towards the information shown at the event by at least one person, and two of these were mentioned by three attendees (More children within the village and The Pool)
- 17 points were offered which were judged negative towards the information shown at the event by at least one person. Ten of these were noted multiple times, and notably “Too many houses (proposed)” with 12 mentions, “Design/housing type mix not appropriate” with seven mentions, and “Loss of village integrity/integration of new residence” with five mentions

Springfield will continue to collect feedback up to the cut-off point of 3rd April and then finalise the report Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) report for the Council.

He further noted that since the consultation event Springfield were receiving feedback from the various surveys that needed to be carried out (e.g. ecology, hydrology, archaeology), but that these were still in draft. Also, informal consultations had been held with the Council’s Planning Department on various issues.

Members, and attendees from the community present, then had the opportunity to comment and to ask questions. The main points emerging were:

1. The Chairman thanked NM. He noted that there were many more negative points of feedback than positive. NM replied this was to be expected given disruption from development work but Springfield was surprised by the number of comments received which could be classified as positive.
2. SD commented on the lack of detailed information which was available at the event, making it difficult to provide coherent feedback. He noted that Springfield had now fulfilled their statutory obligations to consult, therefore, MCC may not see more detailed information on which further comment could be made before the full development application is submitted. MCC would like to see more in order to be able to give more feedback; could NM comment on the process from now on? NM said that approaching the community at an early stage - as had been done - gave the community more chance to influence the final plans to be proposed. He agreed the statutory obligations had been fulfilled but that the PAC report will be made available. They were now working on more detailed designs and speaking to the Planners about this.
3. SD then noted that the MCC was working on its own feedback to supply to Springfield by the 3rd April deadline but this was difficult because of not having enough information. NM noted Springfield will come back to MCC with more details.

4. JJ asked about the standards of energy efficiency to be incorporated into the proposed dwellings and whether these would be to the highest level. NM replied that properties would be built to meet the Government's Silver standard.
5. Tim Allan (TA), attending as a member of the community (who is the landowner of approximately 1/3 of the H49 site not included in the proposed development) asked to which Council Planning Committee the consultation feedback report will be referred. NM noted that they hoped the application will be submitted in May, from which time there were four months for the Council to reach a decision.
6. TA further noted that he thought the consultation had been "lightweight", a view endorsed by JJ and by other members. NM responded by saying there had been a number of opportunities to gather information: a pre-meeting with MCC representatives, held in December; a presentation at the MCC Special Meeting, held on the 6th February; the Pre-Application Drop-in Event, held on 6th March; and this evening's meeting.

At this point MRW gave a brief update on the feedback MCC had received following both the MCC Special Meeting and the Springfield consultation event. There had been approximately 95 to 100 attendees, at the 6th March event, and as of the 19th March, feedback had been received from 29 members of the community. Feedback is still coming in and will be added to MCC's formal consultation response to Springfield. Similar to Springfield, the comments received were both positive and negative, with the latter predominating. To a large extent, feedback, so far, mirrored that presented by Springfield with by far the most views raised relating to the number of houses being proposed and the negative impact that this would have on the character and nature of the village. Concerns regarding road safety, parking, a lack of infrastructure and services and the likely environmental impacts also rated highly and were considered to be of importance. A completed MCC response will be sent to Springfield by 3rd April deadline.

The discussion with Springfield continued:

7. JJ enquired how many developments had Springfield completed in Clackmannanshire? None; NM referred to the developments in Perth and Kinross, in particular the development at Lathro Farm, between Kinross and Milnathort.
8. SD made a plea to Springfield to do something special here. Muckhart is a unique conservation village and something unique and noteworthy could be achieved which would reflect favourably on Springfield, in addition to enhancing the village. To achieve this would not be a one-way process – if there was just one message to take away from this meeting, he asked that Springfield works with the village to do that. MRW echoed these sentiments - make it a "best in class, case study development" by working with us.
9. MW asked how many houses are needed by Springfield to make a profit – Springfield has stated 50 houses? NM said that a price had been agreed with the

landowner and Springfield had to make a profit. 50 houses of the mix planned would be needed to achieve the targeted profit. With just 35 houses it would mean all the houses would have to be very large which was not desired.

10. TA noted that one third of the H49 site was owned by him and his wife (through Drumburn Farm) and the Council's Local Development Plan (LDP) envisioned 35 houses over the whole of the H49 site. The split of housing based on the LDP was approximately 25 houses for the site controlled by Springfield and approximately 10 on his land. However, Springfield is proposing that its share increase by 100% to 50 houses, just on its land. As a guideline, Persimmon expect a profit of circa £60,000 per house – so, if one assumes Springfield want a more modest £50,000 per unit, the approximate expected profit on 50 houses would be £2.5M, while that on 24 would be £1.2M. NM responded stating that TA's comments regarding profitability were inaccurate, in particular, when taking into account the development costs for this site relating to roads, drainage, developer contribution, etc..
11. JJ referred to the LDP - a proposal of 50 houses for two thirds of the site – so, for the full site this would imply circa 70 houses. Does this not drive a coach and horses through the democratic process used to specify 35 houses for the entire site?
12. MW asked if NM could give any details of the feedback they had from the Council's Planners. He replied that he could not do so, in detail, but did note that "mid-market" housing was discussed and the possibility of a social contribution towards enhancing core paths connecting with the local school. Springfield will discuss the latter with the Education Officer.

The Chairman thanked NM, once again, for his contribution. NM then left the meeting.

SD noted that the MCC has until 3rd April to respond to Springfield. Beyond that date, there is a big question-mark over getting the community's views across. The 3rd April may be the last chance to have more than a marginal influence on the design of the development. However, further consultation with Springfield, after the 3rd April, would be welcomed.

A member of the public also stressed the importance of finding out the costs of upgrading the drainage and sewage capacity locally.

SD asked the Councillors present about consultation. They confirmed that they welcome contact and further consultation from the public, stressing that it is very important to them to know the community's views. Cllr Mason also noted that several other developments are proposed, such as in Dollar. He too was very sensitive to the needs of the community which needed to express a clear position. They were aware that the question of housing numbers was also an issue in Dollar.

Members stressed, again, that as many members of the community, as possible, should communicate their views to MCC. The MCC Planning Sub-Group is to meet next week discuss the MCC response to Springfield.

ACTION: SD

Other planning applications

SD reported that the Planning Sub-Group had dealt with six applications since the last meeting, as follows:

- 19/00042/FULL. Erection Of 1.5 Storey House In Garden Ground And Formation Of Parking And Access Road, Rossardan, Drumburn Road. MCC position: Objected with comments
- 19/00038/FULL. Single Storey Extension to Side of House, Including Wood Burning Stove and Associated Flue, Erection of Raised Decking to Rear, 3 Golf View. MCC position: Supported
- 19/00024/FULL. Erection Of Detached Garage To Accommodate 4 No Cars And Storage, With 1 Bedroom Granny Flat Above - Ancillary To Existing Main Dwelling, The Gean. MCC position: Supported with comments
- 19/00023/FULL. Alterations, Conversion Of Garage And Single Storey Extension To Rear Of House, The Gean. MCC position: Supported
- 19/00013/FULL. Installation of Wood Burning Stove and Associated Flue and Erection of Raised Decking to Side of House, 15 Kirkhill. MCC position: Supported
- 19/00012/FULL. Single Storey Extension To Side Of House, Formation of Paved Driveway and Alterations to Reinstate Access from Drumburn Road - Amended Access Arrangements Woodend Cottage Drumburn Road. MCC position: Supported with comments

In summary five applications were supported (some with comments) and MCC had objected to one.

SD reported that MCC has been consulted on a further application relating to the Japanese garden to which the Planning Group would respond (Ref: 19/00045/FULL).

ACTION: SD

7. Muckhart Community Plan: Update

A: Development Trust Working Group Update

PT noted that a meeting would be arranged to take this further.

ACTION: PT

B: Review of Action Plans

A few updates to specific items in the MCP were reported:

Image of the Village, I-1 Lead PW

PW reported that 16 potential volunteers had responded to the request for help in entering Scotland's Village in Bloom competition. A meeting was planned to discuss the way forwards.

ACTION: PW

MRW reported that a consultation on the management of the Glendevon Woodlands had been identified and that he had made a submission on behalf of MCC. He thanked JA and VW for their contribution to the response.

Infrastructure: I-1/2, Lead MRW

Drumburn Road: MRW reported that, with the agreement of the landowner, the Council had now installed the bollards, together with all of the agreed signage. Arrangements are to be agreed to clear and improve the footpath. **ACTION: MRW**

MRW, on behalf of the Working Group, has agreed a date to meet with the Council's Head of Roads, Alan Murray, as a replacement for Carlyn Fraser, the previous Traffic and Road Safety Manager, has yet to be appointed. It was agreed that flashing, speed warning signs will be on the agenda. **ACTION: MRW**

Public Services: P-1 Lead PL

PL reported that there had been a meeting of the Clackmannanshire Community Transport Association (CCTA) and progress had been made in redefining its role. These discussions will continue at the next meeting. Meanwhile, there appears to be a proposal from Cllr Barnacle, from P&KC, to establish a Kinross Community Transport Association, with a scheme to establish a figure of eight route taking in Muckhart and Dollar. This is to be followed up. **ACTION: PL**

Sustainability & Environment: S-1/3 Lead PL

A Working Group has now been established to collect information regarding the living environment, as it relates to H49 development, which it will feed into the Planning Sub-Group. This work will continue and feed into fulfilling the Objectives set out in the MCP. **ACTION: PL**

JJ confirmed that he was working with the Council and Home Energy Scotland to arrange a community event, targeted for April or May. **ACTION: JJ**

8. Publicity: Update

PW noted there was nothing to report.

9. Muckhart Primary School: Update

VW noted that the school will be performing a show, Yeeha!, on Tuesday 26th March, in the afternoon, and on Wednesday 27th March, in the evening, at the Coronation Hall. Members of the community are encouraged to attend the event.

VW further noted that, due to illness, the Head of the village school was also now looking after the primary school in Coalsnaughton.

10. Treasurer's Report

DC presented the Treasurer's Report, for the period to 20th March 2019. The balance of the account stood at £1483.17. The Report was accepted by members. It was now known that Council funding for CCs has been secured, following the recent budget decision.

11. JCCF

DC had attended the latest meeting, noting that the future purpose of the group remained to be discussed.

JJ enquired whether the vital support of Lesley Bailey was still available after the recent budget cuts and the Councillors present confirmed that it was.

12. Governance Documents: Approval

MRW noted that the documents governing the proceedings of MCC had now been fully updated and distributed for review by members. He asked that the members formally approve the documents, as follows:

- MCC Constitution
- MCC Standing Orders
- MCC Code of Conduct
- Dealing with a Complaint against MCC
- MCC Complaints Procedure
- Complaint against MCC Checklist
- Process for Dealing with a Complaint against MCC

Each of the documents was put to members for their approval. Each document was approved unanimously.

MRW will now request that the Council approves them and, subsequently, they will be released, formally, and circulated to members. **ACTION: MRW**

13. Correspondence

MRW had circulated a list of correspondence received, in a summary format. Two items were noted and discussed, namely:

- Email dated 27/02/2019: re Scotland New Community Platform – we await further information
- Email dated 12/04/2019: re a review of the Council's Polling Districts and Polling Places. MCC had been asked to submit comments on this. Since no changes were proposed for Muckhart, it was agreed that the proposals were accepted. **ACTION: MRW**

14. AOCB

- MRW noted that JA would be looking at the local Emergency Plan **ACTION: JA**

- A consultation request covering development in rural Scotland had been received. MRW and SD had met to formulate an MCC response. This will be circulated and, once agreed, submitted. **ACTION: MRW**
- Regarding our insurance policy DC is to be added to the contact list and a check will be made on what it covers. **ACTION: MRW**
- TA noted that logging was due to take place soon on the west side of the lane from Drumburn Farm to the Golf Course (see item 7 B above). MCC was advised that MGC is looking at development opportunities on this site for either lodges or houses. It was suggested that this be followed up with the MGC Secretary. It was noted that any path clearing operations be put on hold. **ACTION: MRW**

15. Date of Next Meeting

The next MCC meeting will be held on Wednesday 29th May 2019, at 7:30pm, in the Coronation Hall.

The meeting closed at 9:45pm.

Addendum 1

March 2019 Report to Muckhart Community Council

The Clackmannanshire budget is the main update from last month's report. Much has already been in the press, but it is worth stating that a balanced budget was passed for 2019/20 despite the ongoing serious financial situation within the Council. Many aspects of public concern, including possible school closures, reductions in teaching hours, closure of the Leisure Bowl and baths, threat to the continuance of the Citizens Advice Bureau, and other concerns, were carefully examined by the Administration and other parties, resulting in the budget being passed by SNP and Scottish Conservative Councillors. Included were the following considerations;

- Council tax set at 4%, as a reasonable level between 3.5% and 4.79%, whilst still assisting the Council's financial situation.
- Move away from reduction mentality to focus on inclusive growth and income generation.
- Develop a core workforce that is likely smaller but more engaged and organised.
- Digital Transformation Strategy that goes beyond moving services online...develop smart education, health, housing and social care services.
- Research and investigate collaborative services with other Councils and Agencies, where appropriate.
- Restructure HR, Finance and other departments to make best use of common resources and reduce operating costs.
- Finalise cost sharing consultations and option appraisal between the Council and Police Scotland, re. occupation of surplus space in Kilncraigs.
- Public awareness campaign for a year to inform the public of withdrawal of food-waste bags in 2020/21, and introduction of brown bin permits in 19/20
- £883K in budget for completion of Clackmannan Primary School refurbishment. £22,000 in capital budget for Dollar CC changing/shower facilities, to be implemented as soon as possible.
- Cycle, Walking and Saver Streets budget of £100k to be developed and completed during this financial year.
- Park, Play areas and open space improvements for Hillfoots facilities, totalling £50K during this financial year.
- Continue supporting Citizens Advice Bureau, in view of the many essential services provided outwith Council resources.
- Earmarked Reserve of £30,000 for 2019/20 to support communities undertaking management of community facilities.
- Maintain financial support of £6,000 in 2019/20 to assist Community Councils to fulfil their functions.
- Ongoing major reorganisation of senior management staffing levels, and development of the next level of management infrastructure.

There is much more, of course, in the budget papers, but I hope that these bullet points are helpful in providing some of the priorities for 2019/20.

Bill Mason, Councillor, East Ward. 17/03/19