



COLLIESTON & SLAINS COMMUNITY TRUST

MINUTES

PUBLIC MEETING 28 OCTOBER 2005

Sally Sheehan welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the format of the evening would revolve around a PowerPoint presentation given by various presenters. She went through the pitfalls of the current hall, the frustrations we had suffered so far and the huge successes as well. She assured the meeting that the Committee has always at the forefront the best interests of the community. She explained that currently CASCT is a group of interested people, not an elected body, but that will happen in the future.

She reported that she was now passing on the reins of Chairman to Steve Rainey but will continue as a member of the Committee and in future focus on fund raising.

She expressed thanks to the Committee, our solicitor for invaluable legal advice, Sarah Menzies with CADISPA, Rod Stewart for Collieston's website, Neil Ironside from Aberdeenshire Council and lastly, to the community for their generous contribution towards the fund raising.

Alan White gave a brief resume of how we had got to where we are now. He explained that CASCT is a Company Limited by Guarantee. We will be putting ourselves up for election and are constitutionally bound to do this annually. Every householder and resident over 18 is automatically a member of CASCT. We are totally accountable to the community and will hold our first AGM in March 2006.

Its aims are to direct and manage processes involved in building a new hall, to set the foundations of a social enterprise fund and to be a central income generator which will then dispense monies to various community groups.

We have a 60% mandate from the community in favour of a new build on the present site. We have now, however, got a dilemma. We had an indication from Aberdeenshire Council that Slains Estate might offer us an alternative green-field site. The Council and Estate, have as of tonight, not been able to confirm or deny this offer. The net effect has been to delay the project for 9 months so far.

Steve Rainey then explained that when CASCT became incorporated he became a Director. He presented the pros and cons of a green-field site:

- | | |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strengths: | sale of the existing site could generate up to £200K of cash towards total cost |
| | proposed location is slightly more central |
| Weaknesses: | any green-field site is likely to be less attractive and compromise sustainability |
| | green-field site is potentially divisive |
| Opportunities: | green-field site may allow the new hall to be less prominent |
| Threats: | unlikely that developer could make a profit from just converting existing site |
| | Slains Estate and Aberdeenshire Council have still to confirm that a site is available |
| | the project could be delayed indefinitely |
| | development of green-field site could set a precedent |

He explained we had tried to be as fair as we could and to take the majority view, while recognising that to some people strengths can be weaknesses and vice versa. He reported that the proposed green-field site was the area between the Coastguard Cottages and Slains House.

Unlike the last public meeting when we had been very careful to make no recommendation, this time Committee members have invested time on the various options and feel justified in making a recommendation.

He finished by summarising that neither CASCT nor Aberdeenshire Council have been able to confirm the reality of the Estate's apparent offer and that Aberdeenshire Council still stand by their original offer to donate the present site to CASCT. He then opened the meeting to questions.

Q Do we still get £200K whether the new hall is built on this site or any other site?

A On the current site we will have to demolish this building and would only raise £200K if the Council sold it and gave us the money. If we build on current site we get a gift in kind that can be regarded as £200K, but it is not cash. However that value is counted for fund raising and we can use the £200K as matched funding from Aberdeenshire Council.

Q Is this just a rumour from the Estate and Council or does it have a firm basis?

A We did host a meeting earlier in the summer to which we invited members of Aberdeenshire Council and the Estate. No one from the Estate came and the attendees from the Council explained they had approached the Estate with the best interests of the community in mind. Neil Ironside from Aberdeenshire Council confirmed this. It has only been a verbal offer and neither the Committee nor Aberdeenshire Council can get this in writing.

Alan White explained there had been a lot of debate by the Committee and we had tried very hard to get further information and have come to a unanimous decision.

It was clarified that it was not categorically £200K but was subject to valuation at the time of transfer, whether from proceeds of sale or as transfer as an offer in kind.

Questioner then commented he felt there was nothing to be gained except delay.

Q Have Estate confirmed that we can get extra land?

A No, but the architectural drawings we have had done suggest we can build on the current site, although extra land would be beneficial.

Q Why 9 months delay when we already have a mandate to develop this site with a new building, should we not go ahead with this?

A Steve Rainey explained we have a duty to the community to make sure that we do not reject an offer of £200K in cash without fully investigating it.

Comment from a member of the audience was that the 9 months was not wasted as we had continued to do fund raising which would enable the next phase of the project. He felt we had worked very hard to get to the position where the project could go forward under the original mandate.

Q Is the vote going to be taken from the whole community or just the people in attendance at this meeting?

A From the people in attendance at the public meeting.

Q Does this building also include the house?

A Yes

Q Will the Planning Department let us demolish the current building?

A Yes. We don't know if we would get planning permission for a different site, but planning indicated they would probably look favourably at a green-field site within certain criteria. Proposed alternative site would require building over new sewer and there could be an issue of liability if something goes wrong with the sewer. We have had no survey of the other site and have no idea if it is suitable. We have investigated the capacity of services.

Chairman proposed a motion that we proceed with the original plan to build a new Community Centre on the present site.

This was put to a vote with a result of -

25 in favour

0 against

Therefore motion carried.

Treasurer presented current financial position. She reported this will be updated monthly on the website.

Bank Balance as of 12 Oct 2005	£15,450
Fundraising Total as of 12 Oct 2005	£17,796

She summarised the control of expenditure and reported that fully audited accounts will be available in March 2006 at the AGM.

Monies spent so far are on architectural fees for conceptual drawings and legal fees plus some small ancillary expenses. She explained that as long as we can demonstrate that we have raised £20K, it will all count as a percentage of the total required, even if we subsequently spend some of it.

Vicky McNiff presented an overview of the architectural competition. She explained we feel this is the most important thing to get right. We have spent time working with Tinto Architecture building up concept designs and this has been very helpful and useful, but we felt we were not getting the choices we wanted in the building design. We needed a range of architects to give us ideas. We have taken onboard Charles Rattray from RGU Architectural School as our adviser and he has given us a list of 14 architects whom we will contact and then we will chose five to go forward with which we feel will offer the community a good range of designs. These five will be paid for entering the competition and will produce scale models and drawings of the same standard. These will be displayed in the hall for comment and an information

pack will also be distributed to the community with a questionnaire, so all comments can be taken into account. Entries will be judged by a panel of 5: 3 from the village, 2 architects and chaired by Charles Rattray. They will select two finalists to go into stage 2 who will provide presentations to the community. The selection of the winning design will be by community ballot.

The competition costs will be approximately -

£1500 honorarium to each of the 4 runners-up

The winner's reward is the professional fee for the design of the building

Total cost of competition £6000 plus expenses.

We are investigating smaller funding bodies for grants to finance the competition. However, we feel it is important to get this right, even if we have to spend part of our fighting fund.

Meeting then opened for questions -

Q Is there any alternative to the competition?

A Select an architect, but we have tried this and it did not work. Alan White explained this is probably the best and most cost effective way of doing it. The architects will spend a lot of time and money on drawings etc

Q Will the finalist be given a scope of work?

A All the architects will be given a brief and all information will be posted on the website.

Q Why two stages?

A Explained architects would not enter into a competition where the whole outcome is dependent on a ballot.

Q The Committee have visited different halls, did we have any favourites?

A Yes, but different ones.

Q What are the envisaged timescales?

A About four months from the start of stage 1. We want to get to the end of the competition by about May for funding applications.

Comment from the audience that we will still have to negotiate with the Estate for extra land.

With no further questions Chairman then proposed two votes of thanks. One to Sally Sheehan for her role as Chairperson of CASCT and the second to the fund raisers who have done a fantastic job. He then thanked everyone for coming and closed the meeting.