

APPROVED Minutes 134 Cambusbarron Community Council April 2021

Members and office bearers

Marion MacAllister, Chair (MMacA)	Janice Paterson, Vice Chair, (JP)
Ann Finlayson, Secretary (AF)	Keith Ratcliffe (KR)
Melissa Nelson, Treasurer (MN)	Jennifer Macleod, Planning (JM)*
Cathie Graham (CG) *	Douglas Campbell (DC)
Richard Blore (RB)	Scott Farmer (SF) elected rep
Christine Simpson, elected rep (CS)*	Neil Benny (NB) elected rep *
Pam Campbell, Stirling Council (PC)*	Pam King, police (PK)*
Mark Hill, Headteacher (MH)*	Helen Bang, minute clerk (HB)

1. Introductions and Welcome (MMacA)

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting via Zoom.
Pam Campbell is resigning from Stirling Council. Here for another month. Says lease will be done.
- 1.2 *Apologies were received from Mark Hill, Pam Campbell, Jennifer Macleod, Cathie Graham, PC Pam King.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the March 133 Zoom meeting were approved with minor amendments, Catriona Rae, Craig Heaney and Treasurer's Report, funds available should be £2830.81
Proposed AF, Seconded JP. **ACTION HB** to AF for Stirling Council.
- 2.2 Conflicts of interest declared
AF and MN on CCDT Board, RB on Management Group.

3. Matters arising

- 3.1 Map project [KR]. Ongoing.
- 3.2 Burnside orchard [RB] Ongoing.
- 3.3 Burnside Bridge – [RB/DC] Ongoing.
- 3.4 Footpath project. [KR]
- 3.4.1 Contacted Stirling Council to get name. Same person – Angela Simpson – has had no reply. Reception at SC didn't find it, had to suggest it. Footpath and Access Officer, perhaps furloughed. Question for Pam Campbell before she leaves. **ACTION AF**.
- 3.4.2 SF – Angela Simpson is current officer. **ACTION KR** will contact again.
- 3.5 Persimmons adoption – [MMacA]. Confirmed contact Ali Malloy. Frustrated with slow progress and escalated to director level. Have to acquire legal ownerships of Suds Basin. This has been going on for over a decade. Have contacts at Persimmons. Suggest contact them directly and produce information leaflet for residents to advise them what is happening. **DECISION** Unanimous agreement.
- 3.6 Playpark improvements
- 3.6.1 The see saw which was purchased new for disabled access/parent use – now has faults with springs and significant cracks have appeared in the metalwork. Photographs have gone to the supplier, going to get back to Donna as soon as resolved. Is this another example of vandalism in the village?

- 3.6.2 Major safety concern - holes have still not been filled in. AF and MMacA saw a child almost injured – it has been reported. SF thought this had been addressed by Land Services. **ACTION SF.**
ACTION AF to take photographs in the park, send to SF.

Has put up signs asking for vandalism to be reported, these were taken down. A substantial/vandal proof sign should be in every playpark for people to report damage to correct department.

- 3.7 Dog fouling and litter [MN/JP]
Sent report in.

Recommendations are summary of report. Highlighted particular areas which are bad. More bins, bins relocated.

Path from motorway bridge – no bins at all. None near Gillies Hill, route to school.

Want to start putting up posters asap.

Is JP going to contact Land Services – what is available, do we have to fundraise for additional bins? £330 cost for bin?

Any new bins will be on the existing route for the bin lorries. Stephen Robertson.
ACTION JP.

- 3.8 Cambusbarron Fund (MMacA) Fund is open, closes at end of month. Lots of applications this month,
- 3.9 Community Council insurance [AF] All Community Councillors now insured if need to drive on CC business.
- 3.10 Parking church corner. (MMacA) SF has been involved in this. Dan Hartley has asked team to pay particular attention to this area. Enforcement team, also flagged with the police.
- 3.11 Quarry Road [DC]
Not much has happened this last month. Had meeting at end of February with SC. Asked in two emails for progress report but reply didn't indicate that any action was forthcoming. This is with regard to the permanent repair. Chief concern now is had asked for temporary protection (cones, bollards) for what is a vertical drop at the side of the road and has had no response. Say someone is looking at it fortnightly but it is dangerous.
Asked SF to chase this issue. It's a flooding issue from last year. Claire Elliott was contact. **ACTION SF.**
- 3.12 Brown bins [MMacA] See reports at end of minutes. Questions raised regarding how team knew who is entitled to bins, what to do if contaminated, if bin stolen, we now have information, thanks to SF for getting this information.

Bins in the community, Kings Park/Thompson Place – full to overflowing on Easter Sunday. People trying to pick up litter, pick up after dogs, but overflowing rubbish is a disincentive puts people off. Rat problem for some residents. What is bin emptying schedule, have they thought about avoiding placing them too close to hedges which might encourage vermin.

SF bin locations – practicalities. Rats will get in regardless. ACTION JP to write to Stephen Robertson.

JP – traps have been put down but rats still in garden. Thought to be a lockdown issue as rats move into residential areas looking for food with hospitality closed.

3.13 Garages Thompson Place

Thanks to SF for response. Has been five years, still saying they are looking at ownership. Ongoing issue with vandalism – if someone falls through there is going to be a serious accident. Concerns there may be asbestos may be at side of garages.

ACTION SF to chase regarding timescales, will alert Environmental Services re asbestos suspicion.

JP the worst garage has been demolished and waste removed by SC but two others are also in a serious state.

4. Reports

4.1 Police Report Attached as Appendix I

4.1.1 MN noticed that an officer had been injured in Kings Park at the weekend.

SF – there were 15 arrests. Police and Enforcement Officers will continue to tackle disorder.

MMacA – attended event where issue with secondary school pupils and litter was acknowledged.

SC and Provost sent message of support to injured officer for a speedy recovery.

4.1.2 Police have volunteered to be in the old quarry and look at drug issue. Can't currently be supplied with bags for litter or have uplifts.

4.1.3 JP sometime last night the path at Touch Road was full of blister packs again.

4.1.4 Item 2/4/21 Dangerous dog – require more information. Has this been dealt with? Are residents allowed to know about this? MN what legislation covers this? MMacA A location would be helpful so we can warn people.

Dangerous to humans or to other dogs? **ACTION MN.**

4.2 School Report [HT] Attached as Appendix II

4.3 Planning [JP]

One extension. Barratt application.

4.4 Murrayshall and ROMP [DC] Attached as Appendix III

Paterson's planning application for new access has been allowed following an appeal. Irreversible but have to comply with 16 conditions. Main one is that Polmaise Road has to be improved in accordance with report.

Remote footpath issue has been mentioned. Reporter has said that details have to be submitted to SC for approval.

Understands there has been Some action in village regarding planning application but not included in report.

ROMP – indication is that this process will be going through in the summer. Background is that we had a couple of items; existing ROMP had condition saying there is only a single access into quarry and secondly the sequoia grove and whether this could be retained.

DC contacted elected members 3-4 weeks ago hoping they could help with sequoia grove issue. Funding may be required if compensation due to Paterson's. Chris Cox, Head of Planning invited DC to have discussion. Meeting took place on 7 April. Informative meeting if not very encouraging. Three items – see Appendix. Involvement of councillors in ROMP process, single access and six additional conditions CBCC requested end 2018.

The ROMP process is not like a planning application, it's a separate process. Planners hoped to be able to give up delegation and put it to a planning panel but have been informed by lawyers that this is not an option. However, are looking at other options to get elected members involved in the process.

Single access – it appears that SC will not retain single access condition in new conditions because there is no planning reason to exclude a separate access. In 2002 when previous ROMP was done and from 1984, the original application. No

AF – concern is number of lorries, walled garden application was rejected owing to single access.

SF – The ROMP is a process which looks at environmental conditions on site e.g. noise, dust, it does not take into account other issues. Owing to holidays and availability of people meeting was delayed but it did take place earlier today. Issue again in terms of access road not having a valid planning reason.

Sequoia – there is no valid planning reason, but this could form basis of negotiation with Patersons going forward. SF doubts that full council meeting would be the right forum as some members have no background or knowledge of specific area. Chris going to speak to Julia, Governance Officer, to see how community can have scrutiny role going forward. Perhaps have a member officer group – legal looking into this.

DC is there any need for CC to meet with elected representatives at this stage? SF the plan is to have a conversation once they have clearer guidance from governance.

Sequoia – felt that elected members could have more of a say. Condition CC proposed was that SC enter into discussions with Paterson's to see if there was compensation arrangement that could be agreed. Planners are saying that cannot be included as a condition in the ROMP because there is no planning reason. Instead of SC it might be community entering discussion with Patersons.

DC wrote to planning consultant (Mike Hyde see appendix 2) this confirms what Chris Cox said.

AF – conditions put in place, who monitors these? SF if any infringement would be referred to Planning. Supposed to be putting in a path? SF yes this goes to Planning AF there are 3 paths through CCDT land. Who is going to make decision on which path to put in? How will CCDT know? Have never negotiated anything with us. Reporter said land belonged to Dry Grange, this hasn't been the case since 2019, it's owned by the community.

No notification as a landowner has been received by CCDT.

SF they have permission to build the path.

AF – how are we going to have any information or say on this? When will it start, who is building it? Too late once trees taken down.

SF in terms of any objections, opportunity was there to make submissions to Reporter. AF CCDT were never asked. SF Should raise with planning authority. DC has been in contact with Jane Brooks – inform her of concerns.

AF we advised them that CCDT owned the land. DC – AF should write to Jane and ask for foreknowledge, whether information will be in the schedule. **ACTION AF.**

KR – is road improvement subject to planning permission?

SF in terms of detail, not sure if this is applicable or whether as part of Reporter's decision permission is extant and Road Authority just looks at technical details.

DC road improvement. One way system discussed. Councillors have no say of whether this is acceptable means of controlling traffic. One of the conditions in ROMP was that there has to be a traffic management assessment. If elected members are involved this may be a way to have a say in what is done on the road.

Currently Tillicoultry Quarries insist they can use the road without any improvements. There has to be a traffic management system to investigate this.

AF and MMacA had meeting with Barratt – they had no idea that quarry could reopen and affect their new development.

MN CCDT were not informed, Barratt not informed about quarry development regarding their new roundabout.

4.6 Greener Cambusbarron [MMacA] Attached as Appendix IV

4.6.1 Derek has ordered for a number of hanging baskets. Can't go by a door or where people might have to pass. Volunteers – watering schedule should be easier. Hoping to fill some of the community tubs, still need volunteers to assist.

4.6.2 CHECK FIGURE £1110.72 Community Pride – to replace tubs by side of bowling green. Only for £600 as contribution as a whole. With permission will apply to Foundation Scotland - **DECISION agreed.**

4.7 CCDT [AF]

4.7.1 Planning volunteer Days after 26 April. Need to check on restrictions. Mineshaft – insurers are insisting it is fenced.

4.7.2 Online survey going out soon on walled garden and firewood supply. Also hard copies for residents not on social media.

4.7.3 Researching access to power. Education group discussing John Muir and D of E awards. Looking at funding available to improve ponds. Memorial benches – these have been requested.

4.7.4 Castle Gardens – ongoing development, hope to do some planting this year

- 4.7.5 Walled garden – have ordered fruit trees, original ones that were planted from 1851 along with others.
- 4.7.6 Storage container – need prior approval. Waiting to see if there any objections
- 4.7.7 Visitor shelter/gazebo – also needs planning permission. Could be a site for information posters.
- 4.7.8 DC – fencing off – what sort of fence? AF thinks it will be wooden stakes and wire – signs to say it is unsafe. DC would a capping of shaft be possible? AF it would need filling with concrete.

4.8 CVN [AF]

Village nursery – one in community centre and woods. Looking to do more sessions in the woods. Want to apply for funding to find out what kind of structure they could put there. Going to use the walled garden, do some planting. Has to wait until walls are finished.

Hoping to put up polytunnel. Blue shed from primary school was moved to Gillies Hill.

4.9 Treasurer's report [MN] Attached as Appendix V

Payment to Stirling Council cleared - £4348 for multi park. Clerical fee. Cheque donated for Gala. £1601. Children enjoyed seeing sunflowers.

Greener Cambusbarron have had a good input. £1500 from Covid fund. £100 from Craig.

Funds available £2830.81

4.10 Seven Sisters

AF and MMacA re Seven Sisters – CC will be making a formal objection based on the number of houses, lack of flats. Safe route to school – so far no one from SC has agreed if land can be used for this purpose.

Seem to assume SC are building road. SF – Barratt should contact council. SF has stepped back from these meetings. **ACTION AF** to write to Peter McKechnie.

KR – pond is dry at the moment!

Main agenda

5 Cambusbarron Village Nursery Project

5.1 Want to do a Gala Afternoon Tea for elderly, isolated residents. Have formalised proposals. Some money has been spent. See report. Will be expecting equality of opportunity to all elderly residents. Not in favour of single use paper products.

5.2 Money has gone for projects that are being done by the nursery.
DECISION - agreed.

6 Damage to Cambusbarron School Nursery/ Park /School

6.1 There was damage over Easter holidays. Tree irreparably broken. No directives from Pam Campbell on CCTV policy.
ACTION MMacA ask PC re CCTV regulations.

6.2 MN library had CCTV inside. Because it was in a contained area.
ACTION MN gather information with AF.

7 Kersebonny Road [AF]

7.1 Issue for SF. MMacA walked it again today. It is dangerous. Met two groups of walkers who agreed. Need 30mph not 40mph. Cars should give way to pedestrians and cyclists. The edge of road is damaged when it was only resurfaced last year. Photos were circulated prior to the meeting.

There are concerns a driver might hit this in the dark.

ACTION SF will see what can be done regarding road edges. In terms of speed – question is how to enforce it.

SF will need to see if there was a preconstruction audit in place regarding who is responsible for repairs.

MMacA would like to invite Caroline Fraser and elected reps to walk road to see the situation.

JP – complaint from resident in Bobbin Wynd – not just construction lorries it is delivery vans because sat nav takes them this way to Co operative.

8 Other business

8.1 Motorway bridge – MN CCTV operation on certain dates. Will look again tomorrow and get a proper picture.

8.2 Scottish Field magazine article – can now freely distribute to anyone.

8.2 Applied for two tables and chairs

8.3 Audit of expenditure by SC – will hold next week.

9 Correspondence

9.1 None.

10 Date of next meeting and events

10.1 Tuesday 18 May at 7pm via Zoom.

11 Decisions taken at this meeting

3.51 Persimmons leaflet

4.6.2 Greener Cambusbarron tubs

5.1 Gala Afternoon Tea - Nursery

12 Actions

2.1 Approved March minutes to AF

HB

3.4.2	Footpath issues	KR/AF
3.6.2	Playpark safety concerns	SF
3.7	Bins	JP
3.11	Quarry Road	SF
3.13	Garages	SF
4.1.4	Dangerous dog concerns	MN
4.4	Path issues, write to Jane Brooks	AF
4.10	Seven Sisters	AF
6.1	CCTV regulations	MMacA
6.2	CCTV information	MN
7.1	Kersebonny Road	SF

13 The Meeting closed at 21:08pm

Appendix I Police Report

Name of Community Council	20/04/2021 – Cambusbarron Community Council meeting
	Our priorities in the Cambusbarron area continue to be Anti-Social Behaviour, Drug misuse/Drug dealing, Road Safety and Community Engagement and Reassurance.
Crime reports	Crime Reports for Cambusbarron area between 16/03/2021-18/04/2021.
	Detected cases: 3
	31/03/2021 – Drugs supply 06/04/2021 – Breach of the peace/vandalism/resist arrest 09/04/2021 – Breach of undertaking conditions
	Undetected: 4
	24/03/2021-25/03/2021 – Theft from motor vehicle

Appendix II School Report

19.04.21 - Cambusbarron Primary and Nursery – Update

Easter Break

- Staff and children have benefited from the Easter break. The first holiday in a year where national guidance has not updated requiring staff to work during their holidays. This allowed staff to switch off and was very welcome.

Vandalism/Anti-social behaviour

- Over the Easter break we have seen a rise in anti-social behaviour around the school. This has resulted in the nursery garden being damaged and litter being left

by groups of young people. I have raised this with our community Police officers and has requested that the school / nursery be visited where possible and young people engaged with appropriately. CCTV signs have been displayed and the nursery team are happy for the community to use the garden but wish this to be done respectfully. I would like to thank members of the community who I know have spoken with young people found in the nursery garden.

APPENDIX III

MURRAYSHALL QUARRY REPORT FOR [VIRTUAL] MEETING 20th April 2021

- **PATERSONS QUARRIES PLANNING APPLICATION FOR NEW ACCESS [Second Application 18/00735**

As reported to the March meeting Patersons application for planning permission for a second access into the quarry has been allowed after appeal.

This decision is irreversible; however, Persons must comply with the 16 conditions associated with this permission. For example, Polmaise Rd must be improved in accordance with the Systra report specified in the conditions attached to the planning permission by the reporter before the access road can be used. Further, details of the remote footpath have to be submitted to Stirling Council for approval.

- **TILlicOUNTRY QUARRIES /PATERSON QUARRIES ROMP APPLICATION 18/00137**

No further information on progress of ROMP, although it appears that 'summer' is the likely date for determination.

I had meeting with Stirling Council planners on 7th April to discuss various issues relating to the ROMP. A separate report on this is attached as appendix 1, but the main issues are summarised:

Involvement of councillors: The ROMP process is formally a 'delegated' decision. It appears however, that the preferred choice of planners to refer the decision to the Planning and Resources panel is not a valid legal option. However other options are being investigated to enable elected member involvement.

Current ROMP condition on only single access: Stirling Council **will not** retain a similar condition in new list of conditions, as there is a requirement [confirmed by planning Consultant Mike Hyde see appendix 2] that as is required in any planning decision, conditions imposed in the ROMP must be based on valid planning reason. At this stage no valid planning reason for the imposition of a single access condition has been identified.

Six CCC proposed additional conditions: see attached report for fuller details of discussion, but the CCC proposed condition to preserve the sequoia grove **will not** be included in the new list of conditions. Again, a valid planning reason is required before inclusion and currently no such reason has been identified.

A question on the status of existing conditions in the ROMP process and the Council's ability to change them in the current process was passed to Mike Hyde [Planning Consultant], and the gist of his response was that any condition attached to the current ROMP - whether an existing condition or a new condition - must be a valid planning reason by passing the tests detailed in

Planning Circular 4/1998: the use of conditions in planning . An extract from his response is given in appendix 2

It is also proposed to have a meeting with local elected members to examine if they can assist with progressing the CC objectives

Douglas Campbell
18th April 2021

**APPENDIX 1
CAMBUSBARRON COMMUNITY COUNCIL
MURRAYSHALL QUARRY -ROMP
REPORT ON MEETING WITH PLANNING 7TH APRIL 2021**

Virtual meeting using 'Microsoft Teams'
Stirling Council: Chris Cox and Jane Brooks-Burnett
CCC: D Campbell

Background information

Following the successful appeal by Patersons for planning permission for a new access into the east half of Murrayshall Quarry, the attention of CCC has turned to exploring any mitigation that can be derived from the current ROMP process. In late 2018, CCC submitted detailed comments on two sets of proposed 'conditions' submitted to the ROMP process by Patersons Quarries and Tillicoutry Quarries separately. These comments consisted of various suggested amendments, primarily aimed at making the wording more precise and enforceable, and also six proposed additional conditions.

The six proposed new conditions covered, retention of the Sequoia Grove [ref PQL53], monitoring of quarrying activities by a formal community/council/quarry operator liaison group [ref PQL51], appointment of an independent Ecological Clerk of Works ECoW [Ref PQL 42(a)], monitoring of particulates [Ref PQL 34(a)], limits on material brought onto site [Ref PQL52] and finally one dealing with formal 'conformity' of additional details with what planners had stipulated [ref PQL50] After the Appeal decision, CCC asked local elected members for information on progress of the ROMP and particularly on the suggested amendments by CCC. A meeting was initially proposed between CCC, elected members and Chris Cox, but it was then suggested that it would be more appropriate if the councillors met with Chris without CCC presence, and that Chris meet with CCC separately.

This meeting CCC/planners is the subject of these notes, which are intended to clarify the planner's position

Primary purpose of meeting was to obtain information on progress with ROMP process, particularly with regard to the additional conditions proposed by CCC, but also on the role, if any, of elected members in the approval of conditions.

Involvement of councillors: The ROMP process is a formally 'delegated' decision. It appears however, that a possible choice of planners to refer the decision to the Planning and Resources panel is not a legal option. However other options are being investigated to enable elected member involvement.

Second access: CCC position has historically been that the single access condition in the 1984/2002 conditions is fixed unless there are good reasons [not PQL's commercial considerations] to change.

Planner's position is different. They argue that the ROMP process is a stand-alone current review and any conditions imposed must conform with planning practice and law. The legal test of any imposed condition is that it must be appropriate, reasonable etc

Post meeting research

Planning Circular 4/1998: the use of conditions in planning

General policy

2. Conditions imposed on a grant of planning permission can enable many development proposals to proceed where it would otherwise have been necessary to refuse planning permission. While the power to impose planning conditions is very wide, it needs to be exercised in a manner which is fair, reasonable and practicable. Planning conditions should only be imposed where they are:

- *necessary*
- *relevant to planning*
- *relevant to the development to be permitted*
- *enforceable*
- *precise*
- *reasonable in all other respects.*

The Secretary of State attaches great importance to these criteria being met so that there is an effective basis for the control and regulation of development which does not place unreasonable or unjustified burdens on applicants and their successors in title.

JBB emphasised that the reason for the imposition of a single access is not stated in the 1984/2002 documentation and cannot be easily deduced from current conditions. Because of this the continued imposition of a single access condition could be judged legally 'incompetent'

Further, the reporter's approval of a second access is a material consideration against the continued imposition of a single access condition.

HGV traffic on Polmaise Road:

DC asked for clarification on the mechanism for determining the requirements for use of Polmaise Road by HGVs.

The reporter has clearly stated in condition** that the road must be improved in accordance with Systra report ***, while the current proposed TQLs ROMP conditions [PQL 35] duplicate this requirement.

An anomaly seems to exist that PQL cannot use their access until Polmaise Rd is improved but there are no restrictions on TQL, hence there may still be a role for the ROMP to remove this anomaly /8and add controls on TQL's potential use.

DC questioned whether the reporter's decision effectively removes any role elected members would have in approving, say, the shuttle working proposed in the Systra report, or whether the ROMP process restores some elected member input.

Remote footpath: DC asked if any formal planning process remained before final detailed approval.

JBB No: only details on gradients, alignment etc submitted to officers for approval required.

JBB noted that interpretation of the reporter's condition 'suitable for all non-vehicular users' will result in a 3m wide footpath, [pram and horse passing!] which could be more environmentally intrusive.

CCC 2018 proposed conditions:

Sequoia Grove:

JBB repeated her previous comments that Sequoia not of ecological value etc and therefore no planning reasons for retention.

DC reiterated that current CCC focus was not on discounting the above, but on promoting a scheme for possible retention through compensation to PQL for loss of profit. CCC proposed condition was to require future talks to examine levels of compensation required, with the option on both parties to decline

JBB stated that any 'conditions' included must have a planning reason and that the proposed CCC condition is unlikely to meet that criteria.

JBB suggested that a direct community approach to Patersons might be the best approach.

Community liaison group / ECoW:

DC mentioned the community wish to monitor compliance and suggested that since Patersons have expressed an interest in working with the community that this condition is appropriate.

CC wants to discuss with JBB before comment

Particulates

DC mentioned current national concern on pollution and that this condition would be appropriate in addressing these concerns.

CC wants to discuss with JBB before comment

Other CCC conditions and suggested wording amendments

No discussion

Douglas Campbell

10th April 2021

Appendix 2

Text of report from Mike Hyde Planning Consultant 13/4/21 in response to question Does the imposition of conditions in the ROMP process have to follow the guidance of Circular 4/1998, or can an existing condition retain its status until evidence is produced by the developer to **change** it?

A ROMP approval does not grant a new stand-alone planning permission, it is merely a process that has to be gone through in order to update the conditions attached to the original permission. When the Reporter said the '2002 permission' what he therefore really meant was the '1984 permission with its revised conditions'.

Having said that, any ROMP conditions imposed must still pass all of the 6 tests set out in Circular 4/1998. This means that they must be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

As the appeal allowed a second access it would now be unreasonable of the Council to seek (through the ROMP process) to retain just a single point of access. As the ROMP application has not yet been determined I would have thought that PQ would simply now be submitting a request that when the new conditions are imposed the Council remove the single access condition.

If the ROMP conditions had been approved already (which they haven't) then in Scotland you would submit a Section 42 Application under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 in order to have the condition removed

Appendix IV

Greener Cambusbarron

On behalf of the group I have ordered the fill of a number of hanging baskets. Due to Covid restrictions it will not be possible to do the full village. A volunteer is happy to put these in place and can do so in a domestic bubble. We hope to fill some of the community tubs but still need volunteers for this task.

The group applied for £1110.72 to replace the tubs on the banking at the bowling green with Amberol tubs, through the Community Pride Fund. GB have been given a contribution towards the project of £600 which has disappointed us given we tried so hard to maintain floral display last year when other communities cancelled everything. We intend, with the permission of CCC, to apply for the remainder from Foundation Scotland before the end of the month.

Scottish Water is working with Persimmon to vest the assets at Cambusbarron, in order for us to complete vesting; the assets need to be at an acceptable standard.

Persimmon have not yet provided timescales as to when they will complete the remedial work and to date have provided little information. The vesting team have met regularly with Persimmon to discuss progress with this and their other sites, the slow progress has been escalated up to Director level.

As part of the vesting process Scottish Water will acquire the SuDs basin land, generally up to the edge of the basin. Legals are progressing but will not complete until the SuDs is at an acceptable standard.

When we do get a further update from Persimmon I will share it with you.

We responded siting community frustration and residents complaints and requesting contact details of their contact at Persimmons. We now have contact names and contact details.

I suggest we contact Persimmons directly and produce an information leaflet for the residents to inform them of the status of this issue.

3.6 Park Renovation and Enhancement

The new adult/child see saw has had to be removed from the park, which is very disappointing. There are two broken springs and some significant cracks where the seats connect to the main body of the unit. This has been referred to the manufacturer who has been asked to investigate the matter.

We are very disappointed that there has been minimal progress to the drainage in the park and that there are still huge, and very dangerous, holes in the ground in the Toddler Area. We have received further complaints from parents/carers and would now ask for intervention by our councilors to move this forward.

(Ann – can you attach some of the photographs of holes and the condition of the land around the new Fire Engine please)

3.10 Parking issues at the church junction

The Community Safety Team has been asked to pay attention to the issue and to monitor moving forward. Where necessary enforcement action will occur. This has also been flagged with Police Scotland at a multi-agency meeting.

3.11 QUARRY ROAD DRAINAGE AND EMBANKMENT ISSUES REPORT FOR [VIRTUAL] MEETING 20th April 2021

There has been little progress in the actions arising from the meeting with Stirling Council on 28th February 2021, despite email reminders on 29th March and 16th April.

Although progress on the permanent repair is important, the provision of some form of temporary protection to the hazard of unprotected slope into the burn is urgent and if no action is forthcoming soon, then the assistance of local elected members will be necessary.

Douglas Campbell 18th April 2021

3.12 Brown Bins

Cllr Scott Farmer sent information in regard to our enquiries; please see below the most relevant.

Is it obligatory to have a number on your wheelie bin?

No it is not obligatory to have a number on your wheelie bin.

Should a bin be found to be contaminated and refused for emptying how is the owner identified and charged?

Contaminated bins will not be collected by our crews and if left on the street will eventually be permanently removed by our staff. In terms of fly-tipped waste the Council's Enforcement Officers can look for any identifying information within the waste and contact a householder and if necessary issue a fine.

What happens if a brown bin sticker (or whole bin) is stolen?

The permit stickers are very difficult to remove and as such cannot be transferred to another container.

If a brown bin goes missing a customer can report this to the Council and a new bin and permit will be issued to the customer.

Permits have the address of the property printed on them so cannot be used elsewhere, any bins that have been stolen and are seen in use elsewhere will be uplifted by our staff.

Each permit is unique and as such staff can identify if they are being used within the conditions of the permit scheme. For example a replacement bin and permit can be identified and removed if it is used alongside the original permit and bin, which had previously been reported as missing. The permits are in wide use across Scotland and the UK and are designed to prevent fraudulent use.

3.13 Garages in Thomson Place

CCC sent this enquiry to SC

Several of the garages at Thomson Place are now in a very dangerous condition and are causing concern to residents – schoolchildren pass this area daily and there are fears of a collapse that could cause injury. The near neighbours are also unhappy by the general untidiness, which they live near. This community council and CCDT have had several conversations with council officers over the years in which there have been promises of removal and renewal. Can this now be expedited, particularly the removal of dangerous structures.

Cllr Farmer received this reply from waste services

Our officer have been able to move forward in regards to identifying the possible owners /previous owners of the garages in respect of your enquiry. Once these have been confirmed Housing Services will instruct the amenity squad to take the necessary actions to address these issues.

We would like to reassure you and the Community Council this matter is being progressed however this may take some time to fully complete. We will however keep you updated.

We have replied to Cllr Farmer to say that this is very similar to a response we received several years ago with regard to the same issue. We are anxious to have clarification, as there is a pile of what appears to be asbestos by a garage.

4.7 CCDT

- Considering restarting volunteer days after 26/04/21. restricted
- Fence off Fairy Hill mineshaft.
- Putting out an online survey for walled garden growing area and firewood supply. Offering paper copies for those with no access to social media

- Researching accessing power to the walled garden area.
- Started an education group considering John Muir award and Duke of Edinburgh.
- Gardens continue to be developed more benches being donated community want to help with planting.
- Walled garden. Original fruit trees ordered some already delivered to be planted below the yew hedge.compost toilet due this month, Compost toilet due this month. Awaiting felling licence to clear the trees from the garden and result of the survey before further plans developed.
- Planning permission is in for two containers as storage and work areas situated close to the walled garden.

5 Gala Day Tea at Home

Jane Bain, on behalf of the nursery made the following request. The full application letter is appended.

Further to my recent emails, on behalf of Cambusbarron Village Nursery, I would like to formally request funding for the following project:

Gala Day Tea at Home is a proposal by Cambusbarron Village Nursery (CVN) to deliver Afternoon Tea to elderly, isolated and/or vulnerable Cambusbarron Community Council area residents on Gala Day 2021.

This project will be managed and coordinated by CVN as part of our intergenerational outreach work but will involve other organisations from the community.

2. The costs : • Cost per bag (per person) • Afternoon teas provided by Michael More £5 • Bee bombs £1 • Incidentals (tea bag, paper bag, napkin) £1 Total £7 per bag.

Approval was sought and obtained in principle by the community council, formal clarification of pricing requested, a clear plan of activities and assurance of equality of opportunity for all residents.

Our reply is as follows:-

Thank you for confirming the information from MR More with regard to catering costs. I am happy to confirm the support of the community council with regard to this project with some conditions.

We are unable to support the use of single use paper products. Foundation Scotland, Stirling Council and this community council support the Reduce, Reuse, Recycle philosophy and the supply of paper products to people for use in their own homes would run contrary to this. MR More will supply products in a bag and have always supplied napkins in the past.

We are delighted that the children will make cards and gifts that we are certain will be well received.

The logos of Foundation Scotland and Cambusbarron Community Council should be displayed on all materials used for this project and a short statement to state that their support made the project possible.

Please confirm to us that this project is open to all residents in the community council area and that there will be equality of opportunity.

After conversations with Melissa, given that your numbers are subject to change, she is happy to pay MR More directly to save admin for both sides. Therefore I shall ask her to furnish you with £213.40 to cover your costs. We shall require receipts, a financial breakdown and a refund of any unused monies at the end of your project. We wish you well with this endeavour.

7 Kersebonny Road

We sent the following to SC on 19th March

The condition of the road edges on Kersebonny Road, particularly the stretch from Kersebonny Steading to Dunbarton Road is becoming quite dangerous. Large vehicles, including a crane, are using this road to exit the village from the building site at the mill and there are now areas of the road edge with very large holes. These could be dangerous to drivers in the dark and cause damage to vehicles. This road has become very busy with walkers and cyclist during lockdown and the subject of reducing the speed limit to 20mph will be on the agenda for our next meeting.

The reply from SC Team Leader – Operations

Noted that the speed limit had been reduced to 40mph on this [cycle friendly road](#)_SC deem it is working well and is being monitored but gave no details as to how.

Road Maintenance has been asked to investigate the need for work to roads and verges.

We responded with regard to walkers on the road and concern of walkers.

Personal note:- I walk this road often and push a pram that often gets trapped in the very large holes on the verges. (Photos to follow to attach). I would be looking for a reduction to 30mph at the very least and a sign asking that vehicles “give way to cyclists and walkers”.
Next Steps?