

**Cockburnspath and Cove Community Council Meeting, Wednesday 14th April 2021, at 7pm by
Zoom**

Minutes

Agenda item		Action
1	<p>Apologies and Attendance: Apologies had been received from J Virtue; S Hay and N Simpson. In attendance were P Hood (Chair); K Nelson (Treasurer); K Tulloch (secretary); M Black; J Fairbairn; R Laird; J Lister; S Fletcher; D Bouchard; J Sutton (CDF); Cllrs H Laing and C Hamilton; 3 members of the public (which included E Gray providing the Shop Update).</p>	
2	<p>Police Report: Circulated. Most activity had been around Eyemouth, but suspicious van seen around the village here recently. Silver Ford Connect – YN65 ZZD. If seen please report to police as this is a vehicle of interest to them. Please also be aware that although the occupants were knocking on doors of dog owners particularly, no attempted theft of any animal took place. Please however, remain vigilant. All suspicious activity should be reported to the Police on 101 or 999 if a crime is in progress. Although posts to our facebook page can be made to alert others, please ensure they are accurate and do not compromise live Police investigations before forwarding.</p>	
3	<p>Minutes of Previous Meeting were agreed as correct and signed. Taken early:</p>	
6.2	<p>Cockburnspath Garage Relocation Plans – 21/00513/FUL. A number of written replies had been received. KT started the discussion explaining engagement via facebook and emails particularly from neighbours to the proposal. Although there is some agreement that the siting on the site in question is fairly sensitive, there are concerns re parking, scrap car parking occurring in the future, given the parking currently on verges etc at the current site. She indicated that she knew the CC was supportive of the application but she objected. PH advised what the CC’s function was in this. This is to collate and present the community’s views to SBC Planning Authorities. It is not the CC’s function to support or object although they may add their own comments. RL thanked PH for clarifying and added that individuals who wanted to object or otherwise to this application should make their views known to Planning Authority. Some discussion around amalgamation of activities on the new site, and it was acknowledged that there would be a transition period where both sites would be operational. MoP mentioned that people in the community think the CC have a “recommendation” role here and that they think that making an objection to the CC will suffice. However, although we represent these views, individuals are asked, as stated above, to also contact SBC Planners. A link to the on line site at SBC is as follows: https://eplanning.scotborders.gov.uk/online-applications/ Enter the planning reference number into the search and you can make a comment. Postal comments can be sent to Paul Duncan, Planning Officer at Scottish Borders Council, Council Headquarters, Newtown St Boswells, TD6 0SA. It was stressed that support as well as objections to this application can be made. Plans are now to include the above details in the newsletter (KT to provide snip map for this) which will come out next week, and allow until the end of April for comments, then submit the community view to SBC by the closing date for comments of 5th May. Further discussion included</p>	KT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Zoning – the land is not zoned for industrial use - It is outwith the Local Development Plan - Conditions that may be imposed (re parking, scrap cars etc) - Whether the site blended with existing buildings in the area - Trees and screening were also discussed - Dropping the building on site by approx. 3m. - It was broadly agreed that if the Council (SBC) was minded to approve this application, the proposed site on the field was the most sensible in terms of residential amenity impacts. <p>A MoP (neighbour) also commented on the industrial nature of the application as a larger commercial operation and the propensity for scrap vehicles, some of which are already placed there. This MoP can see the site from downstairs and upstairs windows and has serious concerns and no confidence in the site being kept tidy and well kept. They also commented on the potential visual appearance from the A1 and entrance to Cockburnspath. They added that site has not been maintained well and is basically scrub land, whereas previously it was maintained in a better state and this was the reason it was not suitable for agricultural use.</p> <p>Members of the public were assured that their views will be represented in the community views. Cllr Laing said that members of the public can make representation verbally to the Planning Committee for a maximum of 6 minutes if they wished to support or object and have their voices heard at this level. Action: newsletter inclusion and distribution clarifying function of CC in this matter, and the need for personal views made clear to SBC.</p>	
6.1	Window at Seaview – 21/00428/FUL – agreed that the change to alignment of one window would not detract from conservation area. KT will advise SBC.	KT/JS
4.1	Digital Engagement Platform – no update from developer as yet, but an indication that this will come very soon. KT and JS will press for this next week if no further update. MoP added that he had had input re usability and felt the design was good. PH also added that the PforR (Planning for Real) physical map would also be used once restrictions allow.	KT
4.2	Allotment update – NS had circulated an update that the fencing was now completed; water was going in at present and the hedges and cemetery boundary planting would commence 19 th April, with volunteers expected on site week beginning 23 rd April.	KT/JS
4.3	Village Caretaker update – SH had commenced his role from 6 th April and PH is progressing his contract and insurance currently. KT asked PH about contract for IT worker which she had sent – PH had not received this and KT will send again.	KT
4.4	Shop update – base is in and drainage has been passed by Building Control and the building is arriving next Thursday (22 nd April). A newsletter will be circulated to Hoprig Road, The Square, Callander Place etc and School advising of this as the vehicle is large and will require a clear run to the site. SBC are temporarily removing some street architecture to allow the vehicle to access the site. Volunteers will be required to help paint, put up shelves etc in the next few weeks. Suppliers have been arranged with the major one being Filshill (supplied previous shop) which will ensure value items as well as more specialist and artisan supplies. No opening date is available yet, as electrics, fire alarms, intruder alarms etc have still to be installed. The CC wished the shop team good luck with the next phase and were pleased to hear of progress.	

4.5	<p>COVID update/asymptomatic testing – a programme of asymptomatic testing is going on throughout the area, and this may be responsible for the odd blips in the overall very favourable downturn in infection rates. PH asked about vaccine cards to prove that full vaccination had taken place. At the moment there is no system for this, but it may be available in the future. KT mentioned that this may be available through GP surgeries. Acknowledged the system for under 50s was now centralised and not under GPs or Trusts and would be administered under ScotGov. We hope this will eliminate the issues locally with cross border working. MoP added that in England people received vaccination cards and as someone who worked across the English/Scottish Borders, he was unable to prove that he had had vaccines.</p>	
4.6	<p>Management of wind farm benefits – PH had circulated the previous Development Trust document which was considered some years ago, and was the basis for a SCIO application. Much discussion around this and how the future management of wind farm benefits could be made easier in terms of conflict of interest and varying community views which can make allocating funds contentious. Acknowledged it was important to have a lawyer involved. JS asked PH to summarise where the CC were with this. Much discussion around the CCs duty to collate and pass on community views, which can vary around the community, and how this can be at odds with the need to be impartial and fair in assessing funding applications. It is also around CC workload and administration, and it was agreed that a distinct body to provide due diligence and make recommendations about funding applications was required. DB mentioned that it would make debating funding applications easier and more timeous. It was also agreed that the CC should still have a role in funding applications, and to satisfy some developer’s conditions, some members of the CC would sit on the Development Trust. Discussed Foundation Scotland potential role here which would need to be paid for. Discussed role of CCEL here and whether the Trustees of this group could take on a Development Trust role. PH said it would be difficult for them to award money to themselves and JS mentioned that it could be arranged if the Trustees were to take a holistic view (as a Community Benefits Society) not purely concerned with the shop. KN said that the proactive nature of the Community Action Plan (CAP) made this separation even more important as more major projects are coming forward and will continue to do so under the CAP. KT asked if Foundation Scotland should be invited to a meeting soon as it was important to get some movement on this before CC elections in August.</p>	Cf May
4.7	<p>Old Cambus potholes – being attended to by SBC next time there is a squad in the area. KT has informed complainant.</p>	
4.8	<p>Local flooding – KT has been in touch with SBC Officer and will chase this. Some diggers may be hired for allotment site and could perhaps be utilised to clear some of the debris in the burn.</p>	KT
4.9	<p>Litter and fly tipping – Council have been good at removing items, and CNC Police are aware of bottle dumping close to Bilsdean. Cove volunteers were thanked for their recent efforts around local litter removal. Members of the community have contacted Dunbar McDonald’s from where some of the litter comes but we are outwith their litter picking area. Officer at SBC is also aware and Council are regularly clearing areas here. SF suggested that the schools/older children could be involved in voluntary litter picking which will assist with Duke of Edinburgh awards etc. Litter and visitors at Cove were</p>	

	<p>also mentioned as visitor numbers increase. Discussed litter in Cockburnspath – less of a problem but there are some hotspots and in Dunbar, a litter pick had gathered 10 bags of litter from around the grammar school, despite pupils being off! JS will discuss with School at a relevant point. The school can obtain a “plastic free” status through Sea the Change and JS will suggest this. MB said that Bankhead cemetery car park can gather litter also. SF said that creating awareness in young people was a positive. KN said that she had been speaking to Network Rail Community Engagement Officer, and part of his remit was to do with Health and Safety regarding areas around railways - would be willing to speak to school children. Also Angus Millar from Geological Society was willing to give a presentation to schools to raise awareness of Siccar Point. A Zoom celebration of James Hutton’s work has been suggested also by Geological Society. They would also be interested in a local visitor centre in the long term. This may relate well to ideas of a community hub, and create employment in the area.</p>	JS
4.10	<p>Electric Charging Points – Cllr HL advised that there was a policy being developed to go to the Sustainable Development Group at SBC, and she would ensure we were represented. Grantshouse apparently got theirs due to proximity to A1. KT mentioned that prospective sites could be included in the CAP. PH said that funding may be available for such activities, particularly for homeowners. KN said that charging points may be incorporated into the garage relocation and felt this could be communicated to the owners.</p>	SH
4.11	<p>Cycle rack for Cove – Cllr HL fed back that the Council were willing to provide same and NS/KN are liaising with Officers over site. Discussed several sites and KN will take the lead on this. Robust marine type racks would be best. One parking space would be lost, but the barometer would be more visible. JS also asked whether there may be possibility of a rack outside the new shop and KN will take this forward with Officer as Copath and Cove are close to cycle routes. KN will action.</p>	KN
4.12	<p>Website – MoP who is taking on IT admin role is willing to develop and it was agreed to pay his charges to get this up and running. KT had purchased a cheap wordpress site and MoP is taking this forward. It was agreed that a temporary website was needed now and it was further agreed that MoP be paid for this at the agreed hourly cost. Agreed that MoP should keep work to one day (5 to 7 hrs) and if it escalated much beyond this, to come back to the CC. Discussed purchase of domain name, which KT thinks she has done – JS added to discussion as currently doubt around fusion site with CCEL. KT added aim is to get something up and running now, and RL agreed. Minutes and agendas need to be made digitally available and KN added that as this fell under running the Council, it could come from Community Council budget. KT will liaise with MoP over this. CC could write some content but this could be lifted from existing website.</p>	KT
5.2	<p>Payment for Zoom – SF has paid from this from the monies held by her for COVID and will provide receipt to Treasurer.</p>	SF
4.13	<p>Contract for IT worker and Caretaker – covered earlier – PH to action. Cllr HL said SBC sometimes offers training on Safeguarding and SH can be signposted to this as it arises.</p>	PH
4.14	<p>Bollards at war memorial – will be replaced by SBC asap.</p>	
5	<p>Correspondence – all circulated.</p>	

	<p>restarted on Monday. Some anxiety about doorstep campaigning as some were glad to see people whereas others were still very cautious.</p> <p>KT – Lorries travelling through village – MoP had said that there was a prohibition against this, and signage existed at Hoprig end of village. It was clarified however that this was a temporary prohibition due to wind farm works some years ago. KT will liaise with MoP to clarify.</p> <p>KT – some planning complaints had been sent to the CC and the MoP asked for these to be forwarded to Planning Authorities, but had later retracted these.</p> <p>JF – trees around Church Hall and Old Manse concerns – SF said that Church had inspected the Church Hall trees fairly recently and there were no concerns – she will check this. SF will speak to occupants of Old Manse also.</p> <p>SF – concerned re Secretary workload recently – particularly facebook posts. Need to discuss facebook policy here and the public not reporting things to police etc but notifying CC. KT said that much of this was her own doing as she was trying to be helpful! This was agreed! There is a propensity for people to “jump” on any information posted on fb and this is possibly a symptom of lockdown. Much discussion ensued on this and it was agreed that the approach should be to direct people to relevant authorities and contacts rather than try to answer everything. RL had quite a lot of input to this and suggested that some comments placed (eg information sharing) could say “no comments are invited” and threads could be closed. Some discussion around taking the fb page down entirely, and replacing it with the website. In the meantime complaints and issues could be directed to secretary email address (secretarycccc@live.co.uk) PH said there is a dilemma here as our remit is to gather views, and fb is important to this. KT and JS said that individual councillors should be contactable in their own areas as per her suggestion to others. A “remote” person could administer this, but they need to know the answers to questions, which largely, CC members can respond to. Suggested pinned post to give directions to people over specifics such as planning, police issues etc. RL said that people don’t come to meetings, but are willing to criticise. KT said that people can make up a CC email address for contacting them. Cllr Laing will ask others about best practice in this area and advise (see below). PH commented on previous practices of each CC member having an area of responsibility, or including something in the newsletter. JL suggested a text message alert system like schools have, for some items which has no ability to reply. Website should assist with many of these issues. JS said that in the future the fb page could be taken down and replaced (if the public wished this) with a “Co’path Online” page. Cllr HL said all comments should be positive and constructive and this should be stated. Generally, it was agreed that a fb page was probably needed but it needs to be better controlled. KN said that rarely do people come to CC meetings, even when they have raised a specific complaint or issue and felt that fb generated negativity. To hold under review.</p> <p>PH – said KT had generated a list of “contacts” for future CC after the elections and this was welcomed and will be added to over the next months. Everyone is encouraged to add contacts to the list.</p> <p>PH – Cllr Laing will seek an indication of best practice for members of the public to contact CC members and raise this at CC Review. Agreed that although we have a generic address (secretarycccc@live.co.uk) a higher use</p>	<p>KT</p> <p>SF</p> <p>Cllr HL</p> <p>May</p> <p>All</p> <p>Cllr HL</p>
--	--	---

	<p>of this would generate more work for admins. Many CC members were reluctant to give out personal contact details due to fear of backlash. To cf to May and seek advice from SBC.</p> <p>JS – foodbank accounts – currently in credit to £1162.71. Discussed how this could be apportioned when the foodbank eventually closed (possibly end June if restrictions are lifted and the shop is open). This was not direct funding from windfarms etc but from donations to the foodbank, and it could be sent to Church of Scotland recommended charity in due course. All foodstuffs would be returned to Fareshare for their distribution.</p> <p>JL – Village Hall – concerned re lack of contact re reopening and inability to contact the Chair. PH suggested that she talks to Treasurer re an AGM. KT added that MoP who had raised a complaint to OSCR, had been responded to by the VH Chair indicating that the BAVS recommendations re reopening, are planned and an AGM called. The CAP will also feed in to regeneration of the hall post COVID with what the community wish to see happen there. It was explained that the Village Hall operates separately from the CC.</p> <p>KN – welcomed the work of the Caretaker in Cove and had received positive comments from the public. She also mentioned that work on the interpretation panels on the SUW and at Cove was almost complete, including the broken board at the car park (21st April). The enhancement grant from BHA had also been partially used to regenerate the tubs at Cove and a MoP has volunteered her time as a gardener. She also mentioned that the co-opted member responsible for paths maintenance would continue this year and considered as part of the Caretaker pilot study for the future.</p> <p>KT - mentioned that the information board proposed for the Mercat Cross would be carried forward to the CAP as there had been some disagreement on this – likewise the benches at the war memorial, which may be better left until news of garage application is available.</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.</p> <p>The next meeting of Cockburnspath and Cove Community Council will be held on Wednesday 12th May at 7pm by Zoom. Members of the public are welcome and encouraged to attend all such meetings, and Zoom invitations can be issued on request to jenniesuttoncc@gmail.com</p>	<p>May</p> <p>June</p>
--	--	------------------------