

Forum Meeting Minutes

Date: 18th November 2020, 7.00pm

Venue: Online, Zoom meeting

Minute taken by: Roslyn Clarke

Attendees: (29)

KECM Sheriff Kathrine EC Mackie (Forum Chair)

AG Alan Gillies

RHJ Rodger Harvey Jaimeson (Chair Applecross Trust)

VH Valerie Hodgkinson

GC Gordon Cameron

RC Roslyn Clarke (Applecross Community Company)

JG Jon Glover (Chair Applecross Community Council)

LK Leslie Kilbride

OK Owen Kilbride (Chair Applecross Community Company)

TK Tom Kilbride

JL Jackie Liuba

MM Megan Macinnes (Community Woodland Group)

FM Fiona MacKenzie

DM David Mackie

KM Kirsten Mackie

AM Archie Maclellan (Applecross Trust)

VM Valerie Macpherson

AMA Anne Macrae

JM Jack Marris

EM Elodie Matthews

TM Tery McCowan (sports group)

GM Gerry McPartlin

TO Tom O'Halloran

SV Saara Viitanen

ZV Zuzu Vojackova

CW Chris Ward

FW Frankie Ward

GW Gregor Watson

JW Jess Whistance (Applecross Trust)

1. **Welcome and apologies**

KECM welcomed everyone and said the meeting is being recorded.

Apologies received from Kalie Wilkinson.

2. Minute of the meeting held on Wednesday 15th January

3.

The minute from the previous meeting on 15 January 2020 were proposed by Fiona McKenzie and seconded by Tery McCowan.

KECM thanked Elaine Glover for her time as forum secretary and said she has now stepped down from this role.

4. Action Tracker and matters arising

KECM discussed the Action Tracker. The following items are to be marked as completed and taken out of the action tracker:

- Allotment project – completed
- Coastal road complaint for timber haulage – completed
- Ebike project – completed.

KECM asked about progress of the following items:

- Items 2 & 5 – to be discussed under the updates.
- Item 3 – paths
- Item 6 – conservation policy
- Item 9 - Bealach na ba viewpoints – plan
- Item 12 - Traffic research

5. Update reports

KECM said all the update reports can be found on the forum website. KECM said the Community Council have provided previous meeting minutes, rather than a specific report.

a) Applecross Community Council

JG said the Community Council (CC) meetings have been difficult online. Item 12 on the activity tracker, traffic research – has not been actioned as traffic volumes have been skewed by the covid pandemic. This has been postponed until the traffic is back to normal levels. JG confirmed that CC are working with Strathclyde university for researchers. AM suggested contacting Mackenzie Sutherland for support for traffic counters. He is in charge of local roads.

JG said that for Item 9 Bealach na ba viewpoints, no plans have been received. The viewpoints are now in place, but the interpretation boards are not. AM said Helen Smith is finalising the interpretation boards. JG said the plans are not required now, as the viewpoints are now in place.

They are hardcore surfacing, not bitumen. KECM noted the lack of information provided.

AMA said the extended laybys are being completed this week and the Applecross Sign was replaced yesterday. AMA noted the old sign was taken away. AMA questioned the signage at the junction, as the Highland Council are working there.

b) Applecross Community Company

KECM noted the list of activities undertaken by Applecross Community Company (ACC). GM praised the work noted in the ACC and Applecross Trust report. GM noted there has been a lot of work in the last few years and thanks to all the volunteers involved. KECM agreed and noted the demanding schedule of work.

c) Recreations & Sports

JG noted this has been put on hold until the community fund is established and decisions made about the development of the Steading.

d) Clachan Church

FM said there has been no decision on chairs by the Trustees. The Church of Scotland Church in Camusterrach has been surveyed and it is planned it will go on the market. The minister is also to retire.

OK discussed the community interest in the Church of Scotland church. OK noted this is unsuitable for development for housing, principally due to cost. OK indicated that there could be other possible uses (such as workshops, library, office space) but said it should not duplicate the use of the hall or overburden the community. Interest had been expressed but there was no obvious source of funding. KECM asked if the Church might be donated. OK said he was not sure and asked if anyone has any ideas for use or funding to get in touch with ACC.

FM said she did not know when it was going on the market and it seemed to be progressing slowly. GM asked what the valuation is. OK did not have a formal valuation but believed it was likely to be in the region of £180,000 to £200,000. SV said there was a pre-sale survey undertaken, and there was one individual interested in the property.

e) Applecross Trust

RHJ said there are several buildings ready to be occupied on a small scale. The Applecross Trust would like to see them put back into use.

OK asked which properties were available and if any were for sale. RHJ said the properties are more suitable for community groups who need a space, and the Trust would prefer to engage with a group rather than sell. RHJ detailed the following properties:

- Cart shed by the campsite
- Mike's workshop at Clachan
- Old stables building – The Applecross Trust wish to develop the Steading in phases. If a community group interested, possible areas could be converted for use.

OK said we need more information – eg. what rental value and condition. KECM said the property condition and access are important pieces of information. KECM suggested further discussions may be merited. KECM noted the Applecross Trust's willingness for properties for community use. KECM invited RHJ and OK to have a discussion with a view to obtaining more information and then continue at the next Forum meeting

JW suggested that before getting down to specific details on properties, if there are any ideas from community groups, then they are welcome just come forward and discuss. TM noted she approached the Trust about buildings, and it was a positive and easy way. AM said that upgrade costs vary and matching a use to an upgrade is critical. AM said they need to work out costs for each building. AM/RHJ to provide more information.

DM mentioned that Mike Summers is retiring. The Forum recognised his significant contribution to Applecross over the past 25 years and offered a warm welcome to his replacement, Ian Macfadyen.

f) Helipad

No comment raised.

g) Tourism Management Group

OK suggested that discussions within the Tourism Group should be extended into the community. He was aware of some concerns for example over what appeared to a promotion of "wild camping". TM said something had needed to be done last summer. TM suggested people come forward and enter the discussions. FM suggested it would be good to set "ground rules" for campers because we may face similar

circumstances next summer. Lessons could be learned from recent experience.

TOH asked that the Tourism Group consider how they consult with the community. It would be good if the Group could facilitate an open meeting and consult widely on the matters that affect everyone. TM reiterated that something had to be done last summer, people could join the Group but agreed consultation is important.

JW suggested the Tourism Group discusses the issues on a small scale within the Group, and then this would be put out for consultation with the community – eg. Leaflet/Forum/meeting. JW said the actions in the summer were exceptional and happened in response to the Covid pandemic. JW said things will normally go through the community.

KECM said it was an exceptional year, but suggested things could be similar next year. KECM said now is the time to develop a strategy with the community having learned lessons from what happened this year. JW confirmed that was the intention of the Group. DM said everyone including those who have been unhappy with measures taken need to think of solutions to the issues.

6. Governance of Forum

KECM outlined the previous governance documents. KECM put six questions to forum vote. All six proposals were agreed to as follows:

1. *Does the Forum agree that it remains an unconstituted body?*
Agree 87% Disagree 0% Abstain 13%
2. *Does the Forum agree that a Chair should be elected by a majority of those in attendance at a meeting and should hold office for 3 years with a possible re-election for a further 3 years?*
Agree 83% Disagree 9% Abstain 8%
3. *Does the Forum agree that an Advisory Group be formed to assist the Chair, to determine the costs of the Forum and to review the workings and effectiveness of the Forum?*
Agree 87% Disagree 0% Abstain 13%
4. *Does the Forum wish the current volunteers to continue to set up the Advisory Group?*

Agree 83% Disagree 0% Abstain 17%

5. *Does the Forum agree that the number of members of the Advisory Group should be 3?*

Agree 61% Disagree 9% Abstain 30%

6. *Does the Forum agree that the costs be met from the Community Fund?*

Agree 78% Disagree 4% Abstain 17%

GW suggested the members for the Advisory Group should be advertised in the community.

7. Community Fund

DM outlined details on the £170,000 “community pot”. DM said this funding needs a home, and an independent body is required. DM suggested this could be in the form of a Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation (SCIO) which is recognized by Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR).

DM suggested this SCIO would require the following:

- A bank account
- Minimum of five board members
- A constitution
- ACC and Community Council chair on the board.

OK explained that the Board of ACC had discussed and decided that it was not appropriate for the Chair to be a Trustee for a number of reasons. There was concern about the volume of work involved and possible perceptions of conflict of interest were the ACC to apply for funding. Further the ACC would see itself as the natural home for donations. DM acknowledged that there would be work involved particularly in the setting up but this was not insurmountable and was likely to be a relatively modest commitment thereafter. He expressed concern about a suggestion of a conflict of interest with the ACC in respect of receipt of funds this not having been raised before. FM said it had been considered important that the ACC and CC be involved to achieve the right balance and relationship with the Forum and the

community. GC said that he would email some thoughts later. He emphasised that there could be a *perceived* conflict of interest. GC suggested that public funding should be explored before these funds were dispersed. The immediate needs of the community should be considered. There was no point in investing funds for the future if the community might not survive. GC said the funding should be for the geographical area of Applecross.

KECM put six questions to forum vote. All six proposals were agreed to as follows.

1. *Does the Forum wish the current Shadow Trustees to progress the SCIO proposal?*

Agree 61% Disagree 0% Abstain 39%

2. *Does the Forum agree with the suggestion that Trustee numbers should be 5?*

Agree 78% Disagree 0% Abstain 22%

3. *Does the Forum consider that it would be desirable to have the Chairs of the Community Council and Community Company as ex officio Trustees?*

Agree 48% Disagree 17% Abstain 35%

4. *In the event that 3 above is not agreed, will the Forum nominate a further number of Trustees?*

Agree 78% Disagree 0% Abstain 22%

5. *Is the Forum content with the areas of the draft Purposes, noting that the final document would come back for consideration?*

Agree 78% Disagree 4% Abstain 17%

6. *Is there a desire to look at establishing a joint administrative role funded from the Fund?*

Agree 74% Disagree 4% Abstain 22%

KECM said the results show we should continue on the path of establishing a SCIO and return to the Forum with the progress. DM thanked everyone and noted the positive steps.

8. AOB

KECM said that a complaint had been made about traffic to the hydro scheme at Allt na Moine causing damage to the road. AM to send contact details for the relevant official.

JG said that Elaine had not received any payment for her role as Secretary. KECM undertook to look into this omission.

9. Date of next meeting

Next meeting scheduled for 13th January 2021 at 7pm.