



**Colonsay Community Development Company
Board Meeting
Thursday 10th February 2022**

1. Attendance and Apologies

Board members: Andrew Abrahams (AA), Caitlin McNeill (CM), Callum Hay (CH), Danny Onn (DO), Sarah Hobhouse (SH), Helen Mann (HM), Liam McNeill (LM), William Joll (WJ)

Project Co-ordinators: Carrie Seymour (CS) (part)

Apologies: LK

Also present: Clare Hay(minutes)

2. Minutes of last meeting.

Accepted.

Matters Arising.

The CCDC had still not received any income from TSL. HM will follow up. DO apologised as he had not managed yet to write the letter re the resignation of the registrar to ABC. WJ said he had received a note from Jane Howard asking if the CCC should also circulate the recently issued surveys. CM said that the CCC and CCDC have the same email list so there was no need.

3. Declarations of interest: HM re campsite and crofting, CS re crofting

4. Projects

a) Scalasaig

CS had issued the project report and added that she and HM would be meeting Helen Mackie of the community Housing Trust and J. Forbes regarding assistance with the allocations policy and other matters. There was a discussion about how much to engage with CHT and DO asked that a note of the meeting be circulated to the board. DO noted that WHH also use CHT and that CCDC's allocation policy should align with the WHHA allocation policy. A report would be presented at the next meeting with three options for going forward for the board to vote on. CS said she would also talk to CHT about marketing the plots and houses.

DO raised the issue regarding the moving of the overhead power cables at the site, which needed to be done before TSL restarted work. This would need an island wide power outage for a day. DO would continue to pursue the matter with SSE, and CS would speak to TSL about the possible impact on the project timescale.

Action DO/CS follow up re moving cables

CH presented a paper on the new cost pressures facing the project. Two costs were unavoidable. These were provision of fire suppression systems and third party warranties for the houses for sale.

CH said there were three new options to consider, but if adopted these would take the project over budget, on current projections. These are reinstatement of the deferred second phase drainage link, provision of porches, and provision of enhanced sustainability features. There may also be a claim for increased costs from TSL due to exceptional inflation caused by factors such as the pandemic, Brexit and fuel costs. CCDC's advice is that these should be covered by the fixed price contract, but TSL may contest that.

There was a general discussion of the issues and potential problems. DO noted that delayed decisions could add to costs and said it was important that the board decided on the proposals in the paper at the meeting.

The board agreed to the proposals in the paper as follows

1. agreed
2. agreed
3. agreed but priority order changes to
 - i. additional sustainability features as in paper
 - ii. porches
 - iii second phase drainage link
- 4, agreed, including picking up the work on the diaspora appeal (AA to lead working with CM and CS)
5. agreed
- 6 agreed

There were no comments on the revised risk register.

The Board agreed to all three recommendations in the paper

Action AA to pick up diaspora appeal work with assistance as above

b) Campsite

HM's declaration of interest was noted. LK's project report had been received. DO reported that a response to the funding bid had been received and ABC could offer around £40,000 for the project, which meant reviewing the project costings to fit the sum available. SH and DO noted that it was extremely important that a clear agreement was reached between HM and CCDC as to who assets belonged to, and what CCDC's role was. There must be no conflict of interests. CCDC could act as a conduit to manage funding and provide in-kind support, as it did for the community garden project, but HM would need to make the bid and any assets would belong to her, as would responsibility for running the site. There was a general discussion about how this could be achieved successfully. DO highlighted that CCDC had publicised the opportunity and had no other expressions of interest

DO said the grant application currently stated that CCDC and HM would have a continuing agreement. The bid would have to be revised and resubmitted to meet the funding available, and the revised agreement between HM and CCDC made clear, before the project proceeded. The recommendations in the report were not accepted by the board for the time being, although CH proposed that LK could continue to help HM work on the bid and agreement, providing in-kind support. This was agreed.

The project would be discussed by the board again at the next meeting.

Action DO, HM, LK review and revise agreement, HM submit revised bid, LK revise paper

c) Moorings

Approval had been received from HIE and MOWI and all the funding was now in place. DO said the licence needed had not yet arrived, and its date of arrival was as yet unknown.

5. Assets

Old Manse

In LK's absence, CM gave an update on consultation responses received. Although the deadline had not been reached, there had been a very good response so far. CM said that it should be possible to make site visits soon.

6. Rebranding/Website

DO asked if SH had anything to add to her report. SH asked if the board agreed to proceed with the work as the time available was very short. AA said he had missed seeing the paper so had not read it. DO informed the meeting of the key points of the paper. SH provided her reasons for the choice of West Coast Media. AA asked if the current supplier had been approached to quote. SH said they had not, as they did not do branding. SH proposed a small working group to take the work forward consisting of herself, HM and CM. DO suggested there should be a further meeting with the board once Sarah had something to show the board. CS asked how long it would take to produce signage for the moorings. SH said it would be part of the design palette. The board approved the proposals in the paper.

7. Community Consultation

CM said she was still working through and collating the responses to the survey. Responses were still coming in owing to some confusion on the deadline. She appealed for all directors to respond to the survey and hoped to have focus groups running by early March. She expected to be working on analysis by the week after the meeting.

8. Crofts Update

CS said the sale of the first croft house site had gone through and that the agreement for the sale of the housing site to WHH had been signed (on the day of the meeting).

DO reported that Kevin Byrne (KB) had asked on behalf of the Heritage (??) group if there could be a kissing gate installed in the fence at the top of the croft land. Following a question, the position of the proposed gate was clarified. No concerns were expressed and DO was authorised to report agreement in principle to KB.

The boundary of the CCDC croft land at Uragaig had been professionally surveyed as agreed with the Estate and was now properly mapped. Tenants can now use the map to register their croft. CCDC had agreed to share payment for the survey and this would be £200.

9. Coal Righ

WJ and AA suggested a get together to clear up the coal and gas storage area. This is normally done annually. WJ volunteered to organise it and the date of 19/20th February was proposed. CH thanked them for setting it up. CH and DO volunteered to help.

Action WJ organise tidying of Coal Righ.

AOB.

None.

DONM

The next meeting will be on 10th March 2022 at 7pm
in the hall if possible.

CS left the meeting