

94 Victoria Terrace  
Dunfermline  
Fife  
KY12 0LU  
**Tel: 01383 729869**

**E-Mail: [tomminogue@btinternet.com](mailto:tomminogue@btinternet.com)**

Her Majesty The Queen  
Buckingham Palace  
London  
SW1A 1AA

First Draft by E-Mail via PCO today and First Class post to Buckingham Palace.  
Friday 11<sup>th</sup> August 2006.

Your Majesty,

Privy Counsel Royal Charters—Are you—our Queen being advised to take part in a parody on democracy?

I believe that you are, because of bad advice given to you by your Privy Counsellors. I say this with regret and would ask you to investigate the manner in which the Carnegie Dunfermline Trust has been granted a Supplemental Charter by you at a meeting of the Privy Counsel which took place on the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2006. The details of the application are as follows:

On Friday 29<sup>th</sup> July 2005 The Dunfermline Carnegie Trust applied for a Supplemental Charter to vary the manner in which, on behalf of the people of Dunfermline, it manages a £14.5 million fund and the Pittencrieff Park (known locally as The Glen). The people were not told by the Trustees that a change to the rules governing their activities—which, since 1917 have been regulated by Royal Charter—was being sought.

At the time of their application The Trustees had advertised their intention to seek the change in the Edinburgh Gazette as the law requires, but they had not repeated this advert in the local press which is the norm with such matters and which they were morally obliged (and arguably legally obliged by the terms of their trusteeship) to do.

When it was floated in the press that The Glen was being considered as the site of a speculative development (something that is contrary to the terms of the original bequest) there was serious concerns raised by many local people which were aired in the press and on the streets where petitions appeared calling for no building to take part in The Glen.

Rumours began to circulate that the Trust were seeking ways of circumventing the terms laid down by Andrew Carnegie which prohibited anything of a speculative nature taking part in The Glen. I shared these concerns and over the last 7 weeks I have written to the

Trust asking them to advise me of the current terms governing their stewardship and any proposed changes to those terms. The Trust have failed to disclose these matters

I was present in a delegation from the Pittencrieff Park Society (PPS) who met with the C.E.O. of the Trust yesterday and we were again denied details of the supplemental terms to the original charter.

In another attempt to establish the new terms I have contacted your Privy Counsellors Office with a request under the Freedom of Information Act. Your Privy Counsellors tell me that new terms have been approved by you, our Queen and are now awaiting the application of the Scottish Seal by the Scottish Executive—but until then—the terms of the new charter are not in the public domain and we the people of Dunfermline have no right to know the details of the changes to our bequest!

I am aware that the office of Privy Counsellor has been under attack recently in the tabloid press and I would stress that I do not wish to add to this attack. I think that there is possibly some reasonable explanation why the Privy Council Office has approved the Carnegie Dunfermline Trust Supplemental Charter despite the fact that the PCO's guidelines that applicants should consult with groups who may oppose their application prior to applying have not been followed—in fact the Trust have deliberately withheld the news of their application from the beneficiaries of the Trust—the people of Dunfermline.

In 1903 Andrew Carnegie told the Trust members: “As it is the masses you are to benefit it follows you have to keep in touch with them and must carry them with you” Carnegie also made it clear that the Pittencrieff Park must be used for the recreation and leisure pursuits of the poor people of Dunfermline yet it would now seem that the terms of the charter which governs the actions of the Trust are being changed to allow a speculative £30 million building project in the form of a Harvard style business school, which we are told by our local MSP, Scott Barrie is to be built in the Glen—or not built at all!

I can not imagine that your Majesty would knowingly approve a Charter that is enacted in such an arrogant and flawed manner. Without knowing the terms of the Supplemental Charter the people may be fearing terms that are not a threat to their rights. However by being denied knowledge of the terms of the Supplement their suspicions are being fuelled.

In the event that the worst fears of the people are realised and the Charter has been amended to facilitate development of The Glen I can see the situation arising where the hundreds who have already signed petitions of objection will turn into thousands demanding that the Royal Charter be revoked. I am sure that in such circumstances you would be sympathetic to their demands and rather than wait till that event arises I would respectfully ask that you recall the Royal Charter before it receives the Scottish Seal.

I will be copying this letter to the Scottish Executive by way of a request that they defer application of the Scottish Seal to allow you time to investigate this matter and I append a

more detailed Background to the matter. I would of course be willing to provide any supporting documentation that might be required.

Yours faithfully,

Tom Minogue.

File attachments: 1

C.c. First Minister, Scottish Executive, Privy Council Office.

### **Background.**

As a boy growing up in Dunfermline Andrew Carnegie would look with envy over the walls of the beautiful Pittencrieff estate at the park and glen. Sadly Andrew the son of poor weaver was never allowed to play within the walled estate which belonged to a wealthy family.

As a young man Andrew migrated to America where he made his fortune and in later life he set up many philanthropic trusts in the USA.

In later years Andrew returned to his native Scotland to live and he bought the Pittencrieff estate and transferred the park and glen by trust deed together with a gift of 2,500,000 dollars in bonds to a Commission of nominated trustees. The trustees were addressed by Andrew on August 2<sup>nd</sup> 1903 at Skibo Castle where he read out a letter which charged them with employing the Pittencrieff Park and Glen the annual interest on the bonds in the following specific terms:

“to be used in attempts to bring into the monotonous lives of the toiling masses of Dunfermline more of the sweetness and light: to give to them—especially the young—some charm, some happiness, some elevating conditions of life which residence elsewhere would have denied; that the child of my native town looking back in after years no matter how far from home it may have roamed, will feel that simply by virtue of being such, life has been made happier and better. If this be the fruit of your labour you have succeeded; if not, you have failed”

Carnegie added the following caution to the trustees later in the same letter:

“As it is the masses you are to benefit it follows you have to keep in touch with them and must carry them with you.”

Carnegie’s bequest to the people of Dunfermline was by way of a trust deed which was administered as a Trust until 1917 when application was made for a Royal Charter. The Dunfermline Carnegie Trust as it is know has—as far as I am able to ascertain—operated in accordance with Carnegie’s wishes until 1976 when due to financial difficulties the local authority of the day, the Royal Burgh Council took over the burden of the upkeep and management of the Glen—but not the investment fund.

The Burgh Council gave way to the Fife Council in 1996 and The Glen has been looked after by that body up to the present day but Fife Council are now, like the Trust in 1976, cash-strapped and the once well-cared-for Glen is suffering from the cutbacks in services that have affected all of the assets that Fife Council stewards.

It was against this background that in February of 2006 while on the stump at the Dunfermline By-election The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown MP made the welcome announcement that there were plans to build a £30 million Harvard-style business school at an unspecified location in Dunfermline.

Some time later a series of leaks in the local press intimated that the preferred site for the mooted business park was within Pittencrieff Park which is known locally as The Glen although such rumours were denied by the Trust. These rumours led to a great deal of concern being expressed in the local press.

The concern of the local people turned to anger when on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2006 Scott Barrie the local MSP was quoted in an article in the Dunfermline Press under the banner headline: “It’s Glen or nothing for business school – MSP” stated “The people behind the £30 million Harvard-style executive school being considered for Pittencrieff Park are not interested in any other location in Dunfermline” Mr Barrie went on: “One of the advantages I have is that I’ve known about this for a long time and know that the people behind the project want the iconic setting of the park. They’re not interested in any other location in Dunfermline.

Despite Mr Barrie’s claims the CEO of the Dunfermline Carnegie Trust yesterday (10<sup>th</sup> Aug) told a deputation from Pittencrieff Park Society (PPS)—a group formed under the leadership of a local woman Liz Mogg—that there were no proposals on the table from any developer and one of the companies rumoured to be behind the business school—a company called MACE had in fact only written to her once and this letter did not contain any proposals re the Glen.

Since Mr Barrie’s announcement a petition placed in local shops by PPS has attracted hundreds of signatures to a petition calling for a ban on building in The Glen. An online poll on a Dunfermline website has recorded 97% opposition to the building of a business park in The Glen.

P.S. I have joined PPS while continuing with my independent efforts get to the bottom of the contradictory stories about the development of The Glen, but I am sure that the level and tone of objection to any proposals for The Glen would have been much more moderate had such proposals been aired in an open and transparent manner.

The various contradictory statements about The Glen have not gone down well with the people of Dunfermline who appear to feel that a deal has been struck behind their backs, and who can blame them for feeling this way?

