

[\[CC home\]](#)

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Agenda - July 2001

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm on Monday 2nd July in the Burgh Chambers of the Town Hall. There will be a short break at about 8pm during which the 200 Club draw will be taken.

1. Attendance

Apologies:

2. Minutes of June 2001

(read for accuracy in matters of substance - harangue the secretary for minor (spelling etc) errors outwith the meeting).

3. Presentations

(For anyone wishing to address the meeting on a matter relevant to St Andrews. Please contact the Secretary or Chair before the meeting. Priority will be given to those who have been invited to speak or have given advance notice)

3.1. Community Policing report

(PC Louise Thomson has been posted to Anstruther, her replacement in St Andrews is PC Phil Fordyce)

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.2. Jane Hunter-Blair (Central)

4.3. Sheila Hill (South)

4.4. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

5. Planning Committee Report

6. Matters Arising from previous meetings

6.1. Skateboard Ramp

6.2. Local Forum

Appendix A - response from Douglas Sinclair, Chief Exec, Fife Council.

6.3. St Andrews Library

Appendix B - Ken Fraser's report.

Appendix C - Fife Council's minutes.

Is a 16th July meeting acceptable, if so who will attend?

6.4. Town Hall paintings

Dr Marianne McLeod Gilchrist would be willing to write an article on the portraits etc as a professional project.

6.5. University Numbers

Dr David Corner, Secretary of the University replied to our query on future student numbers:

"Student numbers (FTE) at St Andrews are predicted in the latest edition of our Strategic Plan to rise to 6846 by 2004/05. The individual numbers for the period of the Wester Langlands development plan are 6616 in 2002/03 and 6740 in 2003/04. Not quite 10000!"

6.6. Wester Langlands Development

There was a public meeting on this proposal (20th June) attended by local residents, Fife Councillors, etc. Ian Goudie and Pete Lindsay attended for Community Council. A brief report is in Appendix D

6.7. Town Hall Display Cabinets

Duncan Simpson, Area Operational Team Leader Community Services, responded to our query on progress:

"I am aware that there were various difficulties about bringing the cabinet back into commission. It apparently requires the glass panel to be removed by glaziers every time the display has to be changed, it fills with insects and is difficult clean and so on. Having said that, I am keen that it is filled as soon as possible, especially given the prominent position it is in.

"Councillor Hunter-Blair has also written to me on the same subject so I have today asked Paul Marshall to liaise with the various parties (including our Museums Service) to find an early solution to this matter. In general terms, I would be more than happy if the cabinet were used by the Community Council, although we would obviously wish to discuss with you what contents you are proposing to include."

6.8. Water Consultation/Information

Mr Munro will speak to us in September.

7. New Business

7.1. WRVS appeal for funds

The Women's Royal Voluntary Service write to ask if we would consider making a donation to their funds. In Fife provide support an refreshment facilities in hospitals and sheriff courts, trolley shops at various nursing homes, books on wheels and the Fife good neighbours scheme. More generally they run social clubs for the elderly and disabled and support the 'blue light' services in emergencies by running reception centres and providing refreshments to victims and rescuers.

Donations are used to support work in the areas they are made.

Can we make some gesture of support?

7.2. Planning Aid for Scotland

Planning Aid for Scotland is a voluntary organisation run by qualified and experienced town planners who give free advice on all aspects of town and country planning and related issues to individuals, community councils, tenants associations and voluntary groups. It is not part of central or local government, but is an officially recognised independent charity.

Friends of Planning Aid: Subscription £10 for community organisations covers newsletters etc, it is not a condition of advice.

7.3. Kinburn Park Car Parking

Following a 'near accident' involving a lady from Cupar in Kinburn Park recently a member of Community Council is invited to attend a meeting sometime in July to discuss possible restrictions on cars in the park

Any volunteers?

8. Reports from Officers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer

8.3. Secretary

9. Reports from Committees

9.1. Recreation

9.1.1. St Andrews in Bloom

- St Andrews will be judged on Tuesday 03.07.2001 at 09.30 hrs in the Beautiful Scotland in Bloom Competition.

The judge this year will be Mr Ian McKenzie from Aberdeen, he will be accompanied by Mr Joseph Peterson and Mr Hamish Matheson of the St Andrews Horticultural Society.

9.1.2. Odd One Out

- The annual 'Spot the Odd One Out' Competition is again being organised by Mr Dennis Macdonald. The material has been given to the forty shops concerned, and the Competition will run through the months of July and August.

9.1.3. Meeting

- the meeting scheduled for 03.07.01 is cancelled and will be held later in the week. Main agenda item will be the Garden Competition details. Mr Hamish Matheson will be invited to attend at all times when we deal with horticultural matters.

10. AOCB

If members intend to raise items under AOCB please let the Secretary or Chair know before the meeting. Remember, unless they are urgent, placing items on the agenda for next month's New Business would be more effective...

Appendix A - Local Forums

Text of letter from Douglas Sinclair, Chief Executive, Fife Council.

Thank you for your e-mail of June 5th 2001 on the issue of Local Forums. I will deal with the points you raise but can I say at the outset that your concerns are not well founded. I am sure it will help if I start by explaining the background to the idea of Local Forums.

As you will be aware and following publication of the report of the Commission on Local Government and the Scottish Parliament (the Mcintosh Commission) the Scottish Executive asked all Scottish Councils to review their decision-making structures according to a number of principles including openness and better arrangements for scrutiny. Fife Council set up a cross party working group to take the review forward. The Group produced a draft report in June 2000 and this was widely circulated for consultation to a range of interests including community councils. This report suggested an expansion in the number of Local Service Committees from the existing 3 to 7 or more. Following consultation the Council agreed in October 2000 to make a number of changes to its committee structure with the aim of:

- Streamlining decision-making
- Strengthening decentralisation
- Improving openness, accountability and scrutiny and
- Supporting partnership working and community planning.

A copy of the Council report is attached for your information. You will see that a key element in the proposals is the introduction of Local Forums. Instead of the proposal for more Local Service Committees the Council felt, at this stage, it would be better to have forums as part of the existing 3 Local Services Committees but covering a smaller area than the Committee for example Glenrothes or Dunfermline. The key benefits which we would expect from the introduction of Forums at this intermediate level is the opportunity that they present for elected members to scrutinise service quality and to work with other service providers and the networks of community organisations to develop better local community planning. In many ways the Local Forums are a means of moving the Council through its Local Service Committees closer to communities.

Decisions have yet to be made on implementing the Local Forums but can I make two things clear regarding implementation. The first is that there is a need for flexibility. Fife is diverse and what works for Kirkcaldy may not work for St Andrews. It is also the case that in some parts of Fife there are already area forums where the elected members sit down with community councils and community groups and perform exactly the kind of role envisaged for Local Forums. Where such forums exist there would be little to be gained by creating something new. The second point is that we want community councils and other bodies to be a part of these Forums and there would therefore be a process of discussion and dialogue before a Forum was created. In the first instance it is likely that the Local Services Committee will be asked to consider a scheme for Local Forums and to consult on that scheme before proposing local implementation arrangements.

I hope this reassures you. The Council's new committee arrangements are intended amongst other things to improve the relationship with community and representative organisations.

The Council's commitment to supporting the development of active community councils and to working in partnership with them is undiminished. In fact the Local Forums should strengthen that partnership.

Douglas Sinclair

CROSS-PARTY WORKING GROUP ON POLITICAL DECISION-MAKING

REPORT

INTRODUCTION

1.
An important preface to our recommendations must be the need to take account of the recommendations of

the Kerley report. The recommendation of Kerley in relation to changes in the allowance system which, if implemented, would mean the number of special responsibility allowances in the Council being reduced from currently 42 to 11 cannot be ignored in terms of its impact of the Council's decision-making structures. Whilst it does not follow that the Government will necessarily accept Kerley's recommendations in full it is certain that there will be changes to the allowance system. The basic allowance cannot be doubled without some compensating reduction in the number of special responsibility allowances. And whilst it's unlikely that changes to the allowance system will be implemented before the date of the next local government election, either in 2002 or 2003,-in making our recommendations to the Council it would be foolish for us not to take account of the potential implications of this factor. Indeed, because of the timetable for the determination of the Kerley recommendations and their potential impact on local government we see our recommendations as important steps, but not the final steps, on the road in meeting, in full, the principles laid down by the Executive for Councils in reviewing their political management arrangements, namely:

- The conduct of Council business should encourage people to stand for election to the Council.
- Policy proposals and decision should be subject to open debate.
- Council leadership should be open to scrutiny.
- Council business should be conducted in public.
- The use of whipping by political parties should be reviewed.

OUR STARTING POINT

2.

McIntosh recommended that Councils, in reviewing their decision-making structures, should direct particular attention "to Executive models and also to reformed and simplified forms of the Committee system". We have chosen the latter route. An Executive system cannot be imposed upon a Council; at best, there must be a shared commitment within a Council to its introduction; at worst a willingness to experiment with it. The kind of structure of decision-making operated by a Council cannot be divorced from the prevailing culture of that Council. Whilst there is a common commitment across all the political groups in the Council to reform the Committee structure there is not, at this point in time in the Council's development, any desire or meaningful support to move to an Executive model.

3.

The key objectives we set for making improvements to the Council's decision making structure were as follows:

- To streamline and improve the operation of the Council's Committee Structure.
- To speed up decision-making.
- To strengthen the capacity of Local Services Committees
- To support the development of community planning
- To improve openness, accountability and scrutiny
- To enhance the effectiveness of elected members by improving the support available for them

RECOMMENDATIONS

4. It is right that our starting point should be at the local level, the level closest to our customers and citizens.

5.

Whilst as we said in a consultation paper we did not think that the difficulties of extending the number of Local Service Committees was insurmountable, we do not think the case is a compelling one, particularly at this stage. We believe that more is to be gained by continuing to develop what was put in place in 1995. Moreover, and as the interim review of area structures concluded, the present arrangements work well for Planning. To develop a different arrangement for Local Service Committees within the proposed Committee structure does not seem logical or sensible. We propose, however, further decentralisation through the establishment of local forums below the level of the Local Service Committees which would be retitled Area Service Committees. These local forums would have boundaries which would coincide with the local plan areas subject to minor adjustment of boundaries in order to better reflect travel to work patterns. These are detailed in Appendix 1. There would be 10 in total: West Fife Villages, Dunfermline and Coast,

Cowdenbeath Area, Kirkcaldy Area, Glenrothes Area, Levenmouth Area, Cupar and Howe of Fife, Tay Coast, St. Andrews Area and Largo and East Neuk. These forums would be subsets of the Area Service Committees. All members would be a member of their Area Service Committee (which is not the case currently) and also of their appropriate local forum. Given the creation of these local forums which would provide a mechanism for scrutiny of performance at a more local level as well as being a building block for community planning we would envisage Area Service Committees meeting less frequently; they would have a role of overview and oversight and ensuring consistency in service reporting arrangements as well as providing the important link to Fife-wide Committees.

6.

In our consultation paper we proposed to retain Area Development Committees and sought views on the need for Area Regulation Committees. We were also aware of the need to review the respective responsibilities of the Area Committees. For example the Local Service Committee has an interest in area regeneration yet the responsibility for economic development and for town centre renewal comes under the Development Committee while that for Community Safety in turn falls to Regulation. We do not believe this is in the best interests of promoting integrated working or effective political overview. Similarly the Local Services Committee responsibility for performance review does not formally cover certain key services, where the reporting link is to either Development or Regulation.

We therefore propose to:

- a. reduce the volume of business currently going before Development and Regulation by streamlining procedures and through further delegation;
- b. widen the responsibility of the Area Service Committees to encompass all Local Services with the exception of Planning, and
- c. split the remaining responsibilities of the current Regulation Committee between Development and Local Services. We also believe that there is merit in exploring the concept of a single Fife Licensing Board to ensure common licensing standards and a consistency of approach.

7.

We also recommend to ensure open debate that there should be no formal party meetings before any meetings of local forums or Area Service Committees (there are no party meetings before meetings of the Regulation Committee or Area Development Committees). Experience tells us that at the level of local service delivery the concern of the public is not with party politics but with the quality and scrutiny of local service delivery.

8.

One of our objectives was to speed up decision-making, and on this we wish to make two recommendations. First, we believe there is scope for more delegation within Services and for delegation to be more consistent across Services to the benefit of the public; a consultancy study will shortly be initiated to take this work forward. This is not to argue the case for a blanket consistency. Services differ in the balance about decision-making between members and officers but in terms of the use and deployment of resources, for example, employees and money, Councillors, the public and, indeed, employees, have a reasonable entitlement to expect that staff on the same salary grade should be able to make the same kinds of decisions. Second, work needs to be commissioned on the scope for the decentralisation of appropriate frontline budgets to area level. Not all Services or budgets lend themselves to such an approach and nor does every part of the budget of frontline services; some budgets will continue to require a Fife-wide perspective, e.g. child protection, but where it makes sense and where it is appropriate then a budget should be decentralised.

9.

In relation to Fife-wide Committees, the present structure has served the Council well but has now outlived its usefulness. If the Council wants to be a flexible, customer orientated organisation, then its structure should reflect its customers' and community needs, not the functions of the Council. And nor - unless it has to - should any Council structure reflect central government as opposed to local government's needs. The abolition of CCT provides the Council with an opportunity to devise a structure which reflects its priorities and not those of central government. It is proposed that the Commercial Services Management Committee be abolished and that the scrutiny of performance of DLOs/DSOs currently undertaken wholly by that

Committee be undertaken separately on the basis of, firstly, scrutiny by the local forums, secondly, through an area overview by Area Services Committees, and thirdly on a Fife-wide basis by reporting to Committees in terms of overall financial performance, for example, in meeting current CCT requirements as well as improvement targets set by the Council and by the Policy and Resources Committee. It is also proposed that the Education Committee be abolished and its functions subsumed principally under the Children's Services Committee, and the External and Civic Affairs Committee be also abolished and its responsibilities divided between the Council, the Policy and Resources Committee or otherwise being delegated. In addition to the Council and the Policy and Resources Committee we propose two "Customer" Committees and two "Themed" Committees. These would be Children's Services and Adult Services on the one hand, and Community Safety Services and Environmental and Development Services on the other. We also propose the establishment of a Standards and Audit Committee; the Committee would meet to consider audit business and standards business separately in order to maintain a distinction between financial regularity and the ethical conduct of individuals. The work of the Social Equality Sub-Committee would be subsumed under Policy and Resources within the remit of the Spokesperson for Social Inclusion. Similarly the work of the Training Sub-Committee would be split between Adult Services Committee within the remit of the Spokesperson for Lifelong Learning and the Policy and Resources Committee in respect of Member Employee Development within the remit of the Spokesperson for Human Resources. Our proposals are shown on Appendix 2.

10. We propose two further reforms:

- a. That appropriate community planning partners be co-opted as non-voting members of the new Committees where appropriate.
- b. (b) Special Responsibility positions be framed in the main around a chair for each Committee with spokespersons taking on specific policy as opposed to functional remits. This should enhance the focus on customers and outcomes as well as improving the policy formulation process. A statement of special responsibility positions is set out in Appendix 3.

SCRUTINY

11. Scrutiny involves scrutiny of policy, of performance and probity. We have highlighted the key role of the local forums and Area Services Committees in Council scrutinising performance at the local and area level and have recommended the establishment of a Standards and Audit Committee to scrutinise ethical and financial probity. One issue remains; the role of the Council, Policy and Resources Committee and the Fife-wide Committees in scrutinising policy and performance.

Policy Scrutiny

12. It is a matter of fact that in Councils organised on political lines that major policy items will be determined on the basis of the respective strengths of the political groups. But that in turn requires a mechanism for the Administration's choice or choices to be effectively scrutinised. We believe that the role of the Council should be enhanced to fulfil this role more effectively whereby major items of policy such as the structure plan, budget, community plan, are incorporated in a structured timetable for the Council to ensure that major items of policy are the subject of effective policy scrutiny.

13. Whilst recognising the reality of the majority status of the Administration we would also like to see further developed cross-party working groups to contribute towards the development of policy, as indeed has been the case with our Working Group and has been achieved through other Working Groups, for example, the Best Value Strategic Review Working Groups, whilst recognising the reality of the majority status of the Administration.

14. In order to facilitate this focus on policy development we make two recommendations:

- (a) An inter-party protocol on rights and responsibilities should be developed to ensure effective dialogue

between political groups, improve the functioning of Committees and the co-ordination of consultation exercises on policy proposals. This would also cover arrangements for declaring which matters were subject to the Group Whip and members' rights to call in a proposal for further review prior to a decision being taken.

(b) The only items to be placed on agendas should be those items requiring a decision by Councillors. All items for noting should be incorporated within a regular Council bulletin.

Performance Scrutiny

15.

The Council has an obvious role to play in performance scrutiny as has the Policy and Resources Committee in monitoring the performance of the Fife-wide Committees and indeed, the local Committees. But so do the Fife-wide Committees. There should be incorporated in the annual timetable for each Committee a meeting solely devoted to policy and performance review of the preceding year's work.

SUPPORT FOR MEMBERS

16.

Our penultimate recommendation relates to our final objective - to enhance the effectiveness of elected members by improving the support available to them and reducing the time pressures on them. This is an important issue, not least because of the potential reduction of the number of elected members in the Council. It therefore requires careful consideration, for example, an analysis of how Councillors spend their time, whether everything they do needs to be done by them or could equally effectively be done for them. An analysis of the time commitment and responsibilities of Councillors - of both those holding positions of responsibilities and those not - would assist in the determination of our new scheme of special responsibility allowances to reflect the new Committee system. We believe that a comprehensive review should be undertaken by the Chief Executive of these issues and recommend accordingly.

17.

We also believe that the Cross-Party Working Group should continue in existence to take forward implementation of the new structure, to advise the Council on any amendments necessary and to take into account any further proposals by the Executive, particularly in relation to its consideration of the Kerley report.

(various appendices omitted - PL)

Appendix B - Improvement of St Andrews Library

Report by Ken Fraser

A meeting was held on 14th June, between Councillors Melville, Hunter-Blair and Liston, several Fife Council officials (not all from the Libraries Dept.) and myself representing the Community Council (Mr Strachan was unable to attend). Most of the information came from Mr Iain Whitlaw, the service manager.

There was little said about the nature of the proposed improvements. I asked for more details, which Mr Whitlaw said he would be able to provide. Most of the discussion centred on the finance of the scheme. A funding proposal has been drawn up, comprising several different sources, most of which are not part of the Council's normal budget, some of which are likely to be controversial, and some of which are not certainly known to be available. The one which determines the timetable, a contribution from the National Lottery New Opportunities Fund, is obliged to be spent by December 2002, hence the reason for bringing the scheme forward now.

Mr Whitlaw declared he did not insist on presenting one cut-and-dried scheme, he would be willing to consider several options. He would like to discuss the matter with the Community Council. However he did not think he could attend the meeting on 2nd July. On the other hand there being no meeting in August the

September meeting might be too late, given the timetable. I suggested that a special meeting might be arranged, for as many members as wished to come. The date that was provisionally suggested was Monday 16th July (Mr Whitelaw goes on holiday on the 23rd, and the 16th is not one of the dates for our planning committee).

KF

Appendix C - Library (part 2)

(The Fife Council minutes and a supporting document)

NOTE OF MEETING HELD IN ST. ANDREWS LIBRARY ON THURSDAY

14TH JUNE 2001 TO DISCUSS THE UPGRADING AND REFURBISHMENT OF ST. ANDREWS LIBRARY

In Attendance: Councillor Jane Hunter Blair, Councillor Frances Melville, Ken Fraser (St. Andrews Community Council), Iain Whitelaw (Fife Council - Service Manager), Aileen McLachlan (Fife Council Libraries), Angela Beattie (Fife Council Libraries), Gillian Clark (Fife Council Estates), Kate Hughes (Locality Manager)

Apologies:

Councillor Hill, Councillor J.A. Liston, (arrived at close of meeting), S. Paterson (Fife Council - Law and Administration)

Action

1. Introduction

Iain Whitelaw outlined the background to the St. Andrews library situation as set out in the memorandum of 30th March sent to Councillor Jane Hunter-Blair (attached).

Note

2. Alternative Sites

K. Fraser suggested that consideration be given to looking for a new site where both libraries might be relocated to. Following discussion it was agreed that both in terms of cost, timing and location that the present site provided the best solution.

Note

3. Sale of Children's Library

The proposal outlined in the attached memorandum was discussed in detail with an exploration of issues relating to the use of Council capital receipts, the implications for the Common Good Fund, and the timescale which might be involved in securing a clean

Note

title to the Children's Library and resolving planning issues.

The Way Forward

4.

4.1. Valuations

It was agreed that by 6th July 2001 Gillian Clark provide I. Whitelaw with valuations for both the Main Library and Children's Library for the purposes of giving consideration to a library swap (excambion) between the Council and Common Good Fund. G. Clark to provide a range of valuations taking account of assumptions about planning uses.

G.C.

4.2. Presentation to Community Council

It was agreed that K. Fraser raise the matter at the Community Council meeting at the beginning of July 2001 with a view to inviting I. Whitelaw to make a presentation on the library situation to a Community Council Planning Group meeting on the 16th July 2001. K. Fraser to confirm the date for a meeting to I. Whitelaw and A. McLachlan.

KF

4.3. Fife Council Capital Resources: East Area

It was agreed that St. Andrews Members give consideration to the priority (or otherwise) of the library refurbishment and depending on the level of priority seek to secure funding from the Council's R & R fund (£50k) and the East Area Capital Fund (£20k) to assist in the preparation of a funding package for the library development and ask officers to prepare the necessary applications.

St Andrews
Members

4.4. Fife Council Capital Resources: Community Services

It was agreed that I. Whitelaw seek to secure £50K over 2 years from the Community Services allocation of the Council's capital programme.

I. Whitelaw

4.5. Benefits of Refurbished Library

It was agreed that A. McLachlan/A Beattie set out for I. Whitelaw, for inclusion in a presentation to the Community Council, the current service provision at the 2 libraries and the 'new' provision which could be achieved should the refurbishment proceed on a single site. In addition to the new specification, this should also highlight the improvements in both efficiency for the service and effectiveness for the customer. Again this should be finalised for the 6th June 2001.

A.McL/A.B.

4.6. Creative Funding Mechanism

It was agreed that I. Whitelaw give some thought to following up K. Fraser's suggestion that a similar mechanism to the Byre funding arrangement be explored but this time using the Common Good Fund to create the capital sum. It was agreed that if this could be achieved it might provide a potential capital solution which would not require the Children's Library building to be sold.

I.W

4.7. Fallback Option

It was generally agreed that should the excambion option and the 'Byre' mechanism not be possible that a reduced scheme in terms of available resources be pursued recognising the limited window of opportunity to draw down New Opportunities Funding for 'The People's Network'. This scheme would still require to maximise the various funding sources identified in the memorandum dated 30th March.

Note

IW/JH/19th June 2001

FIFE COUNCIL COMMUNITY SERVICES MEMORANDUM

From: Iain Whitelaw, Service Manager

Date: 30th March 2001

Our Ref: IW/MS

Subject: St Andrews Library

1. Background

- Fife Council operates a main library and children's library on separate sites in St. Andrews.
- In 1999/00 Fife Council acquired upper floor of craft shop at a cost of £80k with a view to extending the main library.
- Property Services subsequently worked up initial plans to link the main library with the extension, including lift access and a new central staircase. Estimated costs for building works, including fees - £302,000.
- To fully refurbish the library with furniture, shelving, I.T. equipment etc. will cost a further £198k bringing the total cost to £500k (Estimate).
- Libraries have recently been offered £741k of New Opportunities Lottery funding for "The People's Network" of which around £50k will be available for St. Andrews (this includes I.T. infrastructure, cabling, equipment etc.).
- Also an opportunity to secure resources from The Scottish University for Industry (SUI) Capital Modernisation Fund for Libraries (possible £70k).
- Currently exploring how a funding package would be finalised.
- Other potential sources include the Heritage Lottery (re external improvement to building). Scottish Enterprise Fife to support the learning aspects of the library, a contribution from Fife Council's Repairs and Renewal Fund (allocation to East Area still to be prioritised), a contribution from the Community Services capital allocation (still to be discussed internally), Trust Funds (being explored at present), revenue resources (Community Services), the potential sale of the Children's Library reinvested in the main library, and a contribution from the Common Good Fund.

2. Indicative Funding Package

Source	£ 000
Trust Funds	20
Fife Council Capital Programme	50
Fife Council R & R Fund	50
NOF People's Network	50
SUFI Capital Modernisation Fund	70
Scottish Enterprise Fife	20
Heritage Lottery	40
Community Services (Library Budget)	30
Common Good Fund	10
Sale of Children's, Library	160
TOTAL	500

3. Sale of Children's Library

- A proposal is being discussed between officers with responsibility for Estates, Finance, Community Services and Legal to consider whether by exchanging the Children's Library with the main library might help to put a key element of funding in place.
- The Children's Library currently pays £13,000 in rental to the Common Good Fund. If the Children's Library were to be relocated within the main library (logical move, more efficient use of staff resources plenty room to accommodate it) then the Common Good Fund could lose a 'guaranteed' income stream.
- If the libraries were swapped over (excambion), the Children's Library sold (valued 2 years ago at £160k) and the total receipt reinvested in the main library (currently only 25% of receipts returned to the Service for their use - an issue to be addressed!), then the Common Good Fund would have an asset of greater value (300k plus) and an income stream from a 'blue chip' tenant (the library!) of at least £13k (current asset rentals are based on 6% of asset value).
- More importantly, for St. Andrews. the library would be refurbished, upgraded and state of the

art, fit for the 21st century.

- At this stage, we are trying to creatively put a funding package in place!

Iain Whitelaw
Service Manager

Appendix D - Wester Langlands

The current proposal, the first phase of a longer redevelopment, is to build new accommodation for nearly 300 students which to be used as a 'decant' facility as David Russell Hall is demolished, Fife Park closed and further phases of the Wester Langlands project built. The new complex will house 700+ (about the total places in DRH and Fife Park) on the David Russell site. It is not clear what will happen to the Fife Park site once closed. It is proposed to open the first phase for Autumn 2002. The redevelopment is driven by changes in legislation and changing student needs, which have left the current accommodation only part-filled in recent years.

A number of concerns were raised about the proposed design: position of an 'amenities' block holding entertainment facilities; total numbers to be accommodated on the site; size of car park, with particular reference to the need to accommodate conferences; and other issues. It seems that some decisions on further development stages have yet to be taken. It is possible (though unlikely we were told) that the project might stop after the 1st phase. No decision will be taken on the Fife Park part of the site until completion of the current Master Plan.

Pete Lindsay

St Andrews Pothole Watch

Outstanding

0105.1) North St streetlight 47 kerbstones loose & displaced on bus boarder.

0105.2) Murray Park, road surface breaking up, potholes and loose gravel.

0105.3) Kinnessburn Road, opposite Lamp 1/outside betting shop, deep long pothole.

0105.4) Kinnessburn Road, between bowling club and Oldburn Road, several other potholes.

0105.5)

Kilrymont Place, junction with Kilrymont Road, surface breaking up into small potholes with loose gravel.

0105.6) South Street, between Bell St junction and zebra crossing, missing metal valve cover in roadway.

0105.7)

Generally it has been remarked that there is a lot of gravel on the road surfaces around town, increasing the risk of skidding, and particularly inconveniencing cyclists (who tend to travel on the grittier margins) and pedestrians crossing those same margins. All suffer the effects of small pieces of gravel spat out from motorists' and cyclists' wheels.

0105.8) Buchanan Gardens, below junction with Strathkinness High Road, potholes enlarging.

0106.1)

Junction of Lawhead Road East and Hepburn Gardens: build up of gravel in the junction risks skidding of vehicles turning in from Hepburn Gardens.

0106.2) 34/36 The Scores: patch breaking up forming deep pothole / rut.

0106.3) South St between Roundel and The Pends, missing toby cover in the road.

0106.4) South St, zebra crossing outside Madras College: open socket from missing bollard - trip hazard.

0106.5) 3 King St: missing toby cover in pavement - trip/lost heel hazard.

New:

Report: Potholes (40mm/1.5in deep) in the road, damaged pavements (20mm/.75in deep), missing or damaged toby covers, blocked drains, floods, defective streetlights etc.

Identify the location (Street and number on closest house or streetlight for instance).

Hand to Community Council Secretary Pete Lindsay or to Fife Roads Service (c/o St Andrews Fife Council offices).

Defect & Location:

Additional, Circulated at meeting

Correspondence

When	Who	What	Where
4/6/01	In Neil Munro, Water Consultative Ctte	Speak to CC?	F
5/6/01	Out Duncan Simpson, Community Svcs	Town Hall display	Email
5/6/01	Out Douglas Sinclair, Chief Exec	Community Forum	Email
7/6/01	In Roads	Acknowledge Potholewatch	F
7/6/01	In Locality Manager	Community Forum press release	F
9/6/01	In Fife Health Council	Right for Fife consultation - tickets	F
9/6/01	In Cllr Melville	Community Forum	F
10/6/01	In Local Services	Agenda 13/6/01	F
12/6/01	Out Cleansing - Waste Mgmt	St Andrews Public Toilets	Email
13/6/01	In Chief Exec	Local Forums	F
13/6/01	In East of Scotland Water	Questionnaire	F
13/6/01	Out Neil Munro, Water Consultative Ctte	Speak to CC?	Email
14/6/01	in Ramblers Scotland	Land Reform Bill	IG
14/6/01	In Duncan Simpson, Community Svcs	St Andrews Town Hall display	F
15/6/01	In WRVS	Funding	F
15/6/01	In Scottish Landfill Tax Credit Forum	Agenda 27/6/01	F
15/6/01	In Calor Gas	CC of 2001 entry forms	F
15/6/01	In Trading Standards	June Newsletter	F
16/6/01	In Cllr Melville	Community Forum	F
20/6/01	Out Local Office	Parking Scheme meeting?	Email
21/6/01	in Planning	Customer Quality Charter	IG
21/6/01	in Planning	Jannettas decision	IG
21/6/01	In Local Office	Parking scheme	F
22/6/01	In Community Services	Tentsmuir/Eden Interpretation group	F
22/6/01	In Local Office	Bandstand Insurance	AS
24/6/01	In Archie Strachan	Bandstand Insurance	F
25/6/01	Out University Secretary	Student Numbers	Email
27/6/01	In Community Services	Kinburn car parking	F
27/6/01	In Run the Planet	Where to run in St Andrews	Dmacg
27/6/01	In University Secretary	Student Numbers	F
28/6/01	In University	Wester Langlands	F
28/6/01	In Prof Samuel Taylor	Arlington Photo Exhibition	F
28/6/01	In NEF Local Healthcare Coop	Minutes of April community meetings	F
29/6/01	In Neil Munro, Water Consultative Ctte	Speak to CC - Sep	F

1/7/01 Out Scottish Landfill Tax Credit Forum Please switch to email

Email