

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Agenda – January 2004

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm on Monday 5th January in the Burgh Chambers of the Town Hall, Queen's Gardens. There will be a short break at about 8pm during which the 200 Club draw will be made.

(Copies of Agendas and Minutes of the Community Council are held at Fife Council's Local Office, St Mary's Place and the Town Library, Church Square. Those from mid-1998 on are online at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/>)

1. Apologies

2. Minutes of December 2003

Read for accuracy in matters of substance – harangue the secretary for minor errors (spelling etc) 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. Police report

3.2. St Andrews Harbour

Ken Sweeney and David Martin, Fisherman Harbour Trustees, on the future of the Harbour.

3.3. Crawford Centre funding

John di Folco, Crawford Centre Management Chair, to outline how we can help the campaign to keep Scottish Arts Council funding.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.1.1. **20mph speed limits at schools** A discussion paper for comment.

4.2. Sheila Black (South)

4.3. Bill Sangster (Central)

4.4. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

5. Planning Committee

Appendix K – Draft response to the 7th golf course application.

6. Matters Arising from previous meetings

6.1. Homelessness

[December 3.2.] What response do we make to the presentation and briefing paper by John Mills of Housing Service? Appendix J.

6.2. Bus Services

[December 8.3.1.] Appendix A: response from Gary Moyes, Lead Officer (Travel Information) Transportation Service.

6.3. Bicycle Safety

[December 3.1.1.] Appendix B: letter by Frank Riddell.

6.4. Phone Boxes

[November 6.1.] An official reprieve has arrived for the boxes in the residential areas. Appendix C.

6.5. Bus Station

Appendix D: report from Ken Fraser

7. New Business

7.1. Saint Andrew's Day Holiday

Keith McCartney asks that we confirm our support for a St Andrew's Day holiday with His Eminence Cardinal O'Brien, Archbishop of St Andrews etc. and to the Saltire Society. Some correspondence in Appendix E.

7.2. East Fife Local Plan

Appendix F: Request for Community Council input to Local Plan consultation.

7.3. Sports Centre Advisory Group

We are invited to send a representative. Appendix G: letter.

7.3a. Harbour Toilets

Appendix H: Steven McColl of Shorehead has concerns about inappropriate use of the toilets.

7.4. Fife CCTV Advisory Group

Is to be disbanded due to lack of attendance at meetings in Glenrothes.

7.5. Police Community Team

Appendix I: December 2003 newsletter, extracts relevant to St Andrews.

7.6. What on Earth

Friends of the Earth Magazine Winter 03: Organisational News; Campaign news on toxics, GM crops, M74; 25 Years of FoE; European Parliament; Ecuadorian activists; Rising tides.

7.7. Volunteer Development

Annual report 2003 comes in the form of a pocket diary for 2004. Is this of use to anyone?

7.8. Christmas etc Cards

From: University (Alistair Work); Betty Willsher, Rubbish-free Zones Co-ordinators; University (Principal & Vice-Chancellor; St Andrews Local Office; Iain Smith MSP.

7.9. Environmental Services Newsletter

Winter 2003: Holiday waste collections; Dog waste – £40 fixed penalty; Food poisoning; A dog is for life...; Environmental Services restructuring; Campylobacter from puppies; War on waste; Yellow Pages recycling [NOT in east Fife...]; 10 Food safety tips esp. cooking turkeys etc; Whale of a job; Christmas stock hampers.

7.10. Water Customer Panels

Report on Affordability of Water Charges for Low Income Households is available on their web site at www.watercustomer.org. The main recommendations are:

- the Scottish Executive's water and sewerage charges reduction scheme should be extended.
- the gap between the Income Support allowance and the actual level of charges for water and sewerage should be closed.

7.11. Strandline

Adopt-a-Beach newsletter winter 2003: Smoking ban; new legislation on ships' waste; Wet wipes strike again; New report of plastic recycling; litter survey and clean-ups; reducing fast food litter; plastic bags.

7.12. Postwatch Scotland

Newsletter winter 2003: New compensation scheme for delayed mail; Victory for Kilmarnock football club; What is consequential loss; Exceptions to universal service; Fight for Princes Street post office; meetings with MPs and MSPs; improvements for Post Office card accounts; What do Postwatch committee members do?

8. Reports from Officers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. Greetings to Patras A recent Citizen "50 years ago today" column reported that St Andrews once sent a saltire flag to Patras. Do we wish to repeat this gesture for Mr Machie's visit [July 7.1.]?

8.3.2. Future presentations Coastal path moved to March (perhaps Feb) as Chris Broome expects to have more to tell us by then.

February 1) Iain Smith MSP; 2) Local Plan: Bill Lindsay (Development Service).

March 1) Wind Farm – Clatto Landscape Protection Group (They have sent a couple of data CDs which contain the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed wind farm; available from the Secretary); 2) Coastal Path: Chris Broome (Ranger Service).

9. Reports

9.1. From Committees

9.2. From Representatives

10. Any Other Competent Business

Please notify Chair of AOCB items before the start of the meeting or at the break. Hint: Given that the end of the meeting is often taken in something of a rush, unless items are urgent it might be better to submit them for next meeting's New Business.

Appendix A – Bus Services

From Gary Moyes, Lead Officer (Travel Information) Transportation Service.

Thank you for your e-mail of 13 November 2003 and please accept my apologies for the delay in replying to you. There were a number of people involved with the different items you mentioned and it has taken time to coordinate this somewhat lengthy response.

With regard to recent changes, liaison took place with both Stagecoach and Moffat & Williamson as well as with passengers of Service 92 (Gauldry to St Andrews) and Councillor Liston.

Service 93 was a commercial, experimental clockwise service, which was poorly patronised and therefore uneconomic, hence its eventual withdrawal by Stagecoach. By simplifying the bus workings of Service 91, this permitted cross South Street journeys thereby allowing passengers to cross the terminus, providing alternative journeys in the traditional anticlockwise town service direction. This provides journeys to all areas previously served by Service 93, albeit with some of them slightly more circuitous, with the notable exception of Langlands Road.

However, taking cognisance of comments regarding the level of service to Langlands Road and following the initial utilisation of Service 92 to provide a skeleton service, an opportunity arose to improve the frequency of service to this area. From 15 December 2003, Service 94 will be extended to provide a more regular service between Langlands Road, the Hospital and the Town Centre.

On information provision, the bus operators – like any other private company – are responsible for marketing their own services. Fife Council operated a Transportation Helpline until March this year to provide impartial timetable and fares information on all bus and train services within Fife. In line with other Authorities, this helpline was closed and its function taken over by the nationwide Traveline service. Traveline Scotland has its own Marketing Officer and is in charge of promoting Traveline throughout Scotland. Fife Council works closely with Traveline and publicises the Traveline details on any publications we issue.

The locations in St Andrews where information is available to the public are no different from any other town or city in the country: the Bus Station, Council Local Office and Tourist Information Centre are the most logical 'access points' to pick up leaflets and timetables and these locations within St Andrews have been supplied for a number of years now.

It is fair to say that the number of bus stops with bus stop information in Fife is small. Fife Council realised this some time ago and purchased software to improve efficiency and increase output. In addition, it was made an important part of the Bus Passenger Information Strategy which was recently published. In April 2002, all Community Councils and various other consultees were invited to comment on the Draft Bus Passenger Information Strategy, which is a requirement of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2001. Copies of the Draft Strategy and a questionnaire were sent to all consultees including St Andrews Community Council. The Strategy took a year-and-a-half to complete and was recently adopted by the Council – the first one in Scotland. In it, we have set annual targets for new locations to receive bus stop information. As the onus has now been placed on the bus operators for providing information we have, in the last 2 weeks, received a second member of staff from Stagecoach whose main task is creating information for new bus stop locations throughout Fife. We have a minimum target of covering 600 stops by December 2004.

Fares information is available in 2 leaflets, which have been available at the outlets mentioned above, for the past couple of years. One is a Stagecoach publication 'tickets to go: St Andrews' and the other is a SESTRAN publication 'One-Ticket.' Fares are the responsibility of the bus operators (except for a very few Council subsidised services). Stagecoach has a range of ticket offers available (as mentioned in the 'tickets to go: St Andrews' leaflet, above) and these cover town only, Fife only and further afield. Of particular relevance to your query, are the Dayrider (£2 unlimited travel for a day on all Stagecoach services within St Andrews) and the Megarider (£6 unlimited travel for a week on all Stagecoach services within St Andrews).

As for maps, Fife Council has been producing the 'Getting Around Fife' bus and train map for many years now and this too is available at the outlets listed above. Corporately, Stagecoach has produced maps in their 'The Guide' series which shows bus routes in a 'London Underground' style. They recently produced a St Andrews edition. As part of the Bus Passenger Information Strategy and in partnership with the bus operators, the 'Getting Around Fife' Map will be replaced by individual town guides, and a simplified Fife-wide map, similar to 'The Guide.' These maps will, in time, be used in the bus stop information too.

The Fife Council website (www.fifedirect.org.uk) acts as a pointer towards all bus and train websites of interest to Fife travellers. The Fife Direct website does not attempt to duplicate existing websites but it is a single source for all public transport information in Fife. Links are provided to bus, train and ferry companies' websites as well as providing information on the St Andrews Park & Ride and Voucher Parking Schemes. Fife Direct and individual operators' websites are publicised heavily on paper-based publicity or easily found on the web using a normal search engine.

I hope this has clarified that most of the information deficiencies mentioned in your e-mail actually do exist and have existed for some time and in sensible locations, should anyone choose to look for them. In addition, I trust we have demonstrated the reasons behind the recent service changes and some of the procedures that Fife Council adopts to maintain the public transport network.

Appendix B – Bicycle Lights

From Frank Riddell to Insp Dewar, St Andrews Police Station.

At the November meeting of the Community Council you described to us the welcome steps that you and the local police had been taking to deal with cyclists riding without lights in St Andrews at night time. At the December meeting this issue was raised again because of the continuance of the problem.

The Community Council does not wish to see any accidents to cyclists in St Andrews but fears that this

might happen because of this problem. We would be grateful if you could pursue your initiative on bicycle lights to attempt, once again, to reduce the likelihood of such accidents occurring.

Appendix C – BT Phone Boxes

From Rick Thompson, Project Liaison Office BT Payphones, to Mike Robinson, Head of Local Services Fife Council

Payphones 01334 473526 / 01334 747970 / 01334 476636 – St Andrews

Thank you for your email dated 31st March 2003 pertaining to these payphones. I apologise for our delay in responding.

In response to your concern regarding the removal of the following boxes from St Andrews we have reviewed our position. I am pleased to advise you that these payphones have been cancelled from the rationalisation programme and will remain in place, at least for the short term.

- 01334 473526 located at Bogword Road, St Andrews
- 01334 747970 located at Lamond Drive, St Andrews
- 01334 476636 located at the junction of Canongate/Largo Road, St Andrews

However, the usage will be monitored and the payphones could be re-introduced back into the programme at a future date. If this should happen, new 42-day consultation notices will be issued.

If you have any further queries or concerns you may contact me by email at bt.authorisation.team@bt.com or by writing to me at BT Payphones, pp 06A21, Delta Point, 35 Wellesley Road, Croydon, CR9 2YZ.

Appendix D – Bus Station

Report by Ken Fraser

Bus Station Consultation Meeting 15/12/03

About 20 people attended (Fife and Community Councillors, Fife Council and Stagecoach officials, and representatives of the consultants and architects). In the morning, discussions were held in groups on the strengths and weaknesses of the existing bus station and on what should be the objectives aimed at in the new one. The groups then voted on which of these ought to be regarded as the highest priorities. Those which got the most support were (in a rough approximation to the wording used by the consultants):

- To provide a good waiting environment for passengers
- To allow integration with other forms of transport (present or future)

Also prominent were:

- To provide a safe operating environment for buses
- To integrate with other proposals for development of the general area

There was then a computer display of designs for recently built bus stations, but these were mostly in towns much larger than St. Andrews.

In the afternoon, the groups discussed what features in the new building would be most conducive to the four objectives listed above. I have only the “scores” for the group I was in, but do not suppose the others would have differed greatly. It was agreed that the most relevant features (in no particular order) would be:

- Adequate shelter for passengers
- Good signage
- A help telephone when no staff were on duty
- Good visibility of buses, etc.
- A pedestrian crossing to the stances
- “Accessible” kerbs and tactile surfaces for disabled people
- A recognised pickup point for motorists
- More and better seats
- Ease of cleaning and maintenance

Many other features were also brought forward, e.g. toilets, lighting, cycle racks etc. There was some support for the idea of moving the bus depot away if this was practicable (though I do not think it will be).

We were assured that all the features mentioned (and many others which are not) would be considered for inclusion, subject to the budget. It was pointed out that many of the most useful features could be incorporated without undue expense.

The St. Andrews proposal is part of an overall plan to improve five bus stations in Fife. The total budget for the St. Andrews scheme is believed to be £700,000. A draft design (or possibly alternative designs) will now be drawn up, and submitted for further consultation during 2004. The final design will then appear. The project is to be carried out within three years.

I felt this was a very worthwhile meeting.

Appendix E – Saint Andrew's Day Holiday

From Keith McCartney

Having read in the Sunday Herald (30/11/03) of the call by Cardinal O'Brien, supported by other eminent Scots including the Rev Alan McDonald Convener of the Church of Scotland's Church and Nation Committee – for St Andrew's Day to be declared a national holiday, I wrote to make him aware of the sterling efforts by the Community Council, particularly in 2000, to progress this aim.

[...]

I would like to propose, as a member of the public, that the Community Council, given their honourable and long standing commitment to a St Andrew's Day holiday, consider writing to both the Cardinal and to the Saltire Society reiterating their support.

Keith McCartney to Cardinal O'Brien

As the person formerly responsible for leading the campaign by the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council to have St Andrew's Day declared a public holiday I was delighted to read in the Sunday Herald (St Andrew's Day 2003) of your call for this which was reported as being supported by, among others, the Rev Alan McDonald, convener of the Church of Scotland's Church and Nation committee.

The Community Council made a big effort in 2000 to have St Andrew's Day declared a national holiday in that millennium year. We had the support of Cardinal Winning, Bishop Holloway and the then Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and managed to have a motion put before the Scottish Parliament. However, despite our best efforts, we were unable to achieve our objective.

I hope that given your stated desire to have St Andrew's Day declared a national holiday you may be in a position to work with other likeminded persons towards achieving this aim. It may be that you and the other prominent persons named in the Sunday Herald article supporting this proposal could seek to set up a campaign group with a view to perhaps agreeing, among other campaigning tactics, the wording of a petition which could be put to congregations of all the Christian denominations and those of other religions on an agreed weekend in 2004 to be forwarded to the Petitions Committee of the Scottish Parliament for their consideration.

The Community Council campaign ultimately foundered as it did not have the means of pursuing what requires to be a Scotland wide campaign. Hopefully you through your position may be able to pursue this goal with more success.

Cardinal O'Brien to Keith McCartney

I am indeed very grateful to you for letting me know of what has been accomplished so far along with Reverend Allan McDonald the Convenor of the Church of Scotland's Church and Nation Committee.

By the same post as your letter reached me so also did one from the director of the Saltire Society speaking of their campaign to have St Andrew's Day turned into an official national holiday.

Obviously there is considerable interest in this project and I am sure things would be able to go ahead nationwide if those interested got together. Consequently I am sending a copy of your letter to the director of the Saltire Society to see if he would be in a position to progress matters.

With my kind regards, good wishes and thanks.

Yours sincerely in Christ

+ Keith Patrick Cardinal O'Brien Archbishop of St Andrews and Edinburgh

Appendix F – East Fife Local Plan

From Cathy Kinnear, Planner (Plans & Policy)

East Fife Local Plan – Community Councils

As I expect you are aware, the East Fife Community Consultation finished on 3 December. In the near future we will be circulating detailed summaries of these exercises, and a newsletter about the future programming of the Local Plan.

In the meantime, we would welcome any further comments and suggestions for the East Fife Local Plan. Please will your community council consider whether there are specific land use issues you would like to see addressed by the Local Plan or specific areas that you would like to see considered for development or protected from development.

I have enclosed a map of your area. It would be helpful if you used this to identify the sites in which you are interested. I would be grateful if you could reply before the end of February 2004, by post and/or the email address above cathy.kinnear@fife.gov.uk

I appreciate that many of you will have come to the community consultations and volunteered this information as individuals. This letter is asking for community council views.

Should I be able to help further, do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing from you.

Appendix G – University Sports Centre Group

From Dr Martin Farrally, Director of PE:

We have set up a new Group to advise us on the operation of the University Sports Centre. The Group represents all our users plus representatives from community agencies such as Fife Council and East Fife Sports Council. The main purpose of the Group is to help us evaluate the effectiveness of the services we offer, and to help us in planning the way forward for sport and recreation both for the University and the

local community.

At the first meeting of the Advisory Group we discussed the constituent members and it was felt that they should be representative of St Andrews Community Council.

Consequently, I write to invite you to nominate somebody to join the Group if it is your wish to be represented.

Appendix H – Harbour Toilets

Steven McColl of Shorehead has a concern about inappropriate use of the toilets

Firstly, I write with seasonal good wishes to the Community Council!

On a slightly less positive note I write to bring a certain issue to your attention and wonder whether you could assist in any way.

My wife and I moved into St Andrews Harbour area a short while ago and are delighted to be here. However, it has come to our attention that our street has a certain problem 'Toilet Cruising'. In short, the male Shorehead toilet is frequented by men trying to pick-up other men. Each to their own. However: -

1. I have had workmen employed at my house who have used the toilets and have been embarrassingly approached by 'cruisers' whilst going about their personal business
2. There are certain men who sit outside the toilet for hours on end during each day, thus putting off people with a genuine toilet need from going in.
3. Each evening, the toilet is unlocked & unlit and when dark – cars constantly pull up and people go use the facility for activity not normally associated with that of a public convenience.
4. The 'cruisers' often drive round slowly round Shorehead, often looking in our windows, something that we could do without.
5. The situation is even reported widely on the internet with one such report to be found at <http://www.thebathroomdiaries.com/scotland/st+andrews.html>

My issue is that apparently this problem is locally well know, to both residents, council and police. The local PC informed me today that they have been asking for the toilets to be locked each evening for quite some time, but the council have thus far refused to do so. She said that they were fully aware of the problem and that it is something that they are keeping an eye on, and suggested that I write to the council / community council about the issue supporting them in the request for a gate and evening locking.

Any help that you can give would be much appreciate and I am sure will help build on the regeneration of this important harbour area.

Appendix I – Police Community Team Newsletter

Selected snippets:

Call Handling Unit (CHU)

I have included this information to update you on the excellent progress of the Call Handling Unit. Bill Linton, who is managing the unit, is willing to attend Community Council / NHW meetings to discuss any matters you may have. If you feel this would be of benefit to you please contact PS Latto.

Daily Average 20th – 26th Nov 03	Calls offered	Calls answered	Calls abandoned	Average speed of answer	% of calls answered	% of calls abandoned
Eastern Div	149	143	6	15	96	4

Crime Statistics for November 2003 – November 2002 in brackets

Nov-03	Dom HB	Vandalism	Theft	BoP	Assault					
	Rep.	Det.	Rep.	Det.	Rep.	Det.	Rep.	Det.	Rep.	Det.
St Andrews	3(2)	2(2)	19(15)	3(8)	31(34)	2(10)	5(10)	4(8)	2(3)	0(2)

Alcohol Free Zones

As you are aware a consultation process is underway regarding Alcohol Free Zones. I want to take this opportunity to explain how Alcohol Free Zones affect the communities from a policing point of view. Confusion can be a problem with the public as to which areas are covered by the AFZ and which are not. The police preference would be blanket coverage in towns and villages as this removes such confusion. However, many communities take the view that street drinking is not a problem in their area and their wishes must be considered and respected.

However, there is no doubt that drinking in the street can lead to behaviour which is anti-social and this impacts on communities. Whether it is drinking after leaving licensed premises, or congregating on a street or outside a shop the effects of the alcohol on an individual can lead them to a mode of behaviour, which could lead to disorder or crimes being committed. There is also an obvious link to such behaviour and vandalism. The mere presence of the legislation is a preventative tool which can be enforced if required, keeping in mind that Police Officers will act with discretion and common sense.

The majority of complaints from the public about youths gathering in the street also involve alcohol. There is intelligence to suggest that youths are moving from areas, which are covered by AFZ legislation, to those that are not.

Fife Constabulary has recently commented upon requests for the implementation of AFZ legislation in certain areas or the review of existing legislation in other areas. These comments have been submitted to Fife Council's Law and Administration for consideration along with the community views.

Integrity Testing

Eastern Division Community Team recently ran an initiative to test the integrity of premises with an off sales licence. We had 16 year youths enter such premises with a brief to try and purchase alcohol. The youths were also briefed to tell the truth if they were asked their age.

Over the period we visited 34 premises with 17 failing the test. This was phase one of the initiative, which was to focus the minds of the licence holder and for them to improve their systems in relation to selling alcohol and staff training. A letter has been sent out to each premises visited and a report submitted to the local licensing board for their information. We will be repeating the initiative early in the New Year with an improvement on the previous results being the target.

Update from School Liaison Officer PC Emma Clarkson

The winter term is a busy time for both primary and secondary schools. [...] 3rd year students at [...] Madras College will receive drug education prior to the Christmas holidays, also Canongate, Langlands, [...] will participate in the Police Primary 7 drug and alcohol education package in the coming weeks. All three High Schools will also receive an input on vandalism and its effects prior to the Christmas break.

Appendix I – 20 mph Zones at Schools

Report to Fife Council Area Chairs meeting by Derek Crowe, Area Transportation Manager, forwarded by Cllr Melville for any responses we may have.

1.0 Background

1.1 At the Environment and Development Committee meeting of 27th October 2003 a report was submitted advising the Committee of the recent award to Fife Council of £1.805M additional funding from the Scottish Executive for the introduction of 20mph speed limits near schools.

1.2 For the East Area a total of £543,000 has been awarded for 20 mph speed limits over 3 years.

- £99,000 – 2003/04
- £222,000 – 2004/05
- £222,000 – 2005/06

1.3 Committee approved the proposal to introduce 20 mph mandatory speed limits at all schools, where it was appropriate to do so. They also approved a proposal to introduce enforceable "school keep clears" markings, again where appropriate to do so. This latter issue will be implemented throughout Fife during 2004/05 from topsliced funds.

2.0 Present Position

2.1 In East Area there are 47 primary schools and 3 secondary schools as shown in the attached table (Appendix 1). The schools are diverse and range from small isolated country primaries such as Kemback, Creich and Rathillet where pupil numbers are very low to busy bustling schools such as Castlehill, Tayport and Newport, situated on busy main roads. The 3 secondary schools Bell Baxter, Waid and Madras College are adjacent to busy main road networks and all have significant school populations, most of which travel to school by bus.

2.2 The provision of this 3 year ring-fenced allocation to deliver reduced speed limits in school zone areas is very welcome and allows a positive approach to be adopted towards speed reduction outside schools. The allocation is neither based on actual budget requirements nor a specified type of treatment for all schools.

2.3 An overview of speed limit issues at all East schools has been carried out and initial proposals for possible speed reduction treatments at each location are shown in Appendix 1. This review quickly showed that it is not the case that permanent 20-mph zones should be located outside every school in East Area.

3.0 Discussion

3.1 To enforce permanent 20 mph zones on site, physical speed reduction measures are required. These are often very unpopular with other road users and can have a detrimental effect on the local environment. The selection of engineering measures requires great care and extensive consultation is also needed with appropriate groups/affected parties. Additional statutory processes (humps) are often required.

3.2 The Scottish trial of advisory 20 mph limits (20's Plenty Scheme) showed only limited short term success and it is not considered that this low cost technique would be an appropriate option to be considered as part of this project.

3.3 A pilot study of part-time speed limits outside schools in other parts of Scotland between 2001-2003 has shown positive results. The Scottish Executive has given Councils the option to use such part-time speed limits at appropriate locations and has invited Councils to seek blanket approval to use a new set of speed limit signs which were trialled during the pilot project. This option could be a very useful technique to deal with many of the rural type locations in East Fife. Further, the option of part-time speed limits is much less costly at each site due to the lesser requirement for permanent engineering measures.

3.4 Within East Area it is clear that erecting 20mph signs at every school could create difficulties in some situations. Five of the fifty schools are located on roads where currently greater than 30mph speed limits apply. For instance schools such as Dunbog, Smithygreen are located on fast 'A' class road where the national 60mph limit applies. It would not be appropriate at such sites to try to force traffic speed down to

20mph in such a rural environment and a different and more realistic limit may be required such as 40mph.

3.5 Schools located within residential areas may also be encompassed within a residential 20mph zone, which could cover several streets or a zone around the school. This would be a very costly option, but would be very appropriate where schools are located in dense housing areas.

3.6 In some locations, the implementation of a permanent 20mph limit would be inappropriate given the location and potential use of the school outside normal school hours. In situations such as this, there would be little physical measures on site and the reduced speed limit would revert back to the normal limit when no children were around.

3.7 There is perhaps an expectancy that all schools will receive a 20-mph speed limit outside their gate. This is neither necessarily appropriate nor affordable within the current budget allocation. It would however be prudent to plan for the delivery of reduced speed limits at all schools in East Fife as suggested in Appendix 1. Further funding support may become available in future years and a clear programme of policy delivery will be needed.

3.8 Similar to other areas of budget pressure, it is suggested that a priority listing of schools is developed to help target the resources at areas of greatest need / potential benefit. The funding allocation is over three years however the funding is ring-fenced and will not be lost due to a slow start. This is particularly important to consider bearing in mind the statutory procedures, which govern the introduction of changes to speed limits and the need for often lengthy consultation exercises.

3.9 Prioritisation of the schools for use of this budget is not an exact science. Consideration can be given to crash records! engineering judgement! past records and correspondence! school travel plans input! comments from the Police and local members etc. The aim is to treat all schools – the issue to be determined is really a matter of timing based on relative priority and relative 'deliverability' in the period being considered. Whilst part-time speed limits could be provided within 12 months subject to statutory processes, it is unlikely that a large number of permanent 20 mph zones could be delivered during 2004/05 due to the high level of consultation required and statutory processes. In addition, sites with permanent 20-mph zones will be more costly! site and would require close budgetary control.

3.10 Initial discussions have been held with the Police and they are supportive of the project. Further, discussions have been held with the Legal Services Manager to provide additional legal resources over the next 2 years to deal with a short term peak in Speed limit Orders associated with the Fife-wide implementation of this project.

3.11 Whilst the Area Transport Plan will include various speed reduction proposals for future implementation, it is considered appropriate to single-out this initiative for a specific Committee report in February 2004. The report will seek approval for an agreed approach to the rollout of this project with prioritised list of sites for ongoing development and implementation within the budget allocations. As the programme develops and is implemented, individual reports for Speed Limit approvals will be brought to Committee and monitoring reports will be presented in conjunction with the Area Transportation Works Programme.

4.0 Recommendation

4.1 It is recommended that the Area Chairs agree:

- the proposed options as detailed on Appendix 1 for reducing speed limits at each school is an appropriate starting point in developing an implementation plan.
- to the proposal to prioritise activity towards the roll-out of sites with 20mph part time limits primarily during 2004/05 with consultation commencing on permanent 20 mph sites for delivery during 2005/06 and onwards.
- to provide comments to the Area Transportation Manager to assist in the formulation of the final Committee report planned for February 2004.

St Andrews proposals extracted from Appendix:

- i) 20mph permanent zone with calming measures.
 - Canongate PS
 - Lawhead PS
- ii) 20mph variable zone
 - Greyfriars RC PS
- iii) 20mph permanent/variable zone (?)
 - Langlands PS
- iv) tba
 - Madras College

Appendix J – Temporary Accommodation for Homeless

Paper by John Mills Housing Manager (Allocations & Homelessness) Fife Council Housing Services. Originally circulated at December 2003 meeting

FIFE HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY (2003/08) – Enhancing the Provision of Temporary Accommodation for Homeless People in St. Andrews Locality

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This brief Report aims to seek formal views from the St. Andrews Community Council on ways and means to expand the current provision of temporary accommodation in St. Andrews Locality. Fife Council is beginning a period of consultation with a range of stakeholders in the Locality to arrive at a preferred option, or package of options to achieve the enhancement of provision for homeless people.

2.0 Homelessness Needs Assessment

2.1 Homeless People presenting in St. Andrews Locality cover the spectrum of society, from young people seeking their first home to professionals, through to elderly people who lose their home. On average, 6 homeless households request interviews with the Homelessness Officers per week.

2.2 A key element in the development of the Fife Homelessness Strategy is the Homelessness Needs Assessment. Craigforth Consultants, commissioned by Fife Council undertook the research. A range of homelessness services in East Fife, provided by a number of Statutory and Voluntary agencies, were analysed and mapped. 9 Projects stated that they provided services in St. Andrews Locality, 22% of the total of Fife Homeless projects. This represents the lowest figure in Fife, along with Howe of Fife and Taybridgehead. The area analysis reveals clients in East Fife are less likely than in other areas of Fife to be able to access services in the area they come from.

Table 1 – Locality Areas where a homelessness service can be provided

Area	Number of Projects	Percentage of Projects in Fife
EAST FIFE		
Cupar	11	27%
Howe of Fife	9	22%
Tay Bridgehead	9	22%
St. Andrews	9	22%
East Neuk	10	24%

2.2 "An analysis of the type of services by area (across Fife) shows the paucity of services in East Fife. Just 12 Services said they could provide services in East Fife... Only two are located in St. Andrews and four in Cupar". (p. 41, Fife Homelessness Needs Assessment)

2.3 In relation to the provision of temporary accommodation, the Research confirmed that proportionately, East Fife had the lowest provision of temporary accommodation in Fife.

"Just three Projects provide temporary accommodation as their primary focus (in East Fife) East Fife Womens Aid, Cornerstone in Cupar, and Fife Council Temporary Accommodation Service" (p.80 Fife Homelessness Needs Assessment".

2.4 In the case of St. Andrews Locality, the provision is limited to two Services.

Table 2 – temporary accommodation in St. Andrews

Temporary Accommodation Service	Fife Council	Women's Aid Supported Accommodation
Individual Properties	11	4

The occupancy rate within the existing temporary accommodation is over 95% at any time and is in high demand. As at 27th November, there are approximately 30 households either in other temporary accommodation in Fife who emanate from St. Andrews Locality, or have made their own arrangements pending an offer of available temporary or permanent housing. "Homeless at Home" is recognised by the Scottish Executive as a legitimate form of temporary accommodation, where homeless people can make their own short-term arrangements.

3.0 Fife Homelessness Strategy (2003/08)

3.1 The Strategy was endorsed by Fife Council and NHS Fife in June 2003. One of the main objectives of the Strategy is to ensure that emergency temporary accommodation is always available to homeless people. A requirement of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001, is that Fife Council has a duty to provide temporary accommodation to all homeless people. In Fife we accommodate non-priority homeless households for 28 days following their homelessness decision. This period enables the Council and the homeless person to find a solution to their short-term accommodation and other needs.

3.2 Fife Council is committed to working in partnership with Local Communities and Agencies to enhance the provision of temporary accommodation in East Fife. The East Area Services Committee accepted the need for additional accommodation in St. Andrews.

3.3 Appendix 1 represents a Review of temporary accommodation options for consideration and discussion. Views from St. Andrews Community Council, and other Community Councils in the Locality, as well as from other organisations such as Churches will be sought over the next 3 months. The next steps involve the collation of Community views, and reporting to the East Area Services Committee in March 2004.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 The need to enhance the provision of temporary accommodation is outlined in the Report. What form the additional provision will take will be based on views from the Communities in St. Andrews Locality. Fife Council is committed to the implementation of the Fife Homelessness Strategy with the support of all Stakeholders.

5.0 Recommendation

5.1 The St. Andrews Community Council is requested to consider the preferred options for enhancing temporary accommodation within St. Andrews, and to provide feedback to Fife Council.

Fife Homelessness Strategy (2003/08) – St. Andrews Temporary Accommodation Options

Temporary	Current Provision	Description

Accommodation Option		
Permanent Accommodation	50% of annual allocations to homelessness in St. Andrews	Temporary accommodation is only necessary where <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homelessness assessment and/or investigation is ongoing • Insufficient permanent accommodation in the Locality To support an increasing pressure for temporary accommodation, the Council could decide to increase the level of homelessness allocations in St. Andrews to a higher level.
Homeless Hostel 1. 10-bed Hostel 2. 3-4 bed Hostel	Nil	Provision based on a number of bedrooms and shared communal facilities within a single building. A staff Team of 5 working shifts would staff the Unit on a 24/7 basis. The level of housing support provided can range from low to high level support. The requirement in St. Andrews would be for a low-level support Unit for homeless people. Clients needs would be for straightforward temporary accommodation.
Individual properties (1) Procurement from letting stock (2) Purchase of properties (3) Private leasing	11 existing 4 new in pipeline 4 East Fife Womens Aid	The commonest form of temporary accommodation used in St. Andrews Locality. (1) The Local Office offers empty properties to the Homelessness Service for direct provision of temporary accommodation, or for use as supported accommodation, e.g. Womens Aid. The properties are fully furnished and can be returned to the Local Office for let as permanent accommodation following at least 3 years of use. The Local Office would replace the temporary accommodation with another property. (2) Predecessor District Councils engaged in buying properties on the open market (usually former Council properties sold under Right to Buy) to supplement the stock in an area. (3) North East Fife DC established a Private Leasing Scheme with Private Sector Landlords. This type of scheme can be a useful addition to enhancing the pool of temporary accommodation.
B&B	Nil	Least favoured form of temporary accommodation due to lack of control of standards of accommodation, services to homeless people, and high costs. Homeless Service currently book clients into B&B accommodation into Levenmouth & Kirkcaldy. A Fife B&B contract will be let by February/March 2004 to regulate standards, control costs, and improve services to clients. B&B should only ever be used for short-stays and for emergencies (fire & flood).
Homeless at Home	30 households	Good Practice recognises the contribution that "Homeless at Home" can make to a temporary accommodation strategy. In these circumstances, homeless people make their own arrangements to stay with friends or relatives until they can be assisted into temporary accommodation, or can be made an offer of permanent accommodation. In effect, in East Fife, this is the most common form of temporary accommodation used due to shortage of other options.
Caravans/ Portacabins/ Logcabins	Nil	The purchase or lease of caravans is an option for consideration. Previous experience of their use for decanting tenants from their homes during modernisation works. The use of Portacabins has a precedent in North East Fife, in Strathmiglo. This was a successful provision but discontinued in the early 1990's due to vandalism and the high repair costs.

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Homeless Hostel 1. 10-bed Hostel 2. 3-4 bed Hostel	Whether directly managed by the Council, or indirectly through a Voluntary Sector Provider, a high standard of accommodation, support services, and amenity can be guaranteed and maintained, Hostels are cost effective in revenue terms, if there is an adequate number of residents on one site. 9-10 bedrooms is the desired size for this type of provision. A smaller building/fewer number of bedrooms can provide a less-institutionalised provision. Particularly difficult to locate suitable properties at the right price in the right location for use as a hostel.	High Cost of provision – typical cost for new build or rehabilitated building can reach £400-500,000. Consultation with homeless people confirms this type of shared accommodation as less popular than single – occupation or individual properties. Smaller hostels are not cost-effective as there are fewer rents to offset staffing and other revenue costs.
Individual properties	(1) Recognised as most popular form of temporary accommodation with homeless people. Recognised as Best Practice. Typical cost of provision is £5,000 per unit, if selected from the Council's Stock. (2) Purchasing properties from the private sector	(1) A balance needs to be maintained between taking properties from the letting stock and the provision of permanent accommodation to homeless people. This requirement limits the number of

	would alleviate the pressure on the letting stock in St. Andrews. (3) As above, leasing temporary accommodation in the private sector could ease pressure to take units from the letting stock.	temporary accommodation units that can be selected. (2) The cost of acquisition, particularly in a high-cost property area, is likely to be considerable. Current estimate to purchase 4-5 properties could cost £400-450,000. (3) Cost of provision is higher than in the public sector.
B&B	Relative, ease of access where the Homelessness Service has reached agreement with proprietors to house homeless people. This is not the case in all parts of Fife, particularly St. Andrews. Preferred option by some homeless people due to relative lack of rules and restrictions applying to them. This is the least favoured option for Councils, guided by Government Strategy. There are a number of practical issues arising from the use of B&B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor standards • Poor level of services for residents • Clients tend to be not supported by Homelessness Service, although this is improving • Seen as not cost-effective for the Council – income from charges does not match expenditure.
Homeless at Home	Main advantage is no financial cost to Council. Some homeless people do have this as an option if they understanding friends or relatives. By using this option, homeless people can usually stay in their own Localities.	Two main disadvantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is not meeting its statutory obligation to temporarily accommodate homeless people in its area. • We have experience where homeless people are at risk of further violence where they cannot access accommodation and go back to unsafe situations.
Caravans / Portacabins / Logcabins	Caravans – relatively low cost if leasing/renting option is selected. Standard of accommodation can be quite high, depending on age and condition of caravan.	Portcabins/Logcabins – Higher standard of accommodation can be achieved at a higher cost. More acceptable than Caravans due to semi-permanence of sites. Are used in Rural Local Authorities where housing supply is low. Caravans – procuring new sites a major issue due to non-availability of housing sites in St. Andrews Locality. Question mark over whether homeless people should be placed in this form of temporary accommodation, and whether it would be regarded as second-class accommodation. Portacabins/Logcabins – issues consistent with those for Caravans. Higher cost than Caravans to establish, but more acceptable than Caravans.

Appendix K – 7th Golf Course

Planning committee draft response to the 7th golf course application, by Ian Goudie

Proposed Golf Course, Kinkell and Brownhills Farms, St Andrews.

1. I write on behalf of the Community Council to object to the above application. We would also wish to draw your attention to a number of serious shortcomings in the associated Environmental Statement (ES), and to indicate a number of issues on which further investigation or clarification are needed.

Summary

2. Our major points include:-

(i) The implication of the Fife Structure Plan is that this application for probable Green Belt land should be deemed premature. To do otherwise would set a very dangerous precedent for the town.

(ii) The proposal does not comply with Structure Plan Policy N7 on Development on the Undeveloped Coast.

(iii) The applicants' case for a new course is an amalgam of statistical and legal arguments, but neither of these strands is pursued with sufficient precision to be persuasive.

(iv) The methodology used to assess the numbers of vehicle trips which would be generated by the proposed development is unsound. The predicted figures are likely to be serious underestimates. One can therefore have no confidence in the conclusion that a full Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) is not required.

The broad picture

3. Although we find less than convincing the arguments which purport to establish the need for a seventh

course run by the SLT (St Andrews Links Trust), the main concern of the Community Council with this application is over the chosen site. Indeed, although the boundaries of the Green Belt (GB) for St Andrews are yet to be determined, para 3.4.2 acknowledges that “The most likely scenario however is that the site will be within the GB”. Throughout its existence the Community Council has been a jealous guardian of the reputation of St Andrews as “The Home of Golf”. We are also, however, conscious of the need to maintain our perspective and to safeguard the well-being of the town as a whole. The beauty of the landscape setting of the town is a key element of that well-being. It is a cornerstone of the tourist industry, and by no means an insignificant factor in attracting students to the University of St Andrews, which remains our principal source of employment.

Threats to likely Green Belt land

4. The strength of support in St Andrews for the concept of the Green Belt needs no underlining, but we appreciate that it will take some years to get the Green Belt boundaries into place. The landscape setting of the town is under considerable threat in the intervening period. The outcome of the recent planning enquiry implies the sad loss of the hillside above John Knox Road, and further encroachment into land which we would wish to see in the Green Belt may come not only from the present application, but also from the proposed golfing development at Feddinch, the proposed Clash Wood chalet development, the proposed hospital and healthcare centre and the enormous proposed Western development.

Prematurity considerations

Processing applications for Green Belt land

5. Accordingly there was a warm welcome for Policy SS8 of the July 2002 Fife Structure Plan, which requires the Local Plan to identify Green Belt boundaries for St Andrews, and indicates that “development proposals likely to prejudice this process will be considered premature”. This operational procedure was reaffirmed by the unequivocal statement, reported in The Courier of 12 December 2002, by the former Head of Planning, Mr David Rae, that “development proposals submitted for St Andrews in advance of green belt boundaries being drawn up will be regarded by Fife Council as “premature””.

6. The principle of the prematurity of proposed developments in the Green Belt is thus central to the protection of the landscape setting of the town until the Green Belt boundaries are determined in the Local Plan. Where major applications are concerned, to permit the creation of any category which is deemed exempt from the prematurity clause would clearly be very foolish, and would set a precedent which would be liable to undermine the clear intention of this part of the Structure Plan.

The Undeveloped Coast

7. Our objection to the proposed site is that not only is it within probable Green Belt land but also that it is on the undeveloped coast, which this Community Council has always been keen to protect. Its use would be in clear breach of Structure Plan Policy N7 on Development on the Undeveloped Coast, which indicates that such developments will only be permitted if three conditions are met. The proposal fails to satisfy two of these conditions, in that it cannot be said to contribute to “renewal and regeneration”, and it neither demonstrates “a need for a coastal location nor is it “required for a coastal activity”.

Filling the gaps in the ES

8. We have previously highlighted the comment in PAN 58 (Para 25) that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process “rarely proceeds in a simple linear fashion”, and we believe that Fife Council should seek clarification of parts of the present ES. For, despite its size, this ES leaves some important questions unanswered, whilst in other places the submitted material raises more questions than it answers. We recall that the letter from the Planning Division of the SEDD to all Heads of Scottish Planning Authorities (ref PGD/5/12) says in para 19.1 “The planning authority should be prepared to challenge the findings of the ES if it believes they are not adequately supported by scientific evidence.”

Is a seventh course needed?

Inconsistencies between the ES and the NTS

9. The importance of challenging unsubstantiated claims is relevant, in particular, to the justification given for the development of a 7th course. On the statistical part of this case, Fife Council should initially seek clarification of the submitted data. One concern lies in the inconsistencies between the data in the full ES and that in the Non-Technical Summary (NTS). The comparison is not aided by the poor proof-reading of section 4.8 of the ES on Economic Impact, where it appears the data of Table 1 should have formed a 4 x 6 table rather than a single column. Once reconstructed, it emerges that the waiting list numbers for three of the five categories of sales differ from those in the NTS. Two of the percentage increases are somewhat understated due to use of incorrect denominators. The NTS also includes further data on yearly tickets for R & A members with no comment on the relationship of these data to the analysis in the ES.

The need for a longer perspective

10 More importantly, Fife Council should also seek more comprehensive data covering a significantly longer timespan. Bearing in mind the dates of recent Open Championships, the starting points for the time series data appear to have been chosen to maximise the apparent growth in golfing activity in St Andrews over the last few years. Different starting points are chosen for the series on rounds played and those on ticket sales. The reader of the ES is left with the strong suspicion that the growth would look much less spectacular if viewed against a longer perspective and a common base year. It should also be noted that part of the increase on the ticket sales is attributable to the policy change, with the introduction of sales of Open Links Tickets.

Long term implications of claimed increases

11. Para. 3.2.1 of the ES says “between 1995 and 2002 total rounds played on SLT courses has increased from 168,200 to 211,000. An increase of 25% in total rounds played. There is no indication to suggest that such growth will not continue”. If this is correct and such an increase is typical, the long-term

position is not sustainable. If overall demand continues to increase at 25% every seven years, then by 2016, twice the capacity of 1995 will be needed to cater for it. If demand from local golf club members living outwith North East Fife continues to increase at 60% every four years, it will by 2018 have exploded to ten times its volume in 1998. Manifestly the town cannot cope with expansion on this scale.

Transferability of demand

12. Section 3.0 of the NTS reports that “As a consequence of the Links Act, SLT must provide access to the Links to any resident of St Andrews”. Para. 3.2.3 of the ES says of the proposed new course that “In terms of the Links Act, this course will form part of the links”. There is an implication here that the SLT could in theory discharge its obligations to St Andrews golfers even if were to effectively debar them from the present courses and provide facilities elsewhere, but that would scarcely seem to be within the spirit of the Links Act. Just as importantly, if a case is being made for the 7th course, is to establish that local demand is indeed transferable from the present links to the proposed new course at Kinkell Braes. The ES advances no data to substantiate such a proposition.

Which constraints are absolute?

13. If Fife Council is persuaded of the increased demand, it should still consider whether provision of a new course is the appropriate response. Despite the lack of any seasonal disaggregation in the submitted demand data, the capacity problem on the links is a phenomenon restricted to the summer months. Clearly the SLT has decided that demand is transferable to a new course, but not transferable to the “shoulder months” of the year. The SLT has to operate within many constraints, but the Council should consider whether those constraints are absolute or whether the time will soon come where the legal and policy framework will need modification. If the world has moved on, is the current prohibition on joint ventures, for instance, one that must be viewed as though it is divinely decreed? For it is evident that the SLT has no immediate prospect of satisfying the requirement of Policy C4 of the Structure Plan that proposals for new golf courses must “demonstrate that the demand cannot be met on an existing course in the area”. The validity of its claim for effective exemption from this clause on legal grounds must therefore be examined.

Alternative sites

Strathtyrum and Easter Kincapple

14. The consideration of alternative sites in the ES is also inadequate. It is clear that the applicants have not noted question 2.5 in the EIS Review checklist in the EU's Guidance on EIA, which reads “Are the main environmental effects of the alternatives compared with those of the proposed Project?” Section 3.3 of the ES implies that the alternative which looked most viable to the SLT was the one which used part of the Strathtyrum Estate combined with land at Easter Kincapple Farm. The environmental effects of this alternative are not considered at all. The reasons given for the option being “unworkable” are firstly that “the course would be somewhat ordinary” and secondly that “the Strathtyrum proprietor was still keen that that any arrangement should become a joint venture”. On the latter point we note that the ES does not report reaching a complete impasse with Strathtyrum Estate. Indeed, in the discussion of a possible site solely on Strathtyrum land, it is recorded that the Estate “was prepared to consider the construction of a golf course on part of the Strathtyrum land” and that “while they might consider a lease, (Strathtyrum) indicated that on balance they would prefer some form of joint venture”. Although short-term problems regarding the prematurity of applications for probable Green Belt land would also apply to Strathtyrum, the apparent willingness of the Estate to discuss the matter should be welcomed. For, if Fife Council could secure an answer to the EU's question on environmental effects, we think it likely that any objective assessment would deem a Strathtyrum site as less damaging to the environment than one at Kinkell Braes.

Hillside locations

15. In assessing possible alternatives at Scooniehill and Feddinch, the ES does make a brief attempt to address environmental issues. Indeed, para. 3.3.4 of the ES candidly records that these sites were discarded “as they were already the subject of contractual arrangements with third parties and because (in the case of the Scooniehill site) the reporter at a recent planning appeal had determined that a golf course on a hillside site at present in permanent pasture and overlooking St Andrews was not an appropriate location for a new golf course.” There is, however, no discussion of the extent to which the reporter's verdict might also apply to the Kinkell Braes site.

Traffic Impact

The use of TRICS

16. Another inadequate part of the ES is the TIA, which is presented with an inappropriate brevity. Of particular concern is the methodology used to assess trip generation. The consultants Faber Maunsell choose to rely solely on the TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System) database, the intention being to obtain comparable data from similar golf courses elsewhere. An appendix indicates that the data are drawn from private golf courses in East Sussex (8 days), Hertfordshire (1 day), Kent (1 day), Dorset (10 days), West Midlands (2 days) and Greater Manchester (5 days). It also lists the selected survey days. No justification is offered for any of these selections. On the basis of these data, arrivals and departures are predicted for a full 24 hour period.

Relevance and robustness

17. The extent to which the selected data is suitable for predicting trip generation by the proposed new course is clearly highly questionable. At the most basic of levels, it should be noted that golf is not a game played at night, and that during the time of greatest demand – the summer months – St Andrews enjoys considerably more daylight than the southern English counties which form so large a part of the sample. The question of how the sample data should be summarised also merits attention. The IHT guidelines leave a lot to be desired as regards statistical methodology, but they do comment (para 3.4.17) that “it is recommended that developers and highway authorities adopt a robust forecast i.e. a value higher than the

average. An approach that is currently widespread is to consider a range of values with the higher value being the 85th percentile of the data sample (i.e. the trip rate exceeded by only 15% of the sample) and the lower value being reflected by the average trip rate.”

Trip generation for multi-purpose sites

18. Another very fundamental error here is the failure to recognise the multi-purpose nature of the proposed development. What is proposed is not simply an 18 hole golf course, but also a practice area, a 40 seat restaurant and (as per para. 3.2.3 of the ES) a public park. Para. 3.4.7 of the guidelines of the Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT) says “When multi-purpose sites are being considered, details of each element should be provided and the appropriate trip attraction rates for each element separately should be used as a first estimate.” Fife Council should certainly insist that this is done.

Failure to validate the TRICS output

19. In discussing in para 3.4.4 the use of the national databases (of which TRICS is one), the IHT guidelines say “It should be emphasised that this data is an aid to and not a substitute for professional judgement”. In contrast the approach of the Faber Maunsell TIA is purely mechanistic: the TRICS output appears to have been merely accepted with no attempt at any form of external validation.

More accurate ways to predict trip generation

20. It is clear that a professional approach here to trip generation would not place complete reliance on comparability data of doubtful relevance, but would seek a more balanced view by contrasting it with survey data and with the results of what the IHT call calculation from “first principles”. To predict trip generation by the main users of the facility – the golfers – there is no need to use data from private English courses when the SLT run six other courses in the town on which data could be collected. Usage of the practice area could be tackled in a similar manner. First principles calculations could be used to forecast trip generation by the other users of the development – other restaurant customers, greenkeepers, clubhouse and restaurant staff, service vehicles, those using the site as a public park etc.

Probable underestimation of the trips generated

21. The implication of this discussion is that the brief TIA submitted by the developers is not an adequate basis for decision-making and that Fife Council should seek a full TIA, with trip generation estimates based on more locally relevant data. The consultants Faber Maunsell argue in para. 5.2 that a full TIA is not necessary under the guidelines of the IHT as they believe the newly generated traffic would not exceed 10% of the existing two-way flow. Table 5.1 displays increases varying between 5% and 8%.

22. In fact the high level of uncertainty attached to these estimates implies that they offer no valid statistical evidence that the increases in traffic would be less than 10%. The combined effect of the failure to use suitable comparability data, the failure to note the multi-purpose nature of the development and the failure to use the robust estimation methods sought by the IHT is so great that the tabulated figures are likely to be serious underestimates of the true values. The IHT Guidelines (para 2.4.2) say “Like the Environmental Statements it is considered that the TIA should be written as an impartial assessment of the traffic impacts of a scheme and it should not be seen to be a “best case” promotion of the development.’

Sensitive locations

23. Faber Maunsell have also been selective in quoting para 3.1.5 of the IHT Guidelines which indicates when “a TIA should normally be produced.” The first bullet point that follows gives the 10% criterion that Faber Maunsell have quoted. The second reads “traffic to and from the development exceeds 5% of the existing two-way traffic flow on the adjoining highway, where traffic congestion exists or will exist within the assessment period or in other sensitive locations”. The Kinkell Braes site is indeed a “sensitive location” for the obvious reason that most of the traffic to it will come through St Andrews, which in the crucial summer months is already at its traffic capacity for a large proportion of the time.

National recognition of the unsuitability of the percentage criterion

24. The other important aspect of the 5% criterion for sensitive locations is that it represents the first glimmer of recognition by the IHT of the essential stupidity of the percentage increase criterion. The criterion implies that the greater the level of existing traffic the more acceptable it is to add still more from new developments. So naive application of the rules triggers a full TIA when the loading on a lightly used rural road increases from 20 to 23 vehicles an hour, but an increase of 50 vehicles an hour may not trigger one if the current loading exceeds 500 vehicles an hour and will not do so if the current loading exceeds 1000 vehicles an hour. It is pleasing that the Scottish Executive has recently highlighted this fundamental flaw in its Guide to Transport Assessment in Scotland. Considerations of road and junction capacity are always likely to be more pertinent, and this is particularly so in the St Andrews context. We would urge Fife Council to recognise that it should not allow the developers to dispense with a full TIA on the basis of a frail analysis relying on a flawed and outmoded criterion.

Trip Distribution

25. In view of the unreliability of the total trip generation statistics, the consequential calculations are clearly built on sand, and it might be thought that there is little point in considering them until they are corrected. As they stand, however, they are indicative of the level of thought that has gone into this TIA. There is absolutely no reason why the proportions of arrivals and departures at the site travelling in northerly or southerly directions should follow the proportions of existing traffic flows. During the morning peak most existing traffic on the A917 is heading for St Andrews, as the local focus of employment, but to deduce that most users of the golf course would be arriving from the direction of Boarhills is simply silly.

Green measures

26. This Community Council remains keen to encourage greener forms of transport, but we are sufficiently realistic to appreciate that their proportionate contribution is likely to be small in the short term. In the case of other recent developments in the area, our predictions of the total effect of green travel

plans have been closer to reality than many of the professionals. In the case of the present application, we would welcome the provision of facilities for walkers, cyclists and public transport users, but for the foreseeable future such users would only represent a tiny fraction of the modal split. Para 2.3 of the report candidly recognises that cycling is “unlikely to be a popular form of transport for golfers”. Even the young are likely to be reluctant to cycle up the hill with a bag of clubs.

Road safety

27. This brief TIA restricts consideration of road safety to the site access itself. The proposed development would, however, add significantly to the dangers at the junction of the Crail and Anstruther roads (A917 and B9131). In particular it would significantly increase the volume of right-turning traffic emerging in a northerly direction from the Anstruther road. Redesign of the junction to cater for this increased flow would be necessary.

Correspondence

Date	From	Subject
02/12/2003	Warmburgh	November newsletter
02/12/2003	FoE	What on Earth newsletter
02/12/2003	Planning Aid	Newsletter Nov 03
03/12/2003	Forestry Commission	Consultation Paper on Review of Land Managed by Forestry Commission
06/12/2003	East Area Service Committee	Agenda 10 Dec
08/12/2003	Law and Administration	CCTV advisory group minutes 20/11
08/12/2003	Police	Community Team newsletter Dec 03
09/12/2003	Fife Heritage Orchestra	New Session
09/12/2003	Mrs J Routledge	St Andrews Toilets
10/12/2003	Fife Health Council	Healthwatch
10/12/2003	Iain Smith MSP	Season's Greetings
11/12/2003	Development	Hospital Environmental Statement opinion
12/12/2003	Keith McCartney	St Andrew's Day Holiday
13/12/2003	Rubbish-free zone Co-ordinators Env Svcs	Xmas Card
17/12/2003	Development Svcs	East Fife Local Plan – community councils
17/12/2003	Volunteer Development	Annual Report 2003
17/12/2003	Scottish Water	Winter Precautions
17/12/2003	Alistair Work	Christmas Card
18/12/2003	Local Services	Phone Boxes
18/12/2003	Postwatch Scotland	Newsletter winter 03
19/12/2003	Mrs Willsher	Christmas Card
19/12/2003	Cllr Melville	School 20mph zones
19/12/2003	University – Principal & Vice-Chancellor	Christmas card
20/12/2003	Environmental Service	Newsletter winter 03
22/12/2003	Marine Conservation Society	Strandline newsletter winter 03
22/12/2003	Keith McCartney	St Andrew's Day hol –more fwded correspondence
22/12/2003	Water Consumer Consultation Panel	Affordability of Charges (low income)
24/12/2003	Transportation Services	Cycleclips Newsletter circulation
24/12/2003	St Andrews Week	Week 2003
29/12/2003	Scottish Civic Forum	Annual Report 02-03