

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Agenda – June 2005

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm Monday 6th June 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 late 1997 on are at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/>)

1. Apologies

Richard Douglas, Ken Fraser

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

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. The 2005 Open

Inspector Edmonston from the Open Golf Planning Team on this year's arrangements.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.2. Sheila Black (South)

4.3. Bill Sangster (Central)

4.4. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Minutes

Appendix D

5.2. Submissions

Appendix O: Structure Plan.

Appendix P: Local Plan (outline).

Appendix R: Planning Enquiry, Armit Place.

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Honorary Citizen

[May 6.1.]

6.1.1. Representations

Representations received will be circulated at the meeting.

6.1.2. Criteria of the Honorary Citizen Scheme

Requisitioned in accordance with Fife Council's Scheme for Community Councils [Appendix A] by five members of community council: Ken Fraser, Keith McCartney, Dennis Macdonald, Murdo Macdonald, Patrick Marks.

6.1.3. Reconsideration of the proposed award to Jack Nicklaus

(As 6.1.2. Requisition states that this item is dependant on the outcome of 6.1.2.)

6.2. Oil Transfer Terminal, Firth of Forth

Appendix E: Report by Ken Fraser, recommending that we support Fife Council's opposition to this scheme [May 7.2.].

6.3. Bandstand Concerts

[May 6.3.]

6.4. Right-to-Buy

Appendix L: Query and response regarding consultation and questionnaire circulation [May 8.3.2.]

(Did anyone from Community Council manage to attend the May 12 focus group in the Town Hall?)

6.5. Any other matters arising?

7. New Business

7.1. Schools Proposals

Patrick Marks, Elise Methven

7.2. Graffiti at Stanks Park

Appendix M: Jim Lesurf of Priestden Place writes asking for our support.

7.3. Planning Aid for Scotland

www.planning-aid-scotland.org.uk: "Planning Aid for Scotland provides a free and independent planning advice service for individuals and community groups across Scotland. The two principal aims are to ensure that everyone has access to planning advice, regardless of their ability to pay; and to educate people to understand the planning system and their participatory role within that system."

Friends scheme subscription renewal: £10.

AGM and Members Day: Saturday 11 June 2005, Dundee.

7.4. Local Holidays 2006

Appendix C: Proposed dates

7.5. Association of Scottish Community Councils

7.5.1. Subscription

Renewal was due in April: £15.

7.5.2. Newsletter

April 2005: Scottish Community of the Year (2004) – the Isle of Whithorn; AGM Sat 8 Oct, Pitlochry (main theme: Planning); Protection of Children (Scotland) Act; Scotland's First Compulsory Purchase Order (affordable homes); Broadband Coverage; (rural) Community Right to Buy; Bathing Water Review Panel; Path Planning; Wallace 700 – the homecoming; Age Concern Scotland's logs project; Green Belts; National Playing Fields Association; Scothedge fight to end hedge wars; The Local Channel (internet project); Freedom of Information; Scottish Charities Regulator sets out the rules; Helping community groups create wealth from their waste; Accessing Relevant Knowledge – FoE-supported scientific knowledge for community use; Ward Boundary Review and a new voting system; Taking the spin out of wind power; Scottish Parliament Outreach Services; Scottish Co-op's Community Dividend scheme.

(Download as a .pdf from <http://www.mgtgof.co.uk/forms.html>)

7.5.3. Community Planning

Two papers: a guide to community council involvement in community planning, and a formal study of the actual involvement of community councils in the community planning process.

7.6. Community Council Seminar

Mike Melville, Law & Admin writes with details of the seminar Sat 25 June 9.30-3.45 in Glenrothes. There are workshop sessions on: Engaging with your community; Fife Council beyond 2007; Good Practice agreement; Standards and Complaints Procedure; and another to be fixed (Scottish Water pulled out).

Further details and registration forms are with the Secretary.

7.7. Gumley Golf Trophy

Two players (with a recognised golf handicap) are required to take place in this annual contest between Edinburgh City Council and Fife Council (East Area). This year's match is on the Old Course.

7.8. Scottish Language Dictionaries

Our year's sponsorship of the word "*bejan!*" has expired; do we renew or do we wish to renew or sponsor a different word ("*stushie*" perhaps?) for £20?

7.9. Fife Coastal Partnership

Appendix K: The second stage of setting up this body for community involvement with the Coastal Path will be a meeting at The Old Manor Hotel, Lundin Links, 7pm Thu 16 June.

7.10. Community Police Newsletter

Appendix G: St Andrews Extracts.

7.11. Police Reorganisation

Appendix F: Letter from Superintendent Maich

7.12. Bus Turning – Younger Gardens

Appendix B: letter from Transportation Services

7.13. Scottish Health Council

Appendix I: text of the introductory leaflet

7.14. Special Uplifts

Appendix J: Information from Environmental Services

7.15. Strandline

Newsletter of the Marine Conservation Society's Beachwatch, Summer 2005: *Country Living* beach clean; Shingle survivors; Good beach guide; Basking shark watch; Great Egg Case Hunt; Recycling; Beware of low flying lawnmowers; Beachwatch 2005 (17-18 September) clean-up and litter survey – registration form; Adopt-a-beach volunteer registration form.

7.16. Forestry Commission Scotland Corporate Plan

Plan for 2005-8 is available online at <http://www.forestry.gov.uk/> feedback on content and format welcome.

8. Reports from Office Bearers

8.1. Chair

8.1.1. Honorary Citizen

Appendix N: Apology to Jack Nicklaus for handling of the proposal.

8.2. Treasurer

Appendix H: Report.

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. Patras book

8.3.2. Entrust Papers?

8.3.3. Picture

Was arranged, but then it seemed this might not be a good month...

9. Reports

9.1. From Committees

9.1.1. General Purposes

Appendix Q: Minutes of 16/5/05

9.2.1. Health Education & Welfare

Chris Lesurf points out there are three members interested in this area – herself, Bette Christie, Stuart Holdsworth and she hopes to involve some of the student and Madras College reps. Is this enough to (re-) constitute a committee?

9.2. From Representatives

9.2.1. Hospital & Health Centre: Services Focus Group

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 – Honorary Citizen Requisition

Text of the requisition:

We, the undersigned, being members of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council, request that an Extraordinary General Meeting be called to discuss -

1. The Honorary Citizen Scheme, particularly criteria
2. Reconsideration for the proposed award to Jack Nicklaus (dependant on the outcome of 1. above).

From the Fife Council Scheme for Community Councils

9.2 A special meeting may be called:-

[...]

(b) on requisition of at least one fourth of the elected members of the Council;

[...]

which meeting shall be held within 21 days of receipt of a requisition stating the reason for the requisition by the Secretary of the Community Council. It will only be necessary to call such a meeting if the subject matter of the requisition cannot be dealt with at the next ordinary meeting of the Community Council.

Appendix B – Younger Gardens

From Robin Dick, Integrated Passenger Transport Lead Officer (East), 01334-412922

Proposed Bus Turning Facility – St Andrews Younger Gardens

As you may be aware, the Melville Road/Younger Gardens area is currently served by an hourly bus

service in each direction between St Andrews and Strathkinness/Cupar/Springfield/Letham as well as school buses. In order to turn at the end of Melville Road (as presently constructed) all buses have to perform a reversing manoeuvre at its junction with Younger Gardens, with associated dangers to pedestrians and in particular to children.

A bus turning facility is, therefore, planned for this location in order to:

- Move towards a safer environment by reducing the dangers as above; and to provide opportunities for operators to enhance public transport in the area.
- A works brief for the design and construction supervision of the proposed turning feature is currently being prepared for our Infrastructure Team.

The purpose of this letter is to give early notice of and to seek your support for the proposal together with any comments you may wish to make at this stage.

The normal Fife Council Transportation consultation procedures, including affected Elected Members, the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council and other relevant stake-holders, will be conducted at the appropriate time.

Meanwhile, should you require further information or wish to discuss the proposal further, please do not hesitate to contact me on the above telephone number.

Appendix C – Local Holidays 2006

From Beth Flynn, Committee Administrator, Law & Administration

Each year a list of recommended holiday dates is submitted to the East Fife Area Services Committee for approval. A copy of this list is enclosed for your attention.

Fife Council has responsibility for the setting of local holidays in the former Burghs and the dates proposed are based on those set for the previous year. Where appropriate local Merchants Associations have been consulted and the East Fife Area Councillors have also been consulted.

To allow me to report to the meeting of the East Fife Area Services Committee on 22 June 2005, I would appreciate receipt of any comments the Community Council may have on this matter by Monday 30 May 2005.

Thank you for your assistance with this.

St Andrews	
February Holiday	Monday, February 6
Spring	Monday, March 6
May Day	Monday, May 8
Autumn	Monday, October 9
November Holiday	Monday, November 6
Half Holiday	Thursday

Appendix D – Planning Minutes & Letters

D.1. Planning Meeting 9 May 2005

Present Chris Lesurf, Bette Christie, Richard Douglas, Pete Lindsay, Ian Goudie (convenor), Patrick Marks, Bruce Martin Ryan (minutes)

Apology Penny Uprichard

D.1.1. St Leonards Fields

IG has submitted today a version of the draft circulated this weekend, taking into account comments received from CCllrs after circulation. The meeting was not particularly optimistic about the chances of preventing house building on St Leonards Fields, considering that this 'late' submission had not been welcomed by Fife Council and that the East Area Development Committee meeting which would decide the issue was to occur tomorrow (10th May) afternoon.

D.1.2. Structure Plan – discussion of tactics

IG has received a few comments on his draft of the CC submission. No further comments forthcoming at this meeting but PL to email his comments to IG, then IG to submit final version.

D.1.3. Area Transport Plan

Despite being distributed for comment at last full CC meeting, very few comments have been received. Since we are very late in submitting comment to FC, BMR to collate such comments as are with him by 6pm on Thursday as coherently as possible, also noting minority views, and submit to FC.

D.1.4. Local Plan

IG noted that the deadline for comment on this is the end of this week. (At least this is the deadline for submitting a draft, containing the outline of our points, to Bill Lindsay of FC.) IG commented that because the ATP had not been published for quite a while and we needed to absorb the ramifications of the Structure Plan (and such absorption has taken a while, nearly overwhelming him) which set the framework for the Local Plan, ATP and much else, it was only fair to ask FC for tolerance over stretching their deadlines.

D.1.5. Routine Business

1.	Gannochy House	05/01294/EFULL Replace wooden-framed windows with UPVC-framed windows	BMR to object if time permits
2.	St Regulus Hall	05/01296/ELBC Replacement windows (retrospective)	NC
3.	Younger Hall	Handrail and guard rail for better disabled access	NC
4.	69 Younger Gardens	Erect 2 timber garages, conservatory and screen fence	NC
5.	Southgait Hall	New metal gates at entrance	NC
6.	15 Priory Gardens	Extension to dwelling-house	NC
7.	12B Howard Place	Internal alterations & external extractor vent	NC
8.	8 Bruce Street	Dormer extension	NC
9.	30 Hay Fleming Avenue	First floor extension	NC
10.	9 Andrews Lang Crescent	First floor extension	NC
11.	Royal and Ancient Golf Club	Golf-ball and club testing at driving range	No plans submitted
12.	Southern Lodge, Abbotsford Place	05/01318/EFULL (didn't get details)	NC

D.1.6. Hospital & Health Centre focus group

CL (and BMR if possible) have volunteered to attend but will, where possible, voice CC's opposition to Largo Road site. (Planning Cttee is concerned that this might be used by developers to say that they have 'consulted with' or 'obtain CC's agreement' to Largo Road site.)

D.1.7. Local Plan

Discussion of the Community Facilities entries in this plan (B20, B21, Pr50, Pr51, Pr52, Pr53, Pr54, Pr56, Pr57). IG will write these up into a draft submission (which will also act as minutes of this part of the meeting)

D.2. Planning Meeting 30 May 2005

Present: I Goudie, B Ryan, P Lindsay, B Christie, G Davidson, P Uprichard.

D2.1. Structure Plan

The reply from the Community Council to the Structure Plan has gone in, and we have an acknowledgement.

D.2.2. Local Plan

Re the Local Plan, I. Goudie sent in the document that has been circulated to members (the Local Plan seems to be devoid of policies). This represented a brief response (1G. said that he intended to say some more, but was not clear how much more it was appropriate to say in the circumstances. Cathy Kinnear said that what we had sent in was very clear – there is no need to send anything else).

D.2.3. Previous applications

1.	33 Fraser Avenue	approved, subject to 'The area for change of use of open space to garden ground shall exclude the ground outlined in green on the stamped approved plans.'
2.	12.5 metre monopole Telecom mast, site at Grange Road, including 3 antennae etc.	refused, for the following reasons: 'In the interest of residential amenity, the perceived health risks from the proposed development, given its proximity to houses and a school, would result in the loss of amenity for residents within the immediate vicinity and the wider community.'

D.2.4. Present applications

1.	35a Bell Street	replacement windows to HMO (in two bedrooms only at rear) – white µPVC	Obj BR
2.	127 South Street (Post Office)	change of use to retail unit, children's nursery	NC
3.	32 Irvine Crescent	extension to dwellinghouse	NC
4.	85G Market Street	replacement windows to flat – traditional sash and case timber	NC
5.	Morrisons	erect trolley shelter and canopy at over-service ramp	NC
6.	Hope Park Church	replace louvres in tower with GRP replicas. Installation of 3 antennae behind GRPs and associated ancillary equipment within church spire (Vodafone UK Ltd.)	Obj PU
7.	37 Largo Road	erect business units and 10 flatted dwellings. Demolish car showroom (Wilburn Houses (Southern) Ltd.) Reasons for objection – exceeding the housing land requirement. Poor design of roofs and outside pipes. Fully industrial site? Or housing with industrial section?	Obj PL
8.	3 Cant	extension to dwellinghouse	NC

	Crescent		
9.	100 acre wood, Brewster Wells	6 holiday cottages, associated accommodation and infrastructure (Stuart Leckie). Reason for objection – premature until the boundaries of Green Belt are determined.	Obj PU
10.	Hamilton Hall	objection already sent	
11.	12b Howard Place	internal alterations to a listed building. Formation of one new internal door and removal of one non-load bearing wall	NC

D.3. Holidays Homes Objection

Letter by Penny Uprichard

The Planning Committee of the Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council wishes to lodge an *objection* to this application, it is considered that it is premature until a decision has been made about the boundaries of the Green Belt.

D.4. Hope Park Phone Mast Objection

Letter by Penny Uprichard

The Planning Committee of the Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council wishes to lodge an *objection* to this application.

In a similar case, although not in a town centre location, the Community Council objected to the proposed mast at Grange Road, suggesting that information should be obtained on the level of microwave radiation to be experienced by the closest residents. There were other reasons for objection, to be found in our letter of 5 March 2005.

As you will know, the Grange Road application has been refused, for the following reasons: *'In the interest of residential amenity, the perceived health risks from the proposed development, give its proximity to houses and a school, would result in the loss of amenity for residents within the immediate vicinity and the wider community.'*

As Hope Park Church is in the town centre and surrounded on all sides by residential buildings and close to the bus station, it is to be hoped that the same reasoning will apply to the above application.

Appendix E – Oil Transfer Terminal

Report by Ken Fraser

Councillor Alex Thomson's letter of 28th April invites the Council to support Fife Council's protest to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency against a proposal by Melbourne Marine Services for a series of ship-to-ship transfers of crude oil at an anchorage 3 miles off Methil. This would involve several tankers from Russia transferring their cargoes, at a rate of 3,000 cubic metres an hour, into much larger vessels (of 100,000 tons capacity or more, and thus too large for the Russian ports in question) which would carry the oil to the Far East or elsewhere. Transfers would occur, on the average, twice a week. A report by consultants to Melbourne Marine Services concedes that this process involves some risk of spillage, but asserts that the chance of a "large" oil spill would be less than one in 200 years. The chance of a "small" oil spill is not stated.

Fife Council's Emergency Planning Officer, in a report, has noted that similar transfers which took place in Lyme Bay in 2003/04 were suspended after objections by Devon and Dorset County Councils who considered that the risk of pollution was unacceptable. The heavy oil to be transferred is stated to be particularly persistent. He draws attention to the variety of fish and bird life to be found in the waters of the Firth of Forth, and the importance of the Fife coastline to tourism: all these would be at risk from an oil spill. Fife Council would receive no economic benefit from these offshore operations, but would be liable to pay the costs of recovering from a spill.

Consequently, Fife Council is asking all local bodies to support the objections it is putting before the Maritime and Coastguard Agency. While it is not clear whether the direct consequences of any spill would be felt as far away as St Andrews, I suggest that we should not take a parochial view of this danger, and should support Fife Council's objections. Considering the number of occasions on which the Community Council itself has objected to various proposals by Fife Council, it would certainly do no harm if we could support them on this occasion.

Appendix F – Police Changes

From Alan G. Maich Chief Superintendent – 'E' Division

Changes to Eastern Division Inspectors Roles and Responsibilities

I am writing to inform you of changes to the responsibilities of Inspectors in Eastern Division. These changes have come about as a result of the Chief Constable allocating an additional Inspector to our management team in Eastern Division on a trial basis.

In line with the Force and Divisional priority of Community Policing the restructuring of the management team will enable the Inspectors to take a responsibility for localities, aligned with the Fife Council Localities, and to progress community issues and initiatives with relevant partners in those areas. The Inspectors will all retain operational command for incidents across the Division when they are on duty.

Initially the responsibilities will be allocated as follows:

- Cupar – Inspector Wallace (Temp cover for Inspector Edmonston)
 - Staffing and administration for Cupar Section, as well as leading on locality issues in that

- area. Inspector Wallace/Edmonston will work from Cupar Police Station.
- Howe of Fife and Tay Coast Sections – Inspector Jenks
 - Staffing and administration for Howe of Fife and Tay Coast Sections, as well as leading on locality issues in those areas. Additional responsibility as the line manager of the Community Sergeant. Inspector Jenks will work from Cupar Police Station
- St Andrews – Inspector Dewar
 - Staffing and administration for St Andrews Section, as well as leading on locality issues in that area. Inspector Dewar will work from St Andrews Police Station.
- East Neuk and Largo Section – Inspector Topen
 - Staffing and administration for East Neuk Section, as well as leading on locality issues in that area. Additional responsibility for Events Planning (i.e. Leuchars Airshow, Lammas and Dunhill). Inspector Topen will work from St Andrews Police Station.

It is my intention to evaluate the effectiveness of the arrangements after 6 months and in that regard I will be happy to receive any comment you may wish to make in due course.

Contact details for the Inspectors remain unchanged and are as listed in the Community Newsletter.

I trust this information is of interest to you and I am sure the new arrangements will help us to continue to improve our links with local communities.

Appendix G – Community Police Newsletter

From Inspector Donald Jenks. Extracts relevant to St Andrews.

Chief Superintendent Maich

June promises to be a very busy month in the lead up to a host of summer events including the Open Golf Championship at St Andrews, the G8 Summit and the graduation of Prince William from St Andrews University.

Many of you will have seen articles in the press and on news programmes recently in relation to the Policing of the G8 summit and the knock-on effects to forces throughout Scotland. I would like to take this opportunity to reassure you that Policing in Eastern Division will be largely unaffected and there will be the same number of officers on duty in the towns and villages of East Fife over this busy period. Extra officers will be on duty to provide the required level of policing to the G8 by working overtime, changing rest days and leave periods and every officer is committed to maintaining a high level of service to the public.

The Chief Constable has allocated an extra Inspector to Eastern Division on a trial basis and this has enabled us to review the responsibilities of the Inspectors in the Division. In keeping with our commitment to Community Policing and Partnership Working we have realigned the Inspectors' responsibilities with Fife Council's locality areas.

Crime Statistics

Listed below are the crimes reported to us during the last month, the figures in brackets are the corresponding figures for the same period last year. Further information on crime statistics can be found on the Force Web site at www.fife.police.uk/about/statistics.

1/5/05 – 30/5/05	Dom HB		Vandalism		Theft		BoP		Assault		Total	
	Rep	Det	Rep	Det	Rep	Det	Rep	Det	Rep	Det	Rep	Det
St Andrews	6 (3)	3 (3)	32 (39)	7 (12)	24 (38)	10 (5)	17 (17)	11 (14)	18 (20)	8 (19)	97 (117)	39 (53)

Open Golf Up Date – Inspector Edmonston

Over the past few months, Fife Constabulary officers have been working closely with our partners to plan the policing response to the Open Championship 2005.

The Open Golf Planning Team have spoken with a number of residents and representative bodies to seek views on how the inevitable disruption to the Community can be best managed.

The Police Plan is now in place and further visits to Community Councils will take place throughout the month of June to update the members of police intentions. We will also be delivering letters to residents of St Andrews, Strathkinness and Guardbridge who may be affected by some of the temporary traffic restrictions which are necessary to ensure the smooth and safe running of the Event.

You may also wish to visit www.fifedirect.org.uk/opengolf to view all of the latest planning and travel information relative to the Event. This web-site is being managed by Fife Council and information has been added by the various organisations involved in the planning process. There is a direct link from Fife Constabulary's own web-site, www.fife.police.uk.

I would like to pass on my thanks to everyone who has contributed to our planning process so far and highlight that the Planning Team remain available for consultation throughout June and July. Any required contact can be arranged through the Force Contact Centre or by email to open.golf@fife.police.uk.

Graduation of Prince William

Prince William completes his studies at St Andrews and is due to graduate at the end of June. There will be considerable media interest, and Inspector Meek has been busy planning for the graduation over the last few months with members of the Royal Household and the University. There will be additional Police Officers on duty to help manage the expected crowds wishing to witness the event and to assist with the extra traffic that will be generated.

Appendix H – Treasurer's Report

From Bruce Ryan

I have heard from Mike Melville that last year's accounts have been accepted by Fife Council and hence we will soon receive our full 2005-6 Fife Council grant.

My thanks go to the previous treasurers for leaving easily understood summaries of these previous years. From these, I have constructed a spreadsheet showing the income and expenditure of our sub-accounts since the start of the 1995-96 financial year.

I have been concerned, as was the previous treasurer, about relatively small amounts of money sitting in sub-accounts, untouched for years.

- We have £260.41 in the Upper Arlington sub-account. In 1997-98 we received a grant from Upper Arlington school (?) to 'further cultural links with them' (according to minutes of 7 April 1997). This account has not been touched since 2000. With CC's approval, I'll write to the Rector of Madras College, offering him £250 to be spend on any cultural exchange programme still running. This will empty this account so it can be closed.
- We have £50 which has been in the Youth sub-account, untouched since its donation to this account 1997-98 from our own 200 Club. Hence it is ours to do with as we see fit. I will transfer it into the General sub-account and close the Youth sub-account.
- The balance of the Newsletter sub-account is now £0. Since we appear unlikely to produce a regular Newsletter, and the last one exhausted the funds in this sub-account, I will close this sub-account.

None of this should be seen as irregular. A number of sub-accounts were closed at the beginning of 1998-99, at the start of previous treasurer's 'reign'. At the beginning of 1997-98, the Floral Basket sub-account was closed and the funds therein donated to the people/organisation now maintaining these. Since all our money is contained in one bank account, rearrangements of our sub-accounts will not affect the total in this bank account.

I am confident that at the present rate of expenditure we will still qualify for the full Fife Council grant for 2006-07.

I present below the accounts for the first two months of this financial year.

Bruce Ryan
Treasurer

Brought forward at 1 April 2005	£24573.79
Deficit for 1st April – 31st May 2005	-£601.73
Balance at 1 June 2005	£23,972.06
Represented by bank account (statement April 2005)	£24,237.56
less cheques not yet showing on bank account	£265.50

Summary of individual Sub-accounts				
Account	Opening Balance	Income	Expenditure	Closing Balance
Administration	£805.49	£0.00	£254.25	£551.24
General	£3,587.24	£194.17	£421.00	£3,360.41
*Millennium	£3666.03	£0.00	£0.00	£3666.03
*Youth Committee	£50.00	£0.00	£0.00	£50.00
*Recreation Committee	£445.35	£0.00	£0.00	£445.35
*Senior Citizens' Party	£3,400.13	£0.00	£0.00	£3,400.13
*Band Concert	£764.24	£0.00	£0.00	£764.24
*Upper Arlington	£216.41	£0.00	£0.00	£216.41
*Coat of Arms	£7,910.35	£0.00	£0.00	£7910.35
*Newsletter	£120.65	£120.65	£0.00	£0.00
*Ceilidh	£3,607.90	£0.00	£0.00	£3,607.90
Total	£24,573.76	£0.00	£0.00	£23,972.06

* The funds held in these accounts are dedicated to specific projects as indicated.

Administration Sub-account			
Opening balance			£805.49
Income			+ £0.00
Expenditure	Fife Council (hire Burgh Chambers)	£89.25	
	Auditing 2004-2005 accounts	£65.00	
	Local Publishing Fife (<i>St Andrews in Focus</i>)	£100.00	- £254.25
Closing Balance			= £551.24
	Hence deficit on this account		£254.25

General Sub-account			
Opening balance			£3,587.24
Income	Interest on bank account	£73.52	
	Transfer from Newsletter	£120.65	+ £194.17
Expenditure	Printing Newsletter	£385.00	
	Friends of the Earth subscription	£36.00	– £421.00
Closing Balance			= £3,360.41
	Hence deficit on this account		£226.83

Newsletter Sub-account			
Opening balance			£120.65
Income			+ £0.00
Expenditure	Transfer to General	£120.65	– £120.65
Closing Balance			= £0.00
	Hence deficit on this account		£120.65

Sub-account closed

Appendix I – Introducing the Scottish Health Council

Who are we?

The Scottish Health Council is a new body set up by the Scottish Executive to ensure that the views of patients and the public are properly taken into account by Health Boards.

We are independent from Health Boards and able to comment honestly on how well they involve people in decisions about care and services.

Why have we been set up?

There is a need to change the way that the health service cares for patients and the way services are delivered.

“It is no longer good enough to simply do things to people; a modern healthcare service must do things with the people it serves” is how the Scottish Executive has expressed this and they have backed it up with a legal duty on Health Boards to consult with the public.

The Scottish Health Council has been set up to help achieve this. Rather than speak on behalf of patients and the public, we will make sure that patients and the public have the chance to give their own views and that those views are properly taken into account.

What are our plans for the future?

We will gather information on how Health Boards currently involve the public and set standards on the best ways to consult and involve people in decisions about their care.

Crucially, we will ask people in local communities throughout Scotland to help assess whether the Health Service has achieved the right level of involvement.

If we don't think proper consultation has taken place – for example, over controversial proposals for local services – we can advise the Health Minister to insist the consultation be repeated properly. We will also put forward views from the public on how well they think the Health Service is performing generally in their area.

How can you get involved?

You can take part in assessing how well your local Health Service is involving local people by applying to join one of our Local Advisory Councils.

These are voluntary positions (although we can repay travel and/or childcare expenses). These Advisory Councils will be involved in assessing and monitoring health Boards and giving their views to the Scottish Health Council. If you are interested in becoming a Local Advisory Council member, please contact your local office – whose address is at the back of this leaflet.

What difference can we make for you?

Health Services that listen and pay attention to the people they serve deliver better care. Our aim is to help your local Health Service get better at listening and consulting with the public. This should lead to improved services and better health outcomes for everybody.

Scottish Health Council, Fife Local Office, Hayfield Clinic, Hayfield Road, Kirkcaldy, KY2 5AD. 01592-263982. diane.dwarte@nhs.net, susan.hutchison@nhs.net.

National Office, Delta House, 50 West Nile Street, Glasgow G1 2NP. t: 0141-241-6308 f: 0141-221-3262
textphone: 0141-241-6316 www.scottishhealthcouncil.org

Appendix J – Special Uplifts

Special Uplifts

Let's get it sorted.

WHO

Fife Council's Environmental Services provides a special uplift service for items which cannot fit into your wheeled bin or sack.

There is a charge of £10 for the use of this service.

WHAT

Maximum items allowed for a special uplift are 6 large items or 18 small items (equivalent to 18 bin bags)
1 large item = 3 small.

The only items which will not be uplifted due to health and safety restrictions are boilers, heavy metal objects, bathroom suites with cast iron baths, windows and asbestos. Fridges and freezers are uplifted free of charge.

HOW

There is a charge of £10 for the use of this service which can be paid by credit/debit cards through the contact centre. Local offices can also accept cheques accompanied by your cheque guarantee card or cash. The items for uplift must be placed at the kerbside by 7.00am on the day of uplift.

To arrange a special uplift please telephone:01592-411605.

WHY

The purpose of the charge is to encourage residents to separate their waste and take it to their nearest Recycling Centre rather than it all being landfilled. Up to 80% of waste taken to Recycling Centres is recycled. Last year an estimated 12,000 tonnes of waste collected by the special uplift service was landfilled. Further information on Recycling Centres is given overleaf.

Action had to be taken to divert waste from landfill – if not Fife Council faces fines of up to £10 million by 2009 under strict National and European rules. These fines may well have to be paid by increasing householders' council tax. £10 million equates to £50 per year for a Band D property..

The charge also encourages householders to think before throwing things away- could it be reused, given to charity or an organisation that could reuse it.

For more information about organisations who can reuse furniture log on to www.morethanfurniture.org.uk

Recycling Centre	Location	Opening Times	Contact Number
Cowdenbeath	Cuddyhouse Rd	8am-4pm daily	01383-610685
Cupar	Coal Road	Summer: 8am-7.30pm daily Winter: 8am-6.30pm daily	01334-413255
Dunfermline	Off the A823, Wellwood	8am-9pm daily	01383-622957
Glenrothes	Cable Road	Summer: 8am-7.30pm daily Winter: 8am-6.30pm daily	01592-631295
Kirkcaldy	Denburn Road	Summer: 8am-7.30pm daily Winter: 8am-6.30pm daily	01592-643316
Ladybank	Lower Melville Wood	Summer: 8am-7.30pm daily Winter: 8am-6.30pm daily	01337-830507
Lochgelly	Cartmore Ind. Estate	8am-7pm daily	01592-780967
Methil	Methil Brae	Summer: 8am-7.30pm daily Winter: 8am-6.30pm daily	01333-421017
Pittenweem	Charles Street	Summer: 8am-7.30pm daily Winter: 8am-6.30pm daily	01333-311972

Items accepted at Recycling Centres include bulkier items such as: wood, scrap metal, TVs, Hi-Fi's & videos, gas cylinders, soil, rubble, bricks, stones and concrete, white goods (including fridges, freezers, cookers etc) and green garden waste. All of these items will be recycled and therefore diverted from landfill.

You can also take vehicle oil, vehicle batteries, glass bottles and jars, paper and cardboard, textiles and plastic bottles.

Excess household waste can also be taken to your local Recycling Centre but items placed in the household waste container will go straight to landfill.

Appendix K – Fife Coastal Partnership

From Amanda Drummond, Trust Manager, Fife Coast & Countryside Trust. 01333-592454.

The Formation of The Fife Coastal Partnership – Second Stage Meeting

Following the success of the three public information evenings explaining what Fife Coast and Countryside Trust's remit was and our plans to form a Coastal Partnership, we have now had time to analyse the feedback obtained from those who attended. It is encouraging to know that there is a real desire to pursue the concept of a coastal partnership, which would represent the views of communities and stake-holders along the length of the Fife Coastal path.

In order to move the process along we need to start to formalise the membership of the Steering Group,

which will operate on behalf of The Coastal Partnership. We intend to hold a meeting at The Old Manor Hotel, Lundin Links on Thursday June 16th at 7pm, so that representatives from coastal community councils can discuss who would best serve their interests on The Coastal Partnership Steering Group. To keep the steering group to a manageable size we hope to allocate three seats, out of a proposed 12, to community council representatives.

I would therefore be grateful if you could ensure that your community council is represented either by the person who has already attended the information evenings or by any other nominee you consider well placed to represent your community and is willing to get involved in The Coastal Partnership. Please complete the attached attendance form so that we have a list of the attendees in advance of the meeting.

It is extremely important that all coastal communities are represented at this meeting, as the key to the success of this partnership is that it is truly representative.

Thank you for your support so far and I look forward to meeting your representatives on the 16th June.

Appendix L – Right to Buy

Query to Housing Service over consultation process, by Pete Lindsay

The community council has heard from one of our number that neither she nor neighbours in the Roundhill Road area of St Andrews have seen the survey/information sheets that you sent to us earlier this year, apparently to be circulated to tenants in March/April.

We'd appreciate it if you could clarify for us the consultation process to date. In particular:

- Have any St Andrews tenants been notified of what is going on?
- If so why have tenants on Roundhill Road not been informed?
- Should the focus groups be being held without information being more widely available?
- What groups have been invited to the St Andrews focus groups?

Response by Claire Mackinlay, Housing Project Officer, Housing Service.

The first stage of consultation was carried out on a sample basis. We contacted a random sample of those applicants and tenants who would be affected by pressured area status. Approx 170 applicants and tenants in the St Andrews locality were contacted, 11 of which were from Roundhill Road.

As explained in previous correspondence, we are only exploring the possibility of applying for Pressured Area Status at the moment. Those attending the focus groups are those who indicated on their returned questionnaire their willingness to participate to discuss their views further. In addition to these, tenants groups and community councils have also been invited. All those attending the focus groups have received information about Pressured Area Status, who it would affect, what the effect would be etc. This will be discussed in more detail at the focus groups.

If a decision is taken to make an application for Pressured Area Status, ALL affected tenants will be informed about what this involves.

I hope this clarifies the consultation process up to this point.

Appendix M – Graffiti in Stanks Park

From Jim Lesurf, Priestden Place.

Graffiti in Public Areas

St Andrews is a popular tourist destination. In addition to the obvious attractions of the golf courses and the University its popularity is founded on having an image of being friendly, relaxed, and courteous. This image is partly based upon the town and its facilities looking pleasant and welcoming. Graffiti visible in public areas is disadvantageous to our image as well as being unsightly for residents. Hence its appearance is a serious issue that affects the Town as a whole.

Over the last year or so graffiti has been appearing in the park between Priestden Place and Kilrymont Place. This takes the form of painted symbols and stylised words and seems to be spray-painted. During the same period and in the same area, there have been incursions into the gardens backing onto the park. On at least one occasion damage has been done on private property. The police have been called on more than one occasion. On more than one occasion trees in the nearby area of the park have also been damaged with large branches torn down. The park is near the Kilrymont School site. It is used as a pathway by many school students, and also as a recreation area at lunchtime and after school. Groups of children often congregate in the affected area. Sometimes they play ball games despite it being a small area of the park.

It seems likely that the process of defacement, etc, will continue, and perhaps escalate, unless it is dealt with in some way. The result may be a park that becomes a 'no go' area for residents who find it ugly, and a sight that deters visitors from wishing to return to the Town. Lack of action and the presence of the graffiti may also act as an encouragement for those tempted to engage in such activities, and hence promote it. For these reasons it seems appropriate for the Town Community Council, Fire Council, and the Police to take some steps that seem appropriate.

Some possible options are as follows:

1. That the police should be seen walking through the area on patrol.
2. That a surveillance camera (and perhaps light) should be located to view the area.
3. That the walls and properties affected be shielded by planting of plants which deter further defacement and hide any existing graffiti.

When the police visited on the most recent occasion (27th May 2005) one of them suggested that a light could be fitted to illuminate the area. However it seems dubious that this would be of value in the absence of (2). If the graffiti is being applied in daylight and added light would be ineffective. If at night, those responsible might welcome a light to paint by! Few people walk though the park during the night time. Such a light might therefore be more of a hindrance than an aid. The areas affected are outwith the direct view of the nearby houses. As a result those engaging in the activity are not seen doing so from the houses. For the same reason the graffiti is not a visible eyesore from the properties, but it is from the park.

In the 20+ years we have lived in a nearby property we have never seen a member of the police force patrol through the park area affected. If one or two were seen doing so occasionally during the school lunchtime and/or in the evening this might act as a deterrent. It may be worth noting that when the police came on 27th May one of them commented that he had served as a policeman in the Town for many years, but did not realise that the affected area of the park actually existed!

A surveillance camera would probably deter any further problems. However it would require a significant capital cost, plus some running costs. It would reduce the need for police attendance. That said, a camera might itself have the drawback of being an unsightly intrusion. Hence it might prove to be counter-productive in promoting the town and protecting its image with visitors.

My personal view is that option (3) is in many ways the best. If those responsible for the maintenance and appearance of the park were to plant a suitable mix of plants like pyrocantha, berberis, and perhaps holly along the affected walls this might solve the problems quite effectively. Anyone familiar with pyrocantha or berberis will know well why these would act as a deterrent if they were planted in a row in front of the affected walls, etc! They are attractive plants and would make a pleasanter boundary than a bare wall or fence. They would also serve to hide any existing defacements. Option (3) would also avoid the costs of (2) and have minimal operational costs as they could be maintained as part of the normal park gardening operations.

For the above reasons I would like to request that the St Andrews Community Council, and the Town's Fife Council members should support the following proposals:

A. That those responsible for the park should plant a suitable mix of pyrocantha, berberis, and/or holly to cover the affected areas. (Option 3)

B. That the police be asked to patrol the affected area occasionally and maintain awareness of any problems there. (Option 1)

The second proposal would have other benefits. The area in question has at times in the past been occasionally used for various unauthorised activities. e.g. on more than one occasion in the past tents have been placed there overnight and it has been used as an unofficial camp site. As with the graffiti this is an indicator that the area in question is regarded as one where the police and others will not notice such activities. An occasional police presence may also deter activities which damage the trees, etc.

Appendix N – Apology to Jack Nicklaus

From Donald Macgregor, Chair of Community Council, to Jack Nicklaus

Dear Mr Nicklaus,

As Chair of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council, I write to apologise for our failure to ensure that there was no press reporting of our consideration of honorary awards. If you have been aware of the press furore that has occurred in recent days, I very much hope that it will not blemish your view of St Andrews. The more long-serving of our members recall with affection the presentation in July 1990 at the Rufflets Hotel when you kindly accepted from representatives of the Council the Coat of Arms and matriculation certificate. I would stress that there is no diminution in our regard for what you have done for the game of golf.

It was therefore entirely appropriate that, at our April meeting, a former chairman, Keith McCartney, raised the possibility of updating our recognition of the rôle that you have played. Privacy of discussion is obviously essential for any organisation making honorary awards, and we, struggling under a workload that is unusually heavy at present, were clearly remiss in failing to take measures to ensure that privacy.

The result was of course the storm of media coverage that we have seen. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the kindness and maturity of your reaction when the angle some elements of the press – though not the local press – chose was to give the entirely unwarranted impression that this Council wished to snub you. I am sure that your response will add to the respect and affection in which so many of our citizens hold you. Your focus on the tribute given by the act of nomination was not only kind but pertinent. In the five years since the award was conceived, no other person has been nominated, and it may indeed be that the criteria for the award should be re-visited.

Much though I might wish to atone for the effect of the Council's procedural mistake in this embarrassing episode, I do not see anything that can now sensibly be done other than to let the matter pass into history. I also regret if any embarrassment to you is being augmented by those politicians who wish to make capital from the matter.

One positive outcome of this business has been that some members of the public have felt moved to retell in detail, in the press, the exemplary manner and the sportsmanship with which you have conducted your game over the years. I very much hope that this episode will not detract from your visit to St Andrews this summer. Many are looking forward to seeing you here again, and I extend to you all my good wishes.

Appendix O – The Draft Fife Structure Plan 2005

Response by Ian Goudie, Planning Convenor.

1. I write on behalf of the Community Council to object to the Draft Structure Plan. Our objections are not only to a number of the detailed provisions of the Plan, but also to much of its underlying expansionist philosophy. We have been told at public meetings that the present document is but a draft which the public can mould, but are nonetheless surprised that so little attempt has been made so far to take on board the well-documented views of the town. There are many dangers in attempting to plan for a 20 year period, and the population and housing need projections in this Plan exhibit the pitfalls. Nevertheless the exercise does offer opportunities to analyse current problems and provide some long-term vision: it is disappointing that, as regards both affordable housing and transportation for St Andrews, those opportunities have not been grasped. There is indeed a considerable danger that this Plan raises false hopes on affordable housing while lacking the vision and power to deliver.

2. The overall impression of this Structure Plan is that it is development promotion on the grand scale with other considerations, such as environmental protection, given scant attention. The comparison with the 2002 Structure Plan is startling, with earlier policies weakened or omitted to smooth the way for the developer. Despite the veneer of science, the housing projections result more from the exercise of discretion than they do from any hard data. Whilst an element of flexibility for developers is a standard part of the procedure, the Draft Structure Plan hands the developers an additional cushion at most of the many points at which an arbitrary judgement is made. The compound effect of all these cushions has an enormous effect on the figures.

Procedural Complaints

3. We feel obliged from the outset to record formally our dissatisfaction with the manner in which the present consultation exercise is being conducted. Whatever the claimed benefits for the public in being able to see the Local Plan implications of the proposed Structure Plan policies, we find it hard to escape the conclusion that the main motivation on the part of Fife Council for simultaneous consultations is to minimise both the number and the scope of the objections to the proposed Development Plan. There seems even less excuse for waiting until now to put the Area Transport Plan into the public domain when we have seen it used in correspondence by transportation officials for at least eighteen months to justify their actions. As a Community Council we have had little option but to direct our primary efforts at the Structure Plan. There is obviously overlap between the subjects addressed in the Area Transport Plan and the Structure Plan, and, as final decisions on matters such as the Structure Plan's approach to reinstatement of the rail link to St Andrews may well lie in the hands of the Scottish Ministers, we trust that Fife Council does not intend to finalise the Area Transport Plan prematurely.

4. As well as avoiding simultaneous consultations on six important documents, there are also other ways in which Fife Council could have made participation in this exercise easier. We are aware of a complaint from the public that the package which purports to make available the maps for the Development Plan fails to operate on many standard platforms. For our own part, the imperfections of the Report of Survey (RoS) have added considerably to our difficulties in attempting to provide more realistic projections of future housing requirements. The whole rationale for such a document must surely be to provide the background information on which the Structure Plan proposals are based. In contrast, we find that at a number of key points, numbers appear like rabbits from hats with no supporting data nor even vague broad-brush arguments to justify the magnitudes of the chosen numbers. The brief search for data that we have managed in the limited time available suggests that much of the required information is not in the Fife Housing Review, and probably not in the public domain at all.

The Context of the Structure Plan

5. The first questions that must be asked about this Structure Plan are "Why does it exist?", "What is it intended to achieve?" and "Whose interests is it intended to serve?". We had been led to understand that, despite the previous such Plan being produced as recently as 2002, the Scottish Executive required Fife Council to produce a new one extending the planning horizon to 2026. Reports in *The Courier* appear to cast some doubt on that, with Dundee Council suggesting a new Fife Structure Plan is not needed, and reminding people that should the Executive's earlier proposals be implemented, Structure Plans would become the prerogative of the proposed City Regions.

6. Whatever the formal position, the most plausible interpretation of recent events would appear to be that the Draft Structure Plan is driven by positional play by Fife Council in the context of the City Region debate. This is perhaps most evident in the redrawing of the boundaries of East Fife, presumably to minimise territorial losses in the event of control of East Fife, for Structure Plan purposes, passing to Dundee. The whole philosophy of the Draft Structure Plan, however, looks to be playing to the gallery of the Scottish Executive rather than addressing local concerns. Certainly the reaction in most of East Fife suggests that if the Plan was designed to meet the aspirations of the local community, it has failed to meet this aim.

7. The Draft Structure Plan portrays a desire on the part of Fife Council to appear economically dynamic, but, nevertheless, it remains hard to see how its proposed strategy for Fife can fit into any coherent national strategy. It cannot be in the national interest to deplete further the populations of Scotland's cities, so an intention to increase the population of Fife on the scale proposed would look questionable were Scotland's indigenous population in a steady state. Such an approach looks even less appropriate at a time when the indigenous population is decreasing and the small net increase in the total population is due to immigrants. The medium-term continuation of this contribution cannot currently be guaranteed even by Holyrood as immigration is a reserved matter.

8. The Draft Structure Plan's strategy for St Andrews looks to be formulated on an unquestioning acceptance by Fife Council of the Scottish Executive's National Planning Framework (NPF). The assertion in the NPF that "There is considerable potential for building on the international profile of St Andrews as a leisure destination and centre of academic excellence" was formulated without reference to the residents of the town. Indeed the Scottish Executive has acknowledged in correspondence that this Community Council was not amongst those that were invited to comment on the NPF.

9. In considering the overall context of the Plan, we should also record that, in our eyes, the requirement

for Structure Plans to cover a 20 year period appears to suggest a lack of joined up thinking at Scottish Executive level. The current reluctance of the General Register Office for Scotland (GROS) to extend mean household size projections beyond 2016 reflects a professional awareness that the uncertainties associated with projections over longer lead times render them too unreliable as a basis for decision-making. The requirement, however, that local authorities plan over a twenty year period leaves them with little option but to produce extrapolations of some nature, but it is anomalous that local authorities are being asked to boldly go where GROS has deemed it unwise to tread. As a minimum, central government should spell out procedures which ensure that local authorities do not imperil the possibility of sound medium-term inference by diluting GROS projections with unreliable long-term speculations. This is the statistical equivalent of paying for a top chef and then pouring ketchup all over the meal before you taste it.

The St Andrews Strategic Study

10. It is particularly galling from the perspective of St Andrews that Fife Council's memory is so short. Following the public inquiry on the Local Plan in late 1994 and early 1995, Fife Region and then Fife Council devoted some considerable effort to the St Andrews Strategic Study, which had been called for by the Scottish Office. This Study should have been treated as a material consideration in the future planning of this town. It was well-researched and made a genuine attempt to investigate the opportunities and the constraints on the future development of the town, and their interaction with the views of its citizens. When it was published in 1998, its conclusions were unequivocal. Its findings included:-

*Conclusion 2	St Andrews is at its landscape capacity and no major expansion should take place.
*Conclusion 3	Limited development to meet local need may be acceptable provided it is restricted to the selected pockets on the south west of the town.
*Conclusion 4	Major new housing development would result in an unacceptable impact on the quality of the town's environment.
*Conclusion 5	The landscape character of St Andrews is crucial to its character and must be protected and enhanced.
*Conclusion 6	There is a need to contain the spread of the town...
*Conclusion 7	There is a shortage of affordable housing which is only likely to be provided in the amounts needed through a large housing expansion. This, according to the views of the community, is unlikely to be an acceptable price to pay.
*Conclusion 9	St Andrews does not have the potential to support significant amounts of new industrial land.
*Conclusion 13	The quality of the town's environment is under threat from traffic congestion.
*Conclusion 18	Secondary school education facilities at Madras College are seriously overcrowded.
*Conclusion 20	The community supports a new hospital for St Andrews, the preferred site being at the existing Memorial Hospital.

11. What astonishes us most is that Fife Council appears to think it can perform a complete *volte face* without being under any obligation to offer even the briefest explanation for its conduct. Perhaps Fife Council should re-read Conclusion 1 of the Study, which said that "There is considerable further potential for involving the community in actively influencing the future of the town". Whilst policy in any sphere is subject to gradual evolution, it is only possible to move from one stance to its exact opposite without total loss of credibility if there has been some dramatic change in the underlying situation. In the present case, nothing has occurred in St Andrews to make a development boom any more realistic a possibility than it was in 1998. In fact more and more of the few remaining suitable housing sites have been used up. We have got ever closer to the point where further development will destroy the landscape setting of the town. Fife's transportation policies have failed to effect any significant move from use of the car to more environmentally friendly forms of transport, and, as the population has grown, congestion in the town centre becomes ever more frequent. The shortage of secondary schools in East Fife has not been addressed, and the position of Madras College is no better. In short, St Andrews is less able to sustain a development boom now than it was in 1998.

12. What is Fife Council's current view of the St Andrews Strategic Study that it produced? How does it square its present proposals with the Study? Are we to conclude that it now regards its own staff as misguided and the very many hours spent on its production as a waste of public money? Does it not realise the damage that it causes to its relationship with the town by its preference for its own short term political goals rather than the well-documented views of the local community?

GREEN BELT

Policy ENV1 : Landscape setting of St Andrews and Dunfermline

13. This Community Council objects to the manner in which this policy has been diluted, compared to the formulation in the 2002 Structure Plan. Indeed the new policy appears intended to undermine the purpose of a Green Belt. This town fought long and hard to get the requirement for a Green Belt written into the 2002 Structure Plan. Even though our eventual success was due to the Scottish Ministers rather than a change of heart from Fife Council, we are surprised that Fife Council should back-pedal so soon on a policy that is so widely supported in this town. It suggests that Fife is indifferent not only to the views of St Andrews, but also to how it is viewed by the town. **We call on Fife Council to reintroduce a Green Belt policy as least as strong as that in the 2002 Structure Plan.** In particular, we seek a clear statement that there is a presumption against development in the Green Belt.

SCHOOLS

14. Amongst the topics on which the Draft Structure Plan fails to provide a coherent vision for the future is the major one of secondary school provision in Fife. Indeed the notion that you can plan for 20 years

without addressing the question of school education is astonishing. The omission is all the more grave as we are not speculating on some problem that might possibly arise in the future, but one with which North East Fife, at least, has lived for many years. Fife Council's views on appropriate school sizes are well out of line with practice elsewhere in Scotland. This can be seen very clearly in the school census data for September 2003, for which the email announcement was made in November 2004. From that data set, the ten largest secondary schools in Scotland are as follows:-

Local Authority	School Name	Secondary Roll
Glasgow City	Holyrood Secondary School	2,017
Fife	Dunfermline High School	1,779
Fife	Queen Anne High School	1,751
Fife	Madras College	1,748
Fife	Bell Baxter High School	1,733
Fife	Balwearie High School	1,714
East Renfrewshire	St Ninian's High School	1,695
Glasgow City	St Andrew's Secondary School	1,616
Falkirk	Larbert High School	1,589
Perth & Kinross	Perth High School	1,547

15. Fife's current policy impacts severely on North East Fife. The problems in St Andrews, with Madras College being on a split-site, have become increasingly acute over the last 20 years. The usual arguments that larger schools mean greater curriculum choice are heavily outweighed by the severe disadvantages experienced daily by the children who spend too much of their lives on school buses, giving an unnecessary increased exposure to the risk of traffic accidents and seriously curtailing their time for both homework and useful recreation. Fife's Draft Structure Plan says in Para. 3.46 that "Integrating land use planning with transportation will reduce the need to travel", but it has failed for many years to apply sustainability principles to the way in which it runs education in Fife.

16. **We call therefore, as we have done many times before, for the provision of a new school in North Fife.** This would yield major planning benefits for St Andrews. It would reduce housing demand in the town from parents who would prefer to stay in North Fife, but wish to avoid subjecting their children to bussing. It would also significantly reduce the problems caused to the town by the daily stream of buses. These include the problems caused to residential roads near the Kilrymont Building which were never built for such traffic, and the problem that traffic flows in the town centre are determined by the need to cater for the buses serving the South Street Building of Madras College.

17. Fife Council cannot rely on demographic change to solve its problems, particularly if it is granted its desire to increase its population by 5%. If, despite our representations, it were to impose on St Andrews a 16% increase (from 14,695 to 17,000 on Fife's published figures), the problems for education in the town would also increase disproportionately. The Council also needs to consider the nature of the migrant population. If, rather than attracting the retired, the aim is to draw in those in employment, including families with children, the Council cannot escape the need to address the implications for school provision.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

18. On the question of economic development the Draft Structure Plan exhibits a remarkable superficiality. It attempts to build a house of cards on a single sentence in the NPF with little apparent understanding of the problems and implications of what it is proposing. The repetitive use of the jargon vocabulary is indicative of the inability to put flesh on the bones. The Structure Plan seeks to "provide the framework for the level of long-term growth for St Andrews", but lacks any understanding of the limitations on such growth. Whether one looks at numbers of tourists, traffic levels or housing completions, it is the threshold model with a capacity constraint rather than the linear model which is more likely to be the appropriate tool for extrapolating future trends in St Andrews. The appropriate mental image is not the open prairie, but pouring liquid into an almost full bottle.

19. The Draft Structure Plan fails to substantiate the notion that St Andrews can be "an economic driver for the whole of Fife". Many people have thought that the name St Andrews was enough to guarantee them instant riches, but the recent track record is more sobering. Economic success is not going to be attained by trying to turn St Andrews into a neatly-packaged stereotypical "world class destination". Indeed preconditions for success are whole hearted measures to retain the "green bowl" setting of the town, and better public transport, including a rail link, in order to reduce the negative effects of both the relative inaccessibility of the town and the impact of cars upon it. Attempts to increase the numbers of tourists arriving by car will prove self-defeating.

Proposal PE1 : Proposed and Existing Strategic Employment Land.

20. **The Community Council objects to those parts of Proposal PE1 that pertain to St Andrews.** Any proposal for 16 to 20 hectares of land in the town for business use is either a triumph of hope over experience or else was written by someone who had no familiarity with the planning history of the town. We are happy to encourage spin-off ventures from university research, but this is not a new idea. Enthusiastic attempts were made long before the jargon phrase "knowledge economy" was born, and so a substantial supporting case is needed to justify a land allocation on even a quarter of this scale. Areas brought within the town envelope for this purpose are likely to end up being developed for other purposes. This is not a satisfactory way to proceed.

TOWN CENTRES

21. **We call for the deletion of the bullet point in para 3.22 which starts "St Andrews is being developed as a world-class destination".** The phraseology is seen as offensive by many in St Andrews who regard the town as already world-class in many senses. We also note that our main problems, in

terms of infrastructure and the lack of a rail link, do not rate highly amongst the priorities of those who use this ‘world-class’ jargon. The Structure Plan should not adopt the colonial-style parlance of those who wish to treat the town as a resource to be exploited without reference to its residents. We are also opposed to the notion of having new shops “focussing on tourism and visitor-related retailing”. This can only result in local people having to travel further to buy what they need. This is incompatible with a green agenda. It also betrays a disturbing lack of awareness of the problems of running a tourist-related shop in St Andrews over the winter months.

HOUSING

22. In our detailed discussion of housing below, our duty as a Community Council is to address Schedule H1 of the Structure Plan, which gives housing land requirements for the newly-defined St Andrews and East Fife Local Plan Area. Whilst we recognise that most of this area is the responsibility of other community councils, we have little choice but to indicate the consequences of our arguments for the Cupar HMA as well as the St Andrews one, since it is the overall figure for the Local Plan Area that is given in the Structure Plan, and obviously it is of considerable importance to St Andrews.

Calculation of the Housing Land Requirement

Population projections

23. The RoS fails to provide any precise quantitative justification for Fife Council’s desired population increase for Fife over and above the figure resulting from their extrapolation of the GROS predictions. The reference in RoS Para. 5.245 to a “target annual population growth of 5%” should presumably have the word “annual” replaced by “total”. Even making this correction, the decision to go for a 5% increase over the Plan period appears entirely arbitrary. Adopting the same “back of the envelope” approach and noting that Fife’s extrapolation of the GROS predictions implies a 1.7% population increase over the Plan period, we do not see how a target increase of more than 3% could be consistent with the national interest and the need to provide a fair deal for other local authorities. A 3% increase implies a population in 2026 of approximately 363,000, which, in the terms of RoS Fig 5.44 means an “Extra population above projections” of 5,000, and thus an “Extra household requirement” of 2,500.

Household projections

24. Correspondence from GROS tells us that they have not produced sub-national household projections past 2018. We therefore assume that the footnote to Fig. 5.46 is incorrect, and that the average household sizes for 2021 and 2026 shown in that figure have been generated by Fife Council. The data for these latter time-points appear to have been produced by linear or near-linear extrapolation. The accumulated uncertainties in such projections are such as to render them essentially worthless. We do not see that any better projection for 2026 can be made than the 2016 projection of 2.02 as the mean size.

Household change

25. RoS Para 5.248 indicates that the household change column of RoS Fig. 5.47 results from natural change, and presumably reflects the net effect of reducing population size shown in RoS Fig. 5.43 counterbalanced by the effect of the reduction in household size. No justification is given for the disaggregation of the total household change figure of 16,122 shown in RoS Fig. 5.47, yet the differences between the different HMAs are quite astonishing, most notably between the two parts of the Dunfermline HMA. Given the apparent absence of any arguments to the contrary, we would argue that overall increase of 10.3% in the number of households should be applied uniformly across the HMAs, giving a household change figure of 1,934 rather than 2,295 for the St Andrews HMA, and 1,129 rather than 1,289 for the Cupar HMA.

Vacancies

26. The RoS indicates (Para 5.252) that “It is considered that the vacancy rate across Fife will not change significantly over the Plan period” from the observed rate of 3% in the period 1991-2001. This does not appear consistent with the description of the demolition programme in RoS para. 5.251, which, not surprisingly, explains that this is “clearance of hard-to-let stock”. Particularly if the number of demolitions is to increase (which is unclear from the data provided), one would expect the demolition programme to produce some overall reduction in the vacancy rate across Fife. More significantly, as Figure 5.48 shows that no demolitions are planned for the St Andrews and Cupar HMAs in the period 2007-09, it has to be presumed that there are fewer hard-to-let properties in these areas. The application of a uniform vacancy rate across Fife would therefore appear unjustified. Unless Fife Council can provide more accurate data, we would propose a 2% vacancy rate for the St Andrews and Cupar HMAs.

27. The effects of the changes that we propose on the calculation of the housing land requirement are shown in the following table:-

HMA	Household change	Additional migration	Demolitions	Vacancies	Additional housing need	Additional demand allowance	Requirement
Cupar	1129	400	20	34	1583	158	1741
St Andrews	1934	600	20	58	2612	261	2873

Additional population growth

28. RoS Para 5.255 indicates that the 6,000 extra households shown in RoS Fig. 5.51 result from Fife Council’s aspiration to increase the population of Fife to “some 12,000 over and above the GRO projection”. As indicated below RoS Fig 5.43, however, the population projection of 358,000 results from a Fife Council extrapolation, and should not therefore be attributed to GRO. As we have indicated above, we regard a target population of 5,000 above Fife’s extrapolation of the GROS projection as more appropriate. In the table below we followed Fife Council in assigning 1/12 of the resulting 2,500

households to each of the St Andrews and Cupar HMAs.

HMA	Requirement	Extra households	New Housing requirement	Requirement per 5 years
Cupar	1741	208	1949	487
St Andrews	2873	208	3081	770

29. The need for rounding in RoS Fig. 5.51 is unclear to us. In the case of the St Andrews HMA, the rounding boosts the housing requirement by more than 5%. There would appear to be little justification for this level of inaccuracy, particularly as latter parts of the calculation (see Fig. 5.58) are conducted to the exact unit.

Housing Land Requirement

30. The housing land requirements that we have calculated imply a total of 5,130 units for the St Andrews and East Fife Local Plan Area over the Plan period. **We therefore object to the proposed housing land requirement for the St Andrews and East Fife Local Plan Area for each of the four periods specified in Schedule H1.**

31. Whilst the figure that we have calculated is significantly lower than the 6,400 units given in Schedule H1, the comparison with the corresponding Schedule in the 2002 Structure Plan is also of interest. An even sub-division of our figure implies a requirement over five years of 1,283 units. This should be compared with a total of 1,030 units for the period 2006-2011 given in the 2002 Plan for the significantly larger East Fife area used in that Plan. So even our figure represents an increase in excess of 25% of what was planned only 3 years ago. The huge increase to 1,600 units proposed by Fife Council illustrates that the whole exercise is about policy and not science, for it is due far more to policy change than demographic surprises. If a projection looking ahead just 9 years is to be subject to a revision of over 50% after just three years, it is very hard to take seriously Fife Council's projections for a 20 year period.

A sounder statistical approach

32. In fact the comparison with the 2002 Plan's requirements for the period 2006-2011 highlights a major conceptual weakness in Fife Council's approach. We believe that any statistician would deplore the manner in which the methodology allows relatively reliable data for the period to 2016 to be significantly biased by the much more speculative projections beyond that point. Policy H1 indicates that the housing land requirement for the five year periods beyond 2011 will be subject to review. Given that position, although provisional figures are required up to 2026 for long-term planning, this does not preclude basing the requirements for the periods to 2016 on the best data available.

Calculation of the Housing Shortfall

Windfall Site Contribution

33. The contribution from windfall sites is discussed in RoS Para 5.265 and the assertion is made that "the short term trend is downwards". This appears to have little statistical validity in the context of a Structure Plan for a 20 year period. Whilst there has manifestly been a decrease over the last three years, the data over the five years in RoS Fig. 5.55 exhibit no statistically significant trend.

34. From a windfall contribution of 3,200 units for Fife, RoS Fig. 5.56 attributes 400 and 200 units respectively to the St Andrews and Cupar HMAs. As RoS para 5.266 indicates, however, the contribution from windfall sites that is employed is under a half of the recently observed level. Just a single reason is offered, namely the possibility of including the same sites in both the windfall and urban capacity figures. Use of the recent yearly average of 431 units would imply a contribution of 8,620 units from windfall sites over the 20 year period. If the Local Plan is kept more up to date than has happened in recent years, some reduction in this contribution might be anticipated, but judging by the approach that Fife Council takes to applications for sites outwith the Local Plan, it is implausible that this reduction will be other than small. We thus propose a projection of 80% of the above 8,620 units be made for the 20 year period. A disaggregation corresponding to that made by Fife Council would then attribute 862 and 431 units respectively to the St Andrews and Cupar HMAs. We would therefore propose that in RoS Fig. 5.58 the urban capacity contribution for these HMAs (currently set at 27 and 42 units respectively) be reduced to zero, but the windfall sites contributions be increased to 862 and 431 respectively. RoS Para. 5.265 indicates that the aim of the calculation is to produce an "estimated output" from windfall sites, and this approach would appear likely to give a far closer approximation. Moreover the use of a nil contribution under urban capacity clearly removes all possibility of double counting, thus addressing the concern indicated by Fife Council.

Small sites

35. The arithmetic of RoS Fig. 5.57 could at best be described as opaque, with two startling discontinuities in the calculation. If the column headed "Average" is the mean of contributions of 114 in 2002 and 184 in 2003 then it should read 149 rather than 206. Moreover, after calculating a projected 5 year output of 825, the reason given in the text is completely inadequate for using an assumed 5 year output as low as 250 in subsequent calculations. We would agree with RoS para 5.267 that "the vast majority of approvals will result in development", and therefore regard an assumed 80% completion rate as the minimum that could be realistic. No reason is offered for any possible decrease in the completion rate, and we do not expect one, so assuming just 30 units and 20 units per annum for the St Andrews and Cupar HMAs respectively looks completely unrealistic.

36. As with windfall sites, the goal should be to produce a realistic estimate. We will make the conservative assumption that the data are correct and 149 is therefore the correct average. Use of an 80% completion rate implies a 5 year output of 596 units for the two HMAs combined, and we have disaggregated the implied total of 2,384 units over the 20 year period in the proportions used by Fife Council.

The housing allocation for St Andrews

37. The effects of the changes that we propose on the calculation of the housing shortfall are shown in the following table. We offer this as a provisional statement of our position, which is inevitably dependent on the validity of the inferences that we have made at points where the RoS is unclear or inconsistent. If Fife Council is able to provide clarification of any of the points in question, we would be happy to consider whether modifications to our analysis would be appropriate. What is, however, already clearly evident from our analysis is that the shortfall figures are highly dependent on the large number of subjective assumptions that have been made.

HMA	Requirement	Contributing supply	Urban capacity	Windfall	Small sites	Shortfall
Cupar	1949	129	0	431	954	435
St Andrews	3081	29	0	862	1430	760

It follows that we object to the proposed housing allocation for St Andrews specified in Schedule H3.

Policy H3 : Meeting the Housing Land Requirement

38. We wish to see this policy strengthened significantly. The requirement that Local Plans will “provide for a range of sites, tenures and house types” is much too vague and weak to tackle the major housing problems of St Andrews. It cannot be assumed that appropriate housing types will naturally emerge as a result of market economics. For housing sites in St Andrews, private developers typically seek consent for developments in which four and five bedroom properties are the norm. A large proportion of these are sold over many months to those from outwith the town, until, after about three years, a more realistic assessment is made of the market and the developer reapplies for rather smaller properties on whatever fraction of the site is still undeveloped. It cannot make the slightest sense to generate housing projections on the basis of households of size two, as this Structure Plan does, and then give consent to housing sites full of four and five bedroom properties – unless this is some form of special needs housing for those who cannot sleep in the same bedroom on two consecutive nights.

39. We will only see progress in this regard if Policy H3 requires Local Plans to disaggregate the housing land requirement for each HMA by both tenure and house size. If there is any substance at all in the housing projections in the Plan, there is also an implied distribution of house types. To simply come up with a grand total and then allow developers to build whatever they (often mistakenly) believe will generate the largest and quickest profits is an abdication of responsibility. If we need, for instance, 200 affordable two-person homes in St Andrews but do not have finance currently available, what good is achieved by permitting a developer to erect 200 luxury ones instead. The result is simply to waste the scarce housing land still available and to intensify the future conflict between the need for housing and the need to conserve the environment. From any logical perspective, this is the housing policy of the mad-house, yet it is what has been happening for years, and this Structure Plan offers little prospect for change.

40. The corresponding policy in the 2002 Structure Plan opened with the words “Local Plans, rather than planning applications, will be the preferred means of identifying sites for development”. We can see no argument for weakening it by omission of the subsidiary clause.

Policy H5 : Affordable Housing

41. The Community Council does not believe that this policy is adequate to meet the exceptional circumstances that pertain in St Andrews. The proposed use of section 75 agreements offers little reassurance that we will not simply see a continuation of past practice, where affordable housing remains affordable for at most 10 or 15 years, and frequently much less than that. Such developments give the deceptive appearance of progress while the reality of the situation gets worse. St Andrews does not have housing land to squander in this way. Our reaction to developer-funded affordable housing is moulded by this shortage of suitable housing land. If Fife Council’s proposal of 45% affordable housing on sites over 10 units in the St Andrews HMA were achievable, and affordable meant affordable in perpetuity, we could see arguments for such an approach. If, however, as the Scottish Executive has implied, a figure of 25% affordable is more realistic, then we end up getting three houses for which we have little need for every one house of the type that is sought. In terms of the dilemma identified in Conclusion 7 of the Strategic Study, this implication of the developer-funded approach “is unlikely to be an acceptable price to pay”. In such circumstances, it is preferable for the land to remain undeveloped until a better funding mechanism can be secured.

42. In seeking above the disaggregation of the housing land requirement by type and tenure, we recognise that the most important categories for St Andrews needs are those types of affordable housing that remain affordable in perpetuity, including rented accommodation from housing associations and housing cooperatives. We wish to see sites earmarked exclusively for this purpose, and indeed believe that the housing needs of St Andrews will only be met when the greater part of the housing land allocation is so designated.

43. In so far as developer-funded affordable housing can contribute to the problem, we would wish to see included in Policy H5 the stipulation, in Para 3.16 of the Supplementary Guidance on Affordable Housing, that the affordable component should be completed within a similar timescale to the non-affordable. Another possibility that merits consideration is that there may be exceptional circumstances in which it might be appropriate to replace the developer’s contribution of affordable housing by some other benefit to the community (e.g a hospital site).

Policy H6 : Non-Residential Development

44. The Community Council is supportive of the intentions of this policy, but notes that, whilst Policy H5 appeared weak on affordability in perpetuity, this policy is completely silent on the question.

Policy H7 : Exceeding the Housing Land Requirement

45. Making comparison with the formulation of this policy which appeared in the 2002 Fife Structure Plan,

we object to the weakening of the wording by the omission of the initial sentence “Proposals which would result in the Housing Land Requirement being exceeded will not normally be supported.”

Policy H8 : Density

46. **We object to this policy which, however well-intentioned, needs a counter-balancing clause to give adequate recognition to the need to ensure housing developments are compatible with their surroundings.** The requirement for high housing densities in town centres will encourage inappropriately tall buildings. The St Andrews Conservation Area has been marred in recent years by a number of developments of this type.

TRANSPORTATION

Policy T1: Transport and Development.

47. The version of this policy in the 2002 Fife Structure Plan required developers to “provide adequate cycle facilities where appropriate”. **We object to the omission of this clause.** We would also query the omission of the clause relating to air pollution.

Policy T4: Safeguarding of Existing and Potential Transport Routes.

48. The clause of this policy safeguarding the disused railway network is well-intentioned and constitutes a sensible proposal for many parts of Fife, but this is not so in the context of St Andrews’ former link with the East Coast Main Line. It has been generally agreed by those campaigning to reinstate the rail link and by the consultants who carried out the Fife and South Tayside Rail Study in 1999 that re-use of the former route from Leuchars to St Andrews makes little sense, not least because the crossing in Guardbridge of the main road from St Andrews to Dundee would be too problematic with today’s traffic levels. It can also be safely assumed that the St Andrews Links Trust would be strongly opposed to reinstatement of a railway across the links. As a path which can be used by cyclists and pedestrians has been constructed alongside the northern side of the A91, it seems highly implausible that Fife Council would wish to use the former railway track-bed for any other transportation purpose. The effect of policy T4 would therefore be to sterilise this strip of land for no purpose.

49. A more appropriate version of this policy would include a provision for Local Plans to identify any parts of the disused rail network to which Policy T4 would not apply, subject to a firm requirement that an appropriate alternative alignment be designated and safeguarded instead.

50. In a Plan that seeks to give a vision for 20 years and has as one of its transportation policy objectives “Encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport”, some more imagination needs to be given to the promotion of cycling than Policy T4 currently contains. Safeguarding the Kingdom of Fife cycle route is a very small first step, particularly bearing in mind that much of the route consists of minor roads, some of which also carry fast vehicular traffic. Even if funds are not currently available for off-road cycle paths, Policy T4 should also require Local Plans to identify and safeguard a connected network of off-road routes which can be developed when finance permits.

Proposal PT2 : Transport Proposals

51. **We object to the clause in this proposal which reads “further consideration of transport link options to the rail network to St Andrews, through the review of Local Transport Strategy”.** This Community Council has long argued for the reinstatement of the rail link to St Andrews and we are appalled at the weakness of this proposal. We believe that, as well as bringing major benefits to St Andrews, it would pay dividends to Cupar and other parts of East Fife. We envisage that likely customer numbers for such a link are significantly higher than has been suggested. The Tay Estuary Study, for instance, was focussed on traffic to and from Dundee.

52. Fife Council appears to be making a dismal attempt to turn the clock back to the situation prior to the 2002 Structure Plan. Amongst the many documents in which the Community Council has emphasised the importance of keeping the reinstatement option alive are our submissions in 2000 on the Draft 2002 Structure Plan and on the 2020 Tourism and Transport Vision for St Andrews. Our argument on the need to safeguard the route of the rail link in the 2002 Structure Plan always fell on deaf ears as far as Fife Council was concerned. Accordingly in March 2001 the question of the rail link formed one of the objections to the Finalised Structure Plan that we put to the Scottish Ministers. The wording in the 2002 Structure Plan fell short of what we would have liked, but nevertheless appeared to reflect a positive intervention on their part. That Plan (para. 2.2.5) said “The Local Transport Strategy identifies the need to review the requirement for new stations at Leven and St Andrews (including a new rail link). Proposal PT2 of the same Plan read “Land for the following routes and facilities will be safeguarded from prejudicial development and identified in Local Plans, in accordance with the Local Transport Strategy”, and the list thereunder included “The Leven and St Andrews lines including new stations (subject to review through Local Transport Strategy)”. Even this rather grudging wording is better than the latest, rather garbled, proposal which amounts to a fairly frank declaration that Fife Council would like to put the issue on the back burner for the next twenty years.

53. In contrast, this Structure Plan should be providing a vision for the future of better and more sustainable transport for those who live and work in the town, and providing a means for more tourists, golfers and academic visitors to access the town more easily without causing continual gridlock on our roads. The repetition in the Draft Structure Plan of the intention to turn St Andrews into a “world-class destination” overlooks the practicalities of access. It will not be a destination at all if people are unable to get there – as is almost the case already during holiday weekends in the summer.

54. Such is the negative attitude in Fife Council Transportation Service to the rail link that there is a failure to appreciate that the contribution that the rail link can make is not restricted to the town’s transportation problems. The need to conserve the landscape setting of St Andrews means, as we have stressed repeatedly in this submission, that little suitable housing land now remains in St Andrews, but an increasing number of university staff and others employed in St Andrews need housing within easy reach

of the town. The rail link offers a real prospect of squaring this circle. The methodology advanced by Prof. George Hazel of E-Rail Ltd in the context of the Edinburgh South Suburban scheme and elsewhere, has shown how rail projects can be made viable by linkage to associated development. Clearly in the St Andrews setting some restrictions on the location and nature of associated developments would be appropriate, but the characteristic desperation of developers to acquire sites near St Andrews mean that the methodology should be more readily applied here than in many other places.

55. Proposal PT2, which starts with the words “Transport proposals are listed below...” looks notably imprecise when compared to the formulation in the 2002 Structure Plan. This Community Council therefore calls on Fife Council to amend Proposal PT2 to include the words:- **“Land for the following routes and facilities will be identified in Local Plans and safeguarded from prejudicial development**

*** a rail link from the East Coast Main Line to a new station in St Andrews, following an alignment on the southern side of the A91.”**

56. The need to safeguard this route, including both southern and northern chords to the main line, is urgent. To maximise the contribution that the rail link can make, the track needs to reach a position close to the centre of St Andrews (i.e. the old station site). Development pressures near St Andrews are such that a failure to act at this time is likely to render this impossible. A Council that is supposed to believe in sustainable transport should be ashamed of its lack of action on the St Andrews rail link. We are not asking Fife Council to finance it, but merely to draw an appropriate line on a map and safeguard it from development.

Development on the Undeveloped Coast

57. **This Community Council objects to the omission of Policy N7 of the 2002 Fife Structure Plan.** Fife Council’s apparent loss of interest in protecting the coastal environment is disappointing. The policy objectives following Para. 4.24 include “Safeguarding and improving the character and distinctiveness of Fife’s landscapes and coastline”, but it is hard to see how this can be achieved by deleting relevant policies.

Built Heritage

58. **This Community Council wishes to see revised versions of Policies B1 and B2 of the 2002 Fife Structure Plan.** We would wish to see an explicit statement that developments that detract from the character of Conservation Areas or adversely affect the character or settings of listed buildings will not be supported. We find it disappointing that, unlike the 2002 Plan, Conservation areas are not even defined in the glossary of the new Structure Plan, and the section on the built environment now has no accompanying policies.

Open space

59. We also wish to see explicit recognition of the beneficial role of green spaces within the urban environment. A townscape which is an undivided concrete jungle is not a vision for 2026 that Fife should tolerate.

Sports grounds

60. We wish to see the retention of Policy C3 of the 2002 Fife Structure Plan, which protected sport and recreation facilities.

Archaeological Protection

61. We wish to see the retention of Policy B3 of the 2002 Fife Structure Plan.

Flooding and Coastal Erosion

62. We wish to see the retention of Policy C1 of the 2002 Fife Structure Plan, which restricted development in areas of known flooding risk. We regard the one line in the new Policy SS1 as inadequate.

Policy C2 : Information and Communication Technology

63. Although para 5.5 focuses on Broadband, Policy C2 can presumably be read as applying to mobile phone technology also. Guidance is required on the siting of mobile phone masts. Some may regard it as ironic that the immediately following policy is on healthcare facilities.

Editorial improvements

64. The organisation of the contents of the Draft Structure Plan makes it less readily accessible than the 2002 Fife Structure Plan. It was easy in the latter to identify the desired section from the contents page, whereas in the new document it is far harder to locate the topic of interest. The new reader is unclear whether housing, for instance, will come under “Fife-wide policies and proposals” or “Key strategic policies and proposals”. We have frequently resorted to electronic searching, but that should not be necessary. As there is only a single university in Fife, we would have hoped that a formal document of this nature might use its correct name, which is the University of St Andrews.

Appendix P – Brief response to Draft St Andrews & East Fife Local Plan

Response by Ian Goudie, Planning Convenor

Objection to schedule. It is inappropriate that this Local Plan is being considered before the Structure Plan parameters have been finalised.

General objection. We wish to see this Plan revised to take account of our objections to the Draft Structure Plan. This applies to paras 1.1, 1.4, etc., etc.

Comparison with 1996 Plan. We are considerably puzzled by this Draft Local Plan. This seems to be a

Plan without explicitly stated policies. Where are they? In particular, on p5, what are the Fife Local Plan core policies? It is hard to see how this document, in its present form, serves as a successor to the 1996 Local Plan. We wish to retain many policies from the previous Plan. These include (omitting some covered by later comments):-

- S1: Skyline
- S6 : Hepburn Gardens Conservation Area
- S9 : Retail frontage
- S11 : Offstreet parking
- S15 : Harbour
- E1 : Environmental Impact
- E4 : Conservation Areas
- E5 : Listed Buildings
- E7 : Tree Replacement
- E8 : Advertisements in Conservation Areas
- E9 : Street Furniture
- E10 : Open Space
- E11 : Access to the Countryside
- E13 : Development in the countryside
- E16 : AGLVs
- E17 : Ecological, Scientific or Heritage Impact
- E21 : Unbuilt coast
- H3 : Non-residential uses within settlements
- H4 : New housing in the countryside
- H5 : Residential development control criteria
- H7 : Special Needs Housing
- ED7 : Camping sites
- ED9 : Prime Agricultural Land
- R1 : Retail development
- R2 : Retail impact
- R3 : Retail warehouses
- R5 : New food and drink establishments
- I4 : Offstreet parking
- I6 : Pedestrian safety
- I7 : Rights of Way
- I8 : Wider public access
- I9 : Protection of identified cycle routes
- I10 : Facilities for cyclists
- I15 : Water supply
- I17 : Flooding
- I19 : New Energy Plant
- I20 : Telecommunications

Comments on Draft Plan Statement

Para 1.3	What is Policy S2?
Para 1.6	“Fife Council has taken account of public opinion...” The Council has completely ignored the St Andrews Strategic Study which genuinely took note of public opinion.
Para 1.8	We are fundamentally opposed to the scale of development envisaged in the “St Andrews needs to grow” philosophy. Developer funded affordable housing looks unlikely to provide a satisfactory way forward if it means getting three luxury houses that we do not want for every affordable one we need. This implies environmental damage on an unacceptable scale. Other types of “affordable in perpetuity” housing are preferable, or, where that cannot be achieved, it is better to leave the few remaining housing sites undeveloped until better funding mechanisms are established.
Para 1.9	The landscape’s capacity to absorb expansion is considerably less than this Plan envisages.
Para 1.10	The view across Langlands from the Strathkinness High Road is one of the town’s best assets. Most of this area should be in the Green Belt.
p12, St Andrews box.	Having three bullet points out of six on business development illustrates the extent to which the Council has got its priorities wrong. The plans for huge business growth are out of touch with reality. We object to the proposed expansion of the population of 17,000 by 2016. We have major concerns about what the eventual mix will turn out to be in “mixed tenure residential developments”.
Para 1.17	The objectives need to be pursued with some awareness of history and recognition of the costs of overly ambitious business development goals.
Para 1.22	The emphasis on St Andrews retail role “serving more visitor and tourism needs” is misguided. Green environmental policies imply that St Andrews shops must cater primarily for the residents. St Andrews town centre is a working environment in which busy people have to be able to carry out their work efficiently. A high degree of functionality is required as well as “an attractive and comfortable experience”.
Para 1.24	The success of the university’s research is not dependent on major land allocations. No evidence is offered why the future achievable level of spin-offs is so vastly greater than what has been achieved in previous determined attempts. University developments at the western edge of town are only acceptable to the extent that they are compatible with the Green Belt.

Para 1.25	A seven year supply of employment land may be reasonable, but it is the evaluation of what that means that needs more realism.
Paras 1.27-1.33	Our objections to the housing proposals have been set out in our Structure Plan submission.
Para 1.31	What is Policy S1?
Para 1.36	Our objections to Para 1.8 apply here also.
Para 1.37	There is little point avoiding unplanned urban sprawl by having planned urban sprawl instead.
Para 1.41	Our objections to the weakness of the Green Belt proposals are given in our Structure Plan submission.
Para 1.43	What are the policies re the coast?
Para 1.44	We seek a tighter definition of brownfield land, at least restricted to land that has actually been built on, and preferably requiring that it be in some sense unsightly.
Para 1.52	What is the policy framework for telecommunications? Guidance is needed on the siting of mobile phone masts.
Para 1.53	This Council may seek tighter guidelines on suitable sites for wind-farms than those set out in this para.
Para 1.54	On educational provision, we want the emphasis not to be on “long term commitment”, but short term action, particularly regarding a new secondary school in North Fife.
Para 1.55	What does “linking existing open spaces “ mean? We wish to see land for a network of offroad cycle paths identified and protected from development.
Paras 1.58-1.60	This Community Council urges that reinstatement of the rail link to St Andrews should be a key aspect of the Development Plan. We support Prof. Hazel’s methodology for achieving reinstatement, using (appropriate) associated development. This means that the rail link should not be a late addition to the Plan, grudgingly extracted from Fife Council, but rather a cornerstone around which the whole housing and development strategy for this town is constructed.
Para 1.61	What consultations has Fife conducted with the local population re the commercial use of Leuchars?

Comments on proposals for St Andrews

Policy	Subject	CC response
E42	Historic Core of St A	Support thrust of policy, but omit word “irreversibly”. Also justification needs amendment.
R9	Town Centre – retail development	Support, but add presumption against developments which would undermine town centre retailers. Note the justification appears under R10
R10	Town Centre – leisure development	Possible caveats re interaction between leisure developments and residential use of centre. Note the justification appears under R9.
GB1	Green belt	Object – Inadequacy of the belt and of the proposed conditions

HOUSING

	Site	No.	CC response
h78	St Leonards	180	Object – preferred site for hospital
h79	Craigtoun Rd South	150	Object – over-provision of housing land Parts of site h80 are preferable
h80	Craigtoun Rd West	250*	Object – over-provision of housing land Higher parts of site inconsistent with our contour-based approach and should be in Green Belt
h81	Carron Lodge	10	Support subject to provisos on access, density, etc.
h82	Northbank	350*	Object – over-provision of housing land Area should be in Green Belt Destruction of superb view of town from High Rd
h83	The Grange	60	Object – loss of southern hillside Area should be in Green Belt

EMPLOYMENT

	Location	Area (hectares)	CC response
c9	North Haugh	6.04	Support
e10	Southern hillside	5	Object – loss of southern hillside
e11	Craigtoun Road	10	Object – excessive allocation.
e12	Langlands		Object – Area should be in Green Belt

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

	Location	CC response
c15	Hospital Largo Rd	Object – loss of southern hillside, etc.
c16	Recycling Behind	Support

	facility	Morrisons	
c17	Cemetery	South of existing	Support
c18	University	AM Hall to High Rd	Object – Most of this area should be in Green Belt, though we would support a limited increase in student accommodation by David Russell Hall

OTHER PROJECTS & PROPOSALS

	Site	Location	CC response
t7	Light rail or guided bus route	Adjacent to A91	Object to proposal (time-scale, half-heartedness, route imprecision, failure to integrate with other plan policies), but enthusiastic support for heavy rail link
t8	Park-and-ride	North Haugh	Object – interaction with rail route
t9	Bus Station		Already objected – lack of coherent overall plan, etc.
t10	Market St		Reserve position until details known
r1	Retail area	Craigtoun Road	Support principle, subject to scale, design etc.
r2	Retail area	Langlands (A)	Object – Area should be in Green Belt
r3	Retail area	Langlands (B)	Object – Area should be in Green Belt
b20	Balfour Place	Brownfield site	Support principle of redevelopment, but need to know more precisely what is proposed.
b21	Largo Rd	Abattoir field	Object – Wish to retain green space
Pr50	Green Belt		Strong support for principle of green belt, but wish to include southern hillside, golf courses, Langlands, areas just out of sight of town, etc. Also want stronger protection against development in green belt.
Pr51	West Sands		Reserve position until details known
Pr52	East Sands & Harbour		Reserve position until details known. We are opposed to any development of the East Bents
Pr53	Craigtoun Park		Willing to consider limited, necessary and appropriate development to support the park. Regard Craigtoun as more suitable than Langlands for a Science Park.
Pr54	Bassaguard		Object strongly to residential development.
Pr55	Historic core		Concept of Design Guide is acceptable, but await details.
Pr56	Craigtoun Road		Support a design brief for site h81 and part of site h80. See above comments on e11 and r1.
Pr57	Langlands and North Haugh		Support having a masterplan for the North Haugh, inc. a route for the railway. Object to h82 and c18, as above.
Pr58	St Leonards		Support provided it includes a hospital.

Appendix Q – General Purposes Committee Minutes

Minutes by Donald Macgregor & Pete Lindsay

Monday 16/5/05. 15 Dempster Terrace.

Present: Donald Macgregor, Ian Goudie, Penny Uprichard, Bruce Ryan, Chris Lesurf, Murdo Macdonald, Dennis Macdonald, Pete Lindsay.

1. Constitution

The committee agreed that an amended constitution, taking into account all the provisions of the Fife Council Scheme, should be retained. Details would be presented to the full Council in due course.

2. Honorary Citizen Award

A discussion on various aspects of the matter was held. No recommendations were agreed. Donald Macgregor reported that as Chair he will be issuing an apology for the poor handling of the issue.

3. Planning Inquiry, Armit Place

Ian Goudie circulated a draft submission on community council's likely position on a business operating in a residential area. Community council had only recently been contacted, deadlines were too short for planning committee or full community council to respond. Meeting agreed this letter represented the likely view of community council.

Appendix R – Planning Inquiry, Armit Place

Letter by Ian Goudie, Planning Convenor.

Public Local Inquiry Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997

5 Armit Place, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 8RE

I write on behalf of the Community Council in support of the enforcement notice issued by Fife Council in connection with the alleged unauthorised partial change of use of the land and dwelling house at the above address.

The primary focus of this Community Council is usually on the Conservation Areas of the town and on other major developments that will affect the life of the town. Although developments in the suburbs constitute a relatively small part of our standard workload, the Council does offer comment when we believe more general principles are at stake.

In the present case, we have not previously offered a view, for the obvious reason that no planning application has been lodged. Nevertheless, at a meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Council last Monday, it was argued, without dissent, that had such an application for planning consent been submitted, it is highly probable that this Community Council would have objected. We do not, however, adopt an absolutist position on the use of property in residential areas for business purposes. If the nature of the business being pursued is such that the impact on neighbouring properties – in terms of noise, litter, smell, traffic etc. – leaves it essentially indistinguishable from other residential properties, we would see no reason to object. We do not, however, regard business use as acceptable if it involves the parking of large lorries or buses for protracted periods. We see such practices as detracting from the character and amenity of residential areas, and believe that Fife Council is entirely correct in seeking to avoid undesirable precedents being established.

Correspondence

(Correspondence regarding the Honorary Citizen vote will be circulated at the meeting.)

Date	from	subject
2005/05/03	Forrestry Commission	Corporate Plan
2005/05/03	NHS Fife	Hospital: Public Involvement
2005/05/03	St Andrews in Focus	May/June 05
2005/05/04	OSCR	Registration
2005/05/05	Law and Administration	Local holidays 2006
2005/05/06	Planning Aid for Scotland	Resubscription due
2005/05/10	Fife Police	Inspectors: reorganisation
2005/05/12	Transportation Services	Younger Gdns
2005/05/18	Bluenote Conferences	Climate Change -Scotland
2005/05/18	Community Services	Fife Access Seminar
2005/05/18	Fife Children's Panel	Children's Panel Advisory Committee
2005/05/18	Fife Coastal & Countryside Trust	2nd Stage Meeting
2005/05/18	VONEF	Scottish Rural Services Conference
2005/05/19	Community Services	Safety Courses
2005/05/19	Development Services	Gumley Golf 2005
2005/05/19	Planning Aid for Scotland	AGM: Dundee 11/6
2005/05/20	ASCC	Newsletter April 05
2005/05/21	Harlequin	Vodafone.mast New Picture House
2005/06/02	Environmental Services	Special Uplift Information
2005/06/02	Scottish Health Council	Introduction
2005/06/03	Scottish Language Dictionaries	Subscription
2005/06/03	Volunteer Centre Fife	Newsletter May/June
2005/06/04	Law and Administration	CC Seminar 25 June
2005/06/04	Marine Conservation Society	Strandline Newsletter
