

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Approved Minutes – 7th December 2009

For Approval

(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 on line at <http://www.standrewscc.net/>)

0 Thanks by Chair

Dr Goudie thanked members of the Community Council for the huge amount of work they'd done since the last meeting, from the Art & Photographic Exhibition to the Local Plan Exhibition, the Civic Reception and the delivery of the newsletter. He felt that the newsletter delivery had been the most determined and enthusiastic effort he'd seen in his time on the Community Council. He wanted to record the assistance of non Community Council members, such as Izzy Corbin's, son Callum and Marysia's son Darren amongst others, and the Residents Associations in the town who'd helped with the leaflet drop.

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Ken Crichton, Ken Fraser, Patrick Marks, Ian Goudie, Marysia Denyer, Henry Paul, Carol Ashworth, Marysia Denyer, Penny Uprichard, Ronnie Murphy, Kyffin Roberts, Catherine Rowe, Derek Skelhon, Judith Harding, Andy Primmer, Izzy Corbin

Students' Association Representatives

Holly West

Nominated

Fife Councillors

Frances Melville, Robin Waterston, Dorothea Morrison

Apologies

Dave Finlay, Fiona Kingston, Ray Pead

2. Minutes of November 2009 Meeting

No amendments – deemed to be correct.

3. Presentations

3.0. Police – PC Brian Robertson

3.0.1. Raisin Weekend

Miss Rowe raised some concerns about behaviour in her area on Raisin weekend. P.C. Robertson acknowledged that matters could have got a bit out of hand later when students had had a few drinks. He said he'd discuss the matter with Inspector Bruce Thomson.

3.0.2. Bicycles without Lights

Mrs Harding mentioned the issue of cyclists without lights. P.C. Robertson acknowledged the problem, which despite schemes to reduce the problem still sees some students without lights. Holly West added that the Students Union had started a campaign, albeit a bit late due to funding issues to supply cheap bike lights to students. Dr Goudie commented that the matter was a hardy perennial.

3.1. Macdonald Estates Presentation

Dr Goudie stated at the beginning that in an exchange of emails it had been agreed from the outset that hearing them speak would in no way prejudice any future planning application. The Community Council he said would still be able to fully or partially oppose aspects of any application. Mr Noble confirmed that he had the same understanding on the subject. He thanked the Community Council for the opportunity to present their project. He said that the purpose of the evening was to inform the Community Council about the proposals in the Craigtoun area of Mount Melville Estate. Macdonald Estates believed that their proposal was the most appropriate and sympathetic project, which could deliver the Structure Plan and Local Plan requirements. He wanted to demonstrate what were viewed as the key advantages to the Craigtoun site. Speakers in the presentation would include Michael Younger of Mount Melville Ltd, Stewart McPhail, Project Director and Neil Galloway.

Michael Younger presented the historical background to the area under scrutiny. The Younger family had had the estate since the early 1800s. He related some of the Younger family contributions to St Andrews, such as the Younger Hall and Younger Gardens. He said that in relation to the present position under the 2005 Local Plan, Mount Melville Estates had made no representation to Fife Council. His company had noted that in the 2005 Local Plan a substantial amount of land in Mount Melville ownership was zoned for potential housing development. Mount Melville Ltd felt that they had to choose a partner to help progress the potential for development. They decided that going with Macdonald Estates was more appropriate than going with a housing developer, as the former would be willing to go into a joint venture and after speaking to a number of potential partners, had selected Macdonald Estates. They signed a 20-year joint venture in 2006, which has recently been extended. He felt that it was important that the potential development would be progressed at a pace appropriate to the needs of the community. He added that both Mount Melville Ltd and Macdonald Estates were not carrying any debt at this time.

Stewart McPhail then talked amongst other things about the visual impact, which he felt was limited because of the already mature plantings and plans for further planting to minimise the visual impact. He then commented on the well-defined natural physical boundaries of the site, such as the Kinnesburn, Craigtoun Road and Lovers Lane. He felt that the town had grown over the years in a southwesterly direction and he hoped that what they were proposing was replicating that trend. In relation to affordable housing, there was a commitment to 30%. He felt that the site was capable, because of its large size of fulfilling a significant proportion of the Structure Plan ambitions. Other possible needs identified and potentially part of the site could include a new Primary School. He acknowledged the possibility of light industrial, but felt that this wasn't something they necessarily viewed as appropriate.

The site was between the 65m contour and the 35m contour. The bulk of the site would be below 60m contour. He also mentioned a commitment of 30% strategic landscaping, which he felt was a huge commitment. A tree belt at the 60m contour was also a commitment by the partnership.

He felt that the proposal was not a dense development compared to what was possible. He said that their study had considered a potential 700 houses, but in the plan they were looking at 550 eventually. This would work out at around 7 houses per acre, not a dense development in his view, compared to what many builders might try to put on a similar size of site.

He also mentioned local concern about flooding and talked about the possibility of an attenuation pond, which he felt could take pressure off the Claremont and Kinness Burns, thus reducing the risk of flooding further down the stream.

Issues which came out of the recent consultation included, traffic, drainage, flooding, the location of possible employment land, lack of facilities, views, scale of development and landscaping.

Mrs Ashworth asked about social housing. Mr McPhail replied that social housing would be fully integrated as each phase came forward for development. He added that social housing could be a mix, from housing for those completely unable to afford to buy, to young couples on the first rung of buying. He acknowledged the need to get the mix right.

Mr Crichton asked if the affordable housing would be the type that would be affordable in perpetuity. Mr McPhail acknowledged the need, but added that it was a complex subject. They have had some discussions with Kingdom Housing on the matter. He acknowledged the difficulty in providing a definitive answer, but added that they had the commitment to make 1:3 affordable. The exact nature of the housing affordability is still to be decided.

Ms Uprichard asked about their views on the statement around 11 years ago by Fife Council that St Andrews was at its landscape capacity. Mr McPhail acknowledged that report, but in his reply said that they had consulted with various bodies, such as the Green Belt Forum and had come to a conclusion that it would have to be whatever was the least damaging to the landscape. He added, that they believed that their proposals were the least damaging in relation to the landscape. Mr McPhail also reminded the

meeting that total capacity included the whole town, but that some parts of the town would not benefit from landscaping to mitigate development, due to their low lying nature. Miss Uprichard commented on the percentage of affordable housing, noting the 30% commitment, but reminding the meeting that this still meant 70% of non-affordable development. She felt that all new housing should be affordable. She also felt that 700 houses was a huge proposition at one time, given the 1998 Strategic Study assessment about the landscape capacity being reached. Mr McPhail acknowledged that the site had a capacity for 700 houses, but in terms of that being delivered, it could be 35 houses per year over the twenty-year period of the Plan. He also added that in terms of the speed of development Mount Melville and Macdonald were not under any pressure financially to rush to develop large numbers of houses in a short period of time, and it could be as little as twenty five a year.

Dr Goudie asked about the non-affordable housing. He cited the Craigtoun "B" development, where a lot of large five bed roomed houses had been built, but which took a long time to sell and went through three house builders in the process. He felt that this had been retrograde as the original master plan for the site, which had quite a beneficial vision, had been partially lost along the way. Mr Younger acknowledged that that had been a learning process from that particular development as they'd sold the option originally to the builders and lost control of how it progressed as a result. The partnership with MacDonald Estates was on a different footing under which control of the development wouldn't be lost. Dr Goudie said that the Community Council would have concerns about the nature of the mix of housing. He cited the difficulties of younger colleagues on lower salaries, who wouldn't be able to afford to enter the St Andrews market because affordable housing was not readily available. He felt that the Community Council would be looking in future developments to see housing that is more in tune with the local needs. Mr McPhail cited an example of a development in the Brechin area, where Macdonald Estates had worked with the Community Council.

Mr Marks asked whether issues relating to sustainability and renewable energy were being seriously addressed as part of the possible housing developments. Mr McPhail replied that they would be taking this into account as part of developments.

A member of the public, Mr Martin, asked about flooding related issues. Mr McPhail answered that they would be putting storage in, in the form of holding tanks at the top end, which would help further down the line. There would be a specific flood risk assessment of the site before any development.

Dr Goudie commented that most of the consultations held over the past fifteen years, had shown that the population of St Andrews would be happy to see development in the Kinness Valley rather than higher ground. He was concerned that this message was not getting through to Fife Council and the area shown, as possible development land in 2005 was considerably greater than that in the present draft. He wondered if Fife Council could be brought any more on board if local people continued to favour the Kinness Valley. Mr Younger replied that they'd been working with Fife Council for the past four years and had felt that they'd been well received, but couldn't be certain of the real picture and the Council's insight into the matter. Mr McPhail added that they'd made representations to Fife Council as a matter of course. He added that they'd been working hard in recent weeks to raise the profile of their proposals, and felt that the Public Exhibition had gone well, with over 400 attending. They wanted to demonstrate to Fife Council that there was an alternative option.

Miss Rowe asked about the transport issues, because of concerns about increased traffic into St Andrews and out towards Strathkiness. She was informed that Colin Buchanan Partners who had done work in relation to the new St Andrews Community Hospital were doing some work for Mount Melville/Macdonald Estates, as they recognised the need to answer questions on this as part of their overall plan for the area. Mr McPhail quoted some figures relating to traffic movement, and how this might relate to their proposals. It was also felt that in the rival St Andrews West plans, access to major shopping and leisure facilities would not be as convenient as the Mount Melville / Macdonald Estates plans. Dr Goudie added that the idea of a shop on the Craigtoun Road had been one of the Community Council's more longstanding, unsuccessful campaigns.

Dr Goudie thanked Mount Melville Ltd and Macdonald Estates for their presentation.

3.2. Kinnesburn Flooding Problem

Mrs Monica Ramsay give a presentation on behalf of a group of local St Andrews Residents affected by flooding of the Kinnesburn. Mrs Ramsay started by describing the flooding of the 1st November 2009, which didn't directly affect her, but severely affected an elderly neighbour. She made some further enquires in relation to the management of the Kinnesburn with Fife Council. She discovered that some £80000 had been spent on two reports in relation to the Kinnesburn. Officials also misinformed her about the time of the high tide in relation to the flooding episode. She then related how her garden path had been flooded four times in the past year, and had had to shovel sewage and muck from her garden. Her

neighbours have had to have their house pumped out at least three times. She said that a Mr Crowe had informed her that it would make very little difference if the burn were dredged. She felt that this was not a realistic view on the, management of the Kinnessburn. She cited silt blockage at Dempster Court as an example of the problem. At a recent meeting in Cupar, Mr Crowe had informed those attending that it would cost £250000 in reports to prepare for the Kinnesburn to be cleared. She felt that this was absurd. She then went on to say that SEPA had said at the last meeting that they hadn't been approached by Fife Council to do anything about clearing the Kinnesburn. Mr Crowe had also informed her that SEPA would object to any clearance of a natural stream, but she felt that the Kinnesburn was not particularly natural in its lower run, but was more like a canal. She then went on to comment on the role of Scottish Water and whether it accepted that there was a problem, particularly with the deposit of raw sewage in local properties. She wondered of their modelling of the town's drainage system had identified the problem, and if they had asked for any system modifications to deal with the problem? She wondered if the Community Council would like to assist in seeking answers to this matter?

Cllr Waterston on behalf of his colleagues said that they all appreciated the enormous challenges and difficulties faced on the 1st November. The Councillors had also had a meeting with Mr Crowe and as a result they had requested that Fife Council officials meet with SEPA, which they are promising to do this month. They were also promising to meet with residents in January.

In response to a query from Cllr Waterston, Mrs Ramsay said that Fife Council had claimed that they couldn't clear the Kinnesburn, because of objections from SEPA on wildlife grounds. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that there was a mutual buck passing going on, as there had been a meeting between Fife Council and SEPA in May 2009. The content of the discussions was in dispute, as Fife Council claims that they were told at that stage that SEPA would require a whole lot of expensive surveys. Cllr Waterston added that they needed to get to the bottom of the matter.

Dr Goudie asked about the date of a Public Meeting in January. Mrs Ramsay said that she'd had a letter from Derek Crowe on the 19th November detailing plans for a meeting with representatives from SEPA and the Scottish Flood Forum in January at a date to be confirmed.

Cllr Melville felt that the issues had to be spelt out strongly. As Councillors they'd been raising similar concerns at Local Office meetings for some years and agreed that there appeared to be a mutual buck passing. She hoped that a meeting in early January could begin to seriously address the problems for local residents. Cllr Melville suggested that the Community Council write in strong terms to Fife Council and to SEPA on the need to begin to tackle the flooding issue.

Miss Rowe commented that in her youth there had never been the same problem in the area near the Kinnesburn where she had lived and felt that the problems with silt must originate higher up the burn. She wondered why there was a problem with clearing the silt build up.

Cllr Melville commented upon the problems associated with building on green field sites. The Planning Committee on which the Councillors sit had recently been given a major report by Fife Council relating to the New Planning legislation and Climate Change. The report had been in response to Government policy. Councillors had felt that Fife Council's response had not been strong enough, particularly with increasing problems for many constituents. Cllr Morrison added that it wasn't just those living in the low-lying areas of the Kinnesburn who were affected. Mrs Ramsay added that one of her neighbours had had to have major internal work in her house to repair flood damage, and over the years, had had to have their house pumped out on numerous occasions.

Mr Martin mentioned that he'd been advised by Waterwatch Scotland to take a petition he'd gathered with 620 signatures to his MSP. He'd followed this advice, and had recently taken his petition to Iain Smith MSP, who'd advised him that it was a Fife Council issue, but he'd look into it. Cllr Melville suggested that Mr Martin present the petition to Cllr Tony Martin, Chair of the Environment and Transportation Committee at Fife Council.

Mr Crichton recollected a meeting from a few years previously, organised by Cllr Liston at which a SEPA representative he would not allow anything to be done to the Kinnesburn.

Dr Goudie in final comments hoped that something more radical would come out of the meeting in January.

Secretary to write to SEPA and Fife Council on this matter.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville

4.1.1. Scottish Planning Consultation Response

Cllr Melville briefly commented upon the Fife Council response to this Scottish Government request and the amendments requested by Councillors. She'd emailed the details to the secretary of the Community Council, who had forwarded these to members for information.

4.1.2. Flooding opposite W H Smith and other areas.

Miss Uprichard mentioned flooding opposite W H Smith, which had persisted for a lengthy period, possibly due to blockage in the drains and the design of the street in that area, allowing water to accumulate easily. Cllr Morrison replied that she'd reported various flooding problems, with one near the DIY being eventually sorted.

4.1.3. Local Plan Allocation Changes

Mr Paul asked who changed the allocation from 2005 to 2009. At the meeting of St Andrews West Partnership he'd heard that Fife Council officials had approved the change, and they were quite happy to move all the building etc on to the Strathkiness High Road. He wondered about the point therefore of the previous objections and to consultation if Fife Council officials had already agreed where the house building was going to be?

Cllr Melville in reply said that Development Services had changed the map. The Councillors had had a presentation at the Local Office, when the consultation process had started again. The Councillors had all expressed alarm at some of the changes. She felt that the past objections were still valid.

Cllr Waterston added that the 2005 version had been described at the time as the consultative version, followed by a finalised version in 2006. This latter he said had a major change, which had taken place between 2005/6. Mr Paul asked if this had been published and had anyone seen a copy. Cllr Waterston replied that there was awkwardness about that, as consultation on that version had started in 2006, but had been called to a halt. Cllr Waterston wasn't certain of the reason, but Miss Uprichard commented that it had been due to delays to the Structure Plan. As a result there had only been one consultation and this had resulted in 2500 objections. Cllr Waterston added that the 2006 Plan was the one which had been described as the finalised version and which the Planning Committee would have been using as the basis for local planning application purposes. He acknowledged that the 2009 Plan came out almost the same as the amended 2006 version. Cllr Waterston reassured the meeting that local Councillors would be taking the issues of concern around the Local Plan seriously.

Cllr Melville commented that the Structure Plan hadn't taken any recognition of the extraordinary changes to the country's financial position with the credit crunch. She felt that this must make a substantial change to the way; even Development Services could view things.

Mr Murphy asked about the democracy of these changes to the Plan. Noting the way it had been changed between 2005 and 2006, he thought that it must have come before the Councillors at some point. He wondered what happened at the Regional Committee level? Had that Committee okayed the changes without question? Cllr Melville replied that the comments from the local Councillors were reported to the Central Planning Committee a few weeks later in the appendix. That resulted in the Site visit and the Alison Grant Visual Analysis and the Computer Visualised Aids. Officials had informed Councillors that the basic document would be the "Changed Zones". Mr Murphy wondered if the Community Council was precluded from saying that they preferred the Macdonald Estates/Mount Melville Ltd site? Cllrs Melville & Waterston advised Mr Murphy that the Community Council could express its own preference in this consultation. Dr Goudie said that the problem is that the changes, which happened between 2005 and 2006, were clearly not driven by local opinion in this area. They are contrary to what the local population was saying at that time. He added that one could only assume that they reflected what Fife Council and the University/Headon Consortium had decided was in their mutual financial interest. Mr Paul commented that at the recent meeting hosted by Mr Headon, he'd said that he'd been working closely with Fife Council officials. Mr Headon had been surprised at the controversy stirred up when the proposals in the Plan came before Fife Council East Area Committee. Cllr Melville cited small-scale examples, where officials had been working with developers and when their advice had come to the East Area Committee, Councillors had queried the advice. Cllr Waterston thought that there was nothing underhand in discussions between developers and planners. He added that there were no financial arrangements reached or proposed in any of those meetings. The question of developer contributions arises from policy, which he said was clearly spelt out and had been recently revised and approved by Planning Committee. He went on to say that

there was a clear policy in developer contributions and that came through during the course of planning applications, but there were no financial agreements made beforehand. He acknowledged that the Planners liked the Consortium proposals. Cllr Morrison thought that the officials in Planning at higher levels saw advantages for Fife from their position. She thought that they were looking at it from the financial perspective, where local citizens would be looking to preserve St Andrews from being swamped by massive development.

Miss Uprichard said that despite 4 times as many objections to the Structure Plan than ever before, things were still going ahead. She felt that there were serious concerns about the process. She then mentioned the Landscape Review, which looked at all the Areas of Great Landscape Value under the previous designation, and was replacing them with a few Special Landscape Areas. She was concerned that these changes were removing protection from St Andrews and Cupar. She said she'd been told that there would be consultation on these changes in the Local Plan. What she said was in the Local Plan was a statement that AGLVs have been replaced by SLAs, which she felt did not make people recognise that there was a consultation on the subject. Her second matter related to the Strategic Environmental Assessment to the Modifications to the Structure Plan. She said that there was supposed to be a post-adoption statement in relation to the SEA saying why they had made a decision about why they had on the SEA and why they had overridden objections within a reasonable time. She added that it was now 6 months since the adoption of the Structure Plan and there was no sign of the SEA Post Adoption Statement. She felt that as the Local Plan was supposed to comply with the Structure Plan that the Community Council and local people were entitled to see this statement before the Local Plan Consultation ended. This was one of the reasons Miss Uprichard had asked for an extension to the Local Plan Consultation. She hoped that the Community Council would support the request to see this Post Adoption Statement in good time.

Cllr Waterston in relation to the timing of the Community Council statement on the Local Plan said he'd asked Bill Lindsay, but hadn't so far had a written reply, but he'd been led to believe that there wouldn't be any problem about submitting comments after the December 24th deadline. He said that Councillors would do everything they could to make the deadline acceptable to the Community Council, so that it could submit its comments

4.1.4. Grange Road Appeal

Cllr Waterston reported that the objection to the Grange Road application had been unsuccessful. The Appeal by the developer had been upheld. The Grounds for the decision were based on the Reporter's view that the landscape issues weren't significant enough to oppose the planned housing development. Cllr Waterston felt as well that there were deeper lessons from this appeal. He felt that without a Local Plan St Andrews was in a vulnerable position to planning by appeal, not a good situation to be in. Dr Goudie acknowledged that it was bad news as it was leading to more piecemeal development on the Southern Hillside. He wondered if there was anything that could be done to stop the rot, such as stopping officials telling potential developers that they would need to allow access through their sites to still more of the Southern Hillside. Cllr Waterston in reply didn't anticipate that would be a risk, because the area next to the site is not proposed as a development area, but is zoned as Green Belt. Cllr Morrison later commented about her disappointment in the outcome. As local Councillors they had tried to turn down the plan on grounds of prematurity, particularly in relation to the local plan.

4.1.5. Site Plan for new Madras College

Councillor Waterston proposed that the Community Council could consider asking an official from Fife Council along to answer questions on this subject, which had appeared in the Community Council's recent pink leaflet.

4.1.6. Student Behaviour Issues

Miss Rowe asked the Councillors if they could approach the University on concerns expressed by some local elderly residents in relation to student behaviour, especially when under the influence of drink. This was causing some elderly residents in her area concern. Cllr Melville said that in her understanding the University was working hard with students to get the message across about their behaviour. She thought that the situation was better than it had been. Ms West felt that such incidents were very isolated. She thought that the main problem related to the police not contacting the university about students, but recognised that it was up to the Police to decide if they should contact the University if charges are being pressed. She added that the Police sometimes didn't press charges, so the University would be left unaware of an incident. Mrs Corbin suggested that the Police HQ at Glenrothes could be contacted if anyone wasn't happy with local police response to an incident. Ms Rowe suggested that the Community Council could write to the Chief Constable as she didn't feel that residents were getting anywhere with the local police. Dr Goudie expressed reluctance to go down that route if there was an existing agreement in place with the

University. Ms West added that the local police had gone round University residences and had give clear statements on what could happen to students breaking the law at Raisin Weekend. Miss Rowe acknowledged that Raisin weekend was a bit worse, but other elderly residents felt less than happy to go out on other weekends at night time. Cllr Morrison queried whether it was just the students causing problems and added that she felt no worries in going out locally at night time. Dr Goudie in concluding the discussion said that he was reluctant to go over the heads of the local police and suggested that Miss Rowe could write personally. Miss Rowe thought that she might write to the Chief Constable or a police contact known to Miss West. Cllr Waterston suggested contacting Inspector Bruce Thomson and asking for his comments first. Ms West mentioned that she'd suggested having a campaign highlighting noise problems in St Andrews, but the local police had advised her that it wasn't necessary as there was a very low incidence of noise problems in St Andrews. Cllr Morrison suggested that if there was a complaint about a particular HMO, a letter could be sent to the Chair of the Regulation and Licensing Committee.

4.2. Bill Sangster

On holiday

4.3. Robin Waterston

4.3.1. Bike Racks

Ms West asked if it would be possible to get any more bike racks in the town. She felt there weren't enough. Cllr Waterston said that the Councillors would do their best, but reminded the meeting that in relation to Market Street when redevelopment took place there would be more bike racks. Ms West cited the problem with the bike rack beside Tesco.

4.3.2. Garden on the corner of St Mary CIs/Market Street

Miss Rowe mentioned ongoing complaints about this site with rubbish being thrown in and the fence still not taken down. Cllr Waterston suggested that the Community Council might want to write to Fife Council, possibly to Kate Hughes at the Local Office. According to Cllr Waterston the basic problem is that despite Kate Hughes writing to the owner, he waits as long as possible before taking any action, making it difficult then to take enforcement action. Cllr Morrison added that knowing the owner and where he lived, he might be spurred to more action, if the state of the garden was publicised in certain newspapers. Cllr Waterston felt that it would be great if the garden could be compulsorily purchased.

4.4. Dorothea Morrison –

4.4.1. Bakers Lane – Black Bags

Mr Skelhon said that a lady living in Baker's Lane who'd been told by Council Refuse workers that they didn't lift black bags of rubbish had approached him. She'd phoned Cupar and been given the same response. Mr Skelhon wondered if the Councillors could give him a name for the lady to contact on this matter. Cllr Morrison gave Mr Skelhon a possible contact name. Cllr Waterston added that in many parts of the conservation area, such as Baker Lane black bags were collected.

4.4.2. Closure of the Pends

Mr Roberts wondered if any Councillor had heard about the closure of the Pends from South Street. He wondered how long it would be closed? Cllr Morrison acknowledged she'd not caught up with her correspondence from Fife Council in relation to such matters, but would check it out.

5. Planning Committee.

5.1. Planning Committee Report –

5.1.1. Thank You to Miss Rowe

Mrs Denyer expressed the thanks of the Planning Committee to Catherine Rowe for all her hard work as Convenor.

5.1.2. Difficulty in Receipt of Plans

Plans are beginning to be received more timeously. There had been problems in recent weeks, partly due to officials attending planning appeals.

5.1.3. Next Planning Meeting - 14/12/09

Dr Goudie commented that the Planning Committee would have to spend some time at the next meeting looking at the Local Plan and the Community Council response. Dr Goudie hoped that the Community Council would get some respite from the December deadline for submissions. Cllr Waterston also hoped that this would be the case, as he felt that it would be unreasonable to expect anything less. Dr Goudie asked Cllr Waterston if he could get some confirmation from Bill Lindsay regarding an extension of the submission deadline.

Mr Paul commented that he'd like to see a clear record of important decisions made at Planning Committee meetings in the minutes. Dr Goudie agreed that it was important and accepted the need to have more than just the spread sheet of planning applications discussed. Other substantive matters should be part of the meeting minute.

Ms Uprichard in relation to the timescale for Local Plan discussion noted that officials in Planning would not be looking at the responses until the New Year, as Fife Council will be closed from The 25th December to 4th January. She'd spoken to Cllr Arbuckle who had indicated that the matter might be discussed at a meeting this afternoon. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that there had been an informal meeting, but felt that it was unlikely that anything would be examined before the New Year. Miss Uprichard had heard that Mr Lindsay would take a pragmatic view about submissions received after the 24th December. Cllr Waterston said that he'd get a definite response with regard to the Community Council submission.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. Art and Photography Exhibition – Update

Mr Roberts reported that the Art and Photography Exhibition would run from 25th November to 2nd January in the Byre Theatre. General opinion about the venue has been favourable. The Exhibition will be in two parts, with a change of pictures half way through the period. Mr Crichton asked about the commission rate requested by the Byre Theatre. Mr Roberts confirmed that it was 40% of sale price. Purchases would be paid for at the Box Office, who would then pay the Community Council. The Community Council would then pay the artist or photographer.

6.2. Climate Challenge Fund – update

Mr Murphy reported that the first application sent in had not been successful. This was the Energy Renewables bid. The Climate Challenge Committee had chosen the most expensive estimate believing it to be the best, but unfortunately it was considerably more than the limit for the recent funding round. Partly because of this, and because of considerable competition for available funds from other bidders the bid didn't succeed. This bid, along with the Cycle bid using Sustrans as the consultant and the Energy Insulation bid will go forward to the first major funding meeting in 2010.

6.3. Civic Reception – Report

Mr Paul reported on the recent Civic Reception on St Andrews Day. Attendance at the event was 44. Mr Paul acknowledged that the event needed reviewing, both due to the low number attending and other areas such as the catering. The quality, quantity and type of food should be reviewed. Mr Paul said that he and Mr Pead would be happy to organise the event for next year and felt that planning should start much earlier in the year. Mr Paul thanked Cllr Melville for accepting the invite to open the event at short notice, because of the Scottish Government's refusal to send a representative. Cllr Melville questioned the timing, feeling that 16.30 was too early and difficult for many people. She also recognised the problems due to health and safety regulations concerning numbers. She was however pleased at the numbers of local people out to view the Beating of the Retreat. She suggested the possibility of using bigger premises. Dr Goudie acknowledged that it was unfortunate, as he knew that there would be people invited in past years, which the Community Council had been unable to invite this year due to number restrictions. Then to end up with less than the 60 was an additional disappointment. Mr Paul suggested having a meeting in February to begin planning for next November's Civic Reception. Miss Uprichard asked about the prohibition on home catering. She had also been disappointed by the quality of the food offered. Mr Paul confirmed that the Community Council had to abide by Fife Council rules about catering. Mrs Corbin

confirmed that Government Hygiene regulations controlled how food could be offered. Dr Goudie confirmed the need to look at a future Civic Reception early in the New Year

6.4. Reports from Representatives

6.4.1. Travel Plan Meeting

Miss Rowe reported her attendance with Mrs Denyer at this meeting, which dealt with the transport situation at the new hospital. Parking was the main issue discussed. It was confirmed that no more parking would be possible. Miss Rowe would distribute the minutes of the meeting when available. Mrs Denyer added that the bus service was working well. Mrs Denyer also talked about a study done after the hospital had opened of the pattern of parking by staff and visitors.

6.4.2. ASCC Meeting

Patrick Marks and Carole Ashworth had attended this meeting at the Scottish Parliament. They had found it a very interesting and useful day. Mr Marks felt that there was a lot of potential to learn about the workings of other Community Councils, and learn from good practice elsewhere in Scotland. He felt that there could be interesting times ahead for Community Councils and suggested that St Andrews Community Council should join the ASCC. He didn't think that membership cost would be substantial.

6.4.3. Planning Aid Seminar

Mr Primmer reported back on his attendance at this seminar, which had taken place in the Boys Brigade Hall at the end of November. He described it as being a sort of beginner's guide to Planning, so presented at a quite basic level. He did however find it an interesting day. Mrs Denyer who had also attended agreed with his assessment. She felt that quite a cross section of representatives from Community Councils and organisations across North East Fife had attended.

6.5. A.O.C.B.

7. Committee Reports

7.1 Recreation Committee

Nothing to report

7.2. General Purposes Committee

Nothing to report – meeting to be arranged for January 2010.

7.3. 200 Club

No meeting, but draw took place during meeting.

7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee

Nothing to report

8. New Business

8.1. Business Audit Districts Scotland

For information only - see appendix. Mr. Marks said that he'd passed relevant information on to relevant parties. He described the organization as a QUANGO set up to give grant support to local businesses/groups in partnership with their local authority to develop an Improvement District – see www.bids-scotland.com for further information. The organization issues a newsletter with examples of the work it does around Scotland.

9. Reports from Office Bearers

9.1. Chair

9.1.1. Presentations to Community Council

Dr Goudie started by looking at the issue of Presentations to the Community Council. Cllr Waterston had asked him about the possibility of having a Mr Alan Paul from Fife Council along to the next meeting to answer questions about the possible new Madras College site. Dr Goudie then asked Mrs Ashworth to inform the meeting about the request by Peter Howden from Fife Council wished to attend a Community Council; meeting to discuss the issue of Craigtoun Park and it's possible future development. Cllr Melville said that this had arisen from a small group who met with officers. A combination of falling income, and increasing maintenance costs, were contributing to the need to look at ways to sort out the future of Craigtoun Park. Miss Uprichard said that Planning had received information on Craigtoun Park and the possible range of options for its future and planned to respond. Mr Paul mentioned that Mr Alan Paul had been in contact with him and it was now suggested that February might be a better time for him to attend as there was a further Stakeholder meeting in January 2010.

Dr Goudie then asked for the meeting's view on having Mr Howden at the January meeting and Mr Alan Paul at the February meeting. There was general acceptance of this arrangement.

9.1.2. Election of New Vice Chairs to Community Council

Following the resignations of Mr Reed and Mr Paul from the Vice Chair posts, he wondered if the Community Council wished to continue to have two Vice Chairs or have just one. There was a general view that two posts would be acceptable. Dr Goudie then asked for nominations for the posts. Mr Crichton suggested Miss Rowe for the post; this was seconded by Mrs Ashworth. There was no opposition. Mrs Corbin volunteered her services, having experience in other organisations in a similar role. Mr Paul seconded Mrs Corbin. There were no further nominations. Miss Rowe and Mrs Corbin were confirmed as the Vice Chairs

9.1.3. Community Council Newsletter

Dr Goudie expressed his thanks about the way the newsletter had been delivered with most of the town now covered by a mix of Community Councillors, family members, friends and community groups.

9.1.4. Web Site for Community Council

Dr Goudie reported that he had updated the website, putting in Mrs Harding as 200 Club Convenor and Mr Roberts as Recreation Committee Convenor.

9.2. Treasurer

9.2.1. Treasurer's Report

Treasurers Report Notes – December 2009:

1. It has been a busy period in terms of events since our last meeting and final accounts for the Art & Photo Exhibition, Civic Reception and Newsletter printing are still in the process of completion and will be available in our next meetings accounts. I can however, inform you that both the Art & Photo Exhibition and the Civic Reception will come in under budget and this is despite some severe pruning of these budgets in the past months. Thanks must go to those involved for their prudence.
2. Whilst awaiting these completed accounts, I have made some approximations in an attempt to show a realistic figure for our "Total Usable Funds Available", as shown in the accounts sent to you in the past week.
3. Our financial position remains challenging and it is requested that the Chair convene a GP meeting early in the New Year to decide on our budget / fundraising strategy for 2010.
4. The Recs and Bandstand sub-accounts do not currently have the wherewithal to support any significant events next year and the Planning sub-committee have had un-budgeted expenditure of nearly £500 in 2009. It will be most important that Planning, Recs, Bandstand Concerts and any other sub-committees within the Community Council adequately bid and realistically budget for any funds required in 2010. I believe our strategy should be one of, whatever we achieved in 2009, we should look to improve on in 2010. This may mean additional funding to achieve this but is a healthy goal to strive for.

5. We also, at present, have no means by which to replenish the Millennium Fund, currently standing empty, but which should stand at £3,666.03p. So our efforts in 2010 will equally, if not more, exacting than in 2009. Mr Crichton voiced his objection to the Millenium Fund being used for admin costs.
6. Finally, as we approach the end of 2009, I thank all Councillors for their support and efforts in keeping expenditure to a minimum.
7. A Merry Christmas to you all !

9.3 Secretary

9.3.1. Correspondence – see appendix

Mr Marks mentioned the receipt of a new book he'd received on Volunteering from VONEF, which he thought, could be of potential use to the Community Council or one of its sub committees. He offered the booklet to any interested Community Councillor.

10. Any Other Competent Business

10.1. Interaction with the Press

Mr Murphy talked about how the Community Council and its members interacted with the press. He felt that he had a need to be conscious that he didn't want the Community Council to be misrepresented by what he might say, unless he knew he was on solid ground in relation to the issue discussed. He felt that on areas where he felt less confident that he was quoting Community Council views, he wanted to be treated as speaking in his personal capacity. He then asked about an article he'd seen recently in the Courier, which had quoted a Community Council spokesman. Dr Goudie clarified that the article was based on the newsletter issued by the Community Council and that it was a standard journalistic convention in such articles. He felt that it was perfectly acceptable as a journalistic style. He added that he was pleased that Mr Murphy had raised the issue, and reminded the meeting that anyone speaking on behalf of the Community Council should be 100% sure that it was the view of the Community Council. Mr Marks mentioned that he had experiences of having to given comments from journalists phoning him, as he could often be the first point of contact for the press. Dr Goudie suggested that press releases should be circulated before release for general support to be confirmed in content and he also suggested avoiding responding to journalist's requests for comments unless the urgency of the situation merited it. Miss Uprichard suggested that with regard to important business, such as the Local Plan, that only the Chairman should make comments to the press. There was no dissent to this suggestion.

10.2. Changed Date for January Meeting

The January Community Council Meeting will be on the 11th January 2010, as the 4th January 2010 is a Public Holiday.