

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Provisional Minutes – 8th January 2018

0. New Members

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Callum MacLeod, Ian Goudie, Gordon Shepherd, Izzy Corbin, Judith Harding, John Jardine, Penny Uprichard, Dita Stanis-Traken, Kyffin Roberts, Iain Munn, Penelope Fraser, Greg Newman, Iain Munn, Alistair Newton, Neil Cunningham-Dobson,

Students' Association Representatives

Co-Opted

Lindsey Adam

Niall Scott

Fife Councillors

Jane Ann Liston, Brian Thomson

Apologies – Patrick Marks, Howard Greenwell, Dominic Nolan, Ann Verner, Jamie McLeod, Hannah Raleigh, Lewis Wood, Jerry Beaulier

2. Minutes of Meeting – December 2017

Minutes agreed as a correct record.

3. Presentations

4. Fife Councillors.

4.1. Jane Ann Liston.

4.1.1. Fife Council Performance Report

Cllr Liston informed the meeting of the availability of this report which is meant to highlight whether the Council is meeting its performance targets.

4.1.2. Workshop on HMO Moratorium

Cllr Liston reported that this workshop due in the near future had been cancelled with a date for a rescheduled meeting to be announced as soon as possible.

4.1.3. Crossing at City Road

Cllr Liston had asked for a response from Fife council on this but had still to receive a response.

4.1.4. Bins Identification Query

Cllr Liston had asked Fife Council about the reason for not having identification markings on bins in the town and this was supposedly for data protection purposes. Cllr Liston had received a reply from the Data Protection officer stating that it was only a data protection issue if a label could identify an individual. She was waiting to get confirmation about identification of commercial bins.

4.1.5. St Andrews West & the NHS

Cllr Liston had asked Fife Planners on the issue of whether the NHS had been consulted on the planned extension of the town. The response she received was that NHS Fife had been consulted during the period of the preparation of the Development Plan. The organisation had been represented at key agency meetings such as TAYPLAN meetings. In respect of the St Andrews West Strategic Development Area NHS Fife noted a potential impact upon local Healthcare services but did not object in principle to the main expansion proposals based on increased stress on services and infrastructure. This was acknowledged in the local Development plan examination report. In terms of GP Practices as these were run as businesses they would need a business case to expand should they need to do so. This would need to be monitored closely and will be one of the issues needing to be addressed as the implementation of the Fife Plan progresses. Fife Council meet with the NHS Fife to look at development issues on a regular basis. Fife health and Social Care will be part of any liaison as plans move forward so there will be discussions throughout all the areas of Fife.

Miss Uprichard commented that she'd read in the local press that some other major developments in Fife were being put on hold because they couldn't get a guarantee of adequate educational and medical facilities. Cllr Liston replied that she could only go on the response from Fife Council which she'd received and quoted to the meeting earlier and could only assume that NHS Fife were satisfied they could manage to meet the challenge of this major development.

In a response to a query from Dr Shepherd about the official post occupied by Bill Lindsay, Cllr Liston informed the meeting that he is the Service Manager (Development) of the Economy, Planning and Employability Services of Fife Council.

4.1.6. Leuchars Drop-off Area

Mrs Harding asked Cllr Liston what was happening about the plan to allow a drop-off area at the parking at Leuchars Station? Cllr Liston in reply thought the modifications were due to happen to have spaces for drop off instead of longer-term parking. Dr Goudie confirmed that the changes had not taken place yet and thought they should happen ASAP. Cllr Liston agreed to check the state of the plans.

4.1.7. Rusty Railings Query

Mrs Harding asked what was happening to replace or repair rusty railings she'd identified in various locations such as the Scores and by the old railway line. Cllr Liston took a note of the locations mentioned by Mrs Harding and commented that she thought this was something that Clean and Green sometimes did but would make enquires.

4.2. Dominic Nolan

4.3. Brian Thomson

4.3.1. Vandalism in the Lade Braes

Cllr Thomson reported that there had been some more vandalism in the Lade Braes with graffiti over the pumping station at Canongate and bin sleeves removed from litter bins and probably dumped in the stream and not recoverable. He urged anyone who might have an idea about the perpetrators to report to the police. He had reported the matter to the police and Fife Council.

4.3.2. Bins Issue

Cllr Thomson has been continuing to check upon the bins situation to ensure that efforts by Fife Council officials don't fall by the wayside. He felt that there had been a slight worsening again since officials had reported an improvement at the last meeting. He urged members to take photos of rogue bins and report them to officials. He then mentioned the issue of bins in parking spaces with Mitchells appearing to be particularly guilty of taking up one and sometimes two parking spaces. He had however received copies of correspondence to another local business, which appeared to indicate that Transportation Services had given special

permission for Mitchells to park their bins in the spaces. He was doubtful of the validity of this arrangement. He added that while his long-term desire would be to see Market Street pedestrianised he didn't feel that it was appropriate to see car parking spaces utilised for bins. He would be speaking to officials on this matter.

4.3.3. HMO Report

Cllr Thomson informed the meeting that there was a report prepared for Fife Council on this issue by a consultancy called Northstar. Councillors had seen the report but for some unknown reason were not being allowed to divulge the contents to the public at this time. He hoped the report would become public in February. He hoped the NE Fife Area Committee with a view to deciding about the way to deal with HMOs in the future would consider it. He added that there was another report prepared by an St Andrews University academic, which had been in the national press talking about the studentification of St Andrews. He said he agreed with some elements of the report but he thought it was based on flawed evidence. The information had been based on an FOI request, which the author had put to Fife Council. He knew that a lot of the data was incorrect as much of the HMO data related to renewals not new applications and also to supported residences such as Glebe Road. Mrs Harding commented on the fact that a lot of student residences didn't need HMO status as they only had two students in them. He didn't know if that was being taken into account in any official response.

4.3.6. Potholes

Cllr Thomson commented upon the increase in potholes, partly due to the winter weather. He gave out a number, which members of the public could call if they felt that a pothole was a danger – 03451550011.

4.3.7. Proposed Crossing Points - Church Street & Argyle Street Car Park Traffic Control Proposal

Cllr Thomson reported that there was a proposal by officers to install two Zebra Crossings at either end of the street. He acknowledged that there were mixed feelings about the proposal. He was keen to hear the CC views on that proposal. Ms Adam wondered if there would be any consultation on this proposal? In response Cllr Thomson informed the meeting that Fife Council officers have a duty to monitor road safety and if they think that a location requires a better way to manage the issue of road safety they come up with proposals. In this case officers had worked up the idea and approached Councillors for their view. If the CC approved the idea Councillors would take the idea back to officials and it would be included in the Area Works Programme for 2018-19. He wasn't certain if the type of work would be subject to a Traffic Regulation Order, but if so it would then go to formal consultation. The Argyle Street Car Park plans would not be subject to a TRO, as the Council own the car park. Councillors would decide a decision on the progress of the Argyle Street Car Park proposal. Ms Adam queried the possible outcome of this proposal. Cllr Thomson thought that bollards might be installed. Mrs Harding commented that many local residents weren't certain that bollards were a good idea. Cllr Thomson acknowledged that Councillors had to weigh up all angles and take a decision.

Mr Munn asked if the car park was classified as a road, but Cllr Thomson confirmed it was a only a car park. Miss Uprichard thought that the proposals for both areas were not sensible and would potentially cause more problems. Cllr Thomson reminded the meeting that the Argyle Street issue had been raised to two previous Councillors and it had been raised at a past CC meeting in relation to concerns about speed at that car park. This had led to the original proposal.

Mr McLeod commented that Cllrs Thomson and Liston would want to take back the CC view on these proposals. Cllr Liston informed the meeting that the Church Street proposal wouldn't happen if there were no support for it as there were competing proposals to which the budget could be redirected. Mr McLeod sought members' views on the idea. Mr Cunningham-Dobson commented that currently pedestrians often absorbed in their phones crossed without due consideration for motorists. He felt that the proposal would cause traffic problems and suggested as a compromise that a crossing mid way along might be more sensible. He commented as well on the need to educate pedestrians in their responsibilities. He felt that

more crossings were not a good option. Mr Jardine thought that the various crossings currently in place worked against each other but thought that to make crossings safe lights should control them. He thought that this would reduce the problem of people crossing without due attention. He recognised that it might be problematic to set up more lights because of financial pressures on Fife Council.

Mr Newman proposed a motion supported by Miss Uprichard not to have any change in the current situation on Church Street. The meeting supported the view that there shouldn't be any new crossings in Church Street.

4.3.8. Tree in Ladebraes

Dr Shepherd commented upon a tree in the Lade Braes, which he believed was dead with bark falling off it into the path. He was concerned that branches could fall off and hurt someone. It was located near Cockshaugh Park. Cllr Thomson agreed to report the tree to the relevant Fife Council officer.

4.4. Ann Verner

No report

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Planning Committee Reports

Miss Uprichard informed the meeting that the Planning Committee had a meeting on 11th December. The committee looked at 20 applications objected to 3. She added that after that meeting they had the news that the West Port pergola had finally been refused by the Reporter. She hadn't had a reply to a query about the removal of sand at the West Sands as it was indicated online as CASE CLOSED and she didn't know what that meant. She asked the Fife Councillors for clarification on that statement. Cllr Liston explained that this matter came up at the West Sands Management Group as a request for taking sand and the meeting had agreed it was alright. She explained that there had been previous removal of sand and SNH she thought had no objection. She had queried the matter as she recognised that removal of sand at beaches could occasionally cause problems. She had been reassured that the removal wasn't going to cause a problem. Cllr Liston later read out a brief summary of the application detailing the location of extraction and the way in which the sand would be extracted to minimise any environmental damage. She reassured Miss Uprichard that the dunes would not be affected by the extraction.

Miss Uprichard commented that she'd had a letter indicating that in future the Sands Meeting would only consist of Councillors and officials which she thought was a retrograde step.

The other objections, which the Planning Committee had sent in, included a plan for the erection of a house in the Lade Braes on what she described as a very small strip of land.

The committee had a second meeting in December because of the large quantity of documents on the web in relation to the roundabout and link road for the new Madras and the Western development. After long discussion, the Planning Committee recommended to the full Community Council that a formal objection should be made on two points, one choosing Route B also disagreeing with the proposal for a Toucan Crossing which the committee thought wasn't very safe for pupils cutting across to Station Park. In addition Miss Uprichard informed the meeting that 6 CC members had put in personal objections. She emphasised that these were personal objections not from the CC or the Planning Committee.

Mr Roberts started by commenting that the CC had had a lot of bad press. He added that the CC knew the reasons why the objection had been submitted by 6 CCs but the impression given to the public was that the CC were objecting to the new school despite the fact that there hasn't actually been an application for the school submitted to date. He felt that the CC should be doing something to make it clear that the CC as a whole did not at this point in time have an objection to the new school. Mr Roberts asked the meeting to confirm for the record that the CC had no current policy as a group to object to the application for the new school at this time. Mr McLeod summarised the situation as follows: "We support the unification of the

two Madras sites on to a single site. In May the CC took part in the educational consultation at which the question was ‘Do you support the proposal to relocate Madras College from the existing school sites to a new single site at Langlands?’ Mr McLeod noted that the CC answered yes to that question. He reminded the meeting that the CC had publicised on its Facebook page all the consultation meetings organised by Fife Council and had not objected in principle to the roundabout and the road but felt that the road should be on the other side of the pond for a range of reasons. Mr Cunningham Dobson commented that he had as a new CC member been shocked by some of the comments on social media which he viewed as abusive and ignorant of the actual views of the CC. He accepted that people were entitled to express their views but thought that they needed to be educated a bit better in understanding the true facts rather than the incorrect facts they were basing their views upon. Mrs Corbin informed Mr Cunningham Dobson that the CC had been subject to much abuse since the Madras saga had started. She emphasised the desire of the CC to get the best outcome for the children and their education and hoped that Fife Council would make a better job of the new project.

6. Matters Arising

6.0. Holy Trinity Church Working Group

Mr McLeod reported on the progress in setting up this working group, which he will attend. The first meeting is to be on 23rd of January and he’d report back to the CC’s internal group looking at how the CC could support the Church. Dr Goudie thought that it might be better if the CC had a thought out position before the meeting. Mr McLeod agreed to call a meeting of CC members interested in taking part in working out the CC views.

6.1. Reports from Representatives

6.2. St Andrews Entry Way Signposts

Dr Shepherd advised the meeting that he thought that Mr Stanis-Traken’s idea of a short life-working group was the best way forward. Mr Stanis-Traken read out a note he’d written earlier in relation to the signposts. “I have noted the designs recently circulated by Dr Shepherd and Mr Greenwell plus associated correspondence. As a town of immense historical importance where the lack of historical, cultural and heritage signage is surprising, this is something upon which many visitors remark. The A91 gateway would benefit from a streamlining of the current overabundance of signage cluttering up the Station Park approaches and as Dr Shepherd has already identified, Links Crescent. I agree with and express a desire in being involved with developing new entry way signage and as an historian there are aspects I feel I could bring to this project that would I think strengthen and enhance the existing proposals”. He confirmed the idea of setting up a short life-working group to study and progress possible alternatives to the current plethora of signage to make the entry to St Andrews more dignified. He added that he had his own ideas for the signage. He saw this as part of a larger town entryway project.

Mr McLeod asked how the group should be set up and suggested a show of hands to allow members to indicate if they wished to become involved. Mr McLeod suggested the possibility of the Loches Alliance being invited to participate, but after some discussion it was agreed that whether this would be appropriate would be discussed within the working group.

Mr Roberts reminded the meeting that in respect of the brown and white signs the organisations involved have paid for the signs to be erected, which had been accredited by Visit Scotland and approved by Fife Council. He thought that there might be some resistance if there was any suggestion to removing or moving the signs. Dr Shepherd wondered if there was a planning issue in relation to the installation of the signs? Mr Roberts replied that no planning permission was required but the organisation had to be accredited by Visit Scotland and then he thought Fife Council transport officers usually made the decision about the erection of the signage at specific locations, not necessarily close to the actual venue advertised. The CC has no input in the decision about the signs.

Mr Stanis-Traken commented that he recognised there would be obstacles and barriers but thought that it was worth drawing up something in principle that the CC would like to see taken forward for consideration.

Mr Roberts advised the meeting that a lot of the work talked about had been worked up by St Andrews Partnership and he thought that this would be helpful to the group.

6.3. Whyte-Melville Fountain

Mr Stanis-Traken reminded the meeting about problems with the fountain since its reactivation in 2015. He and Cllr Liston after protracted correspondence eventually met with two Fife Council Property Services officers on the 8th December. He was hopeful that many of the technical and other issues delaying the proper working of the fountain would be resolved and he'd keep the CC abreast of developments.

6.4. Marriage Registration

Mr Stanis-Traken reported that he'd emailed Fife Council expressing the CCs concern about the cessation of marriage registration in St Andrews. None of the officials including the Chief Executive of Fife Council have so far responded to his email sent after the November CC meeting. Cllr Liston expressed disappointment at the lack of response. She agreed to try and get a response to this query.

6.5. Any Other Matters Arising

6.5.1. Waste Management Workshop

Mrs Harding queried the situation regarding attendance at this workshop. Mr McLeod acknowledged the potential value of this workshop and informed the meeting the Mr Greenwell had expressed an interest in attending. He thought that there would be more than one space for CC members wishing to attend. Mrs Harding expressed an interest in attending.

7. Committee Reports

7.1. Recreation Committee

Mr Jardine reported no recent meetings but would have a meeting at the end of January on this years plans. He also thanked Recreation Committee members for their work in making the various activities successes. He also expressed an interest in attending the Principal's Town & Gown Reception. He felt that it was important to have the town/gown liaison. He had been delighted at the input of students at the Old Folks Treat and thought they had been a great help.

The dates and venues for the various activities in 2018 have been booked. He appealed for more members.

7.2. GP Meeting

No meeting

7.3. 200 Club

1st Mrs K Watson 2nd Sir M Bonallack 3rd Dr J Mills

7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee

No report

7.5. Rail Committee

Nothing to add to report circulated earlier in the day.

8. New Business

8.1. St Andrews Space for Cycling

Mr McLeod reminded the meeting that Mr Tony Waterston had circulated a request to speak to the CC to update it on the campaign's progress and plans. Mr McLeod reminded the meeting of the previous presentation by Professor Sam Taylor and the funding given towards the 1st public meeting. He asked the CC if it wished to hear an update at the February meeting. Mrs Harding thought that it was a bit premature to hear from the group until there was something more concrete to hear. Mr Munn asked if it was the same gentleman who had criticised the CC in relation to the cycle racks proposals and the Planning Committee comments on those proposals. Mr McLeod confirmed that it was Mr Waterston and he'd had subsequent correspondence to try and clear up his misunderstanding, which had led to his critical letter in the press. Dr Shepherd suggested that the group send the CC a summary document of their progress. Mr McLeod asked the members if this was an acceptable request and it was agreed to ask the group to send in their report instead of giving a presentation. Cllr Liston suggested that SASC wanted to feel that they had the support of the CC, as they wouldn't be able to make any progress without this support. She felt that it was a bit of a chicken and egg situation arising as she thought the group wanted to have backing from the CC in order to be able to make progress. Dr Goudie felt that it might have been better if the group representative had made any public apology for their misunderstanding as well. Dr Shepherd suggested that in relation to presentations it might be good if the presenter forwarded a copy of their presentation as this might help shorten the time taken to present the facts and get a decision made by the CC. Mr Newton wondered what form of support SASC expected the CC to give it? Cllr Liston thought that the group just wanted to know that the CC supported what the group wanted to do in the town. She also felt that it was still useful to have a group representative at a meeting to answer questions which might arise from a study of any documentation sent to the CC. Dr Goudie thought that it would still be necessary to see documentation in advance to allow members to assess and consider if they might be achievable and what the problems might be in trying to implement any vision for the future. He added that it wasn't as easy to think of relevant questions in a presentation unless information was given beforehand.

Mr McLeod said he'd write to the group asking if they could send more detailed information about their plans before deciding whether a presentation would be required.

8.2. Greyfriars Gardens

Mr McLeod introduced the topic of plans to look at putting in a note of interest in relation to the garden at the beginning of Greyfriars Gardens by a local group of concerned individuals. The group was seeking the support in principle of the CC in relation to their aims. The group was seeking under recent legislation to try and purchase the garden, which the owner has refused to sell and is objecting to the request made by the group to the Scottish Government. Mr Roberts indicated that he supported the group's efforts, as he was aware of the long history in relation to the garden. Dr Shepherd felt that it was a "no brainer" to support this request. Mr Jardine wondered about the motivation of the group in trying to buy the garden and how they would maintain it and what would happen to it in the future. He supported the idea in principle but required clarification on the group's plans. Mr McLeod advised the meeting that the group had set up a limited company to own the land if successfully purchased. He didn't think that the garden would be at risk of being sold on if purchased by this group. Cllr Liston commented upon the proposal as an example of the community right to buy based on recent legislation. She added that she had been aware of the controversy in relation to the site for many years. She made the meeting aware that the application to the Scottish Government didn't guarantee success as the Scottish Government had turned down two other applications under the legislation. Mrs Corbin gave the meeting more information on past attempts by herself and others to buy the site and keep it tidy without any real success due to the owner's refusal to sell. Dr Shepherd thought that the group were being community minded in their attempt to purchase the garden. Mr Stanis-Traken supported the comments of Cllr Liston and Dr Shepherd and added that his understanding was that new legislation had been introduced to allow a community buy out. He thought that the plans of the group for the garden were very pleasing and what he'd like to see being done with that corner. He confirmed Mrs Corbin's comments about the association of the area with Mary Queen of Scots. He felt that it should

be possible to express some sort of support in principle and stating what that support actually means.

Mr Jardine felt that the CC needed to be cautious about supporting something like this before getting more details to allow an educated assessment of the potential outcome. Mr McLeod advised that the time was limited, as the Scottish Government required the letter of support by 18th January. He didn't think there was any risk in supporting the idea in principle.

Cllr Thomson informed the meeting that the Preservation Trust had obtained planning permission for doing something to the garden a number of years ago and he thought that these might be the same plans. A few years ago there had been a donor willing to give the Preservation Trust money to purchase the site but the owner wouldn't sell. At that time legislation didn't allow use of a CPO to purchase the site but the new legislation might allow such a purchase. He thought there would be a lot of local support to have the site purchased and developed for public use. Dr Shepherd informed the meeting that the plans were new not the old plans. He also felt that Mr Wynd's letter was detailed and understandable enough to allow a decision to support the plan and have a letter sent from the CC to back the proposal. Mr McLeod agreed to write the letter of support.

8.3. Storehouse Trolley

Mr McLeod got approval in relation to expenditure for the Storehouse Trolley.

8.4. Cathedral Lighting Working Group

Mr McLeod announced that a working group was being set up to look at and revive the idea of the cathedral lighting. Mr Lindsey Matheson is heading up the group, which is a sub group of t Andrews Partnership, and he has invited the CC to have a representative. He added that it was to look at a more traditional lighting approach to the cathedral. Mr Cunningham Dobson agreed to attend the group's next meeting on behalf of the CC, after he'd mentioned a possible issue of lighting in the cathedral affecting navigation in the area. Miss Uprichard asked about the proposed cost of the project as she noted that last time only a small percentage of funds had been raised before the project was put in abeyance. Mr Roberts confirmed that some of these funds were still available and the Partnership had decided to have a fresh look at the idea. Mr Matheson had offered to chair the group. Miss Uprichard said she still opposed the idea on grounds of light pollution and she felt that there had been over optimistic forecasts about the amount of visitors it would attract. Dr Goudie felt that the light pollution issue should be considered apart from any other environmental concerns about more waste of electricity. He wasn't against occasional lighting up of the cathedral. Mr McLeod finished the discussion by reminding members that being on a body did not mean the CC was committing itself to unthinking support.

8.5. Principal's Town & Gown Reception

Mrs Harding asked about the reception, which had been circulated, to CC members by email. Mr McLeod informed the meeting that Mr Marks and Mr Jardine had offered to attend on behalf of the CC.

8.6. Question from Member of the Public about CC decision-making procedures

Mrs Sue Armstrong said that she was interested to see that the CC arrives at consensus decisions amongst the Councillors. She wondered what survey methods the CC used to determine the views of constituents? She understood that some things due to short timescale might only be able to be decided by committee but for things with a longer timescale what survey methods were used?

Miss Uprichard explained that as far as Planning went they couldn't survey partly due to the large number of people living in the St Andrews area. She added that when a planning application was made it was announced by Fife Council and they do the consultation. She felt that it wouldn't be appropriate for the CC to carry out another consultation in that type of

case. She didn't know how the CC would be able to contact the whole of the local voting population.

Mr McLeod emphasised that it was important that the CC was representative of age range, gender etc. He felt that it was also important to gauge from the local press etc the local mood on topics. The CC was featured in the St Andrews in Focus magazine distributed to all households in St Andrews and people could contact him as well from the contact details in his article for that magazine. He acknowledged that getting a view of a representative percentage of local residents was easier in small villages, less so in a large and diverse community like St Andrews. He added that the CC tried to be representative as possible, coming where possible to a consensus.

Mr Newman explained that on the Planning Committee members were only expressing a view but did put quite a lot of effort into researching applications. However he added the CC views could be ignored by Fife Council but if the CC objected then legally the application had to be discussed at the Fife Council Area Planning meeting. This then meant that the Fife Councillors would get more opportunity to discuss more applications and then make a decision.

Mrs Armstrong thanked the meeting but thought that in these times of free surveys and free opportunities to collect opinions by social media that something constructive could be done without needing financial resources. She did take the point that time could be of the essence with some decisions to be made.

Dr Goudie commented that in terms of the recent debates the greatest misunderstanding is the belief in some of these social media correspondences that the CC were determining planning applications. He also gave some historical background into how the ability of the CC to influence Council decision-making had changed since the time of District Councils to the current set up. Years ago he thought that the CC views were more respected by District Councillors but with the new planning structures such as development plans opportunities to have much influence had massively reduced. He added that the view amongst social media users that the CC had a serious influence in decision-making was in his view misguided. He felt that it was therefore not worth expending a lot of energy obtaining views if officials were going to ignore them.

He reminded the meeting that just over half the population of the town was students and there could be debate about how much this transient part of the population should have influence upon the future of the town. He felt that a key statistic was that a very small percentage of the population lived in households with children and as a result he felt that some of the numbers which had been quoted about those in favour of developments like Madras could be misleading and might not reflect other elements of the town population. His view as a statistician would be that you had to weigh up the various segments of the town and take into account that sort of information rather than attempting to hold surveys on individual issues.

Mrs Armstrong thanked Dr Goudie but agreed that there was a lot of naivety in the community and misinformation in relation to the purpose of bodies such as the CC.

9. Reports from Office Bearers

9.1. Chair

Mr McLeod thanked Cllr Liston for providing the refreshments at the end of the December meeting. Since that meeting Mr McLeod reported he'd attended the Leuchars Army Base Carol Service at Holy Trinity Church. He'd assisted at the Community Hub Christmas Lunch in St Andrews Church Hall and had taken part in the Hub Group's Carol Singing Walk as part of their bid to get a base near the Spar Shop in the former pub currently a sort of privately run drop in centre called Nibbles & Giggles. He had the honour of being the judge for the BID Best Dressed Xmas Window Competition.

He then mentioned the email from the Community Hub a few weeks ago and their hope in taking over the premises as a base for their activities. They were asking for support from the CC for their plan to take on the lease of the premises. There were some concerns about the possible business plan and Mr McLeod commented upon the lease costs of £10000 for a quarter and £25000 for a year. He asked for member's thoughts. Mrs Harding said they hadn't issued anything specific in writing about the plans and she wondered about possible alternative venues. She wasn't certain whether there would be enough local people to support the plan. She cited a lunch group at Hope Park Church, which had started with serving lunches 5 days a week but this had reduced to 2 days per week due to a lack of support. Mr McLeod advised that the group had a £10000 pledge but this wouldn't last more than a quarter as noted earlier. Mr Newton commented that he'd done a lot of work in setting up charities in the past and said he wouldn't dream of asking for money until there was a clear plan of how funds would be expended. He added that supporting the idea was fine but lack of concrete detail concerned him. Mr McLeod thought it was a good location to meet the needs of local people needing that sort of support. Mr McLeod wondered if he could say to the group that the CC supported their aims and objectives but it wasn't on a scale the CC would have anticipated. He asked the meeting whether the CC should possibly give more tangible support such as financial assistance? Mrs Fraser said she didn't know what the objectives were and that greater clarity she felt was needed before making a decision. Mr McLeod reminded the meeting that we'd supported the group when it had first come to the CC. Dr Shepherd accepted that more information needed to be seen and Mrs Corbin thought that the CC needed to see a formal business plan.

9.2. Treasurer

The December accounts are on the CC website and Mr Munn reminded the meeting that he'd sent an email recently with details about the balances on the accounts. He had also asked for details of money raising ideas or projects to which money could be allocated before the end of the financial year. Mr McLeod wondered about considering the microphone situation again given the healthy state of CC funds. Mr Roberts queried the need to spend funds and Mr Munn explained that there was a formula in the Information Pack which stated that the grant from Fife Council would be determined partly if the cumulative balance of the surplus funds being carried forward exceeded three times the annual grant. However the booklet seems to indicate that the surplus funds may relate to the grant money given not funds raised separately by the CC itself. Mr Roberts didn't think that the current balance was an issue and that the CC needed to suddenly spend a large part of the funds to meet any Fife Council requirements. He recollected a previous time when the CC had £16000 in the bank accounts and this had been used up within months because of a legal issue at the time. Miss Uprichard suggested that the CC could spend some of its funds replacing the seats in the Lade Braes when it is upgraded. Cllr Thomson commented that the Council as part of the planned work would replace some of the benches but he'd be happy to give the CC a contact in the Council to discuss a possible contribution towards the benches.

9.3. Membership Secretary

No report

9.4. Secretary

See correspondence in agenda.

10. Any Other Competent Business