

# Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

## Provisional Minutes – June 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/>)*

### 1. Attendance

Patrick Marks, Zoe Smith, Larry Reid, Ken Fraser, Marysia Denyer, Catherine Rowe, Ian Goudie, Derek Skelhon, Ray Pead, Kyffin Roberts, Penny Uprichard

### Students' Association Representatives

Matthew Guest

### Nominated

### Fife Councillors

Frances Melville, Bill Sangster, Robin Waterston, Dorothea Morrison

### Apologies

Ken Crichton, Judith Harding, Dave Finlay, Henry Paul, Jill Harding, Holly West, Fiona Kingston, Jude Innes

### 2. Minutes of May 2009 Meeting

The minutes of the May meeting were accepted as correct.

### 3. Presentations

#### 3.1. Caroline Ward

Caroline explained the set up of her charity, LINK, which she described as a befriending project. It had links with relevant professional statutory bodies, such as CPNs, Mental Health Social Work & Weston Day Hospital. The Charity befriends one to one anyone referred who has suffered ongoing mental health problems, the idea being to take such people out to engage in community activities. She described the problems such people face, namely low self-esteem, social isolation and similar problems. Volunteers would engage in anything the person might be prepared to try, which might include something as simple as going for a coffee or a walk, or buddying to a drop-in centre etc.

The project has been going for 10 years and they have 16 volunteers, 70% of whom have suffered mental health problems themselves. 10% of the people the Charity befriends go on to become volunteers. She viewed the concept of the charity as simple but also very powerful. Tasks undertaken ranged from very simple to quite complex according to the need of those receiving the service. She reminded the meeting that 1:4 people would experience some form of mental health problems in their lives. She felt that stigma was breaking down. Befriending she reiterated was a very powerful tool, helping to improve the confidence of the users of the service in many ways.

She acknowledged that they were desperate for money and faced increasing difficulties, partly due to the diversion of lottery funds to the Olympics and the general reduction from other Government sources. A considerable part of her job had to be devoted to seeking funds.

Ms Smith in initial reply corrected Ms Ward's impression about the money available from the Community Council. She advised Ms Ward that unfortunately since the production of the notice, which had implied the Community Council had funds, the financial situation had changed and there wasn't money available from the main funds. However after discussion it was suggested that an application could be made to the 200 Club for a small grant. Ms Smith also offered to assist with fundraising if any was to be organised. In reply to a question about the Charity's present funding sources she replied that they had about five sources, which included Fife Council. Mr Marks asked if the Charity applied to any of the local solicitor's trusts, which they administered. Ms Smith thanked Ms Ward for her presentation.

### **3.2. Presentation on the Future of Aikman's Bar**

A delegation from users/employees of Aikman's Bar in Bell Street spoke about the recent closure of that long established independent bar. The bar was one of the last independent pubs in St Andrews and had a long established and loyal community of regulars, It was also the only bar to have regular live music more than once a week. The closure was due to mismanagement, because the owner had been distracted by family problems and had underestimated the time allowed to pay outstanding debts. The speaker, Gregor added that it was the only pub in St Andrews licensed to stay open after midnight, thus catering for shift workers, who would go in for a drink and something to eat. Gregor had started a facebook petition to save Aikmans and it had already attracted over 2500 names, which he felt demonstrated the affection people held for the pub. He felt that the owner had helped to create a real sense of community, which he'd never experienced in any other pub. He was concerned that the pub could be turned into another theme pub, which wouldn't have the atmosphere or the loyalty to its customers. He said that there had been a rumour about trying to get it under co-operative ownership. He had come to the meeting to get a feeling of how the Council would view the situation.

Ms Smith asked about the current position of the pub financially. Gregor replied that there was a £11000 bill, which had not been dealt with when required. When the final demand came in the owner had assumed that she had 28 days to pay, but the order was for payment in 7 days, so the pub was closed down. Ironically the debt was the business rates due to Fife Council, which the owner distracted by family problems had failed to pay. The pub had been profitable when shut down. It was hoped that the pub could be kept going as an independent concern with all its activities as before.

Ms Smith said that it would be sad if one of the last independent pubs in town were shut down. The meeting was asked if the Community Council could give support to those trying to take on the running of the pub. There were plans to approach Price Waterhouse Cooper with a show of interest in taking on the licence, so a show of local support from a body such as the Community Council might be helpful. Ms Smith agreed that the Community Council could discuss that idea.

### **3.3. Presentation on the Disposal of the Memorial Hospital**

Steven Cameron from Drivers Jonas LLP and Jim Leiper from NHS Fife attended to give the presentation. Mr. Leiper described how NHS Fife had taken on Drivers Jonas to market the Memorial Hospital. He explained that there would be public consultation, as part of the process of determining the way in which, proposed ideas for the site would be forwarded.

Mr. Cameron described how his company had been instructed by NHS Fife to market and dispose of the Memorial Hospital. Part of that process would be to establish the best use for the site, in keeping with planning policy of Fife Council. Last year they'd undertaken an options appraisal to examine various possible land uses of the site. The eventual chosen option was one of residential use. At present the firm are drafting up the scheme with architects, with a view to obtaining outline planning permission. The existing hospital would be removed from the site. The replacement buildings are proposed to be two four-storey blocks of flats. A mix of two and three bed-roomed flats was proposed. He mentioned that there would be affordable housing according to local policy and indeed he calculated that their present quota was for more than the 30% required by Fife Council. He felt that disposal of the site with outline planning permission would restrict potential developers to respect the proposals. At present the plans were for 36 flats. There would be 16 two bed roomed flats and 20 three bed roomed flats, with 60 parking spaces. The layout would be a t-shape due to the shape of the site.

Ms Rowe asked of the flats would be affordable or social housing? In reply Mr. Cameron said that they were looking at how they could accommodate affordable housing within the development. Ms Rowe thought that the development would be ideal for retired persons or families with one child. Ms Smith and Ms Rowe emphasised the need to clearly define affordability, given the nature of the demand for housing in St Andrews. There was a difference between affordable to buy and social rented housing. Mr. Cameron felt that the outline planning permission would be an important aspect of future development but passed

the decision as to what conditions would be set as to what affordable meant to Fife Council. He felt that in the end it was up to the developer in discussion with Fife Council how to deliver the affordable flats. He mentioned interest shown by Kingdom Housing.

Ms Uprichard expressed concern about the exit from the site, this being on a busy bend. Mr. Cameron replied that the access had been designed in consultation with Fife Roads Department. She was also concerned from past experience about the way outline planning permission could be misinterpreted by developers. Mr. Cameron felt that what might be built could be controlled. What they were proposing was an indicative layout. He felt that the Council could control the eventual development in a variety of ways from numbers to layout etc.

Mr. Fraser sought clarification on the number of affordable properties, noting that 30% of 36 was 11 flats. Mr. Cameron acknowledged that point. A question was also asked about a possible price for the site. Mr. Leiper said that they'd be partly dependent upon the district valuer for an idea, but hoped that they could get a good return for the public purse.

Ms Rowe expressed further concern about the true affordability of the flats to those genuinely in need, noting that current prices were forcing many young couples to go out of the town. She related her own experience in trying to afford a flat when she returned to St Andrews four years ago. She sold a Victorian House in England, but couldn't afford a one bed roomed flat in St Andrews. Mr. Leiper acknowledged the problem, but said that NHS Fife couldn't control property prices within St Andrews.

Ms Smith said she'd be disappointed to see 36 flats on the site, feeling it to be excessive. She felt that most would be second homes or student accommodation within a short time of going on the market. She didn't think that the Community Council could support the proposal as it stood, given the way in which so called affordable housing rapidly became unaffordable to those in genuine need. Mr. Cameron replied that there were different ways and mechanisms to supply affordable housing. Ms Smith emphasized the need for social housing as opposed to affordable housing. She thought that what was being proposed would be more akin to the properties built nearby, rather than housing for those requiring something they could afford. Mr. Cameron replied that Kingdom Housing was one of the interested parties and they had a record of supplying rented housing. Ms Smith replied that while she recognized that he'd been speaking to Kingdom, he had also been in contact with private developers, so there was no guarantee that the site would go to a social housing agency. Mr. Leiper said that they would be following Scottish Government guidelines in marketing the site and the keenest bid would win.

Ms Smith then stated that as the proposal stood she didn't think the Community Council would agree to it. Mr. Cameron asked for the basis of opposing the proposals. Ms Smith felt that there were too many flats for the site and properties didn't meet current housing need in the area. Ms Smith added that it was a sensitive site and felt that it couldn't just be sold to the highest bidder. She thought that there would be opposition to the site being developed as proposed.

Mr. Pead asked if any other uses of the site had been considered. Mr. Cameron replied that an options appraisal had been carried out last year with Fife Council for possible uses of the site. After the study residential development was considered the best option. Mr. Cameron acknowledged that Industrial or commercial use had been considered but dismissed as inappropriate for the site. Mr. Pead mentioned the need of the Cosmos Centre for a new centre. Mr Cameron acknowledged that leisure had been considered in the proposals, but had not been considered the way to get the best value for the public purse. Mr. Pead expressed his disappointment at the loss of the opportunity.

Ms Uprichard made comments about the affordable housing issue. Mr. Cameron replied that the development would ensure 30% affordable housing. Ms Smith commented that 100% affordable housing was ideally required. Mr. Leiper added that Fife's policy was more generous than many other councils in relation to the percentage of affordable housing.

Ms Smith concluded that the proposals would be opposed as they stood. Mr. Leiper thanked the Community Council for the comments, which he take back to his Board.

## **4. Fife Councillors**

### **4.1. Frances Melville**

#### **4.1.1 Flooding Problems – Pilmour Links**

There has been an ongoing problem in this area, now acknowledged by Scottish Water. However the work will not be undertaken until 2010 due to the Open. Cllr Melville added that the possible solutions were

#### **4.1.2. Traffic Regulation Order – Lawhead Primary School**

An order had been published for a possible traffic order in relation to parking outside Lawhead Primary School. This has been a long-standing issue, and may now have to involve yellow lines due to the ongoing problems.

#### **4.1.3. 20 Mph Restrictions Query**

Dr Goudie queried issues to do with the working of the 20 mph lights around Lawhead School, which he thought weren't working according to an agreed formula. The Planning Committee had got the impression that the lights would be on for half an hour in the morning and similarly in the afternoon at the end of school. He'd however got the impression that they appeared to be on for much longer and were also not programmed for the current school year. Cllr Melville acknowledged the problem and agreed to check it out.

#### **4.1.4. Litter Issue around Crawford Gardens/John Knox Road**

Mr Skelhon raised the issue of a change in the working set up for the Council staffs who regularly deal with the litter created by the pupils at lunchtimes. Staff may no longer be able to cover the area regularly due to a change in shift patterns according to Mr Skelhon. Mr Skelhon felt that after the summer holidays it would continue to be a mess, unless the service provided could be continued as at present. Mrs Denyer seconded Mr Skelhon's plea. Several members expressed concern about the situation. Cllr Melville commented that as far as she was aware schools taught pupils about their responsibilities in relation to issue such as litter disposal. She added that she'd contact Environmental Services on the matter. Mr Skelhon listed his attempts to resolve the problem, including emailing the rector at Madras College, but felt he received a less than adequate reply. He'd also had a visit from the Schools Liaison Officer, but had also felt it a waste of time. Ms Smith asked Cllr Melville if she could feed back to Fife Council concern about the changes in shift patterns, which might result in less staff available to clean up after the Madras School children. She also pointed out the need for a combined look at the problem. Mr Skelhon didn't feel that the Rector, Mr Jones was taking the issue seriously. Cllr Morrison added that she got the same complaint about pupils in the South Street part of Madras College. She also acknowledged the broader extent of the problem. In South Street pupils over the age of 16 could be prosecuted, but the relevant authorities appear reluctant to go down that route. Cllr Morrison added that she'd like to see the school charged for the cost of clearance, to see how that might affect attitudes in senior management. Mr Skelhon informed the meeting that if the police see pupils dropping litter, they take the errant pupil's details and write to their parents. He felt that the policy was not working. Ms Smith acknowledged that there was a problem and asked the Councillors to take it back to Fife Council for further consideration about the cleaning schedule.

Cllr Sangster mentioned a new cleaning programme to be setting up soon in which teams of street cleaners would be sent from area to area. They would be given a cleaning schedule. Ms Smith commented that that wouldn't necessarily address the Madras problem. Ms Smith suggested that the Community Council write to the rector of Madras College to mention that the issue had been raised and that we would be keen to help come to a solution, with the pupils and the staff. She suggested a possible litter pick with the students or photographing the amount of litter deposited on a typical lunchtime. Mrs Denyer felt that the school had responsibility to manage the issue. Cllr Morrison mentioned a project in which the Preservation Trust had given Madras College £500 pa for 2 years as part of a project to clean up the South Street school area. Unfortunately the follow on after two years has not demonstrated an improvement from the school. Mr Marks added that the Parent Governors and the PTA should be asked to discuss the problem with senior school staff. He suggested that Mr Paul could be asked to tackle this when he returned home. Mr Skelhon felt that the problem was reaching a crescendo and Mr Pead added that he felt it was only part of a larger problem of litter management and education. He felt that the matter of rubbish collection had to be examined. The problem in town centre flats relates to the ongoing use of plastic bags, which are easily torn open by seagulls and other scavengers. Cllr Melville commented on the use of the waste management gang

from Fife Council. Ms Smith felt that litter was an issue of personal responsibility. Ms Uprichard added her experience of litter being left to accumulate at Hepburn Hall. She felt it reflected badly on the image of the town.

Cllr Sangster added that Fife Council will only pick up rubbish bagged in Fife Council marked bags and will leave rubbish in unmarked bags. He felt that this needed to be emphasised by the University to its students amongst others in flats, which have black bag collection. The matter where it relates to the University will be brought up at the next Town and Gown Liaison Meeting. Matthew informed the meeting about the information given out to students in flats. A leaflet gave details of how to dispose of rubbish correctly. He acknowledged that it sometimes took a year or more to sink in. He added that it wasn't only students in HMOs who were responsible for bags being left out and attacked by seagulls!

**Chair or secretary to write to Madras College.**

## **4.2. Bill Sangster**

### **4.2.1 Prices Increases at East Sands Leisure Centre**

A Community Councillor had asked Cllr Sangster about the price increases. He reminded the meeting that the Leisure Centres are now part of the Fife Sports and Leisure Trust. Price changes are a reflection of evening out prices between different centres, a process that will take four years Fife –Wide. He thought that the East Sands Leisure Centre was improving and new equipment is being brought in to upgrade current facilities. Ms Smith felt that it was good value despite the price hikes. Cllr Sangster added that there would be a free kids scheme again this coming summer.

### **4.2.2 Eden Estuary Committee**

Cllr Sangster is on this committee. The committee is looking for volunteers to work on the educational side.

### **4.2.3 Bandstand Concerts**

Cllr Sangster announced that the bands had been booked. The concerts start on 28<sup>th</sup> June with the Tayport Brass Band, the Dysart Colliery Band on the 12<sup>th</sup> July, Steamers Lane on the 6<sup>th</sup> July, plus the St Andrews Pipe Band and a young couple who'd played as a duo previously. Total cost is £900. He is hoping to get posters done free. He has the seating arrangements in place. Mr Pead asked if the poster was available online, which he could put round the hotels. He acknowledged a lack of sponsors at present.

### **4.2.4 Road Works on Largo Road**

Cllr Sangster said that the road works at the roundabout by the new hospital should be completed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> June, but the work nearer Aldi will take another fortnight because it was discovered that the sewage pipe had been joined to the water pipe, an added complication to be resolved.

### **4.2.5. South Castle Street Pavement**

Ms Rowe asked Cllr Sangster for a progress report. Cllr Sangster said it had been reported and he could only think that the Council was waiting to do a larger job of pavement replacement repair hence the delay. Cllr Sangster agreed to check with the Council official involved.

### **4.2.6. Pavement Obstructions**

Ms Rowe mentioned ongoing problems with the pavement by the Criterion due to the Wheelie Bins, tables and chairs and "A" board. Recently she'd been out with a friend and they'd noted that the space for passing was hardly wide enough for a wheelchair. Cllr Sangster commented that there needed to be 2 metres space to allow free passage of pedestrians. He agreed to speak to Transportation on the matter. Cllr Morrison added that she'd emailed the Transportation Dept. She felt that the Criterion needed to be firmly told that it couldn't have both bins and tables/chairs out front, despite their claim that they had no space in the back of the bar to store them.

Ms Rowe also commented on an A Board obstructing the middle of the pavement at the Artex Gallery in South Street. She'd asked the shop assistant to move it mentioning its potential to cause injury to a visually disabled person. She wasn't satisfied with the response and felt that something had to be done about "A" boards causing obstruction.

Cllr Sangster related how several years ago he'd suggested that pavement areas used by shops to put out tables and chairs should be clearly shown by putting metal studs in the pavement, but this idea, which takes place in some places in Europe, was not taken up by Fife Council. He has mentioned it again in recent weeks to officials. Ms Uprichard said that Dundee had a policy about "A" board use, which appeared to work.

### **4.3. Robin Waterston**

#### **4.3.1. Blue Bin at Criterion Bar**

Cllr Waterston was also concerned about the bins parked outside the Criterion Bar. He had hoped recently that the problem had been resolved when the large bin disappeared only to find a few days later that it had been replaced by two smaller bins. He was campaigning again to have them revived, as he understood it wasn't legal for them to be parked on the pavement. He and his colleagues were working to resolve this unsatisfactory situation.

#### **4.3.2. University Development at Greyfriars School**

Conditional planning permission had been recently awarded, but an aspect of the work will need to be changed. The University had allowed their contractor work start before planning permission had been granted, and would now have to get an aspect of the work changed, namely the condition of finishing the work in the same stone as the rest of the building. Unfortunately the University had allowed the contractor to finish the work with a pebbledash render. Fife Council has asked for this to be rectified. He expressed disappointment with the way the University and developer had started work before planning permission had been granted, which was outside the spirit and the letter of the law. To finish work contrary to the requirements in the planning permission also disappointed him and he hoped that the University would comply with the planning conditions. Fife Council's enforcement officer is in negotiation with the contractor on the matter. Ms Smith echoed the disappointment about the University's attitude towards the development of Greyfriars School.

#### **4.3.3. Market Street Exhibition**

Cllr Waterston commented on the response from the public. The comments received are to be considered with a new proposal to be worked up for the summer, after which planning permission will be applied for and a further public consultation. If all goes well work will start in 2010.

#### **4.3.4. West Sands**

Councillors had been shown a recent report on the problems of the far end of the West Sands where an old rubbish dump exists. There has been concern that erosion will expose toxic materials, but surveys have shown that this is not a risk in the short term. Cllr Waterston reassured the meeting that there is no complacency and that monitoring will continue with sample borings of the old dump as required.

### **4.4. Dorothea Morrison**

#### **4.4.1. Sandcastle Competition - West Sands**

Cllr Morrison reported that it was still hoped that there would be a competition this year. The main problem was not financial but in terms of people to assist. She hoped that the Community Council would be able to assist in finding volunteers to assist in the competition. Ms Smith acknowledged the popularity of the event and hoped that it would continue. Mr Guest asked for details to see if he could assist with student volunteers. The event takes place on each Friday of July/August between 10 – 1.

#### **4.4.2. West Sands Toll Charges**

Mr Marks asked if it was correct that the charges are no longer to be levied as the road is to become adopted? He was informed that this would be the case, as entry charges couldn't be levied on an adopted road. Ms Uprichard wondered if the levying of charges in recent years was legal. However despite the doubts on this matter, she acknowledged that it was satisfactory that the charge had been removed.

#### **4.4.3. Seaweed on West Sands**

Cllr Morrison informed the meeting that as a way to try and reduce erosion risks on the West Sands, particularly the far end, the Council would not be removing the seaweed, only man made rubbish.

#### **4.4.4 Green Dog Walkers/ Beach Status**

Cllr Morrison reported that there had been over 30 applications under this scheme, an excellent response to the initiative she thought. Ms Smith acknowledged that she'd heard about the excellent response. Ms Smith added that she felt that Fife Council were doing an excellent job of managing the local beaches despite a misleading report from the Marine Conservation Society on water quality. Cllr Melville acknowledged the compliment and added that once the results from this year's Blue Flag Awards are compiled St Andrews will retain blue flag status for most of its beaches. Cllr Morrison acknowledged the good work of Robbie Blyth in management of the local beaches. Ms Smith added her own compliments about Robbie Blyth's work, feeling that he worked in an imaginative way to get the beaches looking their best.

## **5. Planning Committee**

### **5.0. Planning Committee Meeting with Chris Smith**

Ms Rowe announced that there had been a very constructive meeting between herself, Mrs Denyer, Cllrs Morrison and Waterston and Chris Smith of the Planning Department. Ms Rowe felt that she'd learnt a lot about what the Community Council Planning Committee was supposed to do and not to do. She hoped that the work of the Committee would run more smoothly with the rules she'd been given. She thanked the Councillors for their assistance. Ms Uprichard queried some of the basis of the belief that the receipt of plans would run smoothly and reminded the meeting that in her belief the Community Council was entitled to copies of all plans for the Conservation area and major plans from around the periphery of St Andrews, e.g. St Andrews Bay. Ms Smith replied that she had assumed that following the recent meeting the Planning Committee would receive plans they requested. Ms Rowe replied that they would receive the plans, which were essential. Ms Uprichard doubted that this would be the case. Ms Rowe said that they'd receive plans for the Conservation area, which they requested, except for plans such as windows/ doors, which had a specific specification to which they had to adhere anyway. Cllr Morrison added that all plans could still be viewed online anyway.

Ms Uprichard raised the problem with getting information in relation to appeals. This consisted of planning objections and other past material relevant to preparation of any objection and giving of evidence at a planning enquiry. The Landscape Setting Assessment was never according to Ms Uprichard available online, and she added that Chris Smith has stated they don't need it. She felt that it was unsatisfactory that officials could dictate what papers the Community Council could access. Mr Roberts wondered about the possibility of getting a computer of big enough size to allow the Planning Committee to view plans. He added that there had to be an acceptance of the presence of eplanning. Ms Smith replied that there had been previous discussion about getting a computer of suitable size, but at the time it hadn't been felt appropriate. Mr Roberts replied that he'd come across information, which had indicated that Fife Council could supply office equipment to Community Councils to aid their function. Ms Uprichard still felt that it wasn't satisfactory to look at plans on a screen when original plans were often several times bigger than A4.

Cllr Melville acknowledged that there was a problem as she'd been trying to get a previous planning application on the Fife website and had been unsuccessful despite trying numerous searches. She'd emailed and official and had later met him and discussed the query. He'd acknowledged that the system was faulty. Cllr Melville related the problem to that faced by Dr Goudie and Ms Uprichard when trying to find older information for planning enquires. She felt that such information needed to be much more easily accessed. She also thought that a computer for the Community Council Planning Committee would be very helpful. Cllr Sangster suggested the possibility of using the Cosmos Centre in the evening and asking to use one of their computers. Cllr Morrison also commented on the difficulties with the current IT system. Ms Uprichard added that the information put on the web was often incomplete in relation to applications.

Cllr Waterston explained the process in relation to appeal paperwork. He explained that there were two stages of an appeal process, the statement of case and the precognition. All relevant documents get presented at the appeal stage, before the precognitions have to be prepared. The precognitions are the documents that get used at the formal hearing and are the ones for which the background information is required. The Appeal information is all made available by the Scottish Government within an appropriate timescale before an appeal goes live. He felt that to expect Fife Council to produce documents which would

be produced for the appeal was to expect something to happen which was not happening anywhere in Scotland. Ms Uprichard still felt that there were unsatisfactory aspects to the process, which hindered the work she and Dr Goudie were trying to put together for various appeals.

Cllr Melville commented that there were real concerns about the process. She felt that just because there was eplanning, that the papers relating to appeals should not be made available to the Community Council so that the Community Council or other objectors could make their case well before the pre-enquiry meeting etc. She acknowledged the need to have time, and all the facts available in good time to make one's case. She added that until a couple of years ago there hadn't been such difficulties, and couldn't understand why it was now so difficult. Cllr Melville is to have a meeting with Jim Birrell and Cllr Andrew Arbuckle later in the week on these matters.

## **5.1. Planning Committee Minutes - see Appendices in agenda**

No comments on planning minutes

## **5.2. Fife Structure Plan**

Ms Uprichard made a statement about the recent The Structure Plan was first published four years ago, and there were thousands of objections to it, both from individuals, but also Dundee and Edinburgh Councils, SNH and dozens of Community Councils. The objections have never been published. It became clear some time ago that the Government was going to approve it and this was announced on the 27<sup>th</sup> May.

What then does it mean for St Andrews? Two local residents have estimated that there could an increase for St Andrews of 50% in built area, which contrasts with the Strategic Study published 10 years ago by Fife Council, which talked about the town being at it's landscape capacity. The Draft Local Plan says that North East Fife will see a 15% increase in built up area. In St Andrews the plans mean about 1090 houses for St Andrews, plus a share in 930 extra houses for North East Fife as indicated in the Structure Plan, plus a distributor road and associated development. She talked about statistical flaws in the report in relation to projected statistical increases in population, varying from 8 % to 20%, plus a figure of around 20000 increase in the population of Fife by 2026. North East Fife the report estimated would need to cater for around 7400 if this projected increase. She felt that the Structure Plan was extremely confused and in some places questionable. One example was the fact that the General Register Office, upon whom the plan depends for its figures, doesn't include the student population in the figures.

Ms Uprichard announced that she has decided to challenge the Structure Plan's validity in the Court of Session. There is a 6-week period after the publication for objectors to file their objection with the Court. She felt that this challenge was of major importance as the future of St Andrews was at stake. She expressed her disappointment, that Ms Smith had made comments that the Community Council was pleased, with the progress of the Structure Plan, when she knew that hundreds of local people and thousands across Fife had objected to it. Ms Smith replied that she'd hoped that a line could be drawn under that matter, and that the Community Council could concentrate on the Draft Local Plan. Ms Uprichard replied that the only sign of any change in the Structure Plan related to the distributor road and other local facilities, which in the original plan were to be funded by the housing developers. Now the developers are only being asked to make a contribution to the cost of the road and other facilities. Ms Uprichard added that anyone giving financial support to the challenge to the Structure Plan would only be liable for the amount pledged.

## **6. Matters Arising**

### **6.1. Arms Convenor Update**

See appendices in the June Agenda. Mr Pead spoke to his reports. He started by acknowledging that the Community Council had pretty much run out of funds and that our legal challenge had come to an end. We had already dropped the legal challenge in the USA.

The Community Council was left with two options. One was to agree the licensing of additional products, but this would involve further costs, which he knew the Community Council couldn't afford, and even if it did would be very difficult to monitor effectively.

The second option would be to do nothing and let the agreement run until 2012 and give notice as per the present agreement of 5 years notice.

Mr Skelhon suggested that the Community Council take the second option, as there was a clear £1000 pa, which Mr White had to pay until the end of the agreement.

Mr Fraser quoted a famous judge who had said, “the law is open to anyone, like the Ritz Hotel”, implying that without any money we couldn’t pursue our legal claim.

Ray suggested that there might still be a possibility of allowing the licensing of other products to go ahead in case any made money. Mr Skelhon felt that we would be entering an area of commercial licensing of which we could lose control. Ms Uprichard backed Mr Skelhon’s views and proposed not to approve more products and just let the agreement lapse. This was seconded by Mr Roberts. Ms Smith thanked Mr Pead for his work on the matter.

## **6.2. St Andrews Partnership – invitation to further meeting**

Mr Marks briefly explained that this was a public meeting and that Patrick Loughlin was merely looking to get numbers for the meeting by 3<sup>rd</sup> June. The meeting to be on the 9<sup>th</sup> June. Ms Uprichard still had suspicions that the change from World Class, to St Andrews Partnership would not make a lot of difference, as thought that it’s aim was as a tool to support the direction of the Structure Plan, which viewed St Andrews as an economic driver for Fife. Cllr Morrison contested Ms Uprichard’s views and felt that there was never anything underhand about World Class. June 2009 had always been the date for the changing of World Class to a new body. She felt that the new body was for the people of the town, with no one kept out of it. She added that it was about what the people of St Andrews wanted for the town and how they might be able to do it. She emphasised again that involvement was open to anyone who felt they had something to contribute to the future of the town.

Mr Pead supported Cllr Morrison’s comments. He acknowledged that initially St Andrews World Class had some poor press. The new body will be open to anyone. He acknowledged the involvement of Scottish Enterprise, but added that their funding would reduce and eventually the body would have to become self-funding. In reply to a further expression of concern from Ms Uprichard, he added that the body had brought all the major businesses and interests in St Andrews around the table, in a way he’d not seen before. He felt that it was a tremendous springboard for the town’s secure economic development. He felt that by not supporting it development could be set back by ten years. Ms Uprichard still thought that there was a tie in with the Structure Plan. Ms Smith thought that it was similar to “Futurescapes” in Cupar and Glenrothes etc. Cllr Morrison agreed that that there was a comparison with these bodies. She added that in her time on World Class there had never been a discussion of the Structure Plan. She felt that the revamped body was about seeing that all the players in the town would have voices. Ms Rowe asked if there was a voice for ordinary citizens on the new body. Ms Smith reminded Ms Rowe that the next meeting was open to local people.

## **6.3. Climate Challenge Group**

Mr Marks said he’d leave the report until the next meeting.

## **6.4. Reports from Representatives**

### **6.4.1 World Class – see report in Appendix B of agenda.**

## **7. Committee Reports**

### **7.1 Recreation**

There had been a meeting under the new Convenor, Mr Reed. New members are welcomed. A separate account has now been set up to cover the Ceilidh, Old Folks Treat and also things like the Civic Reception.

### **7.2. General Purposes**

No meeting

### **7.3. 200 Club**

#### **7.3.1. 200 Club Draw**

June Draw: 1<sup>st</sup> No 64 E.J. Baxter

2<sup>nd</sup> No. 57 Mr A. Humphries

3<sup>rd</sup> No. 101 Catherine Rowe

#### **7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee**

Ms Rowe gave a report on the new Madras Development Meeting. The original ten sites considered have been reduced to two sites. One is the current Kilrymont site and the Langlands Field site behind Andrew Melville Hall area. Ms Smith agreed to forward notes on the meeting to the Community Council.

In relation to Licensing all new applications will be sent to Mr Reed who plans to send them out to members for their consideration. He commented about an application for

### **8. New Business**

#### **8.1. Review of Scheme for the Establishment of Community Councils in Fife**

Ms Smith asked members to respond to the questionnaire in this email.

#### **8.2. Enquire – The Scottish Advice Service for Additional Support for Learning**

For information. Contact the secretary for details.

### **9. Reports from Office Bearers**

#### **9.1. Chair**

No report

#### **9.2. Treasurer**

Mr Marks reminded the Chair of the need to approve the financial report. Ms Smith proposed acceptance. There was no dissent.

Mr Pead also gave some up to date details following his election as treasurer. The Abbey account has been shut as it was giving very little interest. After all the sub accounts had been deducted, he said there was very little left until the new grant was received. He felt that the Community Council needed to do some serious fundraising.

Mr Pead also raised the issue of needing to get two signatures on cheques of any size, and proposed that this be amended to one signature for cheques under £200. There was general agreement as to the idea.

Mr Pead also informed the meeting that the first cheque he'd issued had bounced and he'd received a letter saying that the bank would be charging £35. Ms Smith said she'd take the matter to the bank and appeal the charge.

Cllr Sangster voiced concern at the lack of funds in the account given that he'd set up the bandstand concerts and promised the bands they'd be getting paid. He asked for a guarantee of payment as the first band would be playing at the end of the month and he'd need a cheque for about £250. Mr Pead agreed to check on the grant payment and Ms Smith thought that something would be resolved before the date.

#### **9.3 Secretary**

See Correspondence list.

### **10. Any Other Competent Business**

#### **10.1. Proposed Madras School Site**

Dr Goudie commented that as far as he was concerned the decision on the school site would be tied in with the Structure Plan. If the western site was chosen he believed that it would support Fife Council's hopes to progress development in that area. One of the major ongoing problems with the Structure Plan has been

that the people in Edinburgh who approved it said that the western area was an undefined concept, it was clear that in the minds of those charged with implementing the plan, namely Fife Council officials, that the western development should be synonymous with this concept.

## **10.2. Proposed New Community Councillor/ Community Council Vacancies**

Mr Pead mentioned that a Mr Ronnie Murphy, a local solicitor had expressed an interest. The secretary agreed to invite him to the next meeting. Mr Pead to give Mr Murphy's details to the secretary for circulation.