

# Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

## Provisional Minutes – 1<sup>st</sup> February 2016

For Approval

### 1. Attendance

#### Community Councillors

Callum MacLeod, Howard Greenwell, Kyffin Roberts, Ian Goudie, Gordon Shepherd, Iain Munn, Izzy Corbin, Patrick Marks, Judith Harding, Henry Paul, Harry Stewart, Ken Crichton, Zara Evans

#### Students' Association Representatives

Patrick Mathewson

Clare Armstrong

#### Co-Opted

Niall Scott

Lindsey Adam

#### Fife Councillors

Brian Thomson, Dorothea Morrison

**Apologies** - Keith McCartney, Charlotte Andrew, Frances Melville, Chris Wallard, Alicia Schultz

### 2. Minutes of Meeting – January 2016

5.2. University Development Plans – bottom of page 6 – Mr Watson also said that in any expansion of the university in the foreseeable future they “had accepted” not “they will have to accept” the responsibility for any expansion of bed space.

The main minutes were otherwise accepted as correct.

### 3. Presentations

#### 3.1. University Presentation on the Guardbridge Green Energy Plan

Mr Steve Bargeton a member of the University Corporate Communications Team initially introduced some of the delegation from the University and its project partners. Mr Ashley Walsh & Mr David Railey were introduced as representatives from Vital Energi the firm tasked with construction of the Biomass Plant, Mr Geoff Morris a member of the University Community Engagement Team and Sammy Gilran who looks after the social media activity.

Mr Bargeton then set of the context as to why the University would be closing the road to Guardbridge in two weeks time on the 15<sup>th</sup> February. He reminded the meeting that the University acquired the Guardbridge site after the closure of Curtis Fine Papers in 2008. He added that the University project would breathe new life into the site and to the area at large. The heart of it would be the £25 million Green Energy Centre with the Biomass Plant which would heat large parts of the University campus saving carbon emissions and money.

In relation to the pipeline Mr Bargeton claimed that every way was looked at to minimise disruption but the only way was to dig up the road at Guardbridge, thus necessitating the closure of the road from Monday 15<sup>th</sup> February until the 8<sup>th</sup> April.

Mr Roberts wondered why the chosen route was viewed to be the only suitable way and suggested that the cycle way might have been a possible alternative and less disruptive. Mr

Bargeton agreed but added that there would still have been the need to get the pipeline across the river. Mr Roberts asked why it wasn't possible to bring it across the estuary. Mr Bargeton acknowledged that it was a question often asked and added that he would ask Mr Walsh to explain the engineering reasons for the decision and the issues about the other possible ways to cross the river.

Mr Walsh said that he and his colleague had looked at all the feasible options, from running it over or under the estuary. He claimed that the logistics of the site made it impossible to run the pipeline over the estuary. The size of equipment needed, the nature of the terrain and the room available to install the concrete pillars necessary were all factors against, and there would have been needed to have been planning permission as well. Regarding going under the estuary he explained that the pipeline was designed to go above the water and couldn't go below the water because of the fusion welded joints required at regular intervals of 60 metres on the pre-fabricated pipe sections. He explained that water could penetrate into the joints if the pipe was constantly under water and this would ruin the high density insulation and the heat properties of the pipe. He added that a pipe could cope with a fluctuating water table in a ditch but not a constant presence. He also explained that if access was required to do repairs or check something access would not be easily managed if the pipeline was under water. The pipes contain wires which would send out a pulse if water ingress was detected thus aiding fault finding.

In Guardbridge itself he explained that the main mass infrastructure of services was located between Kinnear Court and the turning of the roundabout hence the need to close the road as the project had to avoid these services. The pipe would then go across and under the new road bridge which was built in box sections with pipes then going back out on to the fields on the south side of the road. They would be creating large ducts in the fields for the pipeline in order to try and speed up the time of construction and claimed that the work would be done much more quickly by the techniques they were using. They had already done work at the Strathkiness junction. He described how they had divided the work in Guardbridge into four zones in which work would take place simultaneously making a 32 week job much shorter with teams of welders in each section.

Mr Roberts asked if they would be working nightshifts? Mr Walsh replied that this wouldn't be happening due to noise and safety regulations. Work would start after 7 and go on until around 18.00. He'd approached the main residents on the route to discuss the planned work. He described how he'd discussed the need for a very detailed work programme down to an hour by hour plan. This planning would allow them to know how much work would or could be done each day. If the work timing starts to slip they would bring in extra welders.

He then described the zones of work in the village and across the bridge and the expectations on the workforce of high quality work.

Mr Greenwell said that one the concerns was that for a period and especially over Easter weekend there would effectively be no access to St Andrews from the north. He wondered what visitors to the town at that holiday period would be able to do to gain access? Mr Walsh acknowledged that while work was being done at the Kinnear Court to the bridge the road would have to be closed and there wouldn't be enough room for vehicles to drive past. He added that lots of warning signs would be erected to help ensure that visitors were aware and could take the appropriate diversions to get to the town.

Mr Roberts said that in the programme of work it was claimed that access would be given to emergency vehicles and locals so he wondered if this was incorrect? Mr Walsh confirmed that this was true and they were looking at the possibility of patching up access for emergency vehicles at the Cupar edge of the roundabout, but otherwise emergency vehicles would have to come from the Leuchars side of the area or St Andrews.

Miss Uprichard said that when the application for the Biomass Plant was first published there was no information about the impact upon traffic. A second point related to the sourcing of the wood which the University claimed would be sourced from within a 50 mile radius. She

also commented that she'd heard that Biomass Plants would consume 17000 tonnes of wood per year.

Mr Railey explained that the amount the Biomass Plant would use would depend upon the load at the time with winter requiring more than summer and also dependent upon the time of day. The output of the plant could also vary according to the dryness of the wood from 6.5 to 8 MW. He said that at full production the plant would burn through 950 cubic metres of wood in three days. He acknowledged that a significant additional capacity had been built into the plant allowing for a future need for increased load both at Guardbridge and St Andrews. The plant might not work at its full capacity for a number of years and wouldn't therefore consume the amount of wood mentioned by Miss Uprichard for the foreseeable future. He added that the wood chip would come from managed woodlands as part of planning conditions at the request of Fife Council. The university he added were still in negotiations with possible suppliers.

Mrs Corbin wondered about the small size of the pipe bore? Mr Walsh explained that the steel pipe was 250 mm diameter and the actual size of the pipe with insulation would be 500 mms.

Mr McLeod asked about the temperature of the water travelling through the pipe. Mr Walsh told him that the water would be going out at 95 degrees and would return at 65 degrees. Mr McLeod also asked about the lifespan of the pipe and the frequency of access to do repairs. Mr Walsh replied that they'd give the pipes a 50 year guarantee as long as the water treatment was correct and the properties of the steel carrier pipe didn't degrade too severely. He didn't believe that with a properly constructed pipe that access would be needed hence the long guarantee his firm were giving it but he added that there might be rare occasions when access was needed. He didn't think that any repairs would cause major traffic problems if problems could be identified for very specific areas of the pipe. He then commented upon how the firm were using only top class welders so the chance of a faulty weld should be very small and in his time in work there had only been two on projects in which he'd been involved.

Dr Goudie commented upon a question he'd put to Mr Walsh at one of the exhibits in St Andrews when he'd asked why the pipeline couldn't go along the cycle path in Guardbridge. Mr Walsh had replied that it wasn't wide enough to accommodate the required machinery. People to whom Dr Goudie had spoken thought it was remarkable in this day and age that no such machinery existed. He'd also mentioned to Mr Walsh that Sustrans in the 1990s had said that you could put a cycle way under the bridge arch at Guardbridge and he'd asked why it wasn't possible to do it with the pipeline? Mr Walsh in his reply had talked about the need to keep the pipe pressurised and again Dr Goudie commented that it was also remarkable that there weren't ways to keep the pipeline pressurised in order to make that route possible. People to whom he'd spoken had commented on a lack of innovative thinking in the project and he also noted that there was no mention of compensation for shopkeepers in Guardbridge. He wondered whether there hadn't been enough financial incentive to put in innovative thought and asked if that was a fair assessment of the situation?

Mr Walsh in reply said that there wasn't enough width in the cycle path to allow for sudden changes of direction required and to allow for expansion partly as well because of the length of the route. In relation to the method of putting the pipeline in brackets in the open under the bridge he said that there were issues with the external pipework and UV ratings on the external coating. Another issue related to the fact that the pipeline needed to have a substantial framework to hold it in place as the steel carrier plate moves within the insulation of the outer casing of the pipeline. He explained that due to the nature of the pipeline and its function they were very limited in how it could be routed in order to allow its expansion properties to work correctly especially in roadways. He explained about all the brackets and compensators and angle blocks which were going to have to be installed in the 148 metre section under the bridge due to the complexity of negotiating that crossing. He explained as well why they'd not been able to use the cycle route and the old bridge, the latter partly because of its historic nature. The firm had plotted everything in 3-D to try and anticipate the issues which might

arise and allow them to pre-order the appropriate items such as angle bends and compensators for specific parts of the route.

Mr Bargeton then commented on the query about compensation for businesses in Guardbridge. He said they'd had considerable and ongoing discussion with businesses in Guardbridge and a number of different arrangements had been made which suited them. He assured the meeting that the University was continuing to have discussions with the businesses as necessary.

Mr Munn asked about the back road from Balmullo to Leuchars/Guardbridge and how traffic would be managed to prevent it becoming a "rat" run. Mr Walsh replied that the road would be turned into a one way for the period of the project. He also explained the changes on the routes of the buses for people trying to access the village and station. There would also be staff with stop and go signs at the road junctions by St Michaels to offer more flexible response to the traffic flow during peak hours.

Mrs Harding asked how much time anyone would have to add on from St Andrews to get to Leuchars to catch a train? Mr Walsh said that it was estimated that people would have to add on between 15-30 minutes. He acknowledged that it was very difficult to put a time on it but from experience a past road closure in Nottingham road users adapted and traffic tail backs weren't as much of an issue after the first week. It would partly depend upon whether people might decide to use public transport instead of going by car. Mrs Harding asked about going to the station by bus from St Andrews. Mr Walsh explained the route the bus would take going round towards St Michaels from Balmullo and Dairsie. The project managers have worked with Stagecoach to establish a new timetable for the period of the disruption and he thought that Stagecoach were estimating an additional 15 minutes. Mr Bargeton added that the route through the village would be open to pedestrians so some people might decide to get off near the village and walk through to get other transport or walk the whole way to the station. Mr Walsh made the meeting aware that a new bus service the X99 had been added to the timetable for the period.

Mr Roberts wondered where there would be parking for those who opted to walk the last stretch to the station and where would the workers be parking? Mr Walsh replied that all the workers would park in the Papermill site. Mr Bargeton said that there would be additional public car parking on the Leuchars side of the village at the car park opposite the mill used by university staff. There would be a park and pedal facility in a gated parking area for those who wanted to make use of it at the same location to pedal to St Andrews with bikes provided by the university after parking. He acknowledged however that they'd not been able to find additional parking on the Cupar road side of the village. The facility used for the open up by Seggie was not considered suitable as there was no footpath so for health and safety reasons this is not being used. The Avalon Business Park was also unsuitable due to its size and the fact that construction vehicles will be using it for access etc.

Mrs Corbin asked what benefits did the University see the project would bring to the people of St Andrews? Mr Bargeton in his reply said that there would be an immediate benefit to the wider community. The University he reminded the meeting would be putting over 200 staff to work at the Papermill in new purpose built accommodation and offices and he thought that a large number of other jobs would be generated there. He added that Fife Council thought that the increase of jobs there would have a regional benefit, which he thought should be of benefit to St Andrews.

Mr Greenwell thanked Mr Bargeton and his colleagues for the presentation and questions answered. Mr Bargeton reminded the meeting about email contacts on the leaflets circulated in case there were any more questions.

### **3.2. Community Police Report**

PC Peddie gave an update on some issues raised at the previous CC meeting. One issue related to dogs especially ones which have attacked local posties. PC Peddie had spoken to the dog wardens about the procedures for dealing with problem dogs and about the respective

roles of the police and the wardens. If the police were alerted to an incident their emphasis would be in relation to the dog owner whom they could report to the PF. The dog wardens would be made aware of an incident and they have powers to issue a dog control notice on a specific dog. She gave an example of an incident where a dog restriction notice had been issued. Mr Stewart wondered whether such dogs should be muzzled when in public. He was also concerned at a lack of responses from the police and dog wardens in relation to incidents involving his posties. PC Peddie said that there should be a response to a complainant and apologised if that hadn't occurred.

## **4. Fife Councillor.**

### **4.1. Frances Melville – apologies**

#### **4.1.1. West Sands Toilet Blocks replacement/ refurbishment and funding**

Local members have agreed with Fife Council officers that at long last, proposals for demolition of Block 1 and refurbishment of Block 2 toilets at the West Sands, should proceed. Funding would be from the St Andrews Common Good Fund. Block 1 is in such a bad state that it should be replaced with a semi-permanent modular unit, which could be used elsewhere, if and when a new visitor centre ever gets built.

#### **4.1.2. Demand for more cycle racks and parking - St Andrews**

The audit being carried out for cycle rack provision in St Andrew is still to be completed, with plans and proposals hopefully by March. Fife Council are also making sure the University install the 135 cycle spaces, as per planning application, for the The Students 'Union.

#### **4.1.3. Good profit from Lammas Market for 2015 for St Andrews Common Good Fund**

Thanks to Keith Jackson and his team from Fife Council for improving the lay out and stalls/ fairground ride provision over the last few years, 2015 produced an excellent £20,000 profit for the Common Good Fund.

#### **4.1.4. University Pipeline installation for Guardbridge to St Andrews – roadworks**

This has already begun with diversion at St Andrews end and main traffic using the Old Guardbridge Road. From the 15th February to 8th April including Easter, the major closures/ traffic lights and one way diversions will operate along the A91, A919 and A964.

\*\*\*\*Transportation officers have highlighted driver/ cyclist safety, as some drivers have been ignoring 'road closed ' signs during the first phase.

#### **4.1.5. Church Square flagstone replacement and repair.**

So much damage has been done to the flagstones in Church Square because of delivery vans using this space, they will have to be repaired/ replaced. This area was never meant to have heavy vehicles on it and measures will be taken to replace the flagstones.

\*\*\*\*Proposals for a 'stopping up' order for Church Square and associated loading bays and disables spaces will go to the March North East Fife Area Committee.

#### **4.1.6. West Sands Area responsibilities.**

Discussions are progressing with Fife Council, Fife Coast and Countryside Trust and St Andrews Links Trust about sharing responsibilities for the West Sands Area. It is a popular area for the community and visitors and with Fife Council budget constraints, it makes sense. It is hoped that the Links Trust may take on environmental aspects and issues.

#### **4.1.7. Installation of electronic bathing water signs proposed for east sands and west sands St. Andrews by SEPA**

The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency project, which has currently 25 of these installations throughout Scotland, has requested to install one at the East Sands and one at the West Sands. These, like the photo shown, provide water quality information for bathers and visitors to the area and have proved very successful.

## **4.2. Brian Thomson**

### **4.2.1. Common Good Fund**

Cllr Thomson reported that the available revenue at the end of the last financial year was £213754 as of the 31<sup>st</sup> March but he added that that sum would have increased since that date. He informed that meeting that the Seafood Restaurant paid £1250 pa as ground rent but that there were discussions to review this charge ongoing. In relation to the Bruce Embankment Car Park there had been queries as to how the income going into the CGF was calculated. He explained that the car park had been leased to the R&A since 1989. The rent that the R&A pay is half the income generated from the car park after deducting Fife Council's costs for managing it. The total income was around £32000 of which the CGF got half of that amount pa. He added that there was no chance of ending the lease as the R&A was into the second period of leasing for a further 25 years until 2039. The terms of the lease are such that the R&A can continue to renew the lease as they see fit.

Other CGF properties being rented out were the stores at the harbour which brought in an annual income of around £3140pa. The Harbour Trust are in discussion with Fife Council about taking over the management of the stores and possibly redeveloping them.

Cllr Thomson informed the meeting that the land near the British Golf Museum is now at a more realistic ground rent of £10000 pa compared to the previous £500.

### **4.2.2. West Port Bollards**

Cllr Thomson reminded members that he'd sent them an email about this issue. There have been problems with vehicles, particularly delivery lorries parking on the pavement near the West Port when offloading. Fife Council officers have proposed installing bollards and Mr Paul had offered to put planters in the area on an interim basis. Fife Councillors were supportive of the bollards but were concerned about the reflective rings proposed on the bollards. He was keen to get views as to whether such bollards with reflective rings were suitable in that location. Mrs Corbin thought that planters would be a better idea than bollards. Cllr Thomson said he'd not spoken to the company whose lorry parks by the West Port. He thought that it was probably against the law to park on the pavement as the lorry has been doing. He thought that the matter might be a police one if the lorry was breaking the law. He added that a solution was required to stop the illegal parking. In response to a request for ways to stop the problem members indicated that planters would be the preferred option not bollards.

### **4.2.3. Planned Road Improvements**

In the coming financial year Cllr Thomson said that the following road improvements would be taking place:

1. Hepburn Gardens from the junction with Buchanan Gardens to the junction with Double Dykes is to be resurfaced at some time in 2016/7.
2. Abbey Walk is to be resurfaced.
3. Pipeland Walk is to be resurfaced.
4. Melville Road Roundabout to Lawhead Road East is to be resurfaced. There will also be a 20 mph zone in that area after resurfacing.
5. Logies Lane is to be resurfaced and there have been talks about enhancing the specification of the material to be used in that conservation area.

### **4.2.4. Carron Place Work**

The pavement resurfacing in Carron Place has been slowly progressing. Residents had expressed concern about the road getting more churned up because of the heavy machinery

being used so officials will check the road in Carron Place and potholes will be dealt with as required.

#### **4.2.5. "A" Boards**

Cllr Thomson reported that officials had been checking out the idea of encouraging shops to lean their A Boards against the premises, but this hasn't been particularly successful. Boards have blown over in windy conditions so might need something to secure them to the shop fronts.

#### **4.2.6. Banners on Lamposts**

Cllr Thomson reported that the banners were given permission by Transportation Services. He wasn't certain whether they would have required planning permission. He said that Fife Council was in the process of taking down its banners but the Byre ones were still to be taken down.

#### **4.2.7. Telephone Box**

Dr Goudie expressed concerns about the location by BT of some of their boxes claiming that there were a couple of locations where these were causing visibility problems for motorists exiting at Wardlaw Gardens and at the junction of Donaldson Gardens and Hepburn Gardens. Cllr Thomson said he'd have a look at the boxes in those locations. Dr Goudie felt that there should be more thought put into the siting of such boxes.

#### **4.4.8. Hepburn Gardens/Double Dykes Junction Realignment**

Cllr Thomson informed the meeting about work commencing today to realign and improve the sightlines by about 2 metres.

#### **4.4.9. Road Repairs and the Open Income**

Miss Uprichard commented that at the last meeting there had been comment about the lack of money to do things like road repairs. She noted that the Open had generated something in the order of £150 million for Fife and Scotland and wondered if St Andrews couldn't benefit in any way. She thought that surely some of that money could be used to repair the roads hit so hard by the traffic generated during the Open. Cllr Thomson reminded the meeting that Fife Council was responsible for the roads and he reminded everyone about the £38 million shortfall in Fife's budget for the coming financial year. He acknowledged that the Open generated huge amounts of money but estimated that the vast bulk would go into the private sector not into the public coffers. He thought that Fife Council did not make much money directly from the Open. Miss Uprichard then commented on the fact that Fife Council was having to pay compensation for motorists whose vehicles were damaged by potholes and wondered if that was sensible? Cllr Thomson explained that Fife Council could not afford to keep up with the repairs required which would cost around £96 million.

Mr Marks commented on a particularly bad pothole area on John Knox Road he'd seen earlier in the day, and whilst he understood the Council's financial dilemma, such potholes unless mended would only get bigger and more dangerous. Cllr Thomson replied that Fife Council had a commitment to respond to serious potholes within 24 hours and less serious within 5 days, but he acknowledged that this wasn't being achieved and there was a massive backlog.

Mrs Harding mentioned that there were a number of big potholes on the back road to Pitscottie and wondered if Cllr Thomson could mention that to Council officials?

#### **4.4.10. Bins and Vehicle Damage**

Mr Roberts asked about the responsibility of the Council if bins were blown over and became a hazard and damaged vehicles? Would the Council be liable for the repair of damaged vehicles? Cllr Thomson admitted he wasn't certain and would ask officials for their advice.

### **4.3. Keith McCartney - apologies**

#### 4.3.1. Street Lights

**Lights** – the following street lights were not working and were reported for repair

**Argyle Street Car Park** (between Argyle Street and Double Dykes Road) – lighting columns numbers 1 and 2

**City Road** – lighting column number 10

**Doocot Road** – lighting column number 9

**Lade Braes** – lighting column number 12

**Morton Crescent** – lighting column number 4

**North Street** – lighting column outside house number 142, North Street (No number on lighting column)

**Petheram Bridge Car Park** – lighting column number 1

**Viaduct Walk** – lighting column number 3

#### 4.3.2. Illuminated Road Signs

**Cllr McCartney reported that** the lights on the following illuminated road signs were not working and were reported for repair

**Abbey Street** – Roundabout sign on west side by ‘Enchanted’ bridal dress shop at junction with South Street

**Abbotsford Crescent** – Stop sign on west side of Abbotsford Crescent at junction with North Street

**Argyle Street** – Roundabout sign by phone box on north side of road outside Gibson House

**City Road** – Roundabout sign on west side of City Road at junction with Pilmour Links

**Golf Place** – Give Way sign on west side of Dunvegan Hotel at junction with North Street

**Greyfriars Garden** – One Way/No Entry signs on either side of road at junction with North Street

**Lamond Drive** – Roundabout sign on north side by house number 2 at junction with St Mary’s Street

**Murray Park** – No Entry signs on either side of road at junction with North Street

**Murray Park** – No Entry/One Way signs on either side of road at junction with Murray Place

**Murray Place** – One Way sign at junction with The Scores

**North Street** – Roundabout/Give Way sign on south side of road at junction with City Road

**Pilmour Links** - Roundabout sign on north side of road near Auchterlonie’s Golf Shop at the junction with City Road

**South Street** – Roundabout signs on north side of road by DIY shop and south side of road by white building with Preservation Trust plaque at junction with Abbey Street

**St Mary’s Street** – light on column extending up from belisha beacon on west side of road to light pedestrian crossing

**The Scores** – No Entry/One Way signs on either side of road + cycle path sign on pavement at junction with Murray Park

**Union Street** – No Left Turn sign by bus stop on east side of road

#### 4.3.3. Ponding Issues

**Argyle Street** – ponding reported over gullies on south side of road outside Yorkston House. Inspection carried out, gullies cleaned and jetted, issue resolved

**Drumcarrow Road** – ponding reported over gully on west side of Drumcarrow Road at junction with Canongate. Inspection carried out, issue of slow running gully identified, situation being monitored

**Wardlaw Gardens** – ponding reported over gully on west side of road at junction with Hepburn Gardens. Inspection carried out, gully cleaned and jetted, issue resolved.

#### **4.3.4. 'Keep Left' Bollards and light**

Cllr McCartney reported that on John Knox Road at the roundabout at Morrison's two of the 'Keep Left' bollards were reported as having blown over and the cover of the light on the east side of roundabout as having fallen off. Both the bollards and the light cover have been re-affixed.

#### **4.3.5. Potholes**

Cllr McCartney reported that potholes were reported for inspection and repair as necessary on Craigtoun Road, Double Dykes Road, John Knox Road, Lawmill Gardens, Hepburn Gardens and Old Guardbridge Road.

#### **4.3.6. Give Way Markings**

Cllr McCartney reported that the 'give way' markings on the road surface at the junction of both Lamond Drive and Tom Morris Drive with Largo Road have been repainted.

#### **4.3.7. Pavement Renewal**

Cllr McCartney reported that work has been ongoing throughout January to replace the existing pavement, made of paving slabs, in Carron Place with a tarred surface similar to that laid many years ago in the adjoining streets.

### **4.4. Dorothea Morrison**

#### **4.4.1. West Sands Management Changes**

Cllr Morrison explained that from the 1<sup>st</sup> April the Links Trust would be tasked with looking after the West Sands. There would be a partnership of the Links Trust, Fife Council and the FCCT each with its own responsibilities in managing parts of the West Sands. Fife Council will be responsible for the public toilets. Fife Councillors last year had accepted that the toilets were not fit for purpose and needed replaced or upgraded. Some money has now been found to refurbish one of the toilets instead of knocking it down. The second toilet will be demolished and replaced by a modular toilet. Funding for the work may have to come from the CGF as Fife Council has no money for this work. She explained that the money wouldn't come from the CG money in the main current account but from the investment account. This still has to be approved but Councillors are hopeful.

Grass cutting is an area which the Links Trust will be taking over, but Gordon Moir had indicated that it was too large for the Links Trust to completely manage so Fife Council, the Links Trust and FCCT are looking at other ways of managing the grass. Gordon Moir had indicated that when areas of grass had been left in the past and then cut the disposal of the large quantities of grass had been a problem. Further use of the sheep might be a partial solution.

There had also been talk of replacing the barrier but not where it was originally. If it was decided that a barrier was needed it would be put further up. The Links Trust had made it clear that it did not want local people to have additional expense. One option if the barrier was installed would be to ensure that local people could still get in for free or another possible option was to put the barrier up in such a way that there was still a large area for local people and beach users to park but late arrivers might have to go under the barrier. She thought that the barrier might be a way of putting off campervans which have been an issue. There would be consultation before anything might happen. The Links Trust she emphasised wanted to protect the area and make it sustainable. If there were to be a charge the money would be ring fenced and would be spent on the maintenance of the area. She thought that that seemed worthwhile.

The play park at the West Sands is to be taken away on health and safety grounds being considered no longer fit for purpose. Fife Council she added didn't have the funds to replace the equipment and it wasn't clear how much it would be missed.

Management of safety at the beach will in future be run by the RNLI and not guards employed by FCCT. She said that staff employed by RNLI had better qualifications than FCCT employees.

Cllr Morrison explained in response to a query from Miss Uprichard about the barrier and possible charges that the barrier referred to was not the one near the north end of the beach but one nearer the Jubilee sheds to try and control the amount of traffic going in to that end of the beach. She advised that the Links Trust lawyers would possibly look at whether any charge could be levied by a road barrier as Miss Uprichard had stated that it was not legal to put up a barrier whether the road was adopted or not. Cllr Morrison said that everything would go out eventually for consultation.

Cllr Thomson mentioned that he'd suggested to Mr Loudon CEO of the Links Trust that it might be good for the Trust to attend a CC meeting and give a presentation on the new management of the West Sands.

Miss Uprichard said she'd strongly resist any attempt to charge again on the West Sands road. Cllr Morrison replied that if charges were reintroduced there would still be areas of free parking.

#### **4.4.2. Railings by Castle**

Cllr Morrison reported that the fence issue which was supposed to have been addressed last had not been actioned as the official concerned had forgotten about it but had now agreed to get some costings for replacement of the railings. The CGF might be used to fund replacement or repairs of these railings as there was nothing in the local budget. Cllr Morrison was keen to get the railings repaired or replaced before an accident took place, despite uncertainty about who owned the land!

## **5. Planning Committee**

### **5.1. Planning Committee Report**

Miss Uprichard reported that the Planning Committee had met once in January and had looked at 22 applications and lodged objections to 4 of them.

One of the objections was to an extension at 24 Murray Park which the committee thought might cause problems of access to emergency services. Other objections were to 22 Golf Place and 2 The Scores where the committee considered that the proposals for alterations were not appropriate for listed buildings. The fourth had been an application for the change of use of a house to an HMO which she said had already been refused.

Miss Uprichard then said she wanted to raise the issue of traffic through St. Andrews. She explained that under the current system of planning applications are put in and if they are approved it was assumed that St Andrews would have to put up with the resulting traffic. She said that there had been support from an unexpected quarter, namely the Scottish Government in a planning note on the 19<sup>th</sup> January about aligning road and construction consent. The notification said that the Chief Planner has written to all local authorities to encourage them to align road construction and planning consents for residential developments and to follow a consistent structured approach when doing so. At present Miss Uprichard said that the present system whereby planning applications could be put in and approved before any consideration was given to the impact on local roads was unacceptable. She thought that local people were unaware of what was going to hit them following the approval of major planning applications. Miss Uprichard listed the major developments which could affect the town because of the additional heavy traffic they would generate. She doubted that there was any town the size of St Andrews in the UK subject to so much development and approved development.

She added that there was also the Craigtoun North proposal with 350 units, the Priory Gardens proposal with 37 units and Northbank Farm near Cameron which was a proposal for a new settlement in the countryside and added that for all of these if approved the transport would have to come through St Andrews. She commented that since the initial consultations on these proposals considerable amounts of material had been put in by the applicants and accepted by the Council. Miss Uprichard said that she was objecting to the process and felt that the three applications were examples of what was going wrong with the planning process. She commented that in relation to the Craigtoun North proposal a considerable number of documents were accepted after the end of the consultation period as late as January 2016.

She then commented that a Council official had refused to open the consultation period on the grounds this would simply elongate the process of dealing with the planning application beyond acceptable time limits. She noted that the consultation period had ended 6 months ago so she thought that the process had already been elongated beyond acceptable time limits without the public being able to have any part in it. Another statement from a senior Council official was that “only matters which fundamentally change the nature of the application will be consulted upon to do other wise would be to make the system unworkable in any reasonable timescale”. The three applications she mentioned had been consulted upon in July, September and September, during which time considerable information has been put in by the applicants. She added that on the 13<sup>th</sup> January the applicants for Craigtoun North lodged a document titled:- “Consideration of Application Issues”. Miss Uprichard couldn’t see any reason why the public shouldn’t be able to see and comment upon this application.

Priory Gardens was validated in August 2015, with the consultation ending on the 9<sup>th</sup> September 2015. The applicant lodged a supporting statement after the closure of the consultation period. Sport Scotland lodged a holding response on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2015 and Miss Uprichard wondered when they were consulted.

She said that the impression was that Council officials having given the public and voluntary bodies limited time to respond have now put the responses to one side and are getting on with the matter of trying to agree with the applicants an application which is likely to be acceptable. She reminded the meeting that in the case of Priory Gardens there were nearly 60 objections to the site which is on protected open space not an area designated for development in local plans.

The Northbank Farm application was the last matter raised through the Planning Committee report. Miss Uprichard explained the background to the application which was proposing a new settlement in the countryside. The application was for a mix of various commercial units as well as some private housing and access for camping. She gave some history of the development from its start in 2006 through to its approval as planning in principle by Fife Council Planning in 2010. At that time Transportation had recommended refusal. The current application she explained was an ARC which used to be called reserved matters and would be decided only on the site(?). There is to be no further assessment by Transportation Services or anybody else. Ten days after the closure of the consultation SEPA sent in a response concerned about sewage arrangements for the site. By October 2015, 14 amended plans including site plan had been received by Fife Council. She informed the meeting that Cameron Community Council had managed to be approved as a statutory consultee but only after considerable correspondence so the application would now go to committee.

Concluding Miss Uprichard said that she believed the Council underestimated the intelligence of the public who are involved in planning matters. There was no evidence of confusion, but what this meant was that Urban design which included the only official with landscape qualification in Fife Council, Built Heritage and part of Transportation had now been subsumed into Planning and reports from those departments would no longer be made available to the public. She believed that this was a most regrettable step which should be reversed.

Her two main points related to the amount of construction and related traffic which would be going through St. Andrews when and if these developments started. Her second point related

to the amount of information being accepted after the close of public consultation. Fife Council were maintaining that to reopen consultation would make the system unworkable and elongate the process of dealing with planning applications. She thought that there was no evidence that in these three applications the refusal to open again for public consultation has in any way speeded up the processing of these applications all of which are still pending.

Cllr Thomson in an attempt to clarify statements in Miss Uprichard's document on Planning and road construction consent commented that road construction consent had nothing to do with construction traffic but was the permission required from the Transportation Department in addition to planning consent for a new road. Miss Uprichard asked why was transportation impact assessment not included in the planning paper? Cllr Thomson replied that transport impact assessments are usually recorded as part of the planning application depending upon the size of the development proposed. This didn't cover the detailed design of the road which was dealt with by a separate road construction consent outwith the planning consent by Transportation Services. Miss Uprichard was still concerned about the impact of the transport generated mainly through St Andrews but Cllr Thomson in reply said that there wasn't scope for such detailed analysis in the process and the issues were dealt with at the planning application stage. Officers had been satisfied with the planned routes and gave that advice to elected members. Miss Uprichard still felt that it didn't take into account residents and didn't detail routes for the transportation to the sites. She couldn't understand why transportation wasn't included in the planning reports.

## **5.2. Statutory Consulteeship**

Miss Uprichard said she had written to a Fife Council lawyer on this subject. He'd replied, "You're right that the legislation says that the Local Authority has to give a minimum of 14 days for a CC to respond. This is after the CC had applied to be a statutory consultee and then has 14 days to reply. If the Council asks for a response within 14 days it is complying with the legislation". Miss Uprichard in her reply argued that within 14 days was not complying with the legislation and that a minimum of 14 days was her understanding which could mean more than 14 days. She felt that the Council was not prepared to give ground in its definition of the timescale.

## **6. Matters Arising**

### **6.1. Community Trust**

Mr Greenwell reported that the amendment to the Licence agreement to the Community Trust and the sub-licence agreement from the Community Trust to the Links Trust have now both been signed. From April 2016 the CC will see a payment equivalent to 6% of the revenue which comes from the Links Trust to the Community Trust.

He also announced that Mrs Harding's time on the Community Trust would be coming to an end at the AGM of the Community Trust in June. A replacement will need to be appointed before the June meeting. Mr Greenwell had approached the treasurer Mr Munn and also Mr Paul and Mr Stewart. The former was unable to accept as the meeting occurs during the day when he is at work. Mr Stewart agreed to replace Mrs Harding on the Community Trust. Members agreed to his nomination.

The final issue raised by Mr Greenwell related to the Nominations Committee. There had been some changes during discussions in the Articles of Association of the Community Trust. Mr Greenwell commented that the issue which had started matters was the Trust trying to remove the Nominations Committee to which the CC objected and took ownership of the problem. There had been discussion about the effectiveness of that committee which hadn't met in four years. Mr Greenwell told the meeting that he'd circulated some small changes to the Articles of Association which he'd like to put to the Directors of the Community Trust. The changes basically bring into alignment the length of service of the Partner Directors and the Independent Trustees who currently can be re-elected indefinitely. Another couple of

changes he'd suggested were to force the Directors of the Community Trust to ensure that the Nominations Committee meets annually even if there is no substantive business to discuss.

Dr Goudie said that he wasn't particularly happy about the way the matters were being handled. He acknowledged that he'd not had time to look at the detail of Mr Greenwell's email sent the previous day on the Community Trust. He thought that one clause seemed to be a repetition of another clause, but Mr Greenwell explained that one referred to the Partner Directors and the other to the Co-opted Directors. He explained that because of the plan to make length of service equal the clauses had to be worded similarly for the different directors.

Dr Goudie also felt that there should be clear separation between the Nominations Committee and the Partner Directors. He preferred the idea of someone on the Nominations Committee being responsible for calling the meeting and not the Partner Directors. Mr Greenwell asked for views on Dr Goudie's suggestion. Mr Paul said he agreed with Dr Goudie. The proposal he had were that the committee would meet every three years and that all three of the local directors would be changed every three years. Mr Greenwell wondered what would happen if a co-opted director decided to stand down after a year? Mr Paul replied that there could be an extraordinary meeting in that situation. Mr Greenwell felt that to look at other possibilities could put several months delay on the changes of the articles. Mr Greenwell asked the meeting if there was any objection with respect to the length of service of the directors coming into alignment? Mr Greenwell accepted that the issue of the Nominations Committee would have to be further discussed probably at a GP meeting in a couple of weeks.

## **6.2. Proposals for a Minutes Secretary**

Dr Goudie wondered if the nature of the proposed Honorarium scheme was going to cause problems? He said that churches often employed minutes secretaries in such a manner and added that the Methodist Church produced advice on its website about honorariums. He said that the definition of an honorarium was that it was a gift for carrying out a voluntary duty and should not be regarded as a receipt of payment for work done. It should not become a regular payment. Organisations found to be paying honoraria regularly could be expected to pay back dated tax and insurance contributions. Mr Greenwell acknowledged Dr Goudie's comments and added that any payment called an honorarium or not would therefore be deemed taxable. Dr Goudie added that there were quite a few other questions as well in relation to amount of work, the minimum wage etc. Mr Greenwell agreed that there were issues which might complicate the idea and suggested that the matter be discussed following further research into how it could be done with minimum liability. Mr Roberts wondered how other CCs managed to have minutes secretaries and suggested that this might be worth researching.

## **6.3. Reports from Representatives**

Mr Roberts wondered when the CC was going to deal with the issue of CC representatives on other organisations. He reminded the meeting that he sat on the St Andrews Partnership for the CC and also the Pilgrim Foundation and more recently on the Byre Supervisory Board all for the CC.

He made members aware that the Pilgrim Foundation had  $\frac{3}{4}$  meetings a year so hadn't had one so far this year. The Partnership had met in January but he'd not been able to attend that meeting.

Mr Greenwell listed his representations including the Community Trust, the Board of Standen and Golf Liaison on to the Links Trust.

Miss Uprichard asked that members should be circulated with a list of those members representing other organisations on behalf of the CC.

Mr Paul commented that there was usually a list of reps in the AGM minutes. He also commented about Standen and that there was a link on the website. He explained the origin

and ongoing work of the organisation. At a recent Board meeting there had also been discussion about the possibility of growing food on allotments.

Mrs Harding commented upon her connection with the Cosmos Centre.

Mr McLeod felt that there should be a clear indication of who was representing what and more information available to members.

Mr Greenwell acknowledged the need for members on external bodies to produce better reports of activity. He said he'd make a list of the bodies on which the CC had representatives and would distribute the pack to members.

Mr Paul felt that there needed to be a meeting to look at how the CC works and come to a decision about whether we need to remain involved in the external bodies. He felt that the CC also had no plan as to how it operated and stumbled along without any structure to the work it was doing.

## **7. Committee Reports**

### **7.1 Recreation Committee**

Dr Shepherd announced that he was resigning as Chair of the Recreation Committee. A new Chair will be required. The next event to be organised is the Coffee Morning at the beginning of April.

### **7.2. GP Meeting**

No meeting but one will be organised for Monday 15<sup>th</sup> February.

Mr Munn asked about the General Purposes Committee and its function. Mr Greenwell explained that the GP Committee is generally made up of the Committee Convenors and the elected officers, such as Chair, Secretary, Vice Chairs and Treasurer.

### **7.3. 200 Club**

1<sup>st</sup> Mrs G Joy, 2<sup>nd</sup> Mrs C Tricker 3<sup>rd</sup> Mr G Methven

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

Mrs Corbin commented upon her objection to the extension of licensing with respect to the premises at the Sea Life Centre. She expressed concern about the possibility that the changed licence could allow purchasers to take their drinks to the beach etc The objection hadn't stopped the application being approved by the Licensing Committee.

She also commented that there were quite a lot of things going on in the NHS and listed a number of matters which had come to her attention and said she'd keep the CC updated.

### **7.5. Rail Sub Committee**

Dr Goudie reported that there had been a meeting earlier in the month with the new head of economic development at Scotrail who'd previously stressed the importance of linking small towns by way of the cities. Mrs Corbin added that she thought it had been quite a good meeting and that the new head of Economic development had been impressed by the group. The Scottish Government are waiting to see how the Borders Railway works out. The emphasis for new rail development being economic value. She also quoted Steve Grimmond of Fife Council as being supportive of projects increasing travel options for transport users and St Andrews ticked all the boxes.

## **8. New Business**

8.1.

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

### **9.1. Chair**

Mr Greenwell briefly commented on the fact that the CC now had a funding stream in the coming financial year and there would need to be consideration of how this should be spent.

He also commented upon the CC interest in working up projects making use of some of the Common Good Fund money

### **9.2. Treasurer**

Mr Munn reported that he was still awaiting for bills from Carol Ashworth for the catering at the Civic Reception in November . The Fife grant had come into the account. Mr Greenwell said he'd send a note to Carol and would assess whether there was anything else outstanding from that event.

### **9.3 Secretary**

#### **9.3.1. Correspondence**

See emails and items listed in appendix.

Mr Marks also commented that he'd been reminded by Cllr McCartney about the request for more benches in St Andrews along Market Street and that Councillors were prepared to fund them. Mr Paul commented that there had been suggestions at the AGM that they should go at Pret a Manger and Boots. Mrs Corbin thought that there was a need for a bench near the bus stop in Market Street although she acknowledged the pavement was quite narrow at that point.

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

No other public AOCB.