

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Minutes – November 2010

(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.standrewssc.net/>)

0. Chairman's Remarks

Welcome of Mr. Corbin as a new full member of the Community Council and Mr. Scott as a new co-opted member from the University.

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Carol Ashworth, Izzy Corbin, Marysia Denyer, Dave Finlay, Ken Fraser, Ian Goudie, Judith Harding, Patrick Marks, Audrey McAnaw, Ronnie Murphy, Onkar Parmar, Henry Paul, Andy Primmer, Kyffin Roberts, Catherine Rowe, Penny Upritchard

Student's Association Members

Holly West, Owen Wilton, Rebecca Ladley

Nominated

Daniel Stephens, Neil Scott

Fife Councillors

Frances Melville, Dorothea Morrison, Bill Sangster, Robin Waterston

Apologies

Ken Crichton, Meg Platt, Jude Innes

Resignation

Jill Hardie

2. Minutes of October 2010 Meeting

Dr. Goudie and Mr. Marks commented that minor corrections and typos had already been sent via email and only issues of substance and assurance of accuracy need be raised at this point.

4.3.5 Cllr Waterston asked that "admitted" be changed to "agreed" regarding difficulty accessing amended papers on line so as not to imply that he is responsible for those papers. Dr. Goudie also clarified that the Fife Council official was bringing issues of the access road to the attention of NHS, not to the council.

6.5.3 Dr. Goudie suggested that "if" be changed to the definite clause because whether the organizations agree or not, the action is legal.

3. Presentations

No presentations.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Dorothea Morrison

4.1.1. Northeast Fife Area Committee update on Kinness Burn

Cllr Morrison related that there had been an update on the Kinness Burn, but the local councillors are concerned over the timetable that has been presented by Fife Council for improvements to the burn. Fife Council has continued to remind the local councillors that any dredging of the burn needs to be approved by SEPA first. However, Cllr Morrison suggested that simple removal of vegetation might be done without consent of SEPA first.

Dr Goudie commented that he expected there would be widespread frustration regarding the amount of time it has taken to have the burn cleared. Recalling the strong reactions in a meeting following last year's flooding, Dr. Goudie asked the Local Councillors if the major obstacle seemed to be SEPA or the Council officials.

Councillor Morrison suggested that the issues might come from within Fife Council itself because even though the local members have continued to remind the Council of the need to work on the Kinness Burn it does not seem to have priority over other issues. Cllr Morrison sympathized with the families that were forced from their homes during last year's flood and suggested that because of safety issues,

perhaps SEPA would come along faster if the Council officials were moving more quickly to deal with the issue themselves.

Cllr Melville echoed the frustration of Cllr Morrison and shared a timetable received from Fife Council regarding the Kinnessburn, which called for work on the Kinness Burn to begin sometime between April and July 2011 at the earliest. There were several factors listed that could impinge on this "optimistic timescale," further delaying when work would be done.

Ms McAnaw asked if funding was the issue stopping the removal of vegetation or anything else that could be done without permission? Could the Common Good Fund be used for such a purpose?

Dr Goudie suggested that this depended upon the actual issue. He asked if the reason officials seem to be dragging their feet was financial, or if there was some other issue that was causing the delays.

Cllr Waterston reported that he has not heard it said that there was a financial obstacle.

Dr Goudie asked if there was a forum in which the other Local Councillors could voice support for St. Andrews Local Councillors in order to place pressure on Fife Council to take action.

Cllr Melville stated the Head of Transportation Services was well aware of the situation and was moving things along.

Ms Denyer asked if a local resident were to suffer because of another flood, would they have legal recourse to sue Fife Council for their inaction?

Cllr Morrison suggested that this would be a hard case because even though the pace at which officers had been working had been frustrating, they could claim they had always been working on the issue. Additionally, they would want to make sure that everything was in place before any work is done.

Ms Corbin related a story of someone she knew who was thinking of moving to St. Andrews but chose not to, knowing about the issues with the Kinness Burn. She suggested that because this may keep people from moving into the area it is contributing to some of the financial struggles faced by St. Andrews residents.

Dr Goudie commented that should a situation like this go on for any length of time there was no doubt about a negative effect on property values.

Cllr Sangster suggested that one positive step that could be taken would be to write a letter to the Head of Transportation Services asking for an update.

Cllr Waterston suggested we ask a transportation officer to come along to a meeting.

Dr Goudie suggested a motion be put forward to invite an officer from Transportation to our next meeting. He also raised the possibility that this could be publicized in the local press, but if that were done so we would need to be prepared for a significant crowd and that portion of the meeting would likely take the majority of the time.

Mr Murphy suggested that although the timetable that has been presented was unsatisfactory to members of the local community, it was still a timetable. Because of this, he suggested it would be best to wait until after the first of the year to hold a meeting in order to see how things progress now that a timetable was in place. A meeting at this stage would not accomplish anything because the timetable had been set and there wasn't anything that could be done about it.

Dr Goudie commented that a meeting at this stage would accomplish nothing only insofar as the timetable was set in stone. He suggested that if the Community Council did nothing it would be complicit in anything that happened. Therefore, it would be better for the Community Council to take whatever action it could.

Ms Ashworth posed the question to the four Local Councillors for their input as to whether inviting a member of Transportation would accomplish anything or whether we should wait for a meeting of any kind as suggested by Mr Murphy.

Cllr Sangster commented that the feelings of the Local Councillors had been made clear regarding Kinness Burn, but the decision regarding inviting an official really should be left up to the Community Council.

Cllr Waterston made clear he thought it would be useful to have someone from Transportation Services present so their view could be heard directly. However, he expressed reservation at the idea of publicizing the meeting because of the likelihood of a large crowd. Rather, this would allow the members of the Community Council to hear the views of Transportation Services articulated directly, and at some point in the future a public meeting should also be held so that a greater number of the members of the community can communicate with Transportation Services at that point.

Dr Goudie put forward the motion to invite a member of Transportation Services to the next meeting. It was seconded and carried.

In response to the proposal to make the press aware of this meeting in advance, Mr Paul suggested an article be submitted to the press in order to make the public aware of the timetable that has been

proposed by Fife Council, encouraging them to contact their own Local Councillors rather than to encourage others along to a meeting with Transportation Services.

Mr Finlay also suggested that a public meeting would better serve the purpose of inviting the public to be involved with Transportation Services than the context of a normal Community Council meeting. Therefore, it should be on the agenda, but not advertised in the paper.

Based on this conversation, Dr Goudie suggested that the Community Council should make public the timetable for work on the Kinness Burn, but not specifically advertise a meeting with Transportation Services. However, that would not preclude a public meeting on a different date in the future. This position was met with approval by the Community Council.

Cllr Waterston added that an advantage to having someone at the December meeting was that by that time consultant's reports would have come back and they would have something of substance to share.

Dr Goudie modified the previous position to wait on any action in the press until after a meeting was held with an official from Transportation Services. After that meeting, something tangible could be reported based on what was accomplished at that time.

4.1.2. Update from Craigtoun Working Group

The working group decided that the park would operate as a free park next year because there was not sufficient capital to make the railway or the boats safe. Additionally, the Dutch Village had some money set aside for repairs but there were problems with the flow of funds. There was hope for the future to set up a trust that might be able to fund the needs presented by Craigtoun. The hope was also that the Community Council could assess how involved it could be in the process. Cllr Morrison also made clear that by making the park free to enter, there were some sources of funding that could be accessed that were unavailable to parks that required an entry fee. Finally, Cllr Morrison noted that there seemed to be significant public interest in Craigtoun as a facility that needed improvement. She hoped that as the issues surrounding the park became public, members of the community could have input as to what the best ways were to proceed and could help inform what the park's most valued assets were.

4.2. Robin Waterston

4.2.1. Report on Proposed Fife Local Development Plan

Cllr Waterston reported on a letter written by Bill Lindsay from the Planning Department. It was asking for the Community Council to be involved in a consultation process asking what had been learned from the consultation process regarding the previous Local Plan, and perhaps the Structure Plan. They would also be asking Community Councils if the principle of making a Local Development Plan across the whole of Fife would be well received or not.

Ms Upritchard began comments by thanking Cllr Waterston for comments reported by *The Courier*, and then moved on to state that although significant discussion of this issue was yet to be had, a single Local Plan would be even more complex, even less comprehensible than the current local plan, and would take into account sensitive landscape areas even less that the current system was able to do. It seemed that based on the current description of the proposed process, a Local Development Plan Forum would not be viable. There was concern that if Fife Council were to select specific individuals to take part in the Forum it would not properly represent the concerns of individual Community Councils. Based on the current system, Community Councils do not receive a final report detailing what assessments are made based on comments returned to Fife Council. As a result, they are unable to see what is sent to the Reporter by Fife Council after the consultation period has ended. This is something that needs to be addresses regardless of what type of plan goes forward in the future.

Cllr Melville expressed concern that there seemed to be a desire to create one Local Development Plan now, even though the current Local Plan still had not been finalised.

Dr Goudie expressed that there seemed to be a desire to continue changing the plans so quickly that if anyone wished to object they would find it impossible to know what they were objecting to. Although some procedural issues were raised by Ms Upritchard, Dr Goudie cited the impression that officials had been unwilling to take into account the views of the local community under the current Local and Structure Plans, as the chief problem with the creation of yet another local plan, as it could further alienate local communities from the decision-making process that affected them. He expressed dissatisfaction with the current consultation process, but went on to state that the main structural question was how this related to the new city regions planning operation. A Fife-wide local plan would need to be subordinate to the Tay Plan and the Edinburgh-Lothian plan. Even though there were some similarities between these documents, there were liable to be substantial differences between the two. How could a Fife-wide Local plan conform to both? Additionally, when "local" comes to mean the whole of Fife, the word "local" becomes effectively meaningless and signifies another step in which this town loses influence over its own affairs.

Cllr Waterston responded that between the three Local Plans that exist within Fife currently, the policies sections in each were almost identical. There was an attempt to get a specific policy for HMOs relating to St Andrews, but that was an unusual case. The settlement plans were what was critical to

local government plans. Having St Andrews and East Fife conform to the larger plan and the Structure Plan was where problems had come up in the past. What would happen in the future was that settlement plans would have to fit within the larger city-region plans and the strategies outlined within those plans? Fife would be unique in that it would have two city-region plans, and that might make things more complicated in the future, but it might not. It might not affect settlement plans very much. The important thing to focus on was how the settlement plans could be developed in a way the local community felt about how it was consulted. Whether it was within the context of St Andrews and East Fife or the whole of Fife might not make a great deal of difference. The policies themselves under the proposal would be Fife-wide. That wouldn't make a lot of difference because there was still a possibility for local supplementary guidance. It was a question that needed to be aired widely and not simply rubber-stamped.

Dr Goudie stated that the question was whether proper deliberation could even be had at a scale as large as Fife. Local people would not be able to have meaningful input regarding planning issues on such a large scale.

Ms Uprichard complained that regarding settlement plans, for the last six years people had written about the fact that the population figure given to St Andrews of 16,351 included students, but Fife Council had been immovable on that fact. Dr Goudie commented that because 2011 is a census year, we were reliant on a better job being done than in 2001.

4.3. Bill Sangster

4.3.1. Licensing Board Applications

One application went through despite an objection because the objection was based on obstruction on pavement and wasn't applicable to the licensing board. However, a condition was added that tables, chairs and A-Boards must maintain a two-metre walkway and this will be written into the license.

4.3.2. Constabulary Meetings

Cllr Sangster reminded the Community Council that these meetings were important to attend as they provided a forum through which the community could communicate with the police, either for airing complaints, making the police aware of local issues, and asking questions. The next meeting would be held 25th November at Madras Kilrymont.

4.3.3. Transportation Report

The roundabout near Morrisons will be revamped. The 24-volt system on pedestrian beacons and "keep left" signs will be redone as well to make it safer.

4.3.4. "Cash for St Andrews" Scheme

The Courier ran an article where visitors to St Andrews would be able to donate cash to the town. A consultant to the St Andrews Partnership would be available to assess the development of a "community payback" scheme. How did the Community Council feel about that?

Ms Corbin suggested that it would be bad for St Andrews, and visitors and there was no reason to go down that road.

Cllr Sangster added that several years ago there was a scheme suggested where boxes could be placed in hotels and shops for people to contribute to St Andrews. That was never implemented and the worry was that this was going down that road again.

Dr Goudie asked what the proposed mechanism was to raise the money.

Cllr Sangster stated that this would likely be considered by the consultant.

Mr Scott, as a member of the St Andrews Partnership, recalled that the conversation centred around the fact that the Partnership was offered some seed funding from Scottish Enterprise to look at the possibility of whether this kind of scheme would work in this area. This was based on the fact that there was a similar scheme implemented in Loch Lomond that has been very successful and funded several local projects. The Partnership agreed to aid in the feasibility study.

Cllr Morrison said that knowing there was a situation where money was going to be very tight for quite a long time, if St Andrews was going to fund improvements it would have to look in new places because the money wouldn't be coming from Fife Council. It would be prudent to try to find ways to get money into the town that hadn't previously been looked at. If people knew that money was going to be ring-fenced for a particular cause they were likely to be more willing to give.

4.4. Frances Melville

4.4.1. Pilmour Links

Cllr Melville updated the issue of flooding on the putting green. Previously, there were meetings presenting different options through which an agreement was reached between Scottish Water, the Links Trust, and residents affected by the flooding. However, since then, contradictory reports had come back to Scottish Water stating that the previous options given were not viable. Therefore, a new

team of consultants was now working with Scottish Water to come up with new modelling systems to come up with a more viable option. The previous solution was due to be undertaken in January, but the new modelling options are not due until July. It may be that the pumping station only needs to be upgraded and this will solve the problem. That would be a simpler, less expensive solution, but it is a substantial delay from where things were before. There will also be a lead-in time after the report in July, especially if there is need to go across Links land or Council land. Cllr Melville has asked Scottish Water for a meeting to express dissatisfaction with this kind of a delay.

4.4.2. Parking at Forrest Place

There is a possibility of another TRO to be considered. The school is asking parents to be mindful of where they park, especially because this could create displacement and more pressure on the other side rather than solve the problem.⁵ Planning Committee

5.1. Planning Committee Minutes – See Appendices

Ms Denyer thanked Mr Roberts who is now producing the minutes for the Planning Committee meetings. Additionally, the Planning Committee has now taken on a different format for reviewing planning applications in order to cut down the amount of time spent at each meeting reviewing applications. A new format will also be used when emailing the list of applications that are being reviewed. This will reduce redundancy and paper use.

Ms Upritchard stated that a letter was going to be sent to Local Councillors on behalf of the Planning Committee regarding the challenge in receiving paper plans. Ms Denyer thanked Cllr Morrison for her work in clarifying the position of the Community Council as statutory consultees as it related to the challenge of receiving plans. Ms Upritchard clarified her earlier point in stating that plans seem to be either “feast or famine” and cited major applications, which were sent with over 100 documents per application, which are nearly impossible for a lay committee to digest in an efficient manner, let alone assess all the implications of those plans.

Ms Denyer also thanked the Planning Committee for drafting a press statement that was printed in the *Courier* regarding the position of the Community Council regarding development on the St Leonards playing fields site.

Mr Roberts added that the statement was sent to both the *Courier* and the *Citizen*. He also clarified that he did not speak to the *Courier* directly despite their printing reading, “Mr Roberts said...” It was sent on behalf of the Planning Committee and the Community Council rather than as a personal statement.

Ms Upritchard finally added regarding the Knightsbridge application that there has been no Master Plan. It is standard procedure for all Master Plans to have an SEA, and because no Master Plan has been provided, there is also no SEA. Additionally, no Environmental Impact Assessment has been done. The Planning Committee continues to ask for clarification regarding the status of this application, but there has been very little communication received over the last six months.

Dr Goudie asked if there had been any follow up to the previous Community Council meeting agenda item 8.2 regarding affordable housing. No further discussion had taken place regarding this specific agenda item in Planning Committee meetings.

Cllr Waterston added that Fife Council Development Services have recently produced a new document titled *Supplementary Guidance on Affordable Housing*. It tries to take account of new economic circumstances and offers possible mechanisms other than developer contributions to subsidise affordable housing. This is a critical issue, and there is certainly not enough being produced. The strategy up until now has been partly government funding and partly developer contributions, neither of which is producing enough affordable housing.

Dr Goudie confirmed that this is something the Planning Committee could access on the web and discuss at a future meeting.

6. Matters Arising From Previous Meetings

6.1. Climate Challenge Fund

Mr Murphy noted that Santanden was using a new leaflet to distribute to people in the streets, they have been knocking on doors, and leaving “sorry we missed you cards” when not able to reach people directly. This has resulted in high levels of interest among those being targeted. A new database has been created in order to record all work and successes in moving towards current reduction target. They are also looking at getting training in order to update the website on a more regular basis. There is a poster competition currently being designed involving the primary schools in the area. This will raise awareness of energy conservation among children as well as target their parents as children bring home work for the poster competition. It is called “Switch On to Switching Off.”

There has been a great increase in activity from the group in the last two weeks. In the six weeks, 445 leaflets were dropped, but in the last two weeks, 632 were done. Energy advice has been given to 237 people, and 104

energy audits have been done. Insulation work has been done, but those numbers are smaller considering that the previous group did this. Power-downs will be given away, but not many have been given away yet.

Dr Goudie asked if anything could be said at this point regarding whether progress was being made towards the targeted carbon emission reduction. Mr Murphy replied that it was still too early to say anything along those lines, but would be possible closer to the end of the project. However, based on the fact that the group had visited over a thousand homes thus far, if they could continue to visit 600 each fortnight, nearly the whole town will have been covered. If those visits translated to people saving CO₂, it might very well have an impact in moving towards the target reduction.

6.2. Martyrs Monument

Ms Corbin began by thanking the 19th Hole Golf Club for their contribution of £500 towards this project. She also reported that there were some problems with the St Andrews Partnership because the appeal on their website for help in restoring Martyrs Monument failed to mention the Community Council in equal participation with the Partnership. An email was sent requesting that equal credit be given to the Community Council and the Preservation Trust, each of which had partnered with St Andrews Partnership in this project.

Dr Goudie echoed the frustration expressed by Ms Corbin and stated that when various bodies act together in a spirit of cooperation, equal credit would be appreciated.

Ms Ashworth stated that the St Andrews Partnership had been working towards the restoration of Martyrs Monument since last year. The St Andrews Partnership was designed in such a way that it involved the whole of St Andrews and there was no need to seek out recognition beyond what was already being given.

Ms Uprichard expressed concern regarding the manner in which fundraising was being done. She suggested it would be prudent before public appeals are given asking for donations that some start-up funds should already have been raised and a final cost for the project be determined. Where did the figures of £100,000-£150,000 come from? Furthermore, were there ways in which those who read the public appeal could donate or pledge now? If there was no way for willing parties to support the project, the appeal for donations was premature in her view.

Ms Ashworth clarified that the first estimate given regarding the project was only to maintain Martyrs Monument as it is and involved no restorative work. However, it was decided that contributors giving money towards a project would not be happy if the monument simply looked the same as it has. When the decision was made that restorative work would be done, a conservation architect would need to be hired, and this made the project much more expensive. Because a large amount would have to come in to complete this kind of work, an early appeal for donations was seen as necessary. There is also more information on the website about how to donate than there was in the article printed in the paper.

Dr Goudie asked how the decision for the scale of the project was made and who specifically was involved.

Cllr Morrison replied all those on the St Andrews Partnership were involved. It may have been unfortunate the way that some of the press statements were made, but the directors of the St Andrews Partnership wanted everyone involved and the town working together. That is the reason members from different organizational bodies were included on the Partnership.

Mr Paul added that the Community Council also volunteered to register the project with Fife Environmental Trust because it is a member. If we register with the Trust, after all estimates are given for the cost of the project we can go back and then ask for a contribution from the Trust. Permission was requested to continue the registration process. Another question was raised as to whether the Community Council would like to make a donation towards the project from the Ex Trust Fund.

Dr Goudie recognized the importance of what Mr Paul had to offer regarding raising funds towards the project but returned to the problem of recognition from the St Andrews Partnership. He stated that because this is only one of many projects the Partnership is taking on, it is very important that all parties feel they are genuinely part of what is going on. Clearly Ms Corbin does not feel that due recognition is being given and this should be taken into consideration by the writers of the St Andrews Partnership website.

Ms Corbin returned to the discrepancy between the figures given to restore the monument. She worried that they might be too high and that the public might be confused.

Dr Goudie worried that unlike the parties involved in the issue of 1 Greyfriars Garden, the St Andrews Partnership does not seem interested in reporting back to the various organizations involved the decisions that are being made and this may erode a spirit of cooperation for future projects.

6.3. Arms Update

Mr Paul noted that two trustees must be chosen for the St Andrews Community Trust. Dr Goudie stated that there is a lengthy legal document that needs to be read before we nominate trustees and sign the papers, but agreed that a provisional decision for trustees could be made at this stage. Mr Paul and Ms Harding were provisionally nominated as trustees to represent the Community Council.

6.4. Reports from Representatives

Nothing to report at this time.

6.5. Any Other Matters Arising

6.5.1. Allotments Update

Ms Ashworth stated that she has continued to try to get answers from the allotments officer, but has been unable to. Most recently he suggested that the Orchard Group might be able to take up allotments. She reports that she cannot get an answer from Fife Council as to whether the field in question will sometime in the future support allotments.

Cllr Waterston stated he would look into the matter.

Ms Ashworth stated she simply wanted an answer from Fife Council as to whether it could see that this piece of land could be put forward for planning permission for allotments and no answer has been given up to this point.

6.5.2. Funding for Rail Feasibility Study

Mr Scott reported that the University has made a decision to make a donation towards the Rail Feasibility Study to be undertaken for St Andrews. In response, Dr Goudie informed the Community Council that based on e-mail voting that took place since the last meeting, the Community Council has agreed to increase our contribution to £1,000, all of which will come from the Ex Trust Fund.

7. Reports From Committees

7.1. Recreation

Mr Paul stated that the Art and Photographic Exhibition will be happening on Saturday and Sunday during the St Andrews Festival. It will be set up Friday evening and a reception will follow. Tuesday, November 30 there will be a civic reception in the Burgh chambers from 6:00-7:15. Afterwards, there will be a beating of the retreat with the city pipe band.

Dr Goudie asked if there were other guests who should be invited that are not yet on the guest list. He made several suggestions himself and Mr Paul asked that any other invites could be emailed to him.

Ms McAnaw asked that if there are any nominations for the Young Citizen of the Year Award to please send them in the next week or two.

Ms Denyer mentioned that there will be a Seniors Christmas Party on 10 December. The hall has been booked, and entertainment is still in the works. A significant effort is being made to include those who have not previously been invited to similar events. This has caused a certain level of ambiguity regarding different mailing lists and whom it is appropriate to send invitations to. Cllr Sangster offered some clarity on the issue that the mailing lists in question belong to the Community Council. Dr Goudie and Ms Denyer agreed that although this is true in a legal sense, extra care is being taken because of the sensitivity of the issue.

Ms McAnaw asked if there were ways through tools like the voters rolls to find out how many people are eligible for this kind of event. That was answered in the negative because it is privileged information.

7.2. General Purposes

The General Purposes Committee has not met in the last month.

7.3. 200 Club

Ms Harding was not available for comment.

7.4. Health Education and Welfare

Ms Corbin reported that a meeting is forthcoming, but none have occurred since the last full Community Council meeting. There are several fundraising events forthcoming. There are specialists available to give advice on health issues. If you need such a service, please let Ms Corbin know.

8. New Business

8.1. ASCC Annual Conference

Mr Marks reported that there is room for anyone who wants to attend to register. This is a full day training in Glasgow and offers the opportunity to meet members of Scottish Government and members of other Community Councils. An email with details has been sent.

8.2. Cyclists Group

Mr Marks reported there was an initial query regarding a cycling group in St Andrews that would be involved in assessing roads and creating representation for the interests of cyclists within Fife Council regarding St Andrews. The Community Council was contacted as a group that might be interested in participating regarding cyclists, among several other relevant parties.

Dr Goudie responded that the Community Council has been involved in encouraging cycling, but there has not been funding directed towards cycling at this point. Some funding is being pursued for consultancy work regarding cycle safety within St Andrews.

8.3. Craigtoun Park Report

Ms Corbin reported that there was extensive discussion which focused on the cost of making necessary repairs and improvements to the park and that because many of these have prohibitive costs involved, the park would be free to enter this coming year.

Mr Marks reminded the Community Council that an email was sent out detailing some of the reports given to officials and options discussed for Craigtoun Park, including the free option.

Ms Corbin added that a great deal of the discussion focused on the Dutch Village and the cost associated with renovating that. The state of the Dutch Village also created a health and safety issue for the boats.

In response to a question regarding health and safety issues with the boats, Cllr Morrison made clear that although some of the boats are in need of repair, the primary issue is not with the boats themselves. Rather, the issue is with the Dutch Village, which is in such a state of disrepair that some of the tiles are falling off the roofs of buildings in the village and falling into the lake, making it unsafe for use of the boats.

Dr Goudie asked if the Dutch Village was the only significant attraction that is in such a bad state, did this justify removing the charge to enter the park? Would other attractions such as crazy golf be operating? Would the cafeteria still be open for visitors to the park to take advantage of?

Cllr Morrison answered that the cafeteria would operate as normal as well as the new children's play area. However, because of health and safety issues the boats and trains would not operate. There would also be a reduction in staff because there would be no need for anyone to collect money at the gate. Health and safety requires attractions like the train and boats to cease operations, but the other free attractions would still be operational.

Ms Uprichard asked if there was a maintenance budget for Craigtoun, and if so, how did the park come into such a state of disrepair? Secondly, was there a reason for moving the entrance to the park away from the town?

Cllr Morrison answered that there has been discussion regarding the issue of the entrance to the park. Through that discussion it has been found that when the Dukes Course was constructed, a great deal of land was purchased that the park could no longer use for purposes such as parking. Because of restricted land use on that side of the park, the entrance was moved. Cllr Morrison remarked that decisions like this are taken with the best of reasons in mind, but in retrospect may turn out to be wrong. This is why she is encouraging all those in the community with something to offer to the discussion of the future of Craigtoun should be involved. The hope is that by involving the community more directly, decisions are made that are in the best interests of all those involved and unforeseen issues such as have arisen from the movement of the entrance to the park can be avoided. At the time when elected members made the decision to sell the land to the Dukes Course, the best of intentions were in mind, but clearly it has not worked out as was hoped. She added that when money from something like that sale is taken in, it is not ring-fenced for Craigtoun and that is part of the issue. If there were a specific fund set up for Craigtoun, some of the issues it faces would have a guaranteed source of funding, but as it is now, no such fund exists.

Ms Denyer confirmed that the issue with the Dutch Village was not just the tiles falling off the roofs. A portion of the lake would have to be drained in order to remove the tiles that have fallen into it and to allow scaffolding to be erected for repair work.

Ms Corbin added that it was not just a matter of replacing tiles in the Dutch Village, but the wood underneath the tiles was rotting away and therefore all of that would need to be replaced as well. Thus, this required a major construction job to ensure health and safety in and around the Village rather than a simple job of replacing roofing tiles.

Dr Goudie asked whether a joint meeting with Cameron Community Council should be proposed in order to discuss the state of the park.

Mr Marks reported that at the last meeting in Cupar regarding the park, a joint meeting between Cameron and St Andrews Community Councils was suggested in order to discuss whether the Community Councils wished to pursue a joint position regarding Craigtoun as well as issues such as setting up a trust.

Dr Goudie and Mr Marks discussed when a joint meeting between the Community Councils of Cameron and St Andrews could be scheduled. It was decided that an initial date of 15th November would be presented to Cameron Community Council and communication would be made through email in order to confirm a meeting date.

9. Reports from Officers

9.1. Chair

Dr Goudie reported that he is open to suggestion as to what will appear on the website. He then moved on to the resignation of Jill Hardie as was mentioned at the beginning of the meeting. The election is coming up in February, which leaves three more full meetings before the election. Although this is a rather short amount of time, a letter will be written to advertise the vacancy so anyone who wishes to gain experience before the election can do so.

Mr Marks to write letter.

9.2. Treasurer

Mr Paul reported that we are in a good financial situation. This is due in large part to the bandstand concerts that raised £350. Applications for grants also raised £4,000. However, there is question as to the financial status of next year, especially regarding donations from voluntary organizations. Mr Paul also stated that if a Community Councillor is part of another organization or event, written permission should be received before taking part if funding from the Community Council is expected.

Mr Marks reported that some bills came in regarding subscriptions that the Community Council maintains and that those would be forwarded on so they could be paid.

9.3. Secretary

An email was received after the agenda was set from Bill Lindsay regarding the Fife Local Development Plan as was previously discussed.

10. Any Other Competent Business

10.1. Bus Station

Mr Fraser reported that the new stance for long-distance busses does not have a large enough bus shelter to accommodate the queues. He suggested that letters be written to Stagecoach and/or Fife Council to accommodate the queues. Additionally, the times for the long distance buses have been removed from the electronic display. It would be helpful to put them back on the display so people know where they are and when they are leaving.

Cllr Sangster stated that this could be brought up to Transportation in Cupar.

10.2. Remembrance Sunday

Ms Uprichard reminded that there would be a service on Remembrance Sunday, the 14th of November at Holy Trinity. Members of the Community Council who wish to take part should gather at about 10.25 at the bottom of the town hall and then proceed to Holy Trinity for the service.

10.3. Bicycle Lights

Ms Corbin remarked that there are still a great number of students riding bicycles without lights at night. Ms West responded that a campaign is currently being run to address this issue. Lights and reflective strips are being handed out and additional funding is being pursued to give out more of these materials. Cllr Sangster said the Community Safety Panel may have funding available for such a campaign.