

[\[2003 index\]](#)

# Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

## Agenda – August 2003

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm on Monday 4th August in the Burgh Chambers of the Town Hall, Queen's Gardens. There will be a short break at about 8pm during which the 200 Club draw will be made.

*(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 mid-1998 on are online at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/>)*

### 1. Apologies

Frank Riddell, Sheila Black, Laurel Aguilar

### 2. Minutes of July 2003

*Read for accuracy in matters of substance – harangue the secretary for minor errors (spelling etc) outwith the meeting.*

### 3. Presentations

*For anyone wishing to address the meeting on a matter relevant to St Andrews. Please contact the Secretary or Chair before the meeting. Priority will be given to those who have been invited to speak or have given advance notice.*

#### 3.1. Locality Assistant

Rachel Hay to talk about how the Locality Assistant post is developing.

### 4. Fife Councillors

#### 4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.1.1. **Police Station Sign** [July 4.1.8] the sign will no longer be internally illuminated. Appendix A.

#### 4.2. Sheila Black (South)

#### 4.3. Bill Sangster (Central)

#### 4.4. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

### 5. Planning Committee Report

### 6. Matters Arising from previous meetings

#### 6.1. BT Payphones

[March 4.4.3. and April Agenda Appendix C] Appendix B1 BT reply to objections. Appendix B3 Fife Council response to B1.

Appendix B2: Provisional community council response.

**Response to be confirmed/amended**

#### 6.2. Parking Strategy consultation

[June 9.1.1.7.] Colin Buchanan Partners consultants are holding a further meeting to discuss a draft Fife-wide Parking Strategy. 6.30-8.30pm Tue 5th August, Town Hall.

**Who will attend?**

#### 6.3. Carly Kirkcaldy Dance School

As requested by Council the 200 Club Management Committee considered the above appeal for funding. The Committee regrets not being in a position to make a grant in this case.

It is submitted the Community Council might wish to advise the applicant to make application to the Bell Fund.

*Archie Strachan, Convener.*

## 6.4. Fife Coastal Path

The Fife Coast and Countryside Trust send a copy of the Fife Coastal Path Celebration Week Community Scroll:

Thank you for your support during the Fife Coastal Path Celebration Week by signing the Community Scroll that was passed to each Community Council as the week progressed. We look forward to working alongside each of the Community Councils along the path to help enhance and promote the path for the benefit of everyone along it. The week was an enormous success and as a result more awareness of this fantastic natural asset for Fife has been raised.

We hope to make this event an annual one and would be delighted if you could join us again next year!

**Archie Strachan suggests we invite the Trust** to come and tell us what they are doing about the state of the path east of St Andrews.

## 6.5. RSCDS

[July 7.7.] Elspeth Gray, Secretary of RSCDS, was very pleased to hear of our wish to make some form of presentation. For this purpose two members of community council are invited to join their dinner at University Hall 6.15pm Wednesday 6th August (semi-formal, jacket and tie). What shall we present?

**Permission to spend money on egg flowers?**

## 6.6. Hospital Meeting

[July Additional] Report from those attending.

## 6.7. Golf Course meeting

[July 4.1.2.] Report from those attending.

## 6.8. Revised Scheme for Community Councils

[July 6.2.] Appendix D Points for response.

## 6.9. Patras

[July 7.1.] Initial contact made with Mr Mackie. We'll need to determine suitable form of 'greetings'.

## 6.10. Best Kept Town & Village

Appendix E: Results

## 6.x. Other matters arising

## 7. New Business

### 7.1. Public Conveniences Review

Appendix F

### 7.2. Freedom of Information Act

Scottish executive invite us to comment on the draft code of practice for Public Authorities.

### 7.3. Local Governance Bill

Scottish Executive invite us to comment on the draft by 30 September. A number of specific questions are included on STV voting, remuneration, and boundaries.

### 7.4. Homecheck

A Fife community safety partnership initiative aimed at the over 60s. It is a "home safety check for visual hazards\* around the home" eg trip hazards, electrical appliances for training/frayed/lose cables, smoke alarms, microwave oven 'leakage'

\* I think they mean 'visual check for hazards' here...

### 7.5. Tetra Masts

Alison Mackay, who is campaigning against TETRA radio masts, asks if we would like

a speaker on the subject.

## 8. Reports from Officers

### 8.1. Chair

### 8.2. Treasurer

### 8.3. Secretary

**8.3.1. Floral display congratulations** [July 10.1.] Appendix C

**8.3.2. Beach Parties** points from July 7.9. passed on via Cllr Frances Melville

**8.3.3. Rifle Range** [July 7.10.] EnviroCentre emailed with contact details for local historians Mr Christie and Mrs Willsher.

**8.3.4. Lammas Sunday Opening** [July 4.4.4. / 7.6.] results of discussion passed on to Fife Council.

**8.3.5. Heraldry** [July 8.3.3.] Mark Denis invited to speak.

## 9. Reports

## 10. Any Other Competent Business

*Please notify Chair of AOCB items before the start of the meeting or at the break.  
Hint: Given that the end of the meeting is often taken in something of a rush, unless items are urgent it might be better to submit them for next meeting's New Business.*

---

## Appendix A – Police Station Sign

*email to Cllr Melville from Austin Cooke, Principal Planner (Development Control)*

Application withdrawn. The Police advised us that they would no longer illuminate the sign and remove cabling. This means that the sign no longer requires advertisement consent. Lyle Smith will be monitoring this to make sure that this is what happens.

I am disappointed that we cannot get them to install something more in line with what we expect from private individuals but it no longer falls within our control as a Planning Authority.

---

## Appendix B – BT Pay Phones

### Appendix B1. BT's reply

*email from Sue Byrne BT Payphones Customer Services*

For the attention of: Pete Lindsay (BT Ref KR402/03), Bill Sangster (BT ref KR233/03), Sheila Hill (BT ref KR221/03)

Also Councillor Jane Ann Liston and Mike Robinson (BT Ref's KR62/03 and KR198/03) – for information – as you enquired about the lighting in public payphone number 01334 476 636.

I write regarding the e-mails you all sent to us in February and March 2003 regarding the removal of 3 payphones in the St Andrews area. Firstly, I must apologise for the delay in responding to your e-mails; we did receive more correspondence regarding our payphone reduction programme than we had anticipated hence the delay in this reply.

I will address each payphone in turn.

- 01334 476526 payphone at Bogward Rd. We have decided to leave this payphone in place for the time being. This may be reviewed at a later date however we are aware that it is quite a distance to the next public phone box.
- 01334 476636 payphone at the junction of Canongate/Largo Rd. We are maintaining our decision to remove this box on the basis that there is public payphone service 550m away at the junction of Lamond Drive and Pipeland Rd. The power to this box has already been disconnected and will not be reconnected before we remove this box.
- 01334 474970 payphone on Lamond Drive. Again the decision to remove this box has been maintained as there is public payphone service nearby – 450m away in Langlands Rd.

Our consultation policy at the time we sought feedback on the removal of these 3 public payphones was to write to the main council in the area and ask them to pass this information on to interested parties. After consultation with Oftel this has changed and any further planned removals will now involve consultation with all local and community councils for all areas. Future notices about removals of public payphones placed in boxes will invite members of the public to contact the council for the area to lodge any objections with them. We will ask councils to forward any specific objections to us within 42 days.

I must reiterate why this programme of rationalisation is important as it will ensure the future of the BT public payphone network for the foreseeable future. Please could you advise me in writing by 5th August 2003 if have any comments regarding this e-mail. I do realise we did take longer than this to reply to your e-mails but hope you can understand how this situation arose.

## **Appendix B2. Community Council response**

*Provisional response (to meet BT deadline) by Pete Lindsay upholding community council's objection. Copied to Oftel.*

Due to the short time allowed for a response community council has not yet met to formally consider your reply; we next meet the day before your deadline. Your reply has been circulated however and on the basis of comments received I write provisionally to uphold our objections to the removal of the payphone boxes at Canongate and Lamond Drive. Should the meeting of Monday 4th August make any substantial change to the position below I shall inform you.

To reiterate our objections:

- these are in the residential area of St Andrews, not the town centre which is relatively well provided for alternatives;
- all are isolated: there are no immediate alternative payphones in their areas – a 'phone box hundreds of metres away, out of sight, on a different road, is not 'nearby';
- they serve as a valuable local landmarks in their areas. Indeed I should also point out that the two boxes you still intend to remove are both more prominent, on major routes, compared with their suggested alternatives.

Also please note the distances you quote are wrong. Canongate to Pipeland Road box is a bit under 400m; Lamond Drive box to Langlands Drive (actually Glebe Road) is just over 550m (Both measured travelling by road between sites with a handheld GPS unit). It looks rather like you have swapped the figures. While we are not directly concerned about the actual distances to the last centimetre ('hundreds of metres' is close enough) casual inaccuracy like this must tend to undermine confidence in BT's review process.

## **Appendix B3. Fife Council response**

*Copy for information from Mike Robinson, Head of Local Services, Cupar*

I refer to your email of 15th July 2003 and I am pleased that you recognise the need to retain the payphone at Bogward Road.

However, I understand from feedback from members in the community that there are still considerable concerns at the proposal to remove the payphones at Canongate/Largo Road and on Lamond Drive. I understand that despite the fact that power has been removed, people have been observed regularly using the public payphone at Canongate. This particular payphone is on one of the principal routes into St Andrews and is, therefore, quite visible for visitors to the town. Lamond Drive is not a principal route and, therefore, cannot be viewed as a suitable alternative for anyone who does not know the area.

The Lamond Drive payphone (01334 474970) is on a main residential route and, therefore, more accessible and visible to the general public than the payphone in Langlands Road. The local community believe that the Langlands Road payphone is vandalised on a more frequent basis than Lamond Drive and I would question, therefore, why this particular payphone has been identified for removal. Both phones you are planning to retain are on more minor routes and less visible to the public, especially visitors, than those you are intending to close.

In my original response, I asked for more detail on the policy for the removal of payphones, the methods of consultation, and the status of objections from the

Council, Community Council and others. I also suggested that a meeting with local managers from BT and Council officers would help to identify a more constructive approach to decisions on the removal of payphones and achieve more effective consultation. Your reply only addresses the issue of the policy on consultation and I would reiterate my request for a response on the other questions raised.

This issue has produced a strong reaction from the local community because the public payphone network is seen as an essential component of the local and national communications network much in the same way as roads, public transport and the universal postal service. Although it is recognised that there has been significant growth both in personal and mobile phones, there is still a need to maintain a payphone network. I believe, local communities would far better understand these particular proposals if they were part of an overall strategy of a payphone network, rather than a reaction to income or problems of vandalism, which could be addressed in different ways. I do not believe that consultation by email is appropriate for an issue such as this and would reiterate the Council's objections to the removal of these two payphones subject to further more detailed information and consultation.

---

## Appendix C – Floral display

*Thanks sent to Jim Hooton, Community Services*

I am very pleased to be writing to you to pass on the community council's deep appreciation of, and thanks for, this year's excellent floral displays in St Andrews. The Arms at the Petheram Bridge were particularly impressive, and commented upon to members of community council by the public.

We also heard reports that other communities benefited similarly. This must have taken a great effort in both planning and execution. We would like to make it clear that we are grateful both for St Andrews' sake and generally for this part of Fife.

Thank you, and your workers, very much indeed.

[Jim Hooton acknowledged with thanks for the feedback and will pass our message on to his workforce]

---

## Appendix D – Scheme for Community Councils

Rather than include a full item by item analysis of which of our comments from the previous stage have been adopted, or not, I've restricted this to items of importance that I believe we should again comment on in this Final Draft. – PL

### **9.0 Meetings**

*9.1 (a) A Community Council shall hold in every year such meetings as they think necessary and in an election year shall hold a meeting within 21 days from the date of the election.*

and

### **10.0 Appointment of Office Bearers**

*10.1 Every Community Council, at its first meeting, which shall be convened for a date within one Calendar month after the election of members:-*

We have previously suggested that the inaugural meeting should be held within a month rather than, as at present, 21 days of the elections to do away with the need for a special meeting for those community council who hold monthly meetings. It looks as if the intention is to adopt the suggestion of 1 month but this hasn't been applied consistently.

### **11. Removal of Office Bearers**

*11.2 If a motion... [to remove an office bearer from post] ...is passed by a two thirds majority of the elected members present at the meeting...*

Previously suggested that 2/3 majority of all elected members rather than just those attending a particular meeting which might represent a minority of community council if the meeting is only just quorate. Eg minimum quorum in the Scheme is 40%, so for us 6 people could vote out an office bearer in a meeting of 8.

### **12.0 Constitution**

*12.3. Constitutions of Community Councils must be fully compliant with the terms of this Scheme and will remain in force until the next set of Community Council*

*elections.*

i) While the option to retain individual constitutions has been allowed, there is no clear guidance as to what may be varied from the Scheme in Constitutions, which must be “fully compliant” with it. We have suggested that a constitution should cover:

- Objectives
- Quorum
- Titles of Officers (Convenor vs Chair(-person))
- Alteration of Constitution
- Signatories for Cheques
- Dissolution and disposal of assets

ii) Duration: the current Scheme requires a constitution to be set after the first election for a community council and then become the constitution for the community council thereafter on approval by Fife Council. Limiting the constitution to each community council term could be seen, by a suspicious mind, as only a grudging acceptance of individual constitutions with the hope that they will prove too troublesome to maintain if they are to be confirmed every three years. A more innocent interpretation is a desire to be sure that those community councils whose membership changes radically, with little or no continuity between sessions, are not tied by their predecessors (whom they may have overturned) and are aware of their constitution in any case – certainly we have been through periods when no one knew what or where our constitution was.

*Pete Lindsay*

## Appendix E – Best Kept Town

Class	East Fife	Fife-wide
Wee Village / Hamlet	1st Balmerino, 2nd Collessie, 3rd Arncroach, 4th Kilconquhar, 5th Letham, 6th Newton of Falkland	1st Balmerino, 2nd Torryburn
Small Village	1st Pitlessie, 2nd Gauldry	1st Cuiross, 2nd Pitlessie, 3rd Auchtertool
Medium Village	1st Falkland, 2nd Crail, 3rd Freuchie, 4th Newburgh, 5th Springfield	1st Falkland, 2nd Aberdour, 3rd Thornton
Large Village	1st Tayport, 2nd Anstruther, 3rd Newport / Wormit, 4th Auchtermuchty	1st Kinghorn, 2nd Tayport, 3rd Cairneyhill
Small Town	1st Cupar	1st Dalgety Bay, 2nd Cupar, 3rd Leven
Medium Town	1st St Andrews	1st St Andrews
Large Town	none	1st Dunfermline, 2nd Kirkcaldy

## Appendix F – Public Conveniences Review

*From Roy Stewart, Area Manager, East Environmental Services*

The purpose of this letter is to canvas opinions on the existing facilities provided by Fife Council in the East Area with a view to progressing the ongoing review of public conveniences across Fife.

At the Environment and Development Committee on 28 October 2002, a general policy on public conveniences was agreed, copy attached. [9 pages, not scanned – PL] In the interim, the Service has looked at the various elements in the policy in relation to the premises currently on our books as public conveniences. I am also about to discuss the planned maintenance programme with Facilities Services who maintain them in a wind and weather tight condition on our behalf, to decide which premises will take priority in terms of works required.

I have also enclosed a list of details of the location, opening hours and whether or not the premises is currently closed permanently or open. There are also some additional small narrative details on a number of the public conveniences.

Effectively there are a couple of key elements which require to be examined.

1. The necessity or otherwise to retain the current number which can be seen are located widely in a combination of town, recreation and beach related settings. Several of the premises have been closed for a number of years. These particular facilities require to be considered with a view to disposing of them in accordance with the hierarchy described in the policy.

2. There is also a need to look in a more lateral sense at the provision of public toilets in general and other buildings in the area which already have toilet facilities within them, in particular, buildings which are under the control of Fife Council.

I appreciate that there is a considerable amount of information attached however I feel it is essential that as part of the ongoing review, as wide a consultation on the merits of retaining public conveniences against a hierarchy for disposal of the facilities should be carried out.

Section 3 of the report details where it is most appropriate to site public conveniences. To determine the most appropriate location the zoning of streets in a similar fashion to that used in the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse has been used as a useful aid. The East Area in general falls within two zones, these being Zone 1 which would relate generally to the town centres, main streets in villages, busy public places and major transport centres. The rest of the East Area is in general within Zone 3, low density housing, (e.g. detached/semi detached houses) and other recreational areas.

Once you have had an opportunity to digest the information provided and consider the particular facilities within your own area I would be only too pleased to discuss these further or attend any Community Council meetings to hear your views.

*From the notes & information attached:*

**City Road** Situated close to the main town centre car parks but in very poor condition and would require substantial work to upgrade this facility. If not required could be used as a store for Street Sweepers in the town centre.

**Church Square** Staffed public toilet in the centre of St Andrews. Well used by Tourists and in good condition.

**Cockshaugh Park** This public toilet is usually only open in the summer but in August 2001 it was vandalised again and has so far not been repaired and therefore left closed, no complaints received.

**East Sands** Open on the summer only. Needs to be upgraded to meet the standard, recently had disabled facilities added with Radar access. Should be looked at in the context of a wider exercise regarding Blue Flag beach status. Community Services to retain.

**Gregory Place** A small unisex toilet, which is situated not far from the Harbour and Church Street toilets, could possibly be used as a barrow store for Street Sweepers in this area. Closed at present due to continual vandalism.

**Harbour** A basic facility, no lighting, in poor condition and not a good advert for the Town. Toilets close by at East Sands. Possible new development at Harbour will include toilet facilities as part of restaurant development but no timescale or finance confirmed as yet.

**James Robb Avenue** Essential facility for persons using the adjoining park, in good condition.

**Kinburn Park** Open summer and winter and provides facility for persons using the park for recreational purposes. Other facilities adjacent have toilets i.e. tennis courts, museum and only 300m from City Road toilets. Community Services to consider closure/alternative usage.

**Langlands Road** Situated next to the football ground, which now has its own facility. Toilet block probably surplus to requirements, badly vandalised and requiring several thousand pounds to keep wind and weather tight alone.

**West Sands (West And East)** These facilities are in a Blue Flag beach area and in constant use during the summer. The second block is closed during the winter. Generally good condition, however subject to occasional vandalism. Should be looked at in the context of a wider exercise regarding Blue Flag beach status. Community Services to retain.

Address	Winter	Summer	Close	Convert	Disabled	Radar	Comments	Service
---------	--------	--------	-------	---------	----------	-------	----------	---------

	hours	hours	as PC	sweepers bothy	facility	key		
Bruce Embankment	0730-1730	0730-1800	n		y	y		ES
City Rd	0730-1830	0730-1930	n		n	n		ES
Church Sq	0800-2000	0900-2100	n		y	y		ES
Cockshaugh Pk	24 hr	24 hr	y	n	n	n	vandalised – not opened	CS
East Sands	closed	24 hr	n	n	y	y		CS
James Robb Ave	0730-1500	0730-1500	n	n	n	n	good facility	CS
Kinburn Park	24 hr	24 hr	y	n	n	n	closure option possible	CS
Langlands Rd	24 hr	24 hr	y	n	n	n	earmarked for closure	ES
West Sands 1st	0730-1730	0730-1930	n	n	y	y	Blue Flag beach – improve	CS
West Sands 2nd	closed	24 hr	n	n	n	n	Blue Flag beach – improve	CS

## Correspondence

Date	From	Subject
8/07/2003	NHS Fife	Hospital preferred site
11/07/2003	Community Services	Best Kept Town – finals
12/07/2003	Scottish Executive	Draft Local Governance (Scotland) Bill
14/07/2003	Alison Mackay	Tetra Masts
14/07/2003	Scottish Natural heritage	Scotland's Natural Heritage – spring magazine
16/07/2003	Fife Coast & Countryside Trust	Fife Coastal Path celebrations 2-6 June
16/07/2003	Volunteer Development	Spectrum – July magazine
17/07/2003	Environmental Services	Public Conveniences Review
17/07/2003	David W Loudon	CC Constitution etc
21/07/2003	Colin Buchanan & Partners	Fife Parking Strategy
23/07/2003	Chris Lesurf	HEW committee
23/07/2003	Community Services	Best Kept Town & Village 2003
29/07/2003	Community Safety Partnership	Homecheck Service
29/07/2003	TurfTrax	Sports Fields
2/08/2003	Scottish Executive	Freedom of Information Act
2/08/2003	Scottish Natural Heritage	Partner Bodies Relationship Study – results