

# Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

## Provisional Minutes – 4<sup>th</sup> January 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, Chris Wallard, Henry Paul, Harry Stewart

#### Students' Association Representatives

#### Co-Opted

Niall Scott

Lindsey Adam

#### Fife Councillors

Brian Thomson

**Apologies** - Keith McCartney, Ken Crichton, Zara Evans, Clare Armstrong, Patrick Mathewson, Charlotte Andrew, Dorothea Morrison, Frances Melville

### 2. Minutes of Meeting –December 2015

The minutes were accepted as correct.

### 3. Presentations

#### 3.1. Police Presentation

WPC Westwood spoke on behalf of herself and her colleague PC Daniel Crichton. They cover St Andrews and a large part of the East Neuk. She described how they'd been trained in doing firearms checks and licence renewals as an additional skill. In December they'd been involved in a safety campaign and had patrolled local streets to show a presence. They had also been involved in the bike scheme linking with the university to educate students on bike regulations for safe cycling.

Mrs Harding asked about the Police Consultation sent to the CC by email. She wasn't certain who was expected to do it. Mr Greenwell advised that he'd draft a response which he'd circulate to members but just hadn't had a chance to do so.

Miss Uprichard commented on the lack of a letter box at the police station. WPC Westwood acknowledged that this issue had arisen on a number of occasions. She said that the lack of a letterbox was a safety issue due to the current threat level so she couldn't see any kind of box being allowed. She acknowledged the difficulty for the public and said that members of the public would have to attend the station during opening hours to leave in any letters etc. She added that there had been a view by herself and colleagues that St Andrews should have had longer opening hours but the decision had been made at a higher level. They had raised the issue a number of times without success to date.

Dr Shepherd asked about the type of scenario in the area in which armed police would be deployed? WPC Westwood replied that it would be the same throughout the country. There were armed response units and in Fife they were based in Glenrothes, though they could be deployed anywhere in Scotland.

Dr Goudie asked about the police response to flooding and whether any lessons had been learnt as a result of recent flooding and what measures had been put in place to prioritise the need for action? WPC Westwood replied that any response would be a joint action between Fife Council and the Police.

Mr Stewart asked if there was a local policy about muzzling dogs in public? WPC Stewart replied that that responsibility lay with dog wardens and the police automatically reported most incidents to the dog warden. The dog wardens were the officials who could put restrictions on a dog and the need to muzzle it. She said that there was no legislation requiring dogs to automatically have muzzles. Mr Stewart reported conflicting messages about responsibility he'd heard about with dog wardens allegedly saying certain matters were police responsibility. WPC Westwood acknowledged that the PF could suggest the need for restrictions but the dog warden had the final responsibility to confirm restrictions etc. WPC Westwood said she'd check out the situation for Mr Stewart who'd had problems reported by his staff while on their rounds and it felt like there was a certain amount of buck passing. WPC Westwood said she'd check out the exact rules and get back to him.

Mr Greenwell asked Cllr Thomson if he could get any clarification on the issue from Fife Council? Cllr Thomson said he'd see what he could do.

Mrs Corbin asked about the issue of "vagrants" aggressively begging and felt the police needed to do something about it. WPC Westwood replied that there was no legislation against begging but it could become an offence according to the manner in which they were begging. She added that if necessary banning orders could take place to stop an individual going to a town and begging if they were known to abuse the begging rules. She suggested that any concerns should be phoned in so that there could be a police response. The police couldn't target individuals unless they were caught in the act.

## **4. Fife Councillor.**

### **4.1. Frances Melville - apologies**

### **4.2. Brian Thomson**

#### **4.2.1. Carron Place**

Cllr Thomson announced that work was starting on the pavement replacement in Carron Place with slabs being replaced by tarmac.

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

There is an ongoing issue with vehicles parking on the pavement damaging high quality paving and being a danger to pedestrians. Cllr Thomson had photographed an errant vehicle and sent the picture to Fife Council officers. The latter advised him that they couldn't fine someone parked on the pavement but if police witnessed the vehicle driving on to the pavement they could issue a penalty. Parking attendants could issue a penalty if the vehicle was parked beyond double yellow lines but not unloading, but if unloading they couldn't do anything. This limited what could be done to deter offenders but Cllr Thomson mentioned that Councillors and officials might have a site visit to look at the possibility of putting in some bollards.

#### **4.2.3. State of Chariots of Fire Plaque**

Iain Munn had alerted Cllr Thomson to the deterioration in this plaque which had been erected in 1996 by the Scottish Film Council to celebrate the centenary of Scottish cinema. Fife Council had at some stage given a commitment to look after the plaque, but he thought that this might now be doubtful given the state of the Council's finances and suggested that it might be a candidate for Common Good Fund assistance. He thought that the CC could put in an application for funding for the work.

Iain Munn related his attempt to get a response from Fife Council prior to his involvement with the CC but nothing had happened so he thought he'd bring up the matter again. Mr Greenwell said that any CC member could put forward an application to the CGF and the local Fife councillors would decide if they supported approval of funding. Cllt Thomson suggested that Mr Munn should get a quote for refurbishment.

#### **4.2.4. Fife Council Financial Position**

Cllr Thomson gave the meeting an outline of the dire financial position of Fife Council made even worse by the Scottish Government budget statement last month. The cut at 3.6% was considerably greater than had been estimated leaving a shortfall of £38.8 million pounds in the coming financial year. Over three years the shortfall would rise to £90 million. He wasn't certain how the Council would reach a balanced budget. He reminded the meeting that 55% of the budget went on education and 20% on social care so there would be an impact upon current services on which the population depended and expected to take place. Options are limited with the ability of the Council to raise the Council Tax possible but not encouraged by the Scottish Government who would surcharge Councils making increases. He informed the meeting that a draft budget would be out for consultation in the following week. The Fife Council budget meeting will take place on the 11<sup>th</sup> February.

Mr McLeod asked if Fife Council put the Council tax up would the surcharge from the Scottish Government be on the Councillors or the Council tax payers? Cllr Thomson acknowledged that Council tax payers wouldn't see the full benefit of the increase due to the surcharge as it would be a charge on Fife Council.

Dr Shepherd asked about the City Regions Fund and wondered if St Andrews could benefit from that? Cllr Thomson confirmed that because St Andrews is not a city it couldn't benefit from that fund.

#### **4.2.5. Common Good Fund Annual Report**

Cllr Thomson said the report was discussed at the recent North East Fife Area Committee and has about £1.1 million in the fund. He didn't think that enough was being made of the CGF and the availability of the income from it to worthy causes. He thought that the Fund should be looked at for more local needs, especially with the dire funding problems of Fife Council. He thought that the CC could help promote the better use of it. Mr Greenwell acknowledged that Mr Paul had wanted the subject of the CGF to be put on the meeting agenda for this evening and would be discussed accordingly.

#### **4.2.6. Cycle Racks**

Mr Marks asked for an update on the cycle rack situation in town. Cllr Thomson replied that Councillors had met with cycling officers and Transportation officers after the last CC meeting. In conjunction with the university it was agreed that officers would do a joint audit of existing locations and potential locations and would come back with costed proposals about how cycle parking could be increased around the town. He added that it might be necessary to look at using the CGF or other funds to help with the cost due to the state of Fife Council finances. The St Andrews Community planning budget might be another source of funds. Officer are to report back later in the month with proposals.

He also informed the meeting that there weren't as many cycle storage racks at the Students union as had been proposed.

Mr Marks reminded Cllr Thomson of the missing racks from areas such as the former Argos area in South Street and he also reminded Cllr Thomson about the Commonwealth Games racks which he'd discovered down at the North Haugh near university buildings. He wondered about the possibility of getting at least one such rack in the town centre. Cllr Thomson replied that the audit would cover everything. He added that another of the Commonwealth Games racks might end up by the Student Sports Centre instead of the town centre. He didn't know

who was making that decision. He also informed the meeting that there were moves to take over a parking space at Tesco for bike parking.

#### **4.2.7. Advertising Signs on Lamp posts**

Miss Uprichard asked about the signs advertising Fife etc adorning a number of lamp posts on the way into town and elsewhere in town. She wondered who had put them on the lamp posts. Cllr Thomson wasn't certain. Mrs Adam informed the meeting that the signs had been put up by Fife Council Tourism. However there had been some problems with them and some had blown down and one had been dangling in a way which constituted a hazard until removed.

#### **4.4.8. A Boards**

Miss Uprichard asked whether there could be a requirement implemented by Fife Council to have A Boards leant against the premises they were advertising instead of being obstacles in the middle of the pavement. She was aware that a few shops already did this with their boards. Cllr Thomson acknowledged the problem but wondered where shops down the Pends would put their signs? Miss Uprichard accepted that there would have to be exceptions in such cases. Cllr Thomson agreed to ask officials about the possibility of implementing such a policy.

#### **4.4.9. Flood Risk Assessment**

Miss Uprichard said she'd tried to look at this matters a couple of years ago but not very thoroughly as there was so much material. She'd tried to look for information in the Local and Structure Plans but each one had passed on the question to another body. Broadly speaking she said that there was no assessment of previous floods and where they occurred and no future assessment. She wanted to know the present position about flood risk assessment. Cllr Thomson replied that there was a requirement for all major developments to have flood risk assessments. He thought that they were done on a development by development basis. Major developments had to have one as part of their submission. SEPA are consulted on very development and they have the flood risk assessment maps. Miss Uprichard replied that she was not very happy with that as there had been a flood risk assessment for the flats in Kinnesburn Road which had stated that unless some problem was resolved that the Council should know that SEPA would be objecting to the development. She had written to the Council later to ask what had happened to that objection and had been told that SEPA had changed its mind and said the plans were okay. Cllr Thomson replied that in the usual way SEPA worked when consulted it should come back with comments based on their data on their maps. Dr Goudie commented that one of the encouraging thing on the flooding recently had been the realisation that the traditional measures about the timescale of varying levels of flood risk were not worth the paper they were written on because of the instability of the climate. He hoped that Fife Council would now treat such predictions with caution until new more accurate predictions could be developed by SEPA and other agencies.

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

#### **4.3.1. Street Lights**

The following street lights, which were not working, were reported for repair

Canongate – lighting column number 29

City Road – lighting column beside 'The Wee House'

Hepburn Gardens – lighting column number 26

James Robb Avenue – lighting column number 2

Largo Road – lighting columns numbers 6 and 8

Nelson Street- lighting column number 2

Pipelard Road – lighting column number 17

Wallace Street lighting column number 1

#### **4.3.2. Bogward Road**

Cllr McCartney reported that the two 'keep left' bollards on the island at the end of Bogward Road at its junction which were knocked over and damaged were reported and repaired.

#### **4.3.3. Illuminated Road Signs**

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

Bell Street – lights on belisha beacons on east side of zebra crossings at both the South Street and Market Street ends of Bell Street.

Bell Street – 'one way' signs at both the South Street end (Timpson's) and Market Street end (University Shop).

Church Street – two 'no entry' signs at South Street end of Church Street.

Church Street – 'one way' sign at Market Street end of Church Street.

Hepburn Gardens – 'roundabout' sign on lighting column 21 and on south side of road across from lighting column 20.

Kinnessburn Road – 'give way' sign at Bridge Street end of Kinnessburn Road.

Lamond Drive – 'give way' sign at Largo Road end of Lamond Drive.

Market Street – two 'one way' signs on either side of Market Street at the junctions with Greyfriars Garden and Bell Street.

Market Street – two 'no entry' signs between The Keys and Subway.

West Port – two 'one way' signs on City Road side of West Port.

West Port – 'roundabout' sign on City Road side of West Port.

West Port – two 'no entry' signs on South Street side of West Port.

#### **4.3.4. Lamond Drive/Tom Morris Drive**

Cllr McCartney reported that the painted 'give way' lines at the junction of both roads with the Largo Road were reported to be badly worn. They were inspected on 3/12/15 when it was identified that the junction markings at both locations required to be refreshed and a work order issued.

#### **4.3.5. Spottiswoode Gardens**

Cllr McCartney reported that potholes at the junction beside house number 45 were reported. They were inspected on 3/12/15 when two potholes were identified for repair and a work order issued.

#### **4.3.6. Kinburn Park**

Cllr McCartney reported that ivy growing on the stonework forming the wall and gatepost on the west side of the eastern entrance to Kinburn Park from Double Dykes Road was reported and removed.

#### **4.3.7. Cycle Parking**

Cllr McCartney reported that a constructive discussion between a representative of the Bike Users Group, council officers and councillors took place at the Ward Meeting on 10/12/15 regarding bike parking.

#### **4.3.8. Graffiti**

Cllr McCartney reported that tags' in grey paint on the east side of the bus shelter on the south side of St Mary's Place and on one of the green broadband junction boxes on the north side of St Mary's Place by the phone box were reported and removed.

#### **4.4. Dorothea Morrison - apologies**

### **5. Planning Committee**

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

Miss Uprichard briefly reported that the Planning Committee had met once during December. Out of ten applications they had objected to two, one of which was Century House a listed building in Hepburn Gardens and also to an application for a replacement extractor flue at 6a Greyfriars Gardens. In relation to the latter she had checked on the previous planning report when the original application for the restaurant had been made in 2014. That report had commented that other concerns apart from 17 objections had included noise levels, late night disturbances, smoke and bar-be-cue smells with inadequate ventilation, site too small for development, refuse disposal issues, hours of opening, use of pavement, change of street character, litter and too many restaurants within St Andrews. The report had concluded that many of the concerns weren't relevant to the planning application and were not material considerations in determination of the application. The recommendations were recommended for unconditional approval and received approval by the NE Fife Planning Committee. In her assessment the concerns were not addressed as the planning officer had said that they weren't material to planning considerations. Since then she said there have been considerable problems with various complaints to the Council. The new application is for a replacement extractor flue, which some objectors say is inadequate to deal with the problem which had been declared a statutory nuisance. She added that she'd found the original statement in the planning report dismissing the concerns disturbing and felt that it had led to the further problems and the statutory nuisance situation.

She announced that the next Planning Committee would be on the 18<sup>th</sup> January and not the 11<sup>th</sup> January.

#### **5.2. University Development Plans**

Mr Greenwell informed the CC of a meeting he'd attended with John Matthews of the Preservation Trust relating to University proposals for a major redevelopment of their property on the East Sands and later at Albany Park. The development will include a new aquarium at the Scottish Oceans Institute and demolition of some of the older parts of the site to allow his to be developed along with new office space. There isn't a confirmed date when a planning application will be made but there is a desire from the University to do this in the coming months. He reminded the meeting that the existing Victorian buildings were neither listed nor in the conservation area so there would be little the CC could do to influence the changes. Albany Park will be a later redevelopment from Woodburn Place south to Albany Park. There is no current development partner for this proposal. Mr Greenwell confirmed that there was no timescale on the redevelopment of Albany Park.

A further redevelopment would be at the back of the Bute to replace port-a-cabins with a new Music Centre but again there was no timescale on its development.

The University also said that the movement of many administrative staff out of the town to a new office space at Guardbridge would free up a lot of car parking.

Dr Goudie asked about bed numbers at Albany Park after a redevelopment and whether they'd stay at the current level of about 250? Mr Greenwell confirmed that this would probably be the case and that with the rest of the old Estates buildings being demolished and redeveloped there could be between 400 and 800 according to Derek Watson. Mr Watson also said that in any expansion of the University in the foreseeable future they will have to accept the responsibility for any expansion of bed space. This implied no future pressure on housing stock for HMOs in the centre or the newer part of town.

Mr Greenwell following a query from Miss Uprichard said that he'd ask Mr Scott to expand on Mr Watson's statements at the next CC meeting. Miss Uprichard commented that the Local

Plan had stated that expansion north of the Strathkiness High Road would cater for the University's expansion over the next 20 years.

Mr Greenwell also reported that at a meeting at the University on the 17<sup>th</sup> December Mr Scott had informed him that the University wouldn't be able to make their presentation about the Biomass Plant development at the CC January meeting. He hadn't had an opportunity to fix another date over the festive period. He had suggested to Mr Scott that the University should set up something at the Byre the following Monday to the CC meeting. Cllr Thomson said that a Steve Barstow seemed to be heading up the PR for the development and Mr Greenwell should contact him on the possible presentation. Discussion followed about the fact that work was already starting with lights out the road to Guardbridge being put into place to set up a traffic system for the work in the area by the Madras Playing fields. There was an acknowledgement that any session would be for information purposes rather than consultation given the imminence of the work starting.

Dr Goudie felt that there should be some meeting to show that the CC was doing something to inform the public. He felt that there wasn't a clear idea of the impact on the community that the disruption would cause particularly when Guardbridge work started from February onwards.

Miss Uprichard quoted from a 2014 news cutting in which the University had talked about extensive consultation on the development. She didn't think there had been such consultation and wondered what consultation had taken place at Guardbridge. Mr Greenwell said there had been a consultation with Guardbridge CC. Mr McLeod thought it was all a bit late to be quizzing the University when the work was starting.

Mrs Adam reported the local businesses had had a meeting with Mr Scott and Verity Brown to address concerns as the work straddles the Easter holiday period when there are a lot of visitors during that holiday period. They had got an agreement from the University that they would provide some marketing for the town especially at that holiday time given that the town would be effectively cut off from the north.

Cllr Thomson told the meeting that a question which had come up at the Strathkiness CC meeting had related to possible compensation for businesses affected by the work especially in Guardbridge. The reply had indicated that the University wouldn't be compensating businesses in Guardbridge for loss of passing trade but had argued that there would be an extensive workforce for the development who could be using the shops.

Miss Uprichard thought that there should be a meeting to allow local people to ask questions. Mr Greenwell suggested that there was either the option of booking the Burgh Chambers for the following Monday or asking the university to have an event in the byre. Mr McLeod felt that local people would not be impressed by the late offer of a meeting and that there should have been a meeting months ago. Mr Greenwell agreed that the University should have been more proactive.

Cllr Thomson informed he'd first become aware of the plans in late August/early September and that the University had originally wanted to start work last October. Councillors managed to persuade the University that they needed to do consultation. At the Strathkiness CC meeting Cllr Thomson said that the University were able to explain why the work was being done in a particular way. The meeting had allowed the University to pick up on some issues which they'd not considered. He thought that a similar meeting with St Andrews CC might be useful for both sides of the debate.

Mr Greenwell said he'd try to organise something for the following Monday. Cllr Thomson then announced that he'd received an email indicating that there would be a public drop-in event at the Gateway on Monday 11<sup>th</sup> January and at the byre on the 20<sup>th</sup> January.

## **6. Matters Arising**

### **6.1. Community Trust**

It was agreed to go over developments in this matter in-camera at the end of the public meeting.

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

Mr Greenwell informed the meeting that he'd circulated earlier in the day a draft text specifying the job requirements for a Minutes Secretary. He asked for comments. Miss Uprichard thought that the sentiment was fine but felt that the description was too wordy and should be shortened.

Dr Goudie had two points. He queried whether the secretary was obliged to produce a draft then the final minutes for the sum of one payment? Mr Greenwell thought that the amount of change required for the minutes was very little so was not an issue. Dr Goudie's second query related to the audio recording and how this could be managed, given that such recordings had always been in the hands of an elected secretary. Mr Greenwell suggested that the minutes secretary sign a non disclosure agreement when accepting the job. Dr Goudie added that if the minutes secretary wasn't given the audio recording they would have to be competent at taking notes. Miss Uprichard thought that the audio recording should just be used for verification in the case of disagreement with the minutes. Dr Shepherd thought that the minutes secretary would be there to work for the CC secretary and that they would be the guardian of the audio recording.

Mr McLeod suggested that there should be a review period and Mr Greenwell confirmed that there would be a review after 6 months. Miss Uprichard agreed to go over the Chair's wording to make it more concise but still outlining the post adequately.

### **6.3. Reports from Representatives**

No reports

## **7. Committee Reports**

### **7.1 Recreation Committee**

#### **7.1.1. Senior Citizens Party**

Dr Shepherd gave a brief introduction to the Senior Citizens Party and asked Mr Paul to comment on the event. Mr Paul thanked everyone who had helped on the day and thought it had gone very well. There were one or two minor issues which require to be addressed. He'd done all the planning on a spreadsheet and would send Mr Marks and Dr Goudie copies to put in the members area of the website. The spreadsheet would then allow whoever was involved in the organising to know when certain aspects of the event needed to be actioned once the new date for the next party was inserted. He said that it was designed so that a newcomer could take on board the organisation of the event.

Mr Paul also informed the meeting that more people were needed to make up the numbers attending due to natural attenuation. He wanted to reach out to other older people who might benefit from attending the event. He appealed to members to try and refer anyone they know for the next year's party. There had been 20 invited, with 151 accepting and 141 attending on the day. More names to add to the database would be welcomed. Mr Greenwell asked if there was a lower age limit for those attending? Mr Paul replied that this wasn't so much of a concern but he didn't want to invite people able to attend a lot of other events. The idea was to reach out to local citizens who wouldn't be able to get out.

#### **7.1.2. Bandstand Concerts**

Mr Roberts reported that he'd had two emails already asking about available dates from bands. He said that there was enough money to do three concerts before seeking out further



funding from whatever source such as the CGF might be available. He was concerned about the future management of the events as he sensed that there wasn't a lot of interest amongst CC members and while he was keen he needed support to help the concerts to go ahead. He didn't want to have to do every Sunday and needed volunteers to assist or take responsibility on some Sundays. A rota of volunteers would be good to get organised. He asked members to give it some thought. Mr McLeod who said he would help again suggested that the CC should price getting a trailer to store the chairs and transport them to the bandstand. Mr Greenwell acknowledged that he wasn't keen to purchase equipment unless there was a place to store it. Mr McLeod suggested Kilrymont as a possible location. He agreed to look into the possibility without making any firm commitment.

Mr Roberts thought that storing the chairs at the bandstand would be the obvious answer. Mr Greenwell felt that refurbishing the bandstand would be a better way to proceed and this could possibly be funded through the CGF and Community Trust as well as other funding sources.

Mr Roberts agreed to take provisional bookings for bands and it was agreed to have further discussion about the bandstand at the next meeting.

Mr Paul thought that local guest houses etc should be asked to contribute towards funding the concerts as he'd assessed that the vast majority of those listening the concerts were tourists.

## **7.2. GP Meeting**

No meeting.

## **7.3. 200 Club**

1<sup>st</sup> F Humphries 2<sup>nd</sup> Mrs Caskie 3<sup>rd</sup> Sir Bonallack

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

Mrs Corbin reported on 3 applications for variation in licensing. She had not put in objections to two of the applications but had objected to an extension of licensing for the Catch Bar at St Andrews Sealife Centre on a range of grounds. The application had been to licence the bar to sell alcohol to purchasers to take away, potentially creating a nuisance on the Scores and on the beach in relation to both the consumption of alcohol and also the litter created from discarded cans and bottles.

## **7.5. Rail Sub Committee**

## **8. New Business**

### **8.1. Common Good Fund**

Mr Paul described the fund as massively under utilised, much of which was historical due to the funding given to the Byre. The income is now approaching £100000 per year and there was no structure about how to spend the money. He described the funding awards as hit and miss and dependent upon who applied for funds. He cited the need for work needing done in an area like the Ladebraes which is a common good property and couldn't understand why no one was putting in an application to restore the path in the Ladebraes. He thought that there must be a logic in applying the CGF in projects such as the Ladebraes as had previously happened in relation to the Whyte Melville Fountain. He thought that the CC should be promoting the CGF to the public. He noted that there was nothing about it on the CC website as it was very difficult to get a form from the Fife Direct website at the current time. He noted that compared to the Community Trust there were very few applicants and often the same organisations every couple of years. He thought that the availability of funds should be heavily promoted. He hoped to have an article on the subject in the March issue of St Andrews in Focus. He suggested that a word or pdf version of the application form could be put on the CC website for downloading.

Dr Goudie in reply said that there was an update on the CC website and informed the meeting that if a user put /commongood.php into a search on the CC website there should be a basic page with something on the CGF on the navigation column. The page added had a pdf version of Mr Paul's FAQs and the application form.

Mr Greenwell said that was all for promoting the CGF more but added that if members looked at the funds coming through the Community Trust there was a difference in the way funds were viewed. In the Community Trust there was almost an obligation to try and spend as much as possible of the annual income and carry as little forward into the next financial year as possible. The CGF had not the same rules about the expenditure. Mr Greenwell thought that local applicants for funding should try the Community Trust first then the CGF. He thought that any projects should have a champion to advocate the need for action on a particular project. He cited Bill Sangster in relation to his work on the Whyte-Melville Fountain. Mr Greenwell felt that the CC could become more involved and could either support a community champion or he hoped there might be someone within the CC prepared to take on such a role for a project such as the Ladebraes.

Mrs Corbin reminded the meeting that there wasn't a comprehensive list of what belonged to the CGF and such a list she added was necessary. Mr Paul confirmed that there were maps of known CG land and properties available.

Mr Paul informed the meeting that the amount of value of the CGF was divided between land value and rental income etc. About half of what is in the CGF at around £500000 is land and buildings leaving about £600000 of which £400000 was in savings and about £250000 in the current account. The current account he added had too much in it and unless there was a project imminent he suggested that some of that could be moved to savings.

In relation to a query from Mr Greenwell about the Town Hall Mr Paul advised that it wasn't given a particularly high value. Fife Council maintained the fabric of the building and paid the wages of the janitorial staff, so he advised that it would not be financially viable for the CC to ask to have full responsibility of running the building. Mr Paul also commented upon the income from the Bruce Embankment Car Park which was £65000 pa of which £16000 went into the CGF following negotiations with Fife Council. He didn't know how the balance was spent and whether it was spent locally. Mr Paul also briefly mentioned the income from ground rent paid by the Aquarium and Golf Museum which are both on CGF land although the Seafood Restaurant was an anomaly as most of it was sited over the water with only a small amount on land.

Dr Shepherd asked who decided how the CGF funds were disbursed? Mr Paul explained that up to £2000 Fife Council officials could make the decision and above that it was decided by local Councillors. However local Councillors could be overruled by Fife Council as happened with the decision to use CGF funds on an annual long term basis to support the Byre Theatre. Cllr Thomson explained that the majority of applications went to the North East Fife Area Committee as they were over £2000. However actual administration of the various charitable trusts is the responsibility of Fife Council's Executive Committee. Any changes to the way the CGF is run locally would have to have that committee's agreement. Cllr Thomson then quoted from Fife Direct information about the Charitable Trusts situation. "The Charitable Trusts have no explicit reserves policy but as a general principle the capital in funds is held as a permanent endowment with only the annual income available for disbursement during the year. Trustees are permitted to use capital balances should they require however this is discouraged and approval from Committee is required". The quote is from the Charitable Trusts Annual Report which Cllr Thomson said was available online.

Mr McLeod recognising that it was difficult to get people to apply for funds the CC shouldn't wait for applications but should set about developing its own projects with Champions and make applications for funds from the CGF as necessary. He gave examples of how he felt funds could be used and reminded the meeting that only £17000 was spent last year out of an income of over £80000. He strongly felt that there should be much more expenditure to worthy local causes. He thought there were lots of questions to answer in relation to the CGF.

Mr Paul agreed with Mr McLeod's sentiments and ideas but reminded the meeting that the CC had a consultee role and if it began making applications for CGF money it might have to give up the consultee role as there would be a conflict of interest. He thought that the CC could do the championing of local ideas rather than directly applying itself. He was concerned that if people brought through applications which the CC didn't agree with that might lead to bad press as has happened at times in Planning. Mr Greenwell thought that there should be a mechanism by which the CC could approach people to fill in a short application summarising their proposal to allow them to get an idea of the CC support or disapproval. Mr Paul agreed with this idea as it would allow clearly unsuitable ideas to be weeded out before a full application was sent to the CGF. Mr Greenwell commented that it might be a good idea to have some clear written guidelines for applicants. He acknowledged that the Community Trust didn't fund certain types of proposals but the criteria weren't clearly written anywhere so it would be good to have written guidance for the CGF. He thought that the CC could get the message about the CGF out to the public. Mr Paul mentioned the Chariots of Fire Plaque and the Bandstand as two possibilities for funding support from CGF which could come from the CC. Mr McLeod didn't see any problem in getting CGF support for things like a Madras College Hockey Tour of another part of Scotland as he felt this could be justified as promoting the town. Mr Paul added that the final sentence in the CGF rules said that those judging applications could ignore all the written rules and use their own judgement on the merits of an application such as suggested by Mr McLeod.

Mr Roberts suggested that there might be a role for the CC to invite all local Trusts to a discussion as he thought there was a certain amount of uncertainty for an organisation to know to whom they should apply for funds. He added that it was also difficult for the funding bodies to always understand what the other Trusts might be doing in case there was an overlap.

Mr Greenwell drew the discussion to a close. He said he'd try and develop his idea of a form for potential applicants to complete prior to making a formal application to the CGF. Mr Paul said he'd redraft his article for FOCUS on the CGF. Mr Greenwell asked members to think about good projects. Mr Roberts said he'd take on the task of sorting out the Bandstand as a project. Mr Munn would look at the Chariots of Fire plaque.

Mr Paul asked Cllr Thomson for his views on the Ladebraes maintenance as a project. Cllr Thomson acknowledged it would be a massive job and he was hoping to meet with Iain Barbour of Fife Council at the next ward meeting to discuss the Ladebraes. Mr Greenwell added that Jim Macarthur was having a look at the Ladebraes and trying to assess what might need to be done. Mr Greenwell said he'd liaise with Mr Macarthur to discuss his thoughts on the area. Mr Marks reminded the meeting about a past proposal to designate the Ladebraes as a core path and how there had been objections so it had never progressed. He wondered whether there might be a potential for that idea to be revived. Mr Roberts reminded the meeting that the proposed Pilgrims Way would go along the Ladebraes and this might be worth bearing in mind when the proposals for work were being developed.

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

### **9.1. Chair**

Mr Greenwell informed the meeting of correspondence which had been sent out about an event called "European Cities of the Reformation" and that St Andrews had been made one of these cities. A Rev Dr Sheila M. Kesting from the Church of Scotland had informed the CC about the request by St. Andrews and the university to take part in this event over the next year. Mr Greenwell said he'd try to get a contact for the Rev Kesting and establish what exactly might be happening by next month.

### **9.2. Treasurer**

Mr Munn reported that all bills had been paid up to date.

### **9.3 Secretary**

### **9.3.1. Correspondence**

See emails and items listed in appendix.

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

No other public AOCB.