

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Minutes – October 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.standrewscc.net/>)

0. Chairman's Remarks

Dr Goudie started the meeting by noting that the Community Council had had another positive month. He noted the success of the Coffee Morning and thanked Mr Paul and all those who assisted on the day in a wide variety of ways. He felt that it was both a success in raising the profile of the Community Council, as well as contributing to funds.

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Ken Fraser, Patrick Marks, Ian Goudie, Carol Ashworth, Marysia Denyer, Ronnie Murphy, Henry Paul, Dave Finlay, Judith Harding, Kyffin Roberts, Penny Uprichard, Meg Platt

Students' Association Representatives

Holly West

Nominated

Daniel Stephens

Fife Councillors

Frances Melville, Bill Sangster, Robin Waterston, Dorothea Morrison

Apologies

Ken Crichton, Catherine Rowe, Jill Hardie, Izzy Corbin, Jude Innes, Onkar Parmar, Audrey McAnaw, Owen Wilton

2. Minutes of September 2010 Meeting

Dr Goudie apologised for some confusion regarding the minutes and what might constitute the final version. This had arisen with regard to the wording of the report on Mr Buchanan's contribution.

In 5.2. Mrs Denyer advised that she had attended the meeting not Mrs Corbin.

3. Presentations

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville

4.1.1. Beautiful Scotland Award/ Visit Scotland Award

Clr Melville commented upon the success of the Stunning St Andrews Group on the two awards, one from Beautiful Scotland, but also an award from Visit Scotland to recognise the tourism aspect of the group's work.

4.1.2. Market Street work

These works have started and will cause problems for several months for pedestrians and other users of the street. She mentioned the problems, which the work will cause for disabled people. Mrs Rowe had been in contact with Cllr Melville and she had sent an email to the Head of Transportation Services to suggest the possibility, that he or a colleague should come and look at possible ways to reduce the difficulties, for anyone with a physical or visual impairment.

4.1.3. Signposting near Mount Melville

Cllr Melville said that Councillors had requested better signposting near the access to Mount Melville Road following an accident there.

4.1.4. Roundabout Advert

Cllr Melville had chanced upon a company at a roundabout coming into St Andrews, which had set up a large advert, like a "bouncy castle", powered by a generator on the roundabout. She had asked the employee of the advertising company and he'd claimed that planning permission wasn't required. Cllr Melville has emailed Planning Dept to check out on this claim.

4.1.5. Pilmour Links and flooding

Scottish Water is still to find a date to do the work.

4.1.6. Salt for Winter Road Use

Cllr Melville reported that a shipload of 2000 tons of salt has docked at Rosyth the previous week. This cargo would complete the restock with over 21000 tons being available for winter use. Cllr Sangster added that several brand new gritters had been purchased

4.2. Bill Sangster

4.2.1. Regulation & Licensing Committee – Changes

Cllr Sangster reported that the licensing of HMOs will no longer come under the Regulation and Licensing Committee, but will be decided by the Housing Dept. Cllr Sangster advised that the present committee are not entirely happy about the proposed change and will be looking at the details before deciding if it is the best decision. In reply to a query from Mr Stephens, Cllr Sangster acknowledged that it wasn't clear how the new process would work, but hoped that the local community would have appropriate input.

4.2.2. North Street Works

Cllr Sangster said that this work related to replacement of streetlights and will take place over 14 weeks.

4.2.3. Flower Show

Cllr Sangster reported that he'd presented the awards at this recent show.

4.2.4. Police, Fire and Safety Committee

Cllr Sangster reported on the money confiscated via the Proceeds of Crime legislation, with some £33 million confiscated in Fife in the past 8 years since the legislation came into force.

4.2.5. Fife Greenspace Strategy

Miss Uprichard had been reading the outcome of the consultation on this issue, She felt that there didn't appear to be any plan to improve the situation in St Andrews or Cupar, which had been identified as having under the average Greenspace, though the report had described the green areas listed as being of good quality. Cllr Sangster added that he'd mentioned that Craigtoun hadn't been mentioned in the report as well as several other park areas in St Andrews. Cllr Waterston explained that there had been considerable discussion at the Area Committee about the paper, which was a discussion about strategy in North East Fife relating to Greenspace. He acknowledged that the paper was very aspirational and there would be problems in funding. He added that the future of maintaining Craigtoun Park would have to be revisited.

4.3. Robin Waterston

4.3.1. Market Street Work

Cllr Waterston acknowledged that the work in Market Street would have an ongoing impact for the best part of a year. The Councillors were trying to ensure that all communication processes are done as well as they could be with local residents and shopkeepers, to reduce the potential for problems which could damage local trade.

4.3.2. West Sands Partnership

Cllr Waterston reported on the recent public meeting at the launch of the West Sands Partnership in the Burgh Chambers. The meeting was the start of the development of a Management Plan for the West Sands and Outhead Area. It was hoped that within the next few months there would be a draft plan for better co-ordinated management of the area.

4.3.3. Botanic Gardens

Cllr Waterston reported that there had been a meeting a few weeks ago on the future of the Botanic Gardens. More recently there had been a day of consultation involving the consultants employed to look at the future. This meeting involved a wide range of local people from a number of organisations. He acknowledged that this was just a step on the way, but by the end of October the consultants should have produced a report to put to Fife Council and the University detailing possible options for the future. This report would then be the basis of future discussions about how the Botanic Gardens could be best managed in the future.

4.3.3. Kinnessburn

Mr Finlay asked Cllr Waterston about the status of plans for the management of the Kinnessburn. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that the situation was extremely frustrating. Following on the flooding of 1st November 2009, there had been a Public meeting in January at which officials had assured those attending that there would be action to help reduce the problem, such as the removal of the silt berms and looking at more substantial engineering options for a long term solution. Consultants had been appointed, but have still to produce their report. SEPA have also to approve the consultants report. He felt that the berms should be manageable once the SEPA approval is granted.

4.3.5. Structure and Local Plan Issues

Miss Uprichard asked for Cllr Waterston's comments about his recent letter to the St Andrews Citizen in which he had commented, amongst other things upon Green Belt and how its confirmation would secure the landscape setting and the reduced threat of uncontrolled urban expansion. Miss Uprichard wondered that given the Structure Plan had imposed over 1000 houses in St Andrews West, on top of 400 in the town, she couldn't see any limit to expansion plans.

Cllr Waterston acknowledged the Structure Plan requirements of 1090 houses, and that this number was reflected in the Local Plan, with 582 of the 1090 as part of the first phase in the first 10 years. Cllr Waterston added that this housing development reflected nearly the whole area of the Strategic Land Allocation. He added that the numbers were fixed and he didn't see any way that these could be increased within the plan.

Miss Uprichard in her reply couldn't see how this couldn't be breached given the current development proposals from competing developers, who would each hope to build the full number as listed in the Local Plan in their area. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that the area incorporated in the SLA included both areas owned by Macdonald Estates and by the Consortium of Headon and the University. He added that there was no housing site on the south side of St Andrews, apart from the small Grange Road development. Miss Uprichard remained sceptical about the way in which matters might develop. Cllr Waterston admitted that it would not be illegal for a developer to put in a planning application in an area outside the SLA but felt that if land weren't zoned in the Local Plan for housing, such applications wouldn't succeed. He added that Councillors generally opposed anything put forward by officials, which was outwith the agreed housing area and he also thought that a Reporter at any Appeal Inquiry would go by the plan as guidance to considering the appropriateness of an application.

Dr Goudie reminded the meeting that the discovery following an FOI enquiry that it was a Council official who'd insisted that access to the Southern Hill side be given to the land owner, made him feel that matters weren't as straight forward as it appeared. He also cited the recent issue around access and the Grange

Road site. He concluded that one would be only asking for access to a site if it was at least plausible that development could take place in the future. He remained concerned about the security of the Southern Hill side as a result. At a past public enquiry, the developer had employed a top legal representative to try and win their case, but Dr Goudie concluded that fortunately hadn't succeeded, but he remained concerned that if this scenario was to be repeated in the future that Fife Council might not be so fortunate in defending its decision. Dr Goudie also commented upon the issue of the 1090 houses, saying that the Structure Plan didn't specifically say that all 1090 had to be in the SLA, but that the greater part of that number would be in that area. He added that the strategic land allocation was only part of the housing allocation for the housing market area, which covered about half of northeast Fife. He thought that other houses from within the area could be reallocated to St Andrews, outwith the SLA area. He also added that the Community Council had always wanted a worthwhile Environmental Impact Assessment of the proposed housing on the infrastructure of the town, having viewed previous assessments as being in adequate and not prepared to seriously recognise that their might be limits on the town's capacity.

Cllr Waterston in reply said that the access issue at the hospital site had been a requirement of the sale inserted by the landowner, not Fife Council, though he acknowledged that a Fife Council official might have drawn the matter to the NHS's attention.

In relation to a point raised by Miss Uprichard on what would go to the Reporter, Cllr Waterston acknowledged that Fife Council Planning did make changes after the consultation period in response to the consultation. He agreed that the amended papers were not easy to access online, particularly the revised map of the St Andrews West Indicative Framework. He hoped that the changes and ways to access them would be more widely publicised. He went on to indicate that there was a limit to the amount of times consultations could take place or the issue in question would never get resolved. He hoped that there would be a proper Public Inquiry on the Local Plan, not one with just written submissions. Dr Goudie backed Cllr Waterston's hopes in that matter.

Cllr Waterston thought that there should be a briefing statement from Development Services saying what the current position is in relation to St Andrews is as a result of the final decision of the Area Planning Committee.

Dr Goudie hoped that it would be alright with Fife Council to put copies of the relevant documents on the Community Council website as he'd done with the Structure Plan in order to make it more accessible. Cllr Waterston thought that wouldn't be a problem.

In response to a query from Mr Murphy about the 2006 objections, Cllr Waterston thought that these would be forwarded to the Reporter, but he thought that as the goal posts had changed since 2006 in relation to Housing numbers, that the Reporter would give more weight to the more recent objections/comments.

4.3.6. Drain Problem – North Street Area

Mrs Denyer asked on behalf of Mrs Rowe about a problem possibly with street drains. Cllr Waterston thought that the problem related to the camber of some of the paving, and would be corrected in the area when the new streetlights are installed.

4.3.7. Tree Grills

Mrs Ashworth asked about the tree grills, which had been planned for trees in South Street. Cllr Sangster replied that officials had been looking at another way to cover the base of the trees with a special material, similar to material used in playgrounds, but stronger, however nothing had happened to date, but he didn't know why.

4.3.8. Lamp Posts Queens Gardens

Mrs Denyer commented on the state of the lampposts in Queens Gardens. The Cllrs acknowledged that new ones might be needed.

4.4. Dorothea Morrison

4.4.1. Botanic Gardens

Cllr Morrison commented upon this day, which she had attended. She recognised the usefulness of the day, but acknowledged the difficulties in funding due to financial constraints in the Council

4.4.2. Changing Facilities – Tom Morris Drive/Cockshaugh Park

No real progress in getting this actioned, however a planning application has gone in to replace the changing facilities at Cockshaugh Park.

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Planning Committee Minutes – see Appendices

Mrs Denyer commented briefly on the minutes and also mentioned that documentation in relation to the Knightsbridge Application had been received. Mr Roberts would look through that material prior to the next Planning Meeting.

Miss Uprichard informed the meeting that with regard to the Knightsbridge application the Master Plan hadn't been received yet. She felt that the situation needed to be clarified before the next Planning Meeting. Dr Goudie added that in respect of the Knightsbridge application the Community Council needed to get its message over to the public, as there was opportunity for misunderstandings by the public on the Community Council position. He felt that the Community Council needed to continue to press on the affordable housing front given the way developers often managed to get out of this requirement by various means. He also hoped for the possibility that the Knightsbridge development could be considered as part of the strategic land allocation. Dr Goudie also commented on the housing density issue in relation to the site, which was a mid range estimate between the Local Plan and the current Knightsbridge application. The Community Council would oppose any proposal for hotel or office development on the site.

Another planning matter, which had come to her attention related to the future use of the old Health Centre. There was a proposal that the Health Centre be converted into offices. Miss Uprichard had a query in relation to a statement by Fife Council that in their interpretation of the Structure Plan they needed to have a seven-year supply of office space in St Andrews. Miss Uprichard couldn't find this in her reading of the Structure Plan or Local Plan. She didn't know how Fife Council was coming to this view, particularly in light of the current recession and businesses going under, probably resulting in a more than adequate supply of office space. She had wanted to query this statement before drafting any response from CC to the application.

Finally Miss Uprichard detailed a recent reply she'd had from Mr McCready of Fife Council, in relation to a letter sent by herself and Mr Middleton as representatives of two voluntary organisations on the 1st April 2010 about the proposed new Madras School site and the Local Plan. Mr Paul replied to this letter on the 2nd October, two days after the Education Committee had approved a consultation and an intention to seek planning permission in principle. Miss Uprichard commented that the content of the reply concerned her and Mr Middleton and they intended to reply to the letter. She said that the procedure and process mentioned in the letter didn't seem to be entirely clear, as there were seemingly contradictory comments in the Draft Local Plan about the proposed new school. In one place the school is mentioned under the banner of St Andrews West and the plan to build a school in that area, yet in another section there is talk about the ongoing selection process for a site with a consultation as part of that process. Miss Uprichard said that there had been no such consultation, but the letter they'd received talked about the consultation having taken place through the Finalised Local Plan at the end of 2009. Miss Uprichard said that this was out of date and the site now being proposed is not on the site approved by the Education Committee, namely Langlands B. Curiously the letter goes on to say that Fife Council couldn't make a definitive statement on the site selection until the application was received, despite the Council itself being the applicant! Miss Uprichard added that the application would be subject to the requirements of PAN 82 relating to Local Authority interest. The letter also said that the business case for Madras College, which was part of Building Fife's Future, was going faster than the Local Plan, consequently no alternative sites were being considered. The proposed site is on University land and in the proposed strategic land allocation area and will be subject to a Master Plan. The letter also claimed that various Landscape Assessments had been taken into account, but Miss Uprichard thought that there was no evidence of this being the case. The letter also refers to the Climate Change Act, which comes into force in mid January 2011, and implies that because it is currently not in force, Fife Council won't have to carry out an assessment. Miss Uprichard thought that to plan a school, meant to last for at least 40 years and have all the carbon emissions of the bussing (1000 tonnes per annum) was cynical. She felt that despite there being a duty on the Council since 2009 to take into account sustainable development, as set down in the Scottish Planning Bulletin, there was no evidence of this happening in this case.

Cllr Waterston reminded the meeting of the visit earlier in the year by Mr Paul, and he felt that it would be possible to ask Mr Paul and Mr McCready to come again to discuss these matters. Cllr Waterston added

that the main mechanism for communication and discussion in relation to issues about the new school was the local development group on which the Community Council was represented. He added that there had been no CC representatives at recent meetings. He felt that these meetings represented opportunities to ask officers questions and listen to points made. There is to be a further meeting of the development group in November. Miss Uprichard replied that she was unaware of the existence of the group and that the CC was on it, however she was not impressed that it had taken 6 months to reply to a letter. Discussion followed to clarify the situation regarding CC attendance at the development group, with Miss Uprichard willing to attend, though she felt that there might be less benefit at this late stage. She commented upon the CC meeting at which Mr Paul had attended and talked about "Building Fifes Future". She'd asked him then whether there was a document relating to this, but had been informed that it was an aspiration. She found it curious then that this "aspiration" appeared to have overtaken the Local Plan!

Cllr Waterston confirmed that the date of the next development meeting would be the 2nd November at 18.00. He added that there would be a consultation taking place soon as the full details of the planning application were available. Mr Primmer informed the meeting that he was on the development group as he was on the Madras PTA.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. Climate Challenge Fund

A report was circulated by email by Mr Murphy prior to the CC meeting. Mr Paul felt that there should be a meeting of the Standen committee to discuss progress of the project.

Standen Committee meeting to be organised by Mr Murphy.

6.2. Arms Committee

Nothing to report.

6.3. Martyr's Monument Project

No discussion as Mrs Corbin was absent.

6.4. Review of Polling Places

This was discussed at the GP Meeting. All current polling places were viewed as satisfactory.

6.5. Reports from Representatives

6.5.1. RAF Leuchars Community Forum

Mr Fraser reported on his attendance at this forum. The major item discussed had been the car parking problems brought on by severe weather in the morning of the Airshow.

6.5.2. Gordon Christie Plaques

Mr Fraser reported that he'd attended a sub committee of the Preservation Trust to discuss the erection of plaques to local characters. Gordon Christie had left money for this purpose, but until the cost of plaques could be confirmed no decisions had been taken, though the committee had drawn up a list of possible names for such plaques.

6.5.3. Greyfriars Garden Group

Miss Uprichard, Mrs Denyer and Mrs Corbin are member of this group. Mrs Denyer wanted to know if the CC was in agreement with the proposed action of this group. The action was to put in a planning application to form a Community Garden, which will include a public work of art and a display board reflecting the history of the site. The application will summarise in concise form the historical and archaeological importance of the site and provide an instrument for raising public awareness and interest. If the application would not require the applicant to have ownership of the land, but would strengthen the case for compulsory purchase. Mrs Denyer was hopeful that it wouldn't have to go as far as compulsory purchase. Mr Middleton gave some more details about the proposals. Dr Steadman, a well-known architect would be preparing the application.

Dr Goudie asked if the CC was prepared to give support to this proposal. There was unanimous agreement to support the proposal and action.

Cllr Sangster confirmed some of the history of past ownership, with interesting details of how the site had passed into private hands, despite an offer to the old Town Council to buy it for £600. This was turned down and the site moved through several owners, until the current owner acquired it.

6.5.4. Licensing Matters

Mr Finlay mentioned an application by a restaurant Chilli and Peppers to have an external licence for alcohol consumption on the pavement. Mr Roberts confirmed that the Planning Committee had also objected to the application. Cllr Sangster added that it was the Transportation Committee that gave permission for seating on pavements, as there had to be an adequate space for pedestrians etc to get past.

6.6. Botanic Gardens Workshop

Mr Marks reported briefly about this workshop. He acknowledged the complexity of the decisions to be made about the future, partly because of the future uncertainty on Council funding at the present level, but also because there would need to be investment to make the Gardens more attractive as a venue for a range of events, as well as maintaining its reputation as a world class plant collection. Mr Marks reminded members that he'd emailed copies of the consultants report to members before the meeting.

6.7. Any Other Matters Arising

6.7.1. University Representation

Cllr Waterston at the beginning of the meeting raised the issue of representation on the Community Council and whether there was a case for a nominated University representative. He commented on the report in the September minutes that the University be asked to write stating their case.

Dr Goudie explained that he'd invited the University to present their case, so that it would be unambiguously in their own words. He felt that while he understood Cllr Waterston's point, it could also be argued that the University represented a different type of body, similar to other large organisations such as the NHS, with which the Community Council might have contact on a range of matters, including planning. This might cause some difficulties for a representative in certain areas of discussion, where there might be a conflict of interest. He added that it was not his place to make a decision about having a University representative, if the University wanted representation. It would be a decision of the whole Community Council.

Dr Goudie asked the meeting for views on the inclusion of a University representative, as suggested by Cllr Waterston. Dr Goudie gave some background on the original discussion late last year, when a representative had approached him from the University. He'd suggested the idea of writing to the Community Council, but to date there had been no response. Cllr Morrison added that in informal discussion with the University the idea of a representative in the same manner as the Merchants Association had been mooted. She felt that there might be a case for broadening this type of representation to include the University and possibly the Links Trust. Miss Uprichard didn't think that it was appropriate and advised the meeting of her reasons for her opposition. Mr Stephens wondered if it might be appropriate for the University to attend at least initially as a public observer, and then possibly become a non-voting member? Miss Uprichard felt that the presence of a University representative could restrict some discussion at the meeting. Mr Paul didn't think that having a non-voting representative from the University would be as restrictive as suggested. Dr Goudie acknowledged the legitimacy of Mr Paul's view. Mrs Harding wondered about the usefulness in asking for a University representative to attend given the suspension of the Town/Gown meeting, which was the University's interface with the town.

Dr Goudie proposed that the matter be taken to the GP Committee to discuss in more detail and return to the November meeting with a proposal. Miss Uprichard seconded this proposal. In reference to the Scheme of Administration, Mr Marks advised the meeting that the Scheme gave scope for the Community Council to invite other organisations to send a representative as a non-voting member. The meeting voted against passing the matter to the GP Committee by a clear majority.

Dr Goudie asked for a proposal on the idea of inviting a University Representative to attend as a non-voting member. Mr Primmer put forward a proposal and was seconded by Mr Murphy to invite a University Representative to attend as a non-voting member of the Community Council. Mr Stephens asked if such a representative would be able to attend sub committee meetings, unless there was a clear conflict of interest? Mr Marks advised that the Scheme of Administration viewed the attendance of other meetings as being public as well and suggested that a similar non-voting position would be legitimate.

A vote was then held in relation to Mr Primmer's proposal. The vote was 9 in favour and 1 against.

Secretary to write to the University to invite a representative to attend as a non-voting co-opted member.

7. Committee Reports

7.1 Recreation Committee

Mr Roberts gave a verbal report. He had begun the process of organising the Art and Photographic Competition/Exhibition and had attended the Student Freshers Ceilidh as a CC representative. He had also had a meeting with the Editor of the St Andrews Citizen to discuss the relationship of the CC with that paper. Dr Goudie thanked Mr Roberts for taking time to represent the CC at the Freshers Ceilidh. Cllr Sangster congratulated Mr Roberts and his committee for their organisation of the Bandstand Concerts, which he thought were excellent.

7.2. General Purposes Committee

The minutes of the August meeting had been circulated. Dr Goudie briefly went through some of the items discussed.

The boundary query had been discussed following Cameron CCs claim to have a map showing the Grange in its area. Fife Council disputed this and St Andrews CC supported Fife Council on its interpretation.

The scheme of administration and finances was discussed at the GP meeting. The possible change in financial arrangements for CCs would hit the CC to the extent of about £800. The secretary has put in comments on the proposals, but the final decision is still awaited.

The Common Good consultation was discussed. Mr Paul confirmed that areas like the putting green by the R&A were discussed. Mr Paul also pointed out the lack of information as to whether there was any income from some areas of the Common Good such as the land on which the Golf Museum, Sealife Centre, Victory Memorial Hall etc were located. The main sources of income mentioned were the income from the Town Hall, the office below the Town Hall and the Lammas Market. He wondered about the possibility of sending in an FOI to try and find out about the other possible sources of income.

Mr Paul discussed the proposed changes to the financing of Community Councils. This proposes to give a larger block grant of £400 to each Community Council, irrespective of size, but decrease the per head aspect of the grant from 18p to 12p. This would effectively penalise the larger Community Councils such as St Andrews. Mr Paul had estimated that this would mean a reduction of around £800 per annum. The total grant could come down to £2400. While the amount spent on average was closer to this level, it would mean a need to fund raise if expenditure rose over the amount and there was exceptional expenditure, such as a new lap top for the Secretary. He suggested that we could put in an appeal to the Committee discussing the changes, but wasn't optimistic that it would succeed in changing the proposal.

7.3. 200 Club

No report at this time.

October draw winners: - 1st: 65. Mrs Pirie. 2nd 148. Mrs E Lee. 3rd 86 Dr Quinault

7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee

No report in Mrs Corbin's absence.

8. New Business

8.1. Rail Feasibility Study

Following email correspondence with Ms Liston, Dr Goudie had emailed OSCR to check on the possibility of using £1000 from the ex-Trust Fund as a contribution to this study offered at a substantial discount by CORUS. Dr Goudie is still waiting for OSCR's response, before confirming the acceptability of such a donation. The total cost is £4700 inc VAT, offered at this price as CORUS wish to demonstrate the

suitability of new software for route optimisation for such studies on the UK mainland. The company have used it on a project in Ireland. Dr Goudie added that the scope of the study depended upon how much Ms Liston could raise.

8.2. Review of Supplementary Guidance on Affordable Housing

For information. An email had been received about the possibility of affordable housing being built without a subsidy. Planning Committee to discuss this subject if considered appropriate.

8.3. Review of Byelaws Prohibiting Consumption of Alcoholic Liquor in Designated Public Places

Another consultation, but more aimed at areas where byelaws may not exist. Details of the consultation are available at the web link in the agenda. Cllr Waterston commented on the possible extension of the alcohol free zone, but this couldn't include beaches under the present byelaw set up. He wasn't certain of the exact area of the drinking prohibition in St Andrews. He added that drinking prohibition on beaches was dealt with under separate legislation.

9. Reports from Officers

9.1. Chair

Dr Goudie reported the resignation of Derek Skelhon in the past month. He added that he'd thanked Mr Skelhon for his contribution during his time on the Community Council. His resignation leaves a vacancy on the Community Council. Dr Goudie reminded the meeting that Callum Corbin had put forward his name for a past vacancy, but had withdrawn to allow, Mr Parmar to fill that vacancy. Dr Goudie suggested that the new vacancy should be offered to Mr Corbin.

Secretary to contact Mr Corbin about the vacancy

Dr Goudie then gave an update of the CC website. The links between the CC website and that of Standen had been strengthened with the Standen logo on the front page of the CC website. There was also a new page detailing the Young Citizen of the Year Award submitted by Mrs McAnaw.

He encouraged members to put forward ideas for additional material to go on to the CC website. Mrs Denyer wondered whether photos of the Bandstand Concerts would be suitable for inclusion? Dr Goudie was happy with this idea.

9.2 Treasurer

Mr Paul gave his report. He had projected expenditure to the end of the financial year and had estimated that there might be about £800 surplus, unless other items of expenditure arose, such as the possible need for a new laptop for the secretary.

Mr Paul would like to run another Coffee Morning in January, either the 15th or 22nd January. This would be with the intention of publicising the Community Council and the imminent election in late February. Mr Marks reminded the meeting that there was a six-week window between nominations and the election so the earlier date might be more appropriate. Mr Paul asked for volunteers to run the Coffee Morning and agreed to confirm the 15th January as the date. Holly West and Meg Platt volunteered to organise the Coffee Morning.

9.3. Secretary

9.3.1. Correspondence – see Appendix A.

Mr Stephens asked about the email relating to the 20 mph zone consultation. Mr Marks explained the role of the Community Council and how Mr Smith the Fife Council officer had wanted to attend a CC meeting to present the details. Unfortunately he could not fit into the Monday meetings schedule of the Community Council, so it had been suggested that he might attend a sub committee meeting. This is still to be arranged if it takes place at all.

10. Any Other Competent Business

10.1. Community Council Lunch Date

Dr Goudie checked with Mrs Ashworth on the arrangements for this event. Mrs Ashworth confirmed that it is planned for the 7th November. She has sent out invites to members.