

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Provisional Minutes –4th November 2013

For Approval

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Ian Goudie, Kyffin Roberts, Izzy Corbin, Carol Ashworth, Judith Harding, Ken Crichton, Howard Greenwell, Alice Alexander, Patrick Marks, Penny Uprichard, Ronnie Murphy, Henry Paul, Henry Cheape, Marysia Denyer, Ken Fraser, Tom Waterton-Smith

Students' Association Representatives

Chloe Hill

Co-Opted

Lindsey Adam

Niall Scott

Fife Councillors

Dorothea Morrison, Brian Thomson, Frances Melville, Keith McCartney

Apologies

Callum Corbin, Bernadette Cassidy, Robert McLachlan

2. Minutes of 4th November Meeting

4.2.1.

3. Presentation

3.1. Roadworks in St Andrews Area – Mr R. Cox

Mr Cox had come along to explain the reason for the roadworks taking place in the area, why they were taking so long and why there were so many in the area.

He started by mentioning the work connected to the Students Union, which had been a major issue for his department as his department had been trying to keep traffic flowing instead of closing the road so had set up the one-way system. However as the Union have not completed sorting out some legal matters work there has been suspended so the one-way system is to be suspended and the road will be back to normal by early December apart from the pavement in front of the Students Union. The work in this area has had knock on effects for other planned work by other contractors, with Rod's department having to suspend some and only allow some to operate when work at the Union was suspended.

Another major piece of work is a sewer upgrade by Scottish Water at the City Road Roundabout starting soon and going on until the middle of December. This work will include Granny Clark's Wynd and back up the Links. He added that his department do the best they can to work with the utilities but due to the embargo on such major works in the summer it is very difficult to control all the road works that need to be done. They can't stop an upgrade to a service connection, but can only suggest possible suitable dates. He gave examples of a recent refusal when Scottish Gas had wanted to start on work in South Street and Mr Cox's department refused them and suggested that it would be possible in the early new year to prevent disruption of the

xmas trade in the town. He mentioned how developers had to wait their turn and the proposed work at the Argos site which had been planned for January has had to be put back because Scottish gas now have the slot for work in South Street at that end at that time. Mr Cox then mentioned that there would be disruption in Bell Street for several months as two buildings are to be demolished and new ones erected in their place. The developers he added had been told that they would have to halt work during the Lammas Fair and other town events/parades during the year. He gave details of a number of other major works, which he said his department couldn't stop but could try to fit into a schedule aimed at reducing the potential traffic disruption these works would cause. Major work around Pilmour Links in relation to flooding of residents homes due to sewage back up was an example of a necessary piece of work, which will impact that area for several weeks. He talked as well about the costs his department and Fife Council could ask developers to pay, citing the Bell Street demolition and how the developer was being asked to pay for the lost revenue as the parking spaces will be out of action for months. Mr Cox's department expect developers to come up with plans to reduce the issues of closed pavements and how pedestrian safety can be managed around any work going on.

A major resurfacing of part of South Street is due to take place as well in the new year, but the logistics of this have still to be sorted out, given the traffic disruption it will create. He concluded by saying that his presentation was just a highlight of the roadworks going on in St Andrews.

Miss Uprichard began the questions by commenting on the problems created by the Students Union development. She wondered if it wasn't possible when an application went in to have a report on possible traffic management problems. She also felt that the traffic order had been misleading as it had said that St Marys Place would be closed eastbound when in fact it was closed westbound. She wondered if it was possible to look ahead with big schemes to give the public a bit more notice of what might be happening. Her second question related to the Bell Street demolition wondering how that was going to be managed in terms of traffic management? Mr Cox acknowledged that what had happened in relation to the Students Union wasn't what had been originally planned when it had first come to his attention a couple of years ago. His department discusses the potential traffic management issues with the developers and their contractors to ensure they understand all the necessary requirements. However when work started there were additional bits of work such as an electrical connection on top of work on the gas connection which hadn't been in the original plans. The developer was fined by Fife Council in relation to the work on the sewer connection which Mr Cox said should have been managed with a road closure and not as it was when it took place. The fine was in relation to health and safety issues. Part of the problem also related to mistakes in determining the location of underground facilities, thus digging up a bit of road unnecessarily. The Union had originally wanted a full road closure for their development but Fife Council had refused and had told them how to conduct their work.

Mr Cox continued to give examples of how one scheme can have effects upon local services. He cited the location of the bus station and how works in City Road and surrounding areas, combined with some work in the bus station itself had necessitated careful planning to minimise disruption. On a temporary basis there will be a shuttle bus service from the bus station down to Petheram Bridge as the road works Mr Cox said would create a problem for the larger buses turning and for safety reasons buses would be stopping at Petheram Bridge when coming into town.

The Bell Street demolition will start now in January after delays as it should have started after the last Lammas Market. There will be a short-term traffic order in relation to parking. Mr Cox described the set up for this work which has required careful planning to ensure public safety and safety of workers as well.

Miss Uprichard while welcoming the detail of what would be happening commented that the publicity was still inadequate in her view and that putting a road traffic

order in the back pages of the local paper was not the best way to draw matters to public attention.

Mrs Adam asked if the Bell Street pavement would be closed all the way to November? Mr Cox acknowledged that it would be closed up until the Lammas Market and as the work progresses access would be reviewed. The Council would prefer to have covered access in the form of a tunnel as happened in South Street, though obviously public safety was a key issue in any decision.

Mr Crichton asked about the income being accrued from the developer in Bell Street for the use of the car parking spaces? He wondered if it shouldn't be going to something like the Common Good Fund? Mr Cox replied that as far as he understood any income would be going into Fife Council's Car Parking Management Team fund, as this team was self-supporting. Where money might go from there he didn't know. Mr Scott commented that when the work started the University Estates Department had advised him that they thought it would be possible to carry out work without completely losing any of the road access by St Marys Place, but that Fife Council had made that suggestion, but he would be happy to check out those facts.

Mr Roberts thanked Mr Cox for the presentation and commented upon its usefulness.

Mr Crichton later asked about the situation with "A" Boards in town. Mr Cox replied that there had been improvements in compliance by most shopkeepers. The Council has done a number of inspections and were using a traffic light coloured system to keep tabs on the compliance. He reported that by the last inspection there was only one shop still creating problems and he hoped that this shop would soon comply. The Council officials are working a penalty system in which boards can be removed with businesses having to pay to have them returned. He was generally pleased with the response from businesses in St Andrews.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville

4.1.1. Thanks to Rod Cox

Cllr Melville proposed thanks to Rod Cox and his team. She felt that it was difficult to imagine the difficult and complex job they were undertaking to try and keep the traffic flowing and the contractors/developers in order. She added that the works outside the Students Union had been a very difficult project.

4.1.2. Kinnessburn Fencing

Cllr Melville had visited the area with Council officials and they had realised the bad state of the fencing from that visit.

4.1.3. Westport Pergola

She acknowledged that there had been quite a lot of discussions behind the scenes in relation to this matter. She thought that it would come back to the Area Planning Committee in January.

4.1.4. Whyte – Melville Fountain

Cllr Melville reported ongoing delays in the reinstatement of the fountain to active service despite funds being available. These were variously put down to the Transportation Department and/or Scottish Water raising various issues.

4.1.5. HMO Review

The issuing of the report on HMOs has been delayed partly due to officials awaiting the outcome of the St Andrews Housing Commission and reports from the University and Council. It is however hoped to be able to bring the report to the Council by February's meeting of the Executive.

4.1.6. Commuted Sums

Cllr Melville reported that there had been a pilot report for Glenrothes in relation to this matter.

4.1.7. Argos Site Redevelopment

Miss Uprichard raised this issue and made the meeting aware that information being given out that it had been approved was incorrect. She commented that there were eight objections and thought that it should go to committee. She was concerned that answers were not being given the scale of the development proposed. She asked Fife Councillors to chase up this matter for her.

4.2. Brian Thomson

4.2.1. Buchanan Gardens - Speed survey

Cllr Thomson reported on suggestions made following the speed survey undertaken in Buchanan Gardens a few weeks ago. He'd asked councillors for suggestions about ways to reduce speed. One suggestion was extending the 30 mph speed limit westwards. The second suggestion was installing signs, which showed a driver's actual speed, and the third related to possibly having mirrors at the junction of Buchanan gardens and the High Road. At a recent ward meeting with Colin Stirling these suggestions were discussed with officials. The first suggestion was dismissed because regulations didn't allow the 30 mph to be set up as there was not housing on both sides of the road, apparently an essential criteria for speed reduction to 30 mph. If there was a cemetery extension this might be given fresh consideration.

In relation to the second suggestion the official questioned was reluctant to change signs as the current one on the road had been installed for a relatively short time.

The suggestion to have a mirror to increase visibility at junctions was not something within the remit of the Council and was a private matter for homeowners at the entrance to their homes.

4.2.2. Westport Pergola Issue

Cllr Thomson reported that if Mr Turner had been minded to go to the Public Ombudsman with his complaint the committee might have been minded to reconsider their decision. But as Mr Turner has had his complaint rejected Cllr Thomson indicated that if he informs officials of that outcome the matter might return to the area committee for further consideration. Miss Uprichard queried why Cllr Thomson had referred to the North East Fife Area Committee and the planning committee for the same area. Cllr Thomson replied that he thought that this was because the application had already been determined at the planning committee. Cllr Melville added that it was partly that the remit of the new planning committee was very constrained but this is being reviewed.

4.2.3. Newmill Bridge

Cllr Thomson reported that the repainting still hasn't been done but he'd eventually managed to get a response from the Criminal Justice officer dealing with the matter after appealing to higher authority, but it was now getting a bit late for such work to be done this year.

4.2.5. Up lighters in Market Square

The up lighters mentioned previously are still not working and he'd chased up the matter. He managed to get a reply to indicate that an order had been put in to look at the up lighters and possibly undertake remedial work on them.

4.2.6. Flooding in Bogward Road

Cllr Thomson reported that the Council couldn't just try to let water from flooding drain into the burn underneath the road as they would be obliged to treat it and there was no money in the budget to repair the collapsed manhole.

4.2.7. Speed Bumps in Tom Morris Drive

Mrs Alexander commented on the sudden appearance of speed bumps in Tom Morris Drive. She thought that residents weren't wholly delighted and had wondered why the Council couldn't have done some work on the footpaths if they had surplus tarmac!

4.3. Keith McCartney

4.3.1. Petheram Bridge

Cllr McCartney reported that the broken paving slab on raised crossing leading to The Gateway had been reported and repaired.

4.3.2. Building Repairs

I have asked that consideration be given to removing vegetation from and repointing where necessary stonework on the library, Town Hall, Madras College (South Street), the perimeter wall of the Argyle Street car park on the Double Dykes Road side and the perimeter wall on the north side of Kinburn Park.

4.3.3. Hope Park Roundabout

Cllr McCartney reported that with the support of my fellow St Andrews councillors I have asked that the possibility of extending the barriers on the edge of the pavement at Hope Park roundabout be investigated as a means of dissuading those pedestrians who routinely cross directly over the roundabout rather than use the two pedestrian crossings provided putting themselves and other road users at risk.

4.3.4. Lighting Faults

Cllr McCartney reported that he had reported a number of faulty streetlights mainly in the Bogward area for repair.

4.3.5. Pothole

Cllr McCartney reported that a pothole on the road immediately to the west of its junction with the entrance to the access road to Craigtoun Park and The Duke's Course on the south side of the carriageway reported.

4.3.6. Litterbin with Missing Top

Cllr McCartney reported that the missing plastic cover on self-standing litter bin beside lighting column 3 on Hepburn Gardens was reported and replaced.

4.3.7. Saltire

Cllr McCartney reported that the saltire on the Town Hall which had been taken down to allow the UN flag to fly on UN Day was not put back. This has been reported.

4.4. Dorothea Morrison.

4.4.1. Empty Homes – Council Tax Increase

Cllr Morrison reported on the initiative to try and get empty private houses back into circulation by doubling the Council tax they are currently paying while lying empty. She hoped that this would encourage owners not necessarily of second homes but those owned for commercial rent etc.

4.4.2. Public Toilets

Cllr Morrison reported on the reprieve of the public toilets and the installation of payment barriers at Church Square and by the East Sands. Mr Crichton asked if the

toilets could be equipped with radar keys? Cllr Morrison thought that access might be by coins.

Miss Uprichard made the meeting aware that there were public toilets within the town hall and wondered how many visitors might be aware of their existence!? She thought that it should be possible to put up discreet sign to make visitors aware of the existence of these toilets. Cllr Morrison acknowledged that that was a very good point. She commented that it wasn't only in the town square that toilets were important and talked about the Leisure Centre and thought that its toilets should be open to the public as well.

4.4.3. Kinnessburn Road – Fencing

Fencing in Kinnessburn Road beside the stream has rusted badly but will now have some repair of the wrought ironwork of the fencing but the actual fencing will be taken away.

4.4.4. Pergola - Westport Hotel

Cllr Morrison reported about the ongoing saga of this controversial development. There had been talk about a discontinuance order but the area committee had turned it down and it was suggested that the owner of the neighbouring property should go to the ombudsman to try and seek some redress. Miss Uprichard then reported that the neighbour had gone to the ombudsman but had been told that it was not within the ombudsman's remit.

4.4.5. Housing for the disabled

Mrs Corbin asked Cllr Morrison about Fife Council's policy of providing housing for disabled people. Cllr Morrison replied that this was something which Fife Council took very seriously because it was the policy of the Council to have people living in their own homes as long as possible. She added that there were houses adapted or custom built to support a person with disabilities. She also cited examples of people with learning disabilities who had 24-hour support to live in their own homes. It was Fife Council policy to have people living independently as long as is possible. In response to a comment from Mrs Denyer she confirmed that there were houses within Fife Council stock adapted to meet special needs. Mrs Corbin stated that she knew a couple of people with Downs Syndrome who had been told by Fife Council that they would never get sheltered housing. Cllr Morrison thought that part of the problem might be the fact that someone with Downs Syndrome might require a two bed roomed property if they had to have 24 hour support. She also confirmed that Social Work took the care needs of anyone with disabilities very seriously and spent a lot of time looking for possible appropriate accommodation.

4.4.6. Grey Bin Replacement - Bakers Lane

Mrs Alexander reported on a resident of Bakers Lane who has been trying to get a replacement grey bin for several months from Fife Council, as her current one has a broken lid.

4.4.7. Market Street - Missing Sign

Mrs Alexander also informed the meeting that the sign was missing at the narrow end of Market Street.

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Planning Report

Mr Greenwell reported that the North East Planning Committee had approved the redevelopment of the old Memorial Hospital site for student accommodation for 241 students. He reminded the meeting that there had been a previous proposal to have 40 affordable flats, and he felt that the Council's decision to approve the student accommodation was another nail in the coffin of affordable housing in St Andrews.

An objection was raised in relation to the screening opinions on 25 wind turbines being tentatively proposed by Fife Council to be sited on its own land / properties and in particular the one in Craigtoun Park.

An objection was lodged in relation to two properties being proposed at the back of the former Argos property in South Street.

The Westport Hotel pergola situation had been discussed. The committee had written to Mr Winter pointing out the failings in the planning process and might lodge a formal complaint to Fife Council and Audit Scotland depending upon Mr Winter's response. He reminded the meeting that the CC had been given statutory consultee status four days before the Council made a decision under delegated powers. The committee didn't feel that this decision was correct.

A letter of objection was submitted in respect of the Madras application.

He reported that the Wonderyears application for student accommodation had come back and the committee had asked for an extension to the 19th November to give time to study it and frame an objection.

The committee will also be considering the fresh application for the conversion and /or demolition of the former police station into flats. The committee had objected to the previous application and would be considering the fresh application at its next meeting.

Mr Roberts commented for the record that the Planning Committee made no comment on more planning applications than objections. Mr Cheape asked whether registering "no comment" meant that the committee supported the other applications? Mr Roberts said that that wasn't necessarily the case although on the Fifiedirect website there is an option to support, as well as being neutral or objecting. Mr Cheape asked that as a statutory consultee did the CC have the same options? Mr Greenwell explained that the committee often registered as a statutory consultee as that was the only way there could be certainty of being able to make a comment. The majority of applications get decided under delegated powers, so by registering the committee had a chance to raise the profile of an application, which Fife Councillors might not have a chance to discuss at the Area Planning meeting. Such applications would have to then be discussed at the Area Planning Committee.

Cllr Melville mentioned that she'd raised the issue of delegated powers with Mr Birrell and she'd been told there was a scheme which would allow some applications being looked at by the Heads of Service and not dealt with in a delegated way by a planning official. Cllr Melville had suggested that senior staff should sometimes have a look at controversial applications such as the Westport, which had been dealt with under delegated powers.

Miss Uprichard informed the meeting that the percentage of planning applications dealt with under delegated powers was 89%.

Mr Cheape then asked whether there were delegated powers from the main CC to the planning committee to allow it to make decisions to support, object or make no comment? Mr Roberts explained that there were difficulties in bringing applications back to the full CC as most had to be responded to within 21 days, and as the full CC only met monthly it wasn't often possible to bring back anything but the more complex and controversial planning matters where there might be more time as they weren't being dealt with under delegated powers. Mr Roberts also noted that Fife Council often imposed a 14 day response time and he added that this meant that the planning committee would often have to make responses quite rapidly, but the decisions were recorded in their minutes.

Mr Greenwell added that the Planning Committee did operate under delegated authority to review the planning applications and object or support as appropriate. However with more controversial and major applications these would be brought back to the full CC, but the Planning Committee used its own judgement about what might need to be brought back to full CC.

Mr Greenwell informed that meeting that he'd forgotten to mention earlier that there would be a review of the Fife Development Plan between Dec 2013 and February 2014. There is no new information that has come into this review, a part of the Main Issues Report and the fact that the Planning Department will now have made decisions on those areas being put forward for development and will be seeking to gauge whether Fife Council will support those areas proposed. He added that there were 3 or 4 areas put forward as possible development sites that reside within the Greenbelt of St Andrews. The CC Planning Committee would be studying this report.

Miss Uprichard reported that following an FOI request Fife Council had sent the CC a paper copy of the Local Plan and a copy is to be put in the library.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. Botanic Gardens

Cllr Melville reported that Cllr Rowley is seeking another meeting with the Principal of the University to try and get the lease extended. Mr Scott commented that the current lease had been extended until March 2014. Cllr Melville commented that a major problem for the Botanics remained the fact that without a longer lease they couldn't apply for funding to try and progress plans.

6.2. Housing Commission

Mr Roberts reported that the final report from the Housing Commission was still not out and he wasn't certain why. It was however hoped to have the report out in November. Dr Goudie thought that matters seemed to be moving in relation to the final production of the report and Miss Hill had been led to understand the report had been finished. Mr Roberts had hopes that the report would be out very soon.

6.3. Reports from Reps

None

6.4. Community Council Newsletter

Mr Roberts reported that Dr Goudie had worked on an amended version of the newsletter following last month's discussion, which would hopefully have the support of more members. He noted that concerns had been raised about the costings and logistics of distribution as well as the timing. There had also been a lot of communication by email on the subject of the newsletter content. The latest version had been emailed to members today. Mr Roberts proposed that if the current version was acceptable it would be published on the Community Council website. He asked for members' views on that idea. Mr Cheape thought that publication on the web was both cheaper and a more robust way of getting the news out.

Mrs Corbin informed Mr Cheape that the newsletter had been an annual event and cost in her view had never been an issue. Mr Murphy queried the past frequency of newsletters, but Mr Roberts confirmed that it had been about annually.

Dr Goudie commented that the draft newsletter before the meeting was not just his work but also a combined effort with input from other councillors. He explained the nature of the input and those involved such as Mr McLachlan and Mr Marks. Dr Goudie formally proposed that the document as circulated be published on the Community Council website. Mrs Harding seconded Dr Goudie's proposal. Mr Roberts asked for a vote about publishing the document on the web site. The vote was 9 for, 5 against and 2 abstentions. The vote was thus carried and the document would be published on the website.

Dr Goudie noted that the web correspondence he'd had appeared to indicate a much smaller majority in favour of printing 5000 copies, partly because of cost concerns. He regretted the extent to which the topic had been divisive. He recognised that those opposed to the newsletter would not be happy to see money raised by the CCs hard efforts at the likes of coffee mornings used for this controversial item. He didn't want this to affect the CC in other ways such as support for future Coffee mornings. He suggested that if the meeting were willing to do so, he'd be willing to execute any hard copy version of the newsletter on the basis that he could get help towards production costs and distribution from other sources in the town. He was also prepared to look at just producing small batches for distribution to more targeted areas of the town, if that was acceptable to the meeting.

Mr Scott commented that the CC expected high standards from the organisations it criticised but he was concerned that in the decision recently taken there was no record of who voted what way. He felt that the public were entitled to know who the CC was and how councillors voted.

Mr Paul adding to Mr Scott's comments said that he found it incredible that the CC website wasn't mentioned on the newsletter and the newsletter tells people to have their say but doesn't tell people about how to contact their CC. Mr Paul's second point was concern about the possibility of the newsletter being funded by an outside organisation and the potential implications of that in the public view. He thought that if there was a vote to publish the newsletter then the funding should come out of CC funds. He didn't like the idea of other groups sponsoring the CC newsletter. The CC had sufficient funds to pay for the newsletter.

Miss Uprichard expressed her concern about the publication of the newsletter on the web unless there were paper copies available for those less competent on the computer. She hoped that some copies would be printed on paper.

Dr Goudie replying to earlier comments suggested that if a copy of the newsletter was to go on the web, then a letter could be submitted to the local press to make the public aware of its existence.. He suggested that in the spirit of transparency he hoped that those CCs who had voted to send the original letter detailing the CCs objection to the Pipeland proposal would add their names to a letter in the Citizen about the CC newsletter.

Miss Hill thought that it would be inappropriate to fund the CC newsletter privately and that either the CC vote to fund it or not.

Mr Waterton-Smith was supportive of printing a paper copy. He felt that it was undemocratic not to give it to people in an accessible format, especially as a percentage of the population won't have web access. He didn't think that cost was the issue and he recognised that the CC had sufficient funds.

Dr Goudie put to the meeting that 5000 copies of the newsletter should be printed. Mr Roberts expressed his disappointment at Dr Goudie's suggestion as he'd hoped that the suggestion of putting the newsletter on the web would illustrate a more conciliatory approach by the CC. He added that there had to be serious consideration about what should be expected from the newsletter? He reminded the meeting that the dates for comments had passed on the Fife Council website where the planning application was displayed. There would be no obligation now for Fife Council to accept any comments received after the closing date, even though the website would be open until 5th January. He didn't think that the newsletter would raise a lot of extra comments as he thought that most people had a view on the application and site.

Cllr Morrison asked if she could make a general planning comment. She understood that with any application there was a deadline for making a comment and the planner in his/her report would include any comments received within the deadline. Comments received after the deadline would not be taken head off in the planner's report. Cllr Thomson agreed with Cllr Morrison's comments that late comments

sometimes received up to the day before the meeting deciding upon an application might not be taken into consideration in the planner's report.

Dr Goudie explained that the newsletter was being issued as a way to explain to the public why the CC had voted as it did at its last meeting. The hard copies would put that information in the hands of householders. He gave some examples of the information in the newsletter about which the public might be unaware and which might impact upon a development at Pipeland and further afield. He thought that anyone reading the newsletter could then decide if they wanted to ignore the comments or take on board the information contained in the newsletter. Mr Roberts reminded the meeting that getting the newsletter out was for information purposes only but pointed out that there was a lot of disquiet around the table last month because of the hard copy issue and that there would be less opposition if the newsletter were only issued on the web. He emphasised that that was his personal opinion only. Miss Uprichard commented that given the huge amount of paper work already generated in relation to the application she doubted that any of those who wrote into the website had looked at many of the documents and were underestimating the difficulties of building at Pipeland. She supported the need for some paper copies to help them to decide to respond or not to the application.

Mr Greenwell asked Dr Goudie and Miss Uprichard how many hard copies they felt would be necessary? He asked how they would circulate the paper copies. He felt that knowing a bit more about that might make it easier to make a decision. Dr Goudie reminded the meeting that he had organised many leaflet/newsletter drops in the past and would accept help for distribution from anyone keen to assist.

Mrs Denyer asked which parts of the town would the newsletter benefit? She remembered from distributing previous newsletters that there were many empty properties or properties let out to students. Others she thought might have little interest in the issue included very elderly residents or foreign workers renting properties. She didn't mind helping but wondered which part of the town would benefit the most?

Mr Paul clarified that he would object to the funding of the newsletter by other organisations, such as the Preservation Trust. He reinforced the need for the newsletter to go out as a Community Council one funded by the Community Council.

Mr Roberts then asked for the meeting to go to a vote on the proposal to allow the printing of the newsletter. He explained his position as Chair in relation to having the casting vote in the event of a tie.

Dr Goudie proposed the printing of 5000 copies of the newsletter at no cost to the Council but not funded from outwith the Community Council. He felt that it would be more palatable for members of the CC some of whom were against funding the newsletter to vote for a newsletter costing nothing to the CC. Mrs Alexander felt that it would still be a problem and that one couldn't say that the newsletter was from the CC if it was privately funded. Mr Roberts felt that Mrs Alexander had a valid point and that if the newsletter went out it should be paid out of Community Council funds.

Mr Roberts then outlined the motion about the newsletter saying that "the printing and the distribution of hard copies should be paid by the Community Council" – proposed by Dr Goudie and seconded by Miss Uprichard. The vote was 6 for, 3 against and 6 abstaining.

6.5. St Andrews Community Trust

Mr Paul reported that the last award period saw £22350 given away to 12 good causes bringing the award numbers up to 66 in the past three years with £172800 being awarded. Next year the Trust is expecting about £170000 to give away. He felt

particularly satisfied in being able to help the small organisations struggling for relatively small grants of hundreds of pounds. Due to Fife Council support cuts he expected some organisations to come back to the Trust for funding assistance in future years.

7. Committee Reports

7.1. Recreation Committee

Mrs Denyer had circulated the Recreation Committee report prior to the meeting with all the important dates highlighted – also printed below.

7.1.1. Recreation Committee Report

As 2013 draws to a close, a meeting has been arranged for **Wednesday 20th November, 7-9pm** at the Cosmos Centre. Under discussion will be the final arrangements for our forthcoming **Civic Reception**. This is being held on **Friday 29th November** in the **Hunter Aisle of Holy Trinity Church**, following on from the **Beating of the Retreat**. The Guest List will be circulated, along with this report, to all councillors and Elected Members for reference and perusal. At present this list is in the hands of the Provost's Secretary - Eileen Reid, for distribution.

This will be followed by discussion on the arrangements for the final event for our calendar year, which is the **Senior Citizens Christmas Treat**. This will take place in the main function room of the Town Hall on **Friday 13th December**. It will run from **2.00pm** until **4.30pm**. We really need lots of “hands on” help that day. Along with fellow councillors and elected members, we depend on our student members, their friends, St Leonards and Madras pupils, to do us the honours. We need volunteers to help set up the hall in the morning, help with the catering, serve the refreshments and circulate with our elderly guests. It is also imperative that we have as many helpers as possible to stay behind, to assist with the all important clearing and washing up. After a very long day, this will allow our catering team and the hall keepers to finish their duties at a reasonable time.

At this point I would like to make a special request to all our councillors and elected members. Could you please bring one or two grocery items for our CC Christmas hamper? This is an additional raffle prize for our Senior Citizens. Bring your goodies along to the Burgh Chambers on Monday evening or failing that, to our next meeting on Monday 2nd December.

St Andrews In Bloom: - nothing to report

No 1 Greyfriars Garden:

As I have not received any update, there is nothing that I can report with this issue. However our elected members may be in a position to let us know how / if things are progressing.

7.3.2. Other Reports

Mr Paul reported that the Beating of the Retreat had been booked and he was looking for volunteer marshals for the night to assist the police.

On the 30th November the night of the Civic reception there will be the switching on of the xmas lights by the Provost assisted by Santa and St Andrew followed by a parade around town to the Quad where there will be a ceilidh in conjunction with the University.

Mrs Denyer asked for volunteers for the Old Folks Xmas Party and for donations for the hampers being given. She will accept donations until the 2nd December.

Mrs Ashworth reported that the university was giving the St Andrews Partnership £2500 towards the St Andrews Festival.

7.2. General Purposes Committee

No recent meeting- Mr Roberts to try and find a date for a meeting in the coming month.

7.3. 200 Club

1st Mr H Paul 2nd Mr Syme 3rd Mrs Freeborn

7.4. Health, Education & Welfare

7.4.1. Report on defibrillators

Mrs Corbin reported that communities along the East Neuk have had to pay £1000 for each defibrillator. She was concerned that this might have to be the same in St Andrews and was going to check with Dr Tait. Mr Roberts commented that in his understanding the defibrillators would not cost the CC anything and there was no cost for the one at Craigtoun. He thought that Dr Tait had indicated that there would be no cost to the CC for these devices.

7.5. Rail Sub – Committee

Comments below are in relation to a NEFAC Briefing note attached to Jane Ann's email:

1. It is most regrettable that an assumption is being made from Transport Scotland's attitude to Newburgh as to what they might think about St Andrews. There appear to be significant differences between the proposals for a start; while Newburgh would be a very valuable commuting station, I don't think anybody has claimed that Newburgh is a key economic driver for Fife/Scotland (neither is there (yet) a University of Newburgh nor is Newburgh the Home of Golf!). I'm certain that the contacts Jim McLeish has suggested would confirm the importance of St Andrews in that respect.

2. In any case, the TS response to the Local Plan is 4 years old and predates the Tata study. The responses since then from Bertrand Deiss and Gareth Wilks surely supersede that. It is unfortunate that Fife Council did not ask TS, or even quoted the replies I have obtained.

3. As to the cost of a STAG, I would guess that is a full exercise, as the report is making assumptions from previous cases (presumably the likes of Leven) but as Scotrail have pointed out, we don't need a gold-plated exercise because much of the technical stuff has already been covered in the Tata report.

It's very unfortunate if a Planning person is vetoing a Transport matter, With respect to Robin Presswood (I'd like to have a word with him), he is not a transport expert, he's a planner, whereas for Dr Bob and his team it's their area of expertise.

There is also the matter of the recent letters of support from the St Andrews Partnership to Transportation, Planning and TayPlan, which should surely have been referred to in the briefing.

8. New Business

8.1. St Andrews Green Film Festival

For information – see agenda. Mr marks outlined the event to the meeting - 22-24 November

8.2. Invitation to speak at St Andrews Student Accommodation Association

An email appended to the agenda on this request to talk about the issue of student accommodation in St Andrews. Miss Uprichard volunteered to speak to the event. The event is 14th November @ School 2.

Dr Goudie reminded the meeting that the speaker should be espousing the CC view but he didn't agree with the CC view that there was too much accommodation being planned for the town. He thought that more student accommodation would be advantageous to the town freeing up accommodation for families. Mr Roberts thought that objections were more related to particular sites and not the concept of the need for more student accommodation.

9. Reports from Office Bearers

9.1. Chair

No new items, apart from business he'd already brought up earlier. He reminded the meeting about Remembrance Sunday coming up and the CC involvement in that event.

9.2. Treasurer

9.2.1. Treasurers Report

See report sent out by email.

9.3 Secretary

9.3.1. Correspondence – see Appendix A.

Mr Marks reminded the meeting that he will be absent at the next CC meeting in December and will leave the laptop for the Chair to take a recording of the meeting for him to transcribe upon his return from holiday.

10. Any Other Competent Business

None.